A SUMMARY OF

CATHOLIC HISTORY

By Newman C. Eberhardt, C.M.

*

VOLUME II

MODERN HISTORY

Contents

Section III: Rationalist Humanism (1638–1789)

PART II:

THE CHURCH IN AN AGNOSTIC WORLD

Section I: Liberal Agnosticism (1789–1870)

Section II: Materialist Agnosticism (1870–   )

Part I

THE CHURCH

IN THE HUMANIST WORLD

*

Section I

SECULAR HUMANISM

1453-1776

I

The Renaissance

1. THE SECULAR RENAISSANCE

A. *Advent of the Renaissance*

(1) Predispositions

Secularism. Besides the political revolt against the clerical theocracy, revealed at Anagni and during the Great Schism, an intellectual alienation of affections had long been in formation. This had developed slowly, for it required time for the ideas of the university intelligentsia to win general favor. But from the fourteenth century onward, a secularist viewpoint had become increasingly prominent within theocratic Christendom, and a new atmosphere of thought was already vaguely termed *vita moderna.* Not only were temporal governments less responsive to supernatural and international ideals, but the papal curia was affected by its preoccupation, legitimate though it may have been, with politics and finance. Supernatural values, if still accorded paramount importance as ideals, were increasingly set aside in practice. The canon lawyer no longer had a monopoly of legal and administrative science; he was opposed by the civil legist who sought his standards in pagan Roman antiquity. The clergy had ceased to be the only educated class, for the universities were now turning out graduates versed in philosophy, civil law, medicine, and the arts. As has been noted in reference to the Councils of Constance and Basle, the spiritual authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy was in danger of being obscured by a swarm of academic "experts," whose opinions were often heard against the voice of tradition. In scholastic speculations, moreover, the Nominalist deductions, or rather distortions, of Scotus's philosophy were placing faith and reason

[4

into a new opposition. And as the supernatural was thus divorced more and more from pure reason, the intellectual field was left open for a Naturalism disguised as Humanism. Humanism, indeed, can be taken in a legitimate and favorable sense, but here stress is being laid upon some of its actual theological implications; in this sense Humanism was to mean in the long run a reorientation of all human science, with man instead of God as the objective: learning would become anthropocentric rather than, as in the Age of Faith, theocentric.

Nationalism. In the political sphere, nationalism was gaining in importance, though its appeal was still more dynastic than popular. But in the world of literature it is perhaps licit to speak of an inchoate popular nationalism. Symptomatic was the rapid progress of the vernacular languages. These had long since been the customary mode of communication among the common people; now the vernacular began to challenge the position of Latin as the vehicle of learned letters. In Italy, this tendency appears in Dante, who may have been influenced by Provençal troubadours exiled by the Albigensian Crusade. It is true that Dante and his immediate successors often seem half-ashamed of their works in the common idiom, but the trend was to prove irresistible, if slow. It may be significant also that this vogue arose during the absence of the papacy at Avignon. In England, Langland, Chaucer, and Wycliffe made English respectable in literary circles. The first two were Catholics, though critical ones, but the last manifested a tendency to make the vernacular an instrument of national revolt against the Roman Church. France possessed Philippe de Commines and François Villon, the one the biographer of national monarchy, and the other the bard of the populace. John Hus's use of the Czech tongue in establishing his theological movement has already been noted. Per se, of course, there was no reason why the vernacular should have been antitheocratic, yet undoubtedly it did come often to serve nationalistic and anticlerical aims. Equally influential was a reaction to ancient "classical" Latin, as contrasted to "barbarous" scholastic Latin. Medieval Latin, however, had proved functional and colloquial; the resuscitation of antiquated classic forms by renaissance pedants caused the mummy to disintegrate on exposure to the air, and Latin presently became a dead language for all but a few scholars.

(2) Christian Aspects of the Renaissance

Dante Alighieri (1265–1321) is, properly speaking, a Janus-figure between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. If the Italian poet of the *Divine Comedy* suggested a change in literary form, he in no way represented a departure from the norms of Christian culture: the content of his masterpiece remained scholastic, though couched in language more

elegant than that of the average schoolman. It is, however, more akin to the emotional aspect of Humanism than to the Rationalism of Scholasticism.

Francesco Petrarca (1304–74), on the other hand, despite some sighs for the past, much more definitely stood on the side of the new. He will be treated presently as well in the evolutionary stream of the pagan Renaissance as marking a deviation from medieval tradition. Yet even he posed as an ideal a Renaissance founded upon Christianity: "Let us study philosophy so as to love wisdom. The real wisdom of God is Christ. In order to attain true philosophy, we must love and reverence Him above all things. We must first be Christians—then we may be what we will."

Christian Humanism remained the standard of Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439), a Camaldolese, who introduced the new science of the age to the old through his unofficial school for Florentine clerics that discussed Greek and Latin literature. Gianozzo Manetti (1396–1459), Traversari's pupil, was, though a layman, of dedicated learning and piety. He placed his knowledge of Oriental languages at the service of Scripture scholars. Lionardo Bruni (1369–1444), a lay student of the papal and Venetian courts, was equally devoted to classical and monastic lore.

Christian education was planned on the Renaissance model at Mantua by Vittorino da Feltre (1397–1446). This exemplary Catholic layman was commissioned by the Marquis of Mantua to open a school for children of the nobility. Da Feltre did so in 1425 but soon added accommodations for poor scholars instructed "for the love of God." He held that fixed hours for study ought to be varied by periods for physical education; hence he promoted excursions for nature study and recreation. He strove to punish more by disgrace than by the rod. Yet he maintained the strictest moral discipline since he held that development of character was even more important than that of the intellect. While he did not believe in humoring every adolescent whim, he did strive to adapt his teaching and curriculum to personal differences. "I want to teach them to think," he declared, "not to split hairs." The groundwork of his courses were the classics, mathematics, logic, and metaphysics. Although himself a lay professor for secular students, he attended Mass daily, said prayers before and after meals, and frequented the sacraments. Such was his charity that he died penniless, but so long as he lived his academy was known as the *Casa Jocosa:* "Happy House."

Christian art did not leave the field entirely to the sensualists. Giotto (d. 1337) inaugurated a renaissance of Christian architecture by his decoration of Italian churches. In conception and inspiration, his painting was medieval, but his style marked a transition toward modern

techniques, for he "knocked a hole in the wall" by pioneering three-dimensional murals. Fra Angelico (1387–1455) carried forward the new art in religious subjects with a vivid and simple technique. Other Italian artists were Ghiberti (1378–1455), Masaccio (1402–28), Lippi (1406–69), and Donatello (1386–1466), though they did not rise to the devotional standards of Giotto and Fra Angelico. German leaders were Van Eyck, Pature (1406–64), Holbein the Elder (1465–1524), and the truly great Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528). French artists of note were Jean Foucquet (1415–80) and Michel Colombe (d. 1512).

Utility as well as elegance was an aim of building during the Christian Renaissance. Martin Luther himself attested this from observations made during his trip to Rome: "In Italy the hospitals are handsomely built and admirably provided with excellent food and drink, careful attendants and learned physicians. The beds and bedding are clean, and the walls are covered with paintings. When a patient is brought in, his clothes are removed in the presence of a notary who makes a faithful inventory of them, and they are kept safely. A white smock is put on him and he is laid on a comfortable bed with clean linen. Presently two doctors come to him and the servants bring him food and drink in clean glasses. . . ." [1]

(3) EVOLUTION OF THE PAGAN RENAISSANCE

Francesco Petrarca, already cited as voicing a lofty ideal of a Christian Renaissance, unfortunately belied his Christian principles in his own life by a very pagan avidity for pleasure, honor, and preferment: on Easter Sunday, 1341, he accepted the laurel of Rome's poet in the Capitol, and saluted Rienzi as restorer of ancient Rome. It is true that in many of his writings he served the Church. He defended faith and morality and kept obscenity from his works. It has been noted that he was not blind to the dangers of the pagan classics: "We must first be Christians, then we may be what we will." Yet this apparently sound principle may contain a fallacious interpretation that anything whatsoever might be reconciled with Christianity. Evidently he believed that a smug contempt for Scholasticism could be so reconciled: "We bid fair to be no longer philosophers, lovers of the truth, but Aristotelians, or rather Pythagoreans, reviving the absurd custom which permits us to ask no question except whether he said it. . . . I am confident that he [Aristotle] was in error all his life; not only as regards small matters, where a mistake counts for little, but in the most weighty questions. . . ." Petrarca's career hints at a danger in the eager pursuit of novelty: that pagan maxims, if rejected in theory, might be accepted in practice.

[1] Cited by Ludwig Pastor in *History of the Popes* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1902), V, 65.

Paganism, however, was sufficiently alien to Petrarca's real character to permit him a happy Christian death.

Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–75) marked a literary, if not a personal, clash with Christian tradition. He remained loyal to the Catholic faith, indeed, but he did not scruple to enshrine immorality in his writings, especially his *Decameron,* which represented clerics and religious as the "quintessence of all immorality and hypocrisy." Yet for Boccaccio, "the spring was not yet broken"; he might relish and relate immoral tales, but he did not defend immorality as good. In later life he returned to stricter norms of life, repented of his writings which he desired burned, and died piously. It required some time, then, before the corrosive influence of sensuality could become so strong that its devotees dared face eternity by its maxims.

Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459) was a great discoverer of classical manuscripts which he published and imitated. He became a pedantic defender of the classics. Insult and calumny poured easily from his pen, and he could serve equally the Holy See and the Synod of Basle. On the other hand, another partisan of Basle and author of immoral writings, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (1405–64), became the penitent Pius II. Grace can always work miracles, but as a rule the pagan humanists did not manifest such thorough conversions.

Lorenzo Valla (1407–57) seems to denote a deeper descent for he ridiculed morality and advertised Epicureanism in his *Book of Pleasure.* His proof of the forgery of the "Donation of Constantine" started a vogue of true and false "revelations" which conveyed the impression that the papal theocracy had been but an imposture. Yet even Valla conformed to convention externally. He secured a post in the papal curia, and confined his malice to "off-the-record" remarks.

Antonio Beccadelli (d. 1471), Valla's disciple, revealed the depths of the moral abyss yawning for the pagan Renaissance. His *Gospel of Pleasure* was nothing short of a philosophic defense of impurity and blasphemy based on the immoral norms of the Olympian gods. His vile *Hermaphraditus,* a collection of obscene epigrams, finally evoked the censure of Pope Eugene IV—a comparatively rare event, for the Renaissance papacy usually stretched the limits of toleration to the utmost.

B. Aspects of the Renaissance

(1) INTELLECTUAL

Discredit of Scholasticism. Scholasticism was admittedly in a condition of decline, though this generalization applies chiefly to the dominant or most highly advertised Nominalism, rather than to loyal Thomists such as Joannes Capreolus (1380–1444), who produced noteworthy

work. Scholastic debaters had to a degree lost touch with reality; some even refused to admit the existence of attacks upon their principles. Many forgot essentials for dialectic subtleties. Nonetheless, many sound truths were imbedded in the hard shell of even a decadent Scholasticism, and these formed an outer bulwark of the Faith. It is tragic that Humanists in making their sweeping assaults upon scholastic foibles failed to confine themselves to abuses, but called into question truths intimately connected with Catholic doctrine. To be sure, the early Humanists professed to be merely purifying Faith from scholastic barnacles and to be getting back to the "pure Gospel." But materially at least some were entertaining actual heresies which, when exposed as such, they would be loath to abandon. Nicholas of Autrecourt dismissed Aristotle with the assertion that he had not reached more than two certain conclusions, and Nicholas of Cusa proclaimed all of philosophy but a *docta ignorantia*. Such verdicts necessarily attained the scholastic theology so closely linked with its philosophy. Gerard de Groote believed that a youth would be certain to lose his faith if he studied theology at the University of Paris, and Groote's disciple, Thomas à Kempis, often echoed these sentiments of the pious founder of the Brethren of the Common Life. Some of these men might have had the best of intentions, but the humanist war against scholastic abuses often provoked a pietist reaction which called human reason into question, and intimated that blind faith ought to suffice. Unwittingly they prepared the way for Luther's "fiducial faith" and his rejection of reason as a "thing of the devil."

Vogue of Humanism. Humanist Rationalism, however, was a dangerous substitute for even the worst Scholasticism. Blind faith, some Humanists seemed to believe, absolved a scholar from all limitations upon freedom of thought: they declared themselves Christians; after that they might speculate as they willed. Some assumed license to criticize anything in the Church that failed to correspond to their internal faith, and many presumed that what did not explicitly agree with the Bible could not pertain to Catholic faith. For such, scholastic theology was but human opinion, so that some might suggest that papal and conciliar decrees ultimately rested on nothing more than scholastic theses. The conciliar theory, the revelation of the falsity of the Donation of Constantine and of the Isidorian Decretals, and the practical repudiation of papal temporal presidency, all these trends hinted at a papacy of merely human institution, a government susceptible to unrestrained criticism and to drastic correction like any other. Anticlericalism, moreover, was a deceptive bridge to antiecclesiasticism: men could castigate clerics without drawing the line at their conduct. Finally, so very much could be insinuated through tentative, academic, "as if" propositions:

e.g., the Eucharist would be more reasonable if it were mere bread—though that is contrary to tradition; sound reasons could be advanced for divorce—were this not forbidden by the Gospel. But wait, some might interpose, perhaps it is not banned; perchance the "original text" would contradict the "barbarous" and corrupt Vulgate. Erasmus was a notorious exponent of this tendency to lampoon. He flayed the theologians for "fine distinctions, newfangled phrases, ethereal terminology." He assured them that the apostles would never have recognized their gibberish, would never have branded propositions with their trifling censures. Monks and religious, clerics and prelates found that though the legitimacy of their state was not formally impugned, Erasmus actually seemed to devote himself almost exclusively to ridiculing and relating the weaknesses of their members. Even Thomas More toyed with this criticism of the clerical order in his *Utopia.* But St. Thomas knew the difference between right use and abuse, between a joke and serious reality; many Humanists did not.

(2) POLITICAL FEATURES

Nicola Machiavelli (1469–1527), long secretary to the Republic of Florence, and admirer of Cesare Borgia, sang sweet music to the ears of nationalistic monarchs in his *Il Principe.* Machiavelli had his share of "as if": he is perhaps not so much immoral as amoral. Pragmatic and scientific, he worshipped force and success as displayed in the ancient Roman Empire. For him, morality and religion ought to have no bearing on politics: they may be sacred, but they are private matters. Brutality, dissimulation, etc., were to be condoned as means to preserve the state, which was to be exalted at all costs. Political motives might be pursued with a certain cynicism, for man was bad, a brute needing curbs. The prince should make the best of this by securing material prosperity. Forms of government were to be judged by their efficiency: either a prince or a commonwealth might be best in different periods. Population ought to be increased, allies gained, property judiciously confiscated, war and diplomacy cultivated—all for the aggrandizement of the state. A sage use of force might be employed, but harsh measures might be blamed on deputies, while favors could be distributed personally. Enlightened despotism, then, should divide and conquer, masking itself when expedient under the cloak of religion, though in the last emergency "reason of state" might justify any expedient.

National monarchs and petty tyrants might all repudiate any blatant Machiavellianism, yet many put its teachings to what use they dared. For the prince, though he had emerged victorious over the feudality and had enlisted the *bourgeoisie* as allies, could not yet be said to have subjugated the clergy. A courageous bishop could yet unmask him, and

failing such a prelate, there was always the pope. There was no room
for theocracy in the new state system, and long before Luther, princes
must have been speculating on a realm over which the popes could
exercise a minimum of control, if, indeed, any at all. A military revolu-
tion was providing kings with the tools of absolutism. Feudal armies
were becoming obsolete and mercenaries taking their place. Gunpowder
and artillery now penetrated knightly armor and castles—the papacy
would learn this lesson in 1527 when Rome itself was sacked.

(3) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

If the intellectual Renaissance can be designated in its pagan excesses
a rebirth of sensuality, the economic Renaissance was simply a revival
of greed. Canonical bans on usury became dead letters as capitalists
came into their own. If some moral theologians were slow in adapting
themselves to the new situation, it cannot be said that conscientious
merchants were left without moral guidance. Thus St. Antonine of
Florence (d. 1459) pointed out the scope of legitimate interest in "lawful
trade"; urged upon public authority a concern for social justice, e.g.,
in providing an adequate store of supplies, in supporting physicians, if
need be, for the care of the poor; and suggested that "drug stores"
might remain open in rotation on Sundays to meet essential needs. But
profit, not need, was becoming a prevailing canon of distribution.

2. THE ECCLESIASTICAL RENAISSANCE

A. *The Renaissance Clergy*

(1) THE PAPACY

Benevolence toward Humanism. Even before the election of Pope
Nicholas V in 1447, the papacy had fostered the Renaissance, though
the resources of the pontiffs of the period of the schisms were meager.
Eugene IV had little desire or opportunity to promote Humanism, but
with Nicholas V and his successors it came into its own. Most of these
popes subsidized Humanists, even some of their least worthy represent-
atives. This tolerance and favor are to be explained by reasons of
expediency, sometimes a little too human. The humanistic style of
writing had become so important politically that every court required
classical scholars as secretaries, librarians, and diplomats. The Humanists
were the leaders of public opinion and had to be conciliated if the
Church were to maintain its hold upon the intelligentsia. Their skill in
invective, moreover, was such that they were quite capable of lampoon-
ing their adversaries to opprobrium or oblivion. Most popes considered
it better to conciliate them—though this often saved them merely from
public, not from private vituperation from men whom they subsidized.
Finally, the popes were temporal princes surrounded by foes who used

Humanists as propaganda agents; politically minded pontiffs were inclined to retaliate with the same weapons.

Patronage of culture. The civilizing role of the Church had been one of its secondary functions from ancient times. Just as she had preserved those very manuscripts which the Humanists were now resurrecting, so it was fitting that she should lead in the new movement to utilize them. The task of inspiring and guiding renaissance culture fell chiefly to the papacy in view of its newly centralized organization and greater resources. Nor did the Holy See neglect this opportunity. The restoration of Rome and its edifices under papal auspices employed what was best in renaissance art and architecture. This attitude of the popes in trying to sponsor the Renaissance and turn it to good was in no way at fault in itself. It was the neglect of proper discrimination that brought papal leadership into disrepute and gave rise to scandal. Even this carelessness is explicable, if not excusable. The papacy in its human aspect was nothing else than what its possessors made it. During the period the popes were beset by so many cares of a temporal nature that they sometimes lost sight of the less tangible spiritual perils which threatened Christendom. Some of the popes had themselves been Humanists, and not always exemplary ones, so that complete objectivity was not always to be expected.

The College of Cardinals, from which these popes were selected, had not greatly improved since Avignon days. Though its composition in pursuance of a recommendation of the Council of Constance was now somewhat more cosmopolitan, its membership remained select. The cardinalate too often became the reward of younger sons of sovereign families, just as bishoprics were often given to younger sons of noble houses. Such cardinals carried their nationalistic prejudices and dynastic rivalries into conclaves, exacted capitulation oaths of prospective nominees, and constituted an inert, reactionary phalanx against any thorough reform of the Church "in head and members." To combat cardinalatial intrigue, popes often had recourse to nepotism.

(2) THE HIERARCHY

The bishops and abbots in many lands had become by this time "lords spiritual," palatine in Germany and aristocrats everywhere. The abuses of the Dark Ages were creeping back, though a more refined and cultured era hid these disorders more carefully from public view. Such prelates had already been denounced at the opening of the fifteenth century by St. Vincent Ferrer: "They are vain and arrogant courtiers, lovers of fine living and pompous display, and much given to usury; they make their faith subservient to schemes of worldly wealth and

ambition, and entirely neglect the care of their churches; they visit the great ones of the world and the wealthy, but seldom the poor and the lowly." [2] Even after due account has been taken of the rhetorical generalizations of this austere preacher, it is difficult to resist the impression that one or more of these strictures falls on many prelates of this period. It is true that the good bishop received less publicity, but that in itself was a symptom. When only one bishop in the entire native English hierarchy remained faithful in the ultimate test, when the list of defections among German prince-bishops to Lutheranism is read, there seems to have been but slight overstatement. Prelatial abuses rest of course on fragmentary and inadequate documentation; but with this reservation the statistics presented by Father Philip Hughes may be examined.[3]

Nepotism. Sixtus IV conferred the cardinalate on six nephews, only one of whom was able, and even he was immoral. Innocent VIII provided openly for his son, daughter, and grandchildren; Pope Alexander VI had four children, one of whom he made a cardinal, while promoting other relations to the same dignity. Valencia was ruled by five absentee Borgia prelates during eighty years; Naples was in the hands of the Carafa from 1458 to 1576; three Campeggios governed Felletre from 1512 to 1580; the Ferreri possessed Ivria from 1497 to 1612, and Vercelli from 1503 to 1572; Siena was ruled by Piccolomini from 1450 to 1597; Mendi was a Della Rovere province and Metz a Lorraine-Guise sphere of influence for more than a century. In Saragossa, illegitimate scions of the Aragonese dynasty ruled between 1458 and 1577, and Juan, natural son of Ferdinand II, left his see to his own son Juan in 1520.

Commendation. Giovanni de' Medici, the future Leo X, was cardinal archbishop of Florence at thirteen. Between 1484 and 1503 Innocent VIII or Alexander VI gave fifty sees to youths under the canonical age; Leo X bestowed Lisbon and two other sees on Alfonso Braganza at the age of eight, but made him wait a year longer for the cardinal's hat. Ippolito d'Este was archbishop of Milan at eleven, and Jean de Lorraine resigned one of his sees to a nephew of nine and another to one of five. Lesser benefices were bestowed on infants in the cradle.

Pluralities. Of twenty-five cardinals named by Pope Leo X, but two had merely two sees; most had five; Giuliano de' Medici had nine, and Jean de Lorraine was high scorer with ten. Rodrigo Borgia once had seventeen sees, the Roman vice-chancellorship, and innumerable lesser dignities. Absenteeism was a natural consequence of this multiplication

---

[2] Cited by John Alzog in *History of the Church* (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co., 1876), II, 929.

[3] Philip Hughes, *History of the Catholic Church* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1947), III, 441 ff., 535 ff.

of sees: not only were most of the cardinals nonresident, but many bishops as well: Milan had not had a resident archbishop for a century before the arrival of St. Charles Borromeo in 1565.

(3) THE CLERICS

Secular and regular clergy were alike held up to ridicule by the humanist writers of the time. Much allowance has to be made for these denunciations of the Humanists and their sweeping generalizations often based only on fertile imaginations. Surely the majority of the lesser clerics could not have aped the prelates; for one thing, they were too poor. To what extent immorality was prevalent among them, is impossible to determine. It would seem that at least a large minority were violating the law of celibacy, and that in some districts this abuse was no longer considered remarkable. The secular clergy, indeed, seem to have been the worst offenders in this respect. The regulars were generally freer from glaring vices, but their monasteries were too often in a state of relaxation. Worst of all, seculars and regulars had become rivals for the patronage of the laity, either in devotion or in remuneration. Local councils denounced mendicant friars to the Holy See for usurpation of parochial jurisdiction, while the friars retorted by flaying the secular clergy from the pulpit. Sometimes competing services led to "battles of the bells."

Penitential preachers, nevertheless, were one of the hopeful signs of the times. These zealous, if not always prudent, men castigated clerics and laity alike in blunt and scathing language. Their strictures were almost invariably heard with respect, and they usually produced at least temporary amendment, for few were the consciences hardened in sin. On the other hand, "bonfires of vanities," such as those lighted by Savonarola, seem to have burned out within a few months or perhaps weeks. Yet given a reformed and spiritually alert hierarchy, it would not have been too much to expect that existing disorders could have been cured by the same means as once had availed during the Reforming Theocracy. The greatest of the Renaissance reform preachers were St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Antonine of Florence, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, legate to Germany, St. John Capistrano, and St. James della Marca. Reform was also carried out to some degree among the Benedictines, the Dominicans, and some of the branches of the Franciscans, but unfortunately was not long sustained. The chief new religious community of the Renaissance period was the Brethren of the Common Life, founded by Gerard de Groote and confirmed by Pope Boniface IX. During the fifteenth century the members of this congregation performed excellent work in the Netherlands and Germany in the cause of Christian education and Humanism. Janssen also gives many instances of monasteries

and other religious institutes continuing to promote social welfare in Germany,[4] and Gasquet has done the same for England.[5] But if the rank and file of the clergy were doing their duty in many instances, without the backing of the hierarchy they could effect little widespread and lasting reformation.

Catechisms and prayer books, together with vernacular translations of the whole or parts of the Bible, revealed that the teaching clergy were not entirely unmindful of the needs of the laity. To take but one example, a manual of confession prepared for the laity by St. Antonine of Florence reveals a keen appreciation of contemporary spiritual problems. Lawyers are asked to examine themselves on whether they have made their services available to all; merchants, if they have sold goods of poor quality or used faulty measures, and so on. If much of the blame for Protestant apostasy attaches to bad clerics, the credit for heroic Catholic constancy in the time of trial should also be given to the faithful clergy of the Renaissance.

B. The Renaissance Laity

(1) THE RULING CLASSES

Courtly immorality. Worse in the absolute sense than the disorders of the prelates, were those of the ruling classes during the Renaissance. Though external magnificence characterized the courts of Naples, Florence, Milan, and Venice, the Italian pacemakers, these palaces hid the worst imaginable moral corruption. The precautions taken by the youth, St. Aloysius Gonzaga of Castiglione, which might seem unreasonably prudish to the modern reader, were posited on a corrupt environment. With but few exceptions, the princes and nobles of the Renaissance came under sweeping indictment for sexual immorality, and even unnatural vices. The distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children was almost effaced for such aristocrats.

Despotism. Leaving this subject with much unsaid, there was cruelty as well. Giovanni Maria Visconti thought nothing of feeding his dogs on human flesh. Pandolfo Petrucci of Siena spent idle moments in rolling down boulders on the road without regard for passers-by. Poison and assassination were so commonplace that rumor pronounced any demise of a prominent individual murder until proved otherwise. Ferrante of Naples was known to invite suspects to dinner, seize them, confine them in dungeons. There he would gloat over them, and after robbing and torturing them, put them to death. These were moral monsters, of

[4] Johannes Janssen, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1896), I, II.

[5] Francis Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the Monasteries* (London: John Hodges, 1893), I, II.

course, but the typical renaissance despot was a calloused ruler. Slavery had returned to Italy, and courts prided themselves on the number of their slaves, black and white, male and female. Even at the better courts, not always excluding the papal, quite indecent plays and dances were held. As for lesser vices, such as vainglory, idleness, extravagance, the nobility were simply ridiculous. Yet over all was spread the mantle of rare artistry, song, and poetry, under the aegis of some patron like Lorenzo the Magnificent. The utter divorce between political and Christian morality led to constant intrigue so that Italy was ever disturbed, and communicated her troubles to France, Spain, and Germany which were seeking to appropriate her territories. Professional soldiers craved occupation, and war was almost a normal condition of the state. Military pay was usually insufficient, and it was understood that the military might reimburse themselves by plunder, ransom, rape, and in case they were resisted, by slaughter.

Anticlerical avarice. If Italian princes were more refined and munificent, northern rulers were more brutal and avaricious. It is of these that Cardinal Cesarini warned Eugene IV a half-century before Luther: "When the heresy of Bohemia is quenched, another still more dangerous will arise. . . . Who can fail to see that there is danger of a total subversion? Woe to the ecclesiastics wherever they may be found. . . . They will be declared incorrigible, decided as they are to live in shameful deformity, cost what it may. . . . Minds of men are full of what they are preparing against us." [6]

(2) THE COMMON PEOPLE

Bourgeoisie. As a whole, the common people shared less in the advantages and disadvantages of the Renaissance and were less tainted by its vices. But the wealthier *bourgeoisie* patterned their lives on those of their masters in Church and State. In their case also, gambling and luxurious extravagance followed in the wake of stupendous commercial prosperity. In this Venice and Genoa led, but other cities shared through trade and plunder. On the other hand, pestilence followed on ceaseless wars and flagrant immorality. The Church worked to provide hospitals, and Luther has been cited as paying tribute to her success in Italy. But superstition and astrology were also prevalent.

Peasantry. In the country the peasants in many instances preserved their primitive simplicity and devotion to the Church. Before the Protestant Revolt they were often quite well off. Agriculture was producing good results so that even rural areas afforded temptation for

[6] Cited by Don Luigi Sturzo in *Church and State,* trans. Barbara Carter (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939), p. 192.

plunder. Peasants of course counted for little in the society of the Renaissance, though the day would come when those allowed to do so would declare emphatically for the Church of their fathers. But the peasantry were woefully uninstructed and prone to superstitions. They would be equally susceptible to plausible proposals of innovators, and could be imposed upon by deliberate falsifications of the Mass and the sacraments. But all in all, the traditions of medieval Christendom were still honored among rural folk.

Popular education. There is evidence that Christian piety was still strong. Pastor [7] cites extant Italian diaries which show the solicitude of parents for their duties, especially those of attending church, training children, and caring for the household. Landucci manifests a Christian resignation in losses of fortune and a high sense of his responsibility before God. Significant are Dominici's counsels for rearing children: when a parent corrects a child, it should be received with thanks; children ought to be silent in their parents' presence, but when spoken to, ought to respond modestly; children should not go out without the knowledge and blessing of their parents; they ought, then, to be brought up first of all for God, next for their parents, third for themselves, fourth for their country, and fifth with a view to the trials of life. If this regime is highly paternalistic, it will be recalled that Da Feltre worked out a progressive program on Christian bases. The illiterate continued to derive some benefit from mystery and morality plays. As late as 1644, the Anglican minister Mr. Shaw encountered a rustic whose sole recollection of Christ was derived from a Corpus Christi play witnessed by the old man in Catholic days.[8] The ancient Church, then, was not entirely neglectful.

3. THE RENAISSANCE PAPACY

A. Reign of Humanism (1447-71)

(1) INAUGURAL OF PAPAL PATRONAGE: NICHOLAS V

Tommaso Parentucelli da Sarzano, cardinal bishop of Bologna, was elected to succeed Pope Eugene IV in a tranquil conclave, March 6, 1447. The new pontiff was a sincere and ardent scholar of exemplary life, who devoted himself to the cause of the Christian Renaissance both before and especially after his election. He was a delicate, slight man of fifty, voluble and impatient, but cheerful and straightforward. With him, the papacy set about in earnest to patronize the Renaissance for the welfare of the Church. As cardinal, Nicholas had collected a goodly

---

[7] Pastor, *op. cit.,* Introduction, 27.

[8] J. A. Halliwell-Philips, "Life of Shakespeare," *Modern Readers' Shakespeare* (New York: Shakespeare Editors, 1909), I, 23.

number of patristic writings. As pope, he continued to gather manuscripts, not only those preserved in Western monasteries, but also those saved from the wreck of the Byzantine monarchy in 1453. From these efforts came the nucleus of the Vatican Library, which may be regarded in a sense as Pope Nicholas's creation. Though personally engaged in the manifold cares of administration, the pope employed manuscript scouts, translators, and transcribers to work under his direction. Even during his own pontificate the Vatican collection became the largest in Italy, and contained several thousand manuscripts. Special care was taken to promote the study of Greek literature, both in the original and in translations. Nicholas was unsparing of funds to finance these undertakings; once when some scholars expressed surprise at the size of the sums placed at their disposal, he urged: "Don't refuse; you may not find another Nicholas."

Art and architecture were also promoted by Pope Nicholas V and modern ecclesiastical Rome owes much to an over-all plan conceived by him. He made remote preparations for the erection of the present St. Peter's Basilica, although work could not be commenced during his pontificate. He likewise began a series of alterations which brought the Vatican palace to its present condition. The restoration of churches, bridges, monuments, and fortifications was prosecuted vigorously, though in so doing this pope consented to the ruthless destruction of ancient buildings in order to secure materials for his own edifices. In his court, he patronized Fra Angelico, Poggio, Fidelfo, Valla, and other artists. His patronage, however, was somewhat lacking in discrimination, for he pensioned some of the worst of the humanist critics of the clerical state.

Theocratic afterglow. Under Pope Nicholas V, indeed, the discredited medieval theocracy seemed for a moment to take on new vigor. The Greek Reunion achieved at the Council of Florence was still formally in existence until 1453, and in 1449 he received the submission of the rebel Council of Basle in the West. Thus, for the Jubilee of 1450 all of Christendom was officially one, though it must be noted that masses of the Oriental dissidents did not adhere to the Florentine Union. In 1452 Frederick III became the last emperor to receive the imperial coronation at Rome—though Charles V would be crowned by the pope at Bologna in 1530. But Frederick III was too powerless to assist the pope, and in 1453 the communal revolt of Stefano Porcaro revealed the weakness of papal temporal rule in Rome itself. Though this plot to seize and possibly kill the pope was foiled, Nicholas V had received a severe jolt. He fell ill, and was confined to bed for much of the last year of his pontificate, dying on March 24, 1455.

(2) MODERATION OF PAPAL PATRONAGE (1455–64)

Calixtus III (1455–58). Alonso Borgia, a Spaniard, was elected to succeed Nicholas V on April 8, 1455. The new pontiff was seventy-seven years old and in feeble health. Though personally blameless, he left the Church a mournful legacy in naming three nephews to the cardinalate. Two of these were of little worth, and the last, Rodrigo, although possessing great administrative talent, was grossly immoral. Calixtus III gave his chief attention to promoting the anti-Turkish campaign, but his nepotism gave Christian princes a pretext for refusing his requests for money, and in vain did Cardinal Piccolomini prepare an apology for the Holy See. Calixtus himself was a competent scholar and continued to patronize the Christian Renaissance, but military expenditures reduced available funds. The pope died on August 6, 1458.

Pius II (1458–64). Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, by now the cardinal bishop of Siena, was chosen to succeed Calixtus on August 20, 1458. He was a prematurely aged man at fifty-three, although he retained great energy of will. His early life and writings had been all too typical of the pagan Renaissance. He had been one of the leading spirits at the rebel synod of Basle, and had participated in the selection of the antipope "Felix V." In 1442, however, he had withdrawn from Basle, first to the imperial policy of neutrality, and finally to complete submission to the Holy See. As proof of his conversion—and an overt bid for a new clerical career—he won over Emperor Frederick III and a majority of the German prelates and lords to acknowledge Pope Eugene IV. Aeneas was subsequently ordained to the priesthood and entirely forsook his immoral life, though not the praiseworthy part of his humanistic activities. Upon his election to the papacy, Pius II made public apology to the Church in a *Bulla Retractationum:* "In my youth I was led astray, and in ignorance and like St. Paul of old, I persecuted the Church of God and the Apostolic See. Some indeed may now say, 'Aeneas, who afterwards became pope, wrote thus and thus,' and may fancy that Pius II and the Holy See now approves what Aeneas then wrote. Let them, therefore, regard those early writings as of no consequence, and believe what Aeneas now teaches, that the pope, receiving the plenitude of authority over the whole Church immediately from Jesus Christ, confers all power possessed by the other members of the body ecclesiastic. . . . Hence, reject Aeneas; accept Pius." In 1460, moreover, this former conciliarist rejected the conciliar theory in *Execrabilis:* "It is worthy of malediction that some presume to appeal to a future council . . . from the Roman pontiff, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. . . . Such appeals we condemn and reprobate as erroneous and detestable" (Denzinger 717). Pope Pius, as

might be expected, was in sympathy with the Renaissance, but his own experience taught him to be more discriminating in his patronage of Humanists than his predecessors. He carefully excluded immoral Humanists from favor, and despite their recriminations, frowned on the poetic vogue of invoking the Muses and other pagan deities. As will be related elsewhere in detail, Pius II did his best to sponsor a crusade. But his conciliar past hampered his relations with Germany, where all his diplomatic talents were required to escape a serious threat of a national antipapal council.

(3) Papal Magnificence (1464–71)

Paul II (1464–71), the former Pietro Barbo, was elected in a one-day conclave, August 30, 1464. The new pope had been born at Venice in 1417 and had at first looked toward a business career. But at the accession of his uncle, Pope Eugene IV, he entered the clerical state and was rewarded in 1440 with the cardinalate. He distinguished himself by his generosity to Humanists and by his affability to all. To this he may in part have owed his election, for he did not scruple to reverse Pius II's rigorous policies while still in the conclave. Though he annulled his capitulation oath after election—as such popes invariably did—his pontificate does mark a considerable departure from the high standard of papal conduct set by his predecessors. With Paul II less admirable traits of the Renaissance began to distinguish even the personal lives of the popes. It is true that the adage, *nemo repente fit summus,* was verified: Paul's foibles were not gross. But this handsome man of forty-eight is reported to have been inordinately vain; it is said that only with difficulty could he be restrained from calling attention to his appearance by taking the title of "Formosus II." Throughout his pontificate he was fond of display. He built the magnificent Palazzo di Venezia—later Mussolini's residence—and introduced carnival festivities. Nor was his collection of coins, shells, pearls, and dainty curios of all sorts exactly the most pressing papal business of the moment. To his credit, however, it should be said that he was not guilty of serious immorality, and was discriminating in his patronage of Humanists. He ordered the dissolution of the College of Abbreviators, whose membership was composed in large part of reprehensible Humanists. Their leader, Bartolommeo Sacchi alias Platina (1421–81), thereupon threatened conciliarism. He was imprisoned, but allowed to survive to vilify Paul II in his *Vitae Pontificum.*

Politics. It would seem that insofar as his love of pomp and magnificence represented a deliberate policy, Paul II intended to enhance the dignity of the Holy See and bolster its control of the Papal State. Renaissance standards now demanded magnificence and munificence of

rulers, and Paul II seems to have been all too willing to conform. But his attitude necessarily obscured the spiritual character of the papacy, and revealed a preoccupation by Paul and his immediate successors with their role as Italian princes, to the prejudice of their position as common fathers of Christendom. The latter concept was never entirely neglected, but seemed to be relegated to secondary place in contemporary opinion. In order to subdue the Lord of Rimini, Paul II allied himself with Venice. Other Italian states deemed this a threat to the balance of power and banded together to defeat the papal armies in 1469. Paul II was obliged to make peace, but was constructing a new alliance with Modena when he died on July 26, 1471. These incongruous wars and alliances were soon to become a commonplace to the renaissance papacy, and under Paul's successors politics took at least equal prominence with Humanism.

B. Reign of Politics (1471–84)

(1) PRINCELY IMITATION: SIXTUS IV

Sixtus IV (1471–84). Cardinal Francesco della Rovere, once minister-general of the Franciscans, was elected to succeed Paul II, August 9, 1471. The new pope had many good qualities. Yet by his nepotism he suggests the high priest Heli whose sons abused his indulgence. For Sixtus IV made one nephew, Leonardo, prefect of Rome and married him to a daughter of Ferrante of Naples—thus arose a feud with Florence. Another nephew, Giovanni, became prefect in succession to his brother, and married into the ruling family of Urbino, to which state the della Rovere clan eventually succeeded. A third nephew, fiery, ambitious, immoral Giuliano, was made cardinal—he was the future Julius II. A fourth nephew, Pietro Riario, promoted cardinal at twenty-five, was given Florence and five other sees. He set an unprecedented example of debauchery and extravagance. Still a fifth nephew, Girolamo Riario, was endowed with part of the Papal State as a secular duchy, though he was later assassinated. In all, six red hats and countless benefices were showered among eleven nephews and cousins. Not merely did Sixtus thus lavish the goods of the Holy See upon his family, but he directed papal diplomacy with a view to advancing Della Rovere fortunes.

Ecclesiastical government. Sixtus IV drew up a program for curial reform, but when the cardinals objected, refrained from promulgating it. Another document was designed to mitigate rivalry between the Dominicans and Franciscans, and the regular and secular clergy. Such, however, was his partiality for his own order that his mediation had little effect; in fact, the Franciscans were themselves incensed at his efforts to unite the Observantine Friars with his own laxer branch of Con-

ventuals. Pope Sixtus's cardinals were for the most part worldly or political figures. The pontiff was too complacent toward monarchs in conceding patronage; during his pontificate Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain secured from him virtual control of the sees in their dominions, as well as of the Inquisition. Nor was Sixtus a vigilant temporal administrator: without his knowledge, speculation in wheat resulted in bad management and exorbitant taxation. A redeeming feature of his pontificate was his devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Sixtus promoted the recitation of the rosary and favored the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, though he refrained from pronouncing a definition in the face of contemporary theological disputes.

The Renaissance continued in favor. Platina was reinstated as librarian of an enlarged Vatican collection. Nicholas V's building program was carried forward: the Sistine Chapel and several famous Roman churches were erected. Humanists were subsidized by Sixtus and his kin, though frequently without discernment and at disproportionate expense. Much was done, however, for public welfare in Rome by building bridges and introducing fresh water by a new aqueduct. Yet in popular estimation the abuse of nepotism overshadowed all of the pope's benefactions, so that at Sixtus's death there was a vindictive reaction against the members of his family.

(2) PAPAL-FLORENTINE CONTEST (1478–80)

Anti-Florentine policy. Pope Sixtus IV's designs of enriching his family threatened the status quo of Italian politics, and roused the opposition of the leading statesman, Lorenzo the Magnificent, "first citizen" of Florence. A refusal of a red hat to the Medici seems to have begun the estrangement. When the Medici banking firm in turn withheld a loan to the Holy See, Sixtus IV took papal finances from their management. Then, believing that the pope intended to encircle Florentine territory by means of fiefs bestowed upon his nephews, Lorenzo countenanced the rebellion of Citta di Castello against papal rule. Nomination of two of Sixtus's relatives, Pietro Riario and Francesco Salviati, to the sees of Florence and Pisa, moreover, introduced these *personae non gratae* into the Medici sphere of influence.

The Pazzi Conspiracy. The Pazzi, rival nobles of Florence, formed a plot in 1478 to overthrow the Medici's domination of the city. Girolamo Riario, Lord of Imola, entered the conspiracy and sounded out the pope. After eliciting from Sixtus a wish for a change of government in Florence, Riario intimated that this could not be achieved without the death of the Medici. The pope replied that he wished no man's death. In the end he consented to the use of armed men, repeated his injunction that no lives be sacrificed, but scarcely could have imagined that

the two courses were compatible under the circumstances. Pastor suggests that Sixtus really wished the revolt to take place, though without formally implicating himself. If we are in possession of all the facts, this would seem to be a reasonable deduction.

The plot accordingly went forward. On Sunday, April 26, 1478, Sixtus's grandnephew, Cardinal Raffaele Sansoni—innocent of the plot for he was but seventeen—came to Florence to preside at High Mass *coram Medici*. By prearranged signal, hired assassins, the clerics Stefano and Maffei, fell on the Medici brothers—at the time of the elevation, some said. Giovanni was slain, but Lorenzo was able to escape to the sacristy with but a light wound. There his retainers rallied and seized the chief conspirators. Most of them, including Archbishop Salviati, were hanged in the piazza without ceremony.

Settlement. Sixtus IV could not easily reprove the Medici but demanded the release of Cardinal Sansoni and deplored the violation of clerical immunity in the case of Salviati. When the Florentines defied papal orders, Lorenzo was excommunicated and the city placed under interdict in June, 1478. To enforce his censures, the pope formed a league of Italian states against Florence. But Lorenzo by a daring personal visit to Ferrante of Naples detached that prince from the papal alliance, and in 1480 the Turkish capture of Otranto in southern Italy diverted attention. In December, 1480, after twelve Florentine citizens had expressed contrition for the violation of clerical immunity, Sixtus removed the interdict, though Lorenzo's excommunication continued. Sixtus IV formed yet other pacts, often changing partners until his nephews dragged him into the ignominious Peace of Bagniolo, August 7, 1484. News of this settlement, so unfavorable to the family interests, precipitated the pope's death on August 12—the fate of Heli.

4. THE EVIL STEWARDS

A. Papal Nadir (1484–1503)

(1) INNOCENT VIII (1484–92)

Conclave. The announcement of Sixtus IV's death was followed by mob violence. The Colonna, whom the Della Rovere had striven to dispossess, sacked the Riario palace and drove the papal nephews from Rome. Factions mounted armed guard; shops were closed; the cardinals barricaded themselves in their residences. Not until August 22 was Cardinal Barbo, a nephew of Paul II, able to secure the evacuation of armed bands so that an election might be held. But although actual violence was not perpetrated, representatives of the Roman and Italian nobility worked strenuously among the twenty-five cardinals to procure a candidate of their liking. The cardinals themselves were linked to many of the parties and the conclave of August 26 witnessed political

intrigues and financial haggling. The leading candidates were Cardinal della Rovere and Rodrigo Borgia. When it became clear that neither could obtain a majority of votes, they united forces on the undistinguished Cardinal Giovanni Battista Cibo, whom each believed that he could control. Sufficient votes were won, perhaps by simony, and Cibo assured of election. Prior to formal selection he signed favors in view of it; on August 28, he was saluted as Innocent VIII.

Innocent VIII was a negative, amiable character, but by no means worthy of the pontifical name that he took. Before ordination he had become the father of two illegitimate children, whom he publicly acknowledged both before and after his election to the papacy. As Sixtus IV devoted much of his time to advancing his nephews, so Innocent VIII seemed wholly absorbed in providing for his family. Matrimonial alliances stood him in good stead in reconciling himself with Sixtus's foes. Lorenzo de' Medici was pacified by a match between Maddalena Medici and Franceschetto Cibo, and the creation of Giovanni de' Medici a cardinal at the age of thirteen. The pope's granddaughter Battistina was betrothed to Luigi, grandson of Ferrante of Naples, and the Vatican palace formed a good place to celebrate the wedding banquet. The latter alliance, however, came only in 1491 after the pope had spent his pontificate in a vain attempt to compel Ferrante by force of arms to respect papal rights over Neapolitan bishoprics. Innocent VIII was also a failure in administration: in 1488 it was discovered that chancery officials, who had bought their offices from the pope, had recouped their losses by forging and selling some fifty papal bulls—six culprits went to the stake. Yet Innocent's authentic bulls were not remarkable; the most notorious was that against witchcraft in Germany, which though sound in doctrine, had accepted too readily unfounded rumors. But the pope acted prudently in prohibiting Pico della Mirandola's offer to defend 900 theses on "dialectics, morals, physics, mathematics, metaphysics, theology, magic, and Cabalism," as derived from the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldean, Arabian, and Egyptian sages. Even for a Humanist of the Renaissance, such a tour de force seemed excessive. Pope Innocent's crusading activities were largely confined to purchasing from France the custody of the Turkish Prince Djem, for whose continued incarceration the Sultan was paying 45,000 ducats annually. For the rest, the pope is praised for his universal kindliness, often verging upon indulgence. But "charity does cover a multitude of sins," and Innocent VIII was granted time to prepare for a pious death on July 25, 1492.

(2) ALEXANDER VI (1492–1503)

Simonical conclave. The election of August, 1492, was more disgraceful even than the preceding. The chief contenders were the same as in

1484, but Cardinal della Rovere had been discredited by his diplomatic service during the last disastrous pontificate. His rival, Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia, nonetheless lacked enough votes among the twenty-three cardinals entering the conclave. After three unsuccessful ballots, Borgia is reported to have purchased the vote of his other rival, Ascanio Sforza, by promising him the Roman vice-chancellorship, the most lucrative office in the curia, which Borgia then held. About nine other votes were influenced by the promises of lesser benefices, and these with the suffrages of his partisans—including his own—brought Borgia to one short of the necessary two thirds. The other cardinals resisted suasion of any fashion until the night of August 10, when the ninety-five year old Cardinal Gherardo was prevailed upon to give his decisive but dubiously lucid vote. The next day Borgia emerged from the conclave as Alexander VI.

Rodrigo Borgia (1431–1503) had been created cardinal over thirty years previously by his uncle, Pope Calixtus III. Since the age of twenty-five, Borgia had been a prominent, efficient, and scandalous member of the papal curia. A reprimand from Pius II in 1460 hints at his immorality or at least serious misconduct at Siena. Borgia was living in concubinage with twice married Vanozza dei Cattanei, by whom he had four illegitimate and sacrilegious children—for he had been ordained (1468) and consecrated (1471). These children, all born between 1474 and 1481, were Juan, duke of Gandia and grandfather of St. Francis Borgia; Caesar, cardinal and later duke of Valentinois; Joffre, prince-consort of Naples; and the notorious Lucrezia, who fortunately does not seem to have lived up to her reputation. By another concubine, Rodrigo Borgia had a son Pedro and a daughter Girolama. But it seems that this dismal tale does not cease with Borgia's election to the papacy: for a bull of September 1, 1501, legitimates one Juan Borgia as the son of Alexander VI. Juan was born in 1497 and his mother could have been Vanozza (1442–1518), Borgia's privately acknowledged mistress since 1460, or *quaedam Romana* of the contemporary gossips. The foregoing seem to be the facts, and no defense, including Orestes Ferrara's, has succeeded in refuting them. On the other hand, this "revisionist literature" has rendered a service in revealing that many charges of incest and unnatural crimes were entirely unsubstantiated, if not disproved. Rodrigo Borgia was by no means a monster; he was simply a brilliant man of the world, capable of being an efficient secular prince, but entirely miscast in the role of ecclesiastic. His highly developed sexual instinct he would not curb, nor would he sacrifice his clerical ambitions by entering a legitimate marital union. He sinned habitually, and acknowledged his failings at least to intimates. His frequent repentances seem to have been sincere, but life-long habit was not overcome by

pious wishes. Intent in his own way on advancing the interests of the Holy See by political security, Alexander VI seems to have postponed his own conversion from day to day. Meanwhile he hoped against hope in the Blessed Virgin—it is by his directive that the Angelus is recited today. And that Blessed Lady may have saved him: he died suddenly, but not before he could make his confession and receive Viaticum. As an individual Alexander sinned through weakness rather than malice, but he could not have blinded himself to the immense scandal that he gave to the Church. He was a great "King of Rome," but as pope his sole reason for existence seems to have been to prove St. Leo's assertion that "Peter's dignity does not fail in an unworthy successor."

B. Papal Political Crisis (1492–1503)

(1) FRENCH INVASION (1492–95)

Political alignments. To offset Florentine influence, and to secure a marriage for his son, Alexander VI allied himself with Alfonso of Naples. Florence, bereft of Lorenzo the Magnificent since 1492, vacillated between his incompetent son Piero and the rising prestige of the Friar Savonarola. But the French, still claiming Naples in virtue of Queen Jane's will, were alienated from the Papal State. Also discontented were Cardinal Ascanio Sforza and his brother, Lodovico Il Moro, regent of the Milanese. Lodovico, unwilling to yield power to the rightful duke, his nephew Gian-Galeazzo, sought to maintain himself with French aid. He invited Charles VIII of France to invade the Italian peninsula, an undertaking entirely agreeable to the latter on his own account. This invasion proved the beginning of a long period of foreign intervention and domination in Italian affairs.

French victories. In September, 1494, Charles VIII departed from France to join Lodovico, who was emboldened to dispose of Gian-Galeazzo. Charles next marched to Florence where Savonarola hailed him as the instrument of divine vengeance which he had long prophesied. The friar induced his fellow-citizens to expel Piero de' Medici and admit the French. Cardinal della Rovere deserted to the French and incited the king to march on Rome where he might coerce Alexander VI into bestowing Neapolitan investiture. Unable to resist, the pope excommunicated Charles and prepared to flee. But the king was too quick for him and occupied Rome without opposition. Alexander was now in great peril, for his foes talked of an ecumenical council to try him for simony and immorality, charges that he could scarcely rebut. Cardinal della Rovere threatened vengeance and Fabrizio Colonna held Ostia. But Alexander VI made the best of a bad diplomatic position by reaching an accord on New Year's Day, 1495, with the French king. By its terms Charles was authorized to traverse papal territory to attack Naples

with which Alexander renounced his alliance. While Charles bore down on Naples, Alfonso in despair abdicated in favor of his son, Ferrante II, and fled to Sicily. Ferrante soon followed, permitting Charles VIII to occupy Naples in February, 1495.

Reversal. While the king dallied in Naples, giving himself up to pleasure and awaiting formal papal investiture in this fief, Alexander VI was busy. He detached Lodovico Il Moro from the French alliance to join a "League of Venice," an ephemeral Italian combination to expel the foreigner from Italy. Only Florence, hoping to regain revolted Pisa with French assistance, held aloof. Emperor Maximilian and King Ferdinand of Aragon, to whose family the deposed Neapolitan rulers belonged, also entered this papal coalition. When Charles VIII turned north to attack the League, Alexander escaped to Orvieto to avoid a second encounter. The French king, his line of communications with France cut off, resolved to force his way through. In July, 1495, his forces, weakened by disease and desertion, were defeated at Fornova, but another change of sides by Lodovico Il Moro allowed the king and his best troops to escape to France through Milan. But behind them the French hold on Naples had collapsed, and Alexander VI had safely regained Rome. He had had a narrow escape. But from Charles VIII he had nothing further to fear; in April, 1498, that diminutive king forgot to duck when passing under a doorway and was succeeded by his cousin, Louis of Orléans.

(2) FLORENTINE THREAT (1495–98)

Girolamo Savonarola (1452–98) had become the chief personage in Florence. Introduced to Lorenzo de' Medici by Pico della Mirandola, he had begun to denounce the moral disorders of the city in 1490. The pagan Renaissance seemed to have made Florence its capital, and the intrepid friar found ample matter for castigation in a cesspool of gilded vice. He assumed the demeanor of a prophet to warn of imminent chastisement in case his strictures were not heeded. His appeal caught on. Prior of San Marco convent in 1491, he introduced strict observance of the Dominican rule. In 1493 with papal permission he became provincial of an autonomous congregation of Dominicans to ensure the permanence of his reforms.

French alliance. His lay followers, the Piagnoni or "Weepers," were now urging him to civic reform. In September, 1494, Savonarola predicted a "deluge" to chastise Florentine sins, and the flight of the Medici and the approach of the French invaders seemed to vindicate him. The friar was named to negotiate the peaceful entry of the French into Florence, which now adhered to their cause on Savonarola's identification of Charles with Cyrus, a heaven-sent liberator. Savonarola was next

asked to draw up a constitution for Florence. This he did largely on the Venetian model. The result was an aristocracy, but an "aristocracy of virtue": the Piagnoni for a time presided over a theocratic or even puritanical regime. Blue laws were promulgated; bands of children were encouraged to denounce and correct their elders; "vanities" were publicly burned. Such acts alienated all but the friar's most ardent followers, and an opposition termed the *Arrabbiati* or "Enraged" formed against him. French discomfiture weakened Savonarola's influence, though the friar who claimed to "hold Pisa in the palm of his hand," kept the Florentines still loyal to France in the hope of regaining the revolted subject city.

Papal discipline. Alexander VI was more disturbed by the politics than the moral strictures of the Florentine friar. After Novara, the Pope cited Savonarola to Rome to explain his preaching. Though he accepted the friar's excuses of ill health, Alexander suspended the autonomy of San Marco and put a restraint upon its prior's activities. But despite evident papal disapprobation, Savonarola yielded to the insistence of the Piagnoni that he was their greatest political asset. He continued to preach in defiance of papal desires. When Alexander tried to win him over by an offer of the cardinalate, Savonarola indignantly spurned "hats and miters" and turned his denunciations directly against the papal curia. Alexander was exceedingly patient—or timorous—but at length in May, 1497, excommunicated Savonarola. The friar struck back by claiming a divine commission which must prevail over papal censure, charged that Alexander's crimes rendered his election invalid, and appealed to a general council to try and depose him. Only French power could effect all this, and the *Arrabbiati* allied themselves with Alexander to silence the demagogue for political reasons. First they confined him to preaching in San Marco, March, 1498. This was too small a pulpit for Savonarola's devoted adherent, Fra Domenico: he demanded vindication by ordeal of fire. This idea captivated all parties, and it was arranged for April 7. It came to naught amid lengthy squabbling over the "rules": Fra Domenico wished to bear the Sacred Host with him into the fire. The Florentines, disappointed in their spectacle, stormed San Marco the following day. Subjected to torture by the signoria, Savonarola, while never repudiating his basic message, "the Church must be scourged and then cleansed," made, or is said to have made, all sorts of admissions to delusion and falsity. Papal inquisitors ratified a civil verdict of strangulation and burning, which Savonarola, having received the last sacraments, suffered in the piazza on Ascension Eve, May 23, 1498. A severe antipapal menace had been terminated, but many observers remarked that if this had been a false prophet, he had spoken much truth.

(3) MASTERY OF THE PAPAL STATE (1498–1503)

French Alliance. People in Italy were not entirely appeased, there-fore, and Alexander VI, still pursuing papal security through politics rather than reform, vainly sought Venetian co-operation in a league of Italian states. This failing, the Spanish pope decided to bring in the foreigner. The new king of France, Louis XII, wished to reassert his country's claims to Naples and to replace his wife, St. Jane of Valois, with the widow of Charles VIII, and heiress of the valuable fief of Brittany. Louis's pleas for an annulment were based on alleged non-consummation and fear induced by Jane's father, King Louis XI. A local ecclesiastical tribunal duly pronounced in the king's favor and Alexander VI with scant if any investigation gave the necessary dispensations. It is quite possible that St. Jane might have obtained justification by appealing to the Holy See as did Catherine of Aragon thirty years later. She did not, however, but retired voluntarily to become foundress of the Order of the Annunciation. In exchange for his complacence, Alexander seems to have obtained a dukedom for his son, ex-Cardinal Caesar, and a French promise of support in Caesar's designs on the vassals of the Papal State.

Borgia triumph. In 1499 Louis XII invaded the Milanese in his turn, deposed and imprisoned the faithless Il Moro, and himself assumed the crown of Milan. Alexander VI meanwhile declared all rebels in the Papal State deprived of their fiefs, and during the next years Caesar Borgia with French aid or neutrality reduced these to subjection. Caesar, created duke of the Romagna, was assured that this papal territory would become an hereditary Borgia possession. Except for Florence, protected by Louis XII, central Italy thus came under the rule of Alexander and his son. Payment for this required Alexander's benevolence toward a secret treaty of Granada (1500), whereby Louis XII and Ferdinand of Aragon had agreed to divide the Two Sicilies between them after expelling the ruling dynasty. Alexander VI, as feudal suzerain of the Two Sicilies, then declared Federigo, Ferrante's successor, deposed and awarded the country jointly to Louis and Fedinand. The two kings successfully occupied the Two Sicilies during 1501, but by 1502 were disputing the spoils. Assisted by the "Great Captain," Gonzalvo de Córdoba, King Ferdinand cornered the entire territory for Aragon by April, 1503. From that date until 1700 the mainland south of the Papal State as well as the island of Sicily were practically a Spanish possession. Such discomfiture of Louis XII did not disturb the Spanish-born Alexander VI. In fact, the resulting division of Italy into a northern French sphere and a southern Spanish territory corresponded to the traditional medieval ideal balance of power for the Papal State.

Alexander VI had not only reduced the papal temporal states to internal order, he had, partly by design and partly by luck, brought external affairs to a favorable condition. By August, 1503, Borgia policy had achieved a brilliant success that augured some stability. But before the end of that month, Alexander VI was dead and Caesar Borgia critically ill. These circumstances would prove fatal for the future of Borgia family power, but some good came from its selfish scheming to the benefit to the Holy See in the better order introduced into the government of the Papal States which were presently to revert to pontifical control.

5: THE MILITANT AND HUMANIST PAPACY

A. *Papal Militarism* (1503–13)

(1) THE PAPAL REVOLUTION (1503–04)

Pius III (1503). At the moment of Alexander VI's death, then, Caesar Borgia was immobilized by serious illness. This enabled the cardinals to secure comparative tranquility for the conclave of September, 1503. Giuliano della Rovere was back, but could not at once turn the reaction against the Borgia to his favor. After five days of deadlock, irreconcilable factions compromised on the aged and sickly Cardinal Francesco Piccolomini, a nephew of Pius II, who took the name of Pius III. He enjoyed a high reputation for virtue and promised reforms, but after a pontificate of only twenty-six days, died on October 18.

Julius II (1503–13). This event, not entirely unforeseen by Della Rovere, had enabled him to utilize the brief interval since the last conclave to advance his own candidacy. Dissembling his antipathy for the Borgias, he had made a pact with Caesar according to which the latter would be confirmed in his temporal office in exchange for withdrawing his opposition to Della Rovere's choice. Caesar fell into this trap, for Alexander VI had handled the diplomatic background for Caesar's military exploits, and the *condottiere* was quite unversed in renaissance negotiations. With opposition to himself thus neutralized, Cardinal della Rovere reached his life-long ambition on November 1, 1503, and became Pope Julius II. The new pontiff was a contrast to his old rival, Alexander VI. Like the latter, he had had a number of illegitimate children, but unlike him, had reformed with age, at least after becoming pope. Like Alexander he was inordinately ambitious and tended to subordinate the spiritual to the temporal; on the other hand he was faithful to his liturgical obligations, rigidly economical in the use of papal funds, a protector of the poor and lowly, a defender of clerical independence, a vigorous, if eccentric, reformer, a foe to the nepotism by which he had himself achieved prominence. His temperament was energetic, irascible, fiery, rude to the point of savagery: *il*

pontifice terribile. He laid the cornerstone for the new St. Peter's on April 18, 1506, and vehemently urged Bramante, Raphael, and Michelangelo to devote their talents to its erection. The Belvedere palace was merged into the Vatican, and with the Laocoön group the Vatican Museum may be said to have made a beginning.

Borgian downfall. But above all Julius II was a temporal prince and warrior. He detested the aliens whom his Spanish foe, Alexander VI, had introduced into Italy. His own policy, not yet openly acknowledged, would now be: *fuori i barbari;* "out with the aliens." Once securely installed on the pontifical throne, Julius II made short work of Caesar Borgia. The latter's French allies were chastened by their defeat at Naples, and Venice was engaged to threaten the Borgia position. Outmaneuvered diplomatically, Caesar lost his nerve and fled to Neapolitan territory. But Julius had the new master of Naples, Ferdinand of Aragon, detain him in prison for two years. Borgia emerged only to die in Spain, May, 1507. In his absence, the pope regained control of Rome and vicinity.

(2) Papal Liberation of Italy

Venetian campaign. Though Julius II may have wished to expel all the foreigners from Italy, he was for a time obliged to dissemble his ire in order to achieve his first objective of recovering the papal lands. To do this he had to oppose an Italian state, but one which had long pursued a selfish policy. Venice had occupied papal territory in the north and was abetting the tyrant of papal Bologna, Bentivoglio. Julius II set out in person at the head of his army in August, 1506. He retook Perugia and Bologna, but Venice proved too strong. Inasmuch as Venice had antagonized all of her neighbors, Julius found little difficulty in forming the League of Cambrai with Emperor Maximilian and King Louis XII of France against Venice. In May, 1509, the allies gave Venice a severe defeat at Agnadello. Germans and French now haggled over the spoils, while the alarmed Republic hastened to make a separate peace with the pope. When Venice agreed to restore papal lands and rights, and to respect clerical immunity in the future, the pope removed his interdict, February, 1510.

Milanese campaign. In making this arrangement with Venice, Julius II had disrupted the League of Cambrai. The emperor was disgruntled but had no reliable forces with which to prosecute war against the pope. But Louis XII was angered by Julius's "betrayal" and prepared to fight him with every weapon at his command. Leaving the royally inspired rebel Council of Pisa for separate treatment, it may here be noted that he reinstated Bentivoglio at Bologna, where that worthy melted down a commemorative statue of Julius II into a cannon named the "Giulia."

The pope then joined his forces with his late foes of Venice and pre-
pared to drive out the French. Yet when he fell critically ill during
August, 1511, his very independence seemed doubtful. But Julius II
made a rapid physical and diplomatic recovery. In October he was
arranging the "Holy League" which allied against the French Venice,
Ferdinand of Aragon, Henry VIII of England, and eventually Emperor
Maximilian. Personally leading his troops and sometimes spurring them
on with choice profanity, Julius II, in full armor, drove into the Alps
in midwinter. The French, indeed, had the better of the papal troops
at Ravenna in April, 1513, but lost their commander, Gaston de Foix.
The emperor, feudal suzerain of the Swiss mercenaries, at this juncture
recalled them from French to imperial service. This dealt the French
forces in Italy the coup de grâce, and they rescued themselves only by
evacuating the Milanese.

Italian settlement. In August, 1513, the Congress of Mantua restored
the Italian status quo preceding the French invasion under Charles VIII
in 1494. The Milanese was now returned to the legitimate Sforza heirs;
Florence, hitherto benevolently neutral toward France, was forced to
take back the Medici; Bologna submitted again to Julius II, and the
pope presided over a restored and enlarged pontifical temporal domain.
Whether Julius also planned to evict the Spaniards from southern Italy
—which would have been quite another matter—will never be cer-
tainly known, for he died shortly after his triumph over the French, on
February 21, 1513.

B. Conciliar Interlude (1510–17)

(1) REBEL CONCILIARISM: THE SECOND PISA

When Julius II made his separate peace with Venice early in 1510,
both his German and French allies were offended. The pope's auto-
cratic manners, moreover, had alienated many of his cardinals, and now
nine Frenchmen and other malcontents in the College allied themselves
to Louis XII. With the French king's firm backing, and the hesitant
approval of Emperor Maximilian, the rebel cardinals, assembled at Pisa
in May, 1511, issued a summons for an ecumenical council. In this, their
only significant document, they complained that *Frequens*, the decree
of the Council of Constance requiring general councils every ten years,
had long been neglected. Now they claimed that Christendom could
wait no longer for the dilatory Julius II, who was directed to sanction
the convocation and appear before the council. Julius was the last man
in the world to respond to such a citation. Before the Pisans could hold
their first session, the energetic and resourceful pontiff had himself
convoked an ecumenical council to meet at the Lateran in July, 1511.

But the promoters of Pisa now fell out among themselves. Every conciliarist attempt since Basle had been foiled because Germans and French each insisted on managing the council within their own national boundaries. Pisa II proved no exception. Emperor Maximilian, warned by Abbot Trithemius that the prospective assembly at Pisa would lead to schism, drew back from Pisa and reopened negotiations with Julius which ended in his recognition of the Lateran council as satisfactory for purposes of reform. During the autumn of 1511 the Pisan Synod began its anemic sessions with merely French support. Before the conferees had gotten beyond the declamation stage, they were driven into France by Julius II's victories over the Milanese. The Synod lingered on in France to die a natural death when in December, 1513, Louis XII deserted it for the papal assembly. Thus expired the last concerted attempt to put the conciliar theory into effect, though the dread of its resuscitation continued to worry the popes throughout the sixteenth century, and malcontents gestured toward conciliarism down to the Synod of Pistoia in 1786.

(2) PAPAL COUNCIL: FIFTH LATERAN

The Fifth Lateran Ecumenical Council, thus originally called to counteract Pisa, opened in Rome on May 3, 1512, under the presidency of Pope Julius II. It continued in session under his successor, Leo X. The council was poorly attended and the majority of the 80 to 90 bishops present were Italians. With the exception of the condemnation of the neo-Aristotelian doubts about the immortality of the soul, the Lateran decrees were principally disciplinary in character. Almost everything under this head that was later discussed at Trent was treated at the Lateran, but the sense of urgency given Trent by the Protestant Revolt was absent. Excellent reform regulations were drawn up; strict rules were laid down for cardinals and members of the curia—and sometimes disregarded by Leo X before the Lateran Council had even adjourned. Censorship of the printing of books was planned, and preachers were warned against rash prophecies and criticism of the hierarchy. The old strictures against absenteeism, pluralities, and commendations were repeated, but dispensations by "broad-minded" prelates continued largely to nullify their execution. After these and many other salutary enactments, which usually remained pious wishes, the Fifth Lateran was closed on March 16, 1517, just six months before Luther's attack on indulgences. Even had the conciliar reform decrees been put into effect, they would have been too late for many souls. The time of grace had run out and the ordeal was at hand; as Savonarola had said: "The Church will be scourged and regenerated, and that soon."

C. *Papal Humanism* (*1513–21*)

(1) Leo X (1513–21)

Peaceful conclave. Julius II died during the night of February 20–21, 1513, and the conclave to choose his successor took place between March 4 and 11. With the rebel cardinals of Pisa excluded, the remaining twenty-five were not divided by any radical rivalries. The recently established Italian peace met with the approval of the majority; their chief concern was to find someone to maintain it with somewhat less vigor than Julius II, and to reconcile outstanding differences. This cardinalatial "era of good feeling" reached its acme with the accord between Cardinal Sansoni, decoy at the Pazzi assassination (1478), and Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici, son of the intended chief victim. The latter had recently been restored to political power at Florence and was known to be conciliatory; on March 11 he was proclaimed as Leo X.

Giovanni de' Medici (1475–1521), although not yet thirty-eight years old, was a curial veteran, since he had been cardinal from the age of thirteen. He was the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and great things were expected of him. Humanists in the bizarre style of the Renaissance saluted the new pontificate: "First Venus ruled (Alexander VI); then came the god of war (Julius II); now great Minerva (Leo X), it is thy day that dawns." Leo X was well suited for the leisurely and cultured pontificate planned for him. He was himself a connoisseur of art, a patron of humanists, a generous spender: "It was easier for a stone to leap from the ground than for the pope to keep a thousand ducats." A lampoon would pass judgment on him that "Leo X had consumed three pontificates: the treasure of Julius II, the revenues of his own reign, and those of his successor." Giovanni de' Medici was fat and pleasant; he loved the finer things of life. The poor, real or simulated, were not neglected, for he made work for hundreds of Humanists, servants, chamberlains. He was wholesome and broad-minded. He banished the scandals of Borgia times; the dances and fetes that Leo attended were never immoderately indecent. He knew how to relax, but not at the expense of piety: he always attended Mass before going out hunting— now and then he even celebrated Mass. He was moderate in eating and drinking, and cultivated the mind while nourishing the body: music was played, jesters performed, or actors put on a play. He appreciated the value of sport, e.g., bull fighting. Though he sold benefices, his own election had been free from simony. He was a man of peace; instead of fighting he would simply make the same pacts—one open, one secret— with both sides, and they could interpret his policy as they would. He never overworked, and had discovered the secret of complete relaxation by getting into the country for months at a time and letting affairs go

on without him. Once when he returned from one of his "month-ends," he learned that there had been some petty squabble involving a monk named Luther, but was informed that the latter was unrefined, ate garlic, and was something of a beast. It was a rather general failing of Teutons to be overserious and puritanical: too many Germans viewed the foibles of the clergy seriously; they could not appreciate a joke. And yet this almost caricature of a spiritual leader, "because he was the high priest of that year," would yet evoke the forces of Catholic Reformation with the call, *Exurge Domine,* condemning Lutheran errors.

(2) DIPLOMATIC TERGIVERSATION (1513–21)

French preponderance. Throughout his pontificate, Leo X wavered without decision between an alliance with France or Spain. In 1515 the French came back to Italy under a new monarch, Francis I. His victory at Marignano in September rewon the Milanese for the French crown. Thereupon Leo reverted to the traditional Florentine alliance with France. During the winter of 1515–16, the pope had an interview with Francis at Bologna and capitulated to the latter's terms which fastened French domination on Lombardy for a decade. Simultaneously the Concordat of Bologna assured the French monarchy of control of nominations to French prelacies down to the Revolution of 1789.

Domestic crisis. These concessions and his extravagance had already reduced Leo's treasury to bankruptcy. To recoup his funds, Leo X was obliged to create more cardinals and provide more offices. Intrigue for curial favor produced a serious conspiracy in 1517 designed to depose or kill the pope. Cardinal Petrucci and some lesser fry were executed, and sensational trials of three other cardinals occupied the months preceding the posting of Luther's Theses. To prevent a recurrence of such power politics, the papal court made it a point to announce no policy, and a laissez-faire course was pursued.

Gravitation toward Spain. New figures were appearing on the political horizon. In 1515 Wolsey became the English prime minister, prepared to embroil Europe in a quest for the balance of power for his country and a personal search for the tiara. In 1516, Charles of Habsburg, serious, determined, and able, became king of Spain, and within three years became a candidate for the imperial throne when Emperor Maximilian died in January, 1519. Leo X at first tried to support Francis I of France against Charles, and then veered toward the candidacy of Frederick the Wise of Saxony, Luther's current protector. But when Charles was selected by the German electors in June, 1519, Leo X inclined toward Spain. Yet in September of that year he tried to offset Charles's growing might by means of a secret treaty with France. Next when Francis of France seemed the more likely military victor, Leo X aligned himself

with the new emperor in another secret pact. Eventually despite these treaties, open and secret, Leo was involved in war on the imperial side and its course was troubling him more than Luther's when he died on December 1, 1521. He was the last of the popes of the Renaissance to regard the papacy chiefly as a temporal principality. Yet for all his secular preoccupations, this member of the Medici banking family left the Holy See 400,000 ducats in debt. Perhaps the bankruptcy was spiritual as much as financial for Leo's curia. It is to be hoped that Leo X had some inkling of this before he died, for he expired with the sacraments, and his last word was, "Jesus."

6. GERMANIC RENAISSANCE

A. *German Conciliarism* (*1378–1450*)

(1) LUXEMBURG MEDIATION (1378–1437)

Emperor Wenceslas (1378–1419), elder son of Charles IV and third member of the Luxemburg dynasty to attain the imperial crown, succeeded his father in November, 1378. At first he continued Emperor Charles IV's policy: he not only acknowledged Urban VI, but tried to win subjects for the Roman obedience through imperial decrees and diplomatic notes to other rulers. Wenceslas's policy during his early years was in large part inspired by Johann von Jenstein, archbishop of Prague from 1379 to 1396, an ardent supporter of the Roman claims. But Wenceslas himself was a drunken brute whose regime came to be despised by his subjects. Once freed from Jenstein's tutelage, Wenceslas succumbed to the repudiation proposals of the University of Paris, and offered himself as mediator to decide the fate of the papal claimants. German adherents of Rome practically terminated Wenceslas's rule in Germany by choosing Rupert of the Palatinate as antiking in 1400. After Rupert's death in 1410, Wenceslas delegated imperial authority to his younger brother Sigismund and returned to Bohemia where he died in 1419.

Emperor Sigismund (1410–37), though technically not emperor until his brother's death and not actually crowned before 1433, entered upon effective exercise of the imperial authority with his selection as king of the Romans in 1410. In contrast to his brother, Sigismund was a man of high principles and sincere devotion to the Church. Possessed of great personal magnetism and diplomatic tact, he employed these qualities in many thorny Church-state relationships. In regard to the Great Western Schism, it has already been seen that he succeeded fairly well. Though King Sigismund in good faith entertained the conciliarist theory, he made but moderate use of it and restrained the excesses of its advocates. At Constance and even more so at Basle, Sigismund strove to harmonize rather than oppose papacy and council. His communications to the

Synod of Basle reveal a farsighted appreciation of the need of reform in the Church in Germany, and of the necessity of co-operation instead of rivalry between the traditional "two swords." If Sigismund, like Charles V during the sixteenth century, was not free from Caesaro-papism, he was nonetheless a staunch Catholic. While mixing politics with religion, in the last analysis he was fully prepared to sacrifice the former to the latter. But his success in disciplining Frederick of the Tyrol for defying the Council of Constance ought not give a false impression of the imperial power. Except when backed by the moral support of Christendom the emperor had influence and prestige rather than real power. Sigismund could do little to repair weakened monarchical authority in the face of the now inveterate custom of princely autonomy. When the great fief of Brandenburg escheated in 1373, his father had bestowed it upon Sigismund, but in 1415 the king repaid an election debt by leasing it out again to Frederick of Hohenzollern, thus founding that family's five centuries of influence in northern Germany. Finally, Emperor Sigismund was the last male of his dynasty, and his hereditary lands, along with the hand of his daughter Elizabeth, passed to Duke Albert V of Austria.

(2) HABSBURG NEUTRALITY (1438–50)

Emperor Albert II (1438–39). Duke Albert was thus marked out as a candidate for the imperial throne to which, in fact, he was elected in February, 1438. His accession began the uninterrupted tenure of the imperial throne by Habsburgs from 1438 to 1740. In conjunction with the electors, Albert at once announced a "neutrality policy" in regard to the respective claims of Pope Eugene IV and the Synod of Basle. This program, as definitively formulated the next year in the *Deliberation of Mainz*, regulated papal-imperial relations for a decade. German princes, both clerical and lay, then professed to revere both papal and conciliar authority; in reality they disregarded the commands of both. Though Albert seems to have been personally inclined to espouse the conciliar cause, the lords and prelates were resolved to make capital of the situation by extorting political, ecclesiastical, and financial concessions from the Holy See. These divided counsels reveal the weakness of German bargaining power in treating with the papal curia, for the emperor could adopt no clear-cut stand for Germany as a whole. Behind this façade of neutrality, however, individual princes and prelates negotiated with either or both sides. Albert was a blunt, soldierly man, lacking Sigismund's finesse; in any case, his premature death in October, 1439, allowed him little time to settle anything.

Emperor Frederick III (1440–93). Though Austria went by hereditary right to Albert's posthumous son Ladislas, the German imperial

electors in February, 1440, chose Albert's cousin, Duke Frederick of
Styria. Frederick was an indolent, laissez-faire ruler, of whom all that
can be said is that somehow he "muddled through" a half century of
reign. Yet the eventual success of the Habsburg dynastic marriages
initiated by him may indicate that perhaps Frederick was not so muddle-
headed after all. The new emperor ratified the existing neutrality policy,
which remained unaltered for two years. In 1442 he bestirred himself to
the extent of suggesting convocation of a third council on German soil
to which both papal and conciliar partisans might rally. Pope Eugene
pointed out that the only true council was that of Florence; if the Ger-
mans must needs have a council, let them come to Rome whither the
peripatetic synod of Basle-Ferrara-Florence-Lateran had come to rest.
This was too drastic for Frederick, who sent to Basle to sound out
Felix V and the conciliarists. Both gave empty promises, and all that
Frederick obtained was a new secretary, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini.
By 1443 Aeneas had made his peace with Eugene IV, and two years later
won over the emperor to papal allegiance. The pope, mistaking Fred-
erick for a ruler whose will was law, now sought to prod his German
subjects into submission by excommunicating and deposing the chief
adherents of Basle, the archbishops of Trier and Cologne. Instead these
defied him and the magnates rallied to their defense, demanding a new
council with explicit recognition of conciliarism. The pope reverted to
diplomacy and through Aeneas Silvius won over sixty princes to new
discussions. These finally made their submission to Eugene IV in Feb-
ruary, 1447. Eugene's successor, Pope Nicholas V, completed the pacifi-
cation of Germany in 1448 by concluding the Concordat of Vienna
which substantially renewed the provisions of the Concordat of Con-
stance. Once again the Holy See evaded the conciliar theory: future
councils were promised—but never held; minor changes in curial pro-
cedure were made. With the submission of Archbishop Jacob of Trier
during the Holy Year of 1450 German participation in the Basle schism
was over.

B. *The Eve of Lutheranism* (*1450–1519*)

(1) ERA OF DRIFT (1450–93)

Frederick III (1440–93) has already been introduced. Placid and
physically inactive, he seemed the parody of a ruler. Most of the time
he remained in Austria without attempting to use what imperial pre-
rogatives remained to him. Meanwhile the Swiss cemented their auton-
omy and magnates resorted to private feuds. For nearly five years
(1485–90) Matthias of Hungary occupied Austria itself while the
emperor patiently begged his way from one monastery to another. But

he regained Austria on his rival's death, secured the election of his son Maximilian as king of the Romans, thwarted the royal ambitions of Charles the Rash of Burgundy, and finally won the Burgundian inheritance for the Habsburgs by marrying his son Max to Charles's daughter Mary. When the king of the Romans was captured while taking possession of his wife's inheritance, Frederick—*mirabile dictu*—mobilized imperial forces and extricated him. Frederick professed himself a conciliarist, but whenever the question of actually holding a council was raised, papal concessions of patronage were enough to induce him to forget the need of a council. Great reforms could not be expected from such a monarch.

Cusan legation. In 1450, however, Pope Nicholas V had named Nicholas Krebs of Cusa the first German cardinal in two centuries and sent him as his legate to Germany. Cardinal Nicholas, a former conciliarist, was now entirely devoted to the Holy See. Between 1451 and 1453 he presided over provincial or diocesan councils throughout nearly the whole of Germany. In each of these assemblies he strove to promote unity by urging inclusion in the Mass of a prayer for the pope, the bishop, and the universal Church. His other consistent objectives were to renew both clerical and monastic discipline, and to mitigate conflict between the secular and regular clergy. Simultaneously St. John Capistrano, despite his ignorance of German, was attracting attention in southern Germany by his earnest sermons and his miracles. A great revival of fervor seemed to have been effected, and shortly after (1455) the new German presses began to print the Scriptures and devotional books.

Dregs of conciliarism. Doubtless many individuals were made stronger in the Faith by these zealous visitors. But that the princes, clerical and lay, had not reformed was soon painfully evident. While seeking to put reform decrees into execution in his own see of Brixen, the cardinal was imprisoned by Sigismund of Tyrol, son of the old trouble-maker for Constance and Basle. Though the emperor eventually patched up a peace with the Holy See, the cardinal's reforms lapsed in Brixen and he died in Italian exile. Simultaneously Diether von Isenburg refused to pay the annates for the see of Mainz to which he had been elected under suspicious circumstances—in 1459. Diether defied the excommunication by Pope Pius II, and won many princes to his demand for a national or a general council. Only in 1464 was Pius II able to detach Diether's followers by shrewd diplomacy. Diether was expelled from Mainz, but in 1475 was re-elected and this time accepted by Sixtus IV to rule undisturbed until his death in 1482. Papal legates, including the eminent Cardinal Bessarion, received a cold reception in

Germany in trying to raise a crusading tithe, and almost every German assembly drew up a list of grievances against the Holy See—the German "papal persecution complex" had become chronic.

(2) Era of Frustrated Reform (1493–1519)

Emperor Maximilian I (1493–1519). Frederick III was succeeded by his son, the amazing Kaiser Max. The latter was an attractive character: chaste, handsome, chivalrous, athletic, and brave. He had all of Sigismund's ideals and devotion to the Church, but lacked his prudence and sound judgment. Max was hailed as "last of the knights," but it must be admitted that he was something of a Don Quixote. Plans, both good and chimerical—but always vast—he possessed in abundance; all that he lacked were the means to put these into execution. To do him justice, this was not mainly his own fault, but that of the princes. Max always kept trying; like Micawber, he felt that something would turn up, and something did—Lutheranism. At least Max was not self-deceived: he wrote the *Epic of Teuerdank,* starring himself as a knight of "glorious thoughts," but futile deeds.

Imperial reform projects. Maximilian had studied Nicholas of Cusa's excellent analysis of the German constitution. The cardinal had declared that "the empire is attacked by a mortal sickness and is about to expire if a cure is not found." The malady was diagnosed as the selfish regionalism of the princes, and their confiscation of ecclesiastical property; the remedy was held to lie in the strengthening of imperial authority. Beginning with the Diet of 1495, the emperor did strive to realize these proposals. He suggested such basic improvements as a "public peace" which would outlaw private warfare; a federal court of justice; a common advisory council; an imperial military force, and a "common penny," a universally applied tax to support centralized government. Of these proposals, the one that alone found favor with the princes was that of the common council, but this they would have modified into a regency capable of checking the emperor in the exercise of his few surviving powers. Real reforms fell foul of the obstinate opposition of the magnates, headed by Archbishop Berthold of Mainz. Maximilian continued to urge reforms and in 1512 succeeded in organizing ten judicial circuits designed to substitute arbitration for private warfare. This measure did some good, but contributed little to centralized administration.

Imperial military projects. The emperor could never afford a well-equipped army; hence his Italian campaigns were always failures. Unable to secure adequate protection even to reach Rome for imperial coronation, in 1508 he assumed the title of "emperor-elect," in which action the Holy See eventually acquiesced. Yet in 1517 the aging emperor-elect was still hopefully assuring the Lateran Council that he

would be glad to lead a new crusade. Alas, he was usually a general without an army. Diplomatically, Maximilian fared better. He continued his father's matrimonial alliances with such success that his own grandson Charles, born in 1500, was to inherit the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, and win the imperial crown, in addition to Austria.

Ecclesiastical policy. The emperor was deeply interested in the reform of the Church, but his projects were scarcely helpful. Advised by Bishop Lang of Gurk, he sought to bring pressure to bear on Julius II by dabbling in the Pisan conventicle of 1511. When the pope was reported mortally ill that year, Maximilian even entertained semiserious designs of mounting the apostolic chair. He asked his daughter Margaret: "What if your daddy were elected pope?" The Church was spared his services by Julius's prompt recovery. Meanwhile Abbot Trithemius had indicated to Maximilian that the German hierarchy would not follow the Synod of Pisa into schism, and the emperor left the sinking rebel assembly for the firmer ground of the Lateran Council. Lang, named a cardinal after the reconciliation with the Holy See, sought from Leo X a permanent legation in Germany similar to that accorded Wolsey in England. Lang was refused, but a similar office was subsequently offered to Albert of Hohenzollern, the occasion of Luther's Theses, in order to win his support from the Habsburgs in the imperial election of 1519—Albert refused the papal terms. Maximilian lived to observe the early maneuvers of Martin Luther with some complacency: "Perhaps we can use this little monk," he is said to have remarked. Again he was to be disillusioned, but again too late.

German condition. Thus Germany remained in an unfavorable condition on the eve of the Lutheran revolt. Imperial prerogatives were insufficiently defended against the "states' rights" demands of the princes. German knights, losing their lands to these magnates, were restless, developing a nationalistic spirit that boded ill for German domestic tranquility. The cities were wealthy and sought political independence, but with luxury and wealth had come a moral decline. Landlords were seeking to reimpose serfdom and a social war was brewing. German Humanism was severely nationalistic and scientific, rather than classical and literary. Cusa's indictment of philosophy as *docta ignorantia* was one of his less fortunate appraisals, which was shared by many earnest reformers. The hierarchy and the clergy were far from exemplary, and a sullen discontent smouldered against any monetary contributions to the Roman curia, even for the international objectives of the anti-Turkish crusade. Nationalism had been long in coming to Germany and had not yet produced political unity, but it had arrived at last with great vehemence and anti-Roman emotion. A revolt portended that would outdo that of Philip the Fair against Boniface VIII. For

alleged modern German regimentation seems to be the result of Lutheran pessimism and Prussian militarism; visitors to medieval Germany remarked on the independent and freedom-loving spirit of the Germans. Too individualistic to create a commonwealth for their own protection, the German princes yet were powerful to resist, to reject, and to frustrate. Largely theirs is the responsibility not only for the religious and political disruption of the German Reich, but for that of Christendom as well.

7. SLAVIC RENAISSANCE

A. *Polish Recovery (1305–1506)*

(1) MONARCHICAL RESTORATION (1305–1410)

Ladislas the Short (1305–33), a scion of the native Piast dynasty, had contended for the Polish crown since 1296, but was able to make headway only after the extinction of the Premsyld family which had subjected Poland to Bohemian rule. Ladislas then devoted himself to the task of reuniting the principalities into which Poland had been divided since 1138. For the most part he was successful, although he had to leave Pomerania and the Baltic coast for the time being in the hands of the Teutonic Knights. By 1320 Ladislas could symbolize reviving Polish unity by assuming the royal title with the sanction of Pope John XXII. During the conflict of the Holy See with Lewis of Bavaria, Ladislas accordingly gave moral support to the pope.

Casimir III the Great (1333–70), Ladislas's only son, continued his work. King Casimir especially devoted himself to the internal organization for which Ladislas's restless activity had left little time. Polish law was codified, civil administration improved, the national defense organized, and urban and commercial life encouraged. In 1364 the first national university was founded at Cracow, henceforth a cultural center. With Archbishop Jaroslav of Gnesen, the king co-operated in a series of synods to revive ecclesiastical discipline. But Casimir was the last of the Piasts to rule over the whole of Poland, though junior branches continued to reign in various provinces.

Louis the Great (1370–82), son of Casimir's sister Elizabeth, succeeded to the Polish throne in virtue of Casimir's last will. Already monarch of Hungary, Louis was prone to neglect Polish interests. In 1374, in order to secure the Polish crown for his daughter Jadwiga, Louis made the first of many royal concessions to the nobility by freeing their order from all but a nearly nominal tax.

Jadwiga and Jagiello. Louis's younger daughter Jadwiga, then, became queen of Poland (1382–99) at Louis's death. At first under the regency of her grandmother, Jadwiga was induced in the interest of a greater Poland to accept as her husband Duke Jagiello of Lithuania, on

the condition of his conversion to Christianity. After his baptism and marriage, Jagiello became king of Poland as well under the title of Ladislas V (1386–1434). Until the formal merger of the two countries by the Union of Lublin (1569), however, Poland and Lithuania retained their separate administrations while frequently sharing the same king. This new Poland-Lithuania, perpetually allied since 1413, could the better challenge the supremacy of the Teutonic Knights. Border incidents multiplied until major hostilities broke out in the Baltic region. In 1410 at the First Battle of Tannenberg, Grand Master Junigingen and many of his knights fell. Teutonic power in the Baltic was thereafter on the wane, although inept Polish diplomacy delayed the fruits of victory for a time.

(2) Jagellon Imperialism (1410–1506)

The Jagellon dynasty ruled Poland-Lithuania from 1386 to 1572, and gave the state what many regard as its golden age. From the victory of Tannenberg until the disruptive force of Protestantism began to be felt in the sixteenth century, the joint Lithuanian-Polish nations constituted the bulwark of Catholicity in the East. The Teutonic Knights were presently reduced to vassalage, but the unification of Russia and the advance of the Turks brought new foreign perils into view. Internally the Polish Church was reorganized by the Synod of Kalisch (1420).

Ladislas VI (1434–44), Jagiello's elder son, succeeded him in Poland, while the younger brother, Casimir, became Duke of Lithuania. Polish affairs, however, came largely under the direction of Cardinal Olesnicki (1389–1455), secretary of state since 1409, bishop of Cracow in 1423, and virtually prime minister after 1434. Olesnicki, though tainted with conciliarism at Basle, was resolute in halting the spread of Hussitism into Poland. It was his diplomatic negotiations that advanced the candidacy of King Ladislas to the Hungarian throne, to which he was elected in 1440. Ladislas distinguished himself thereafter in the war against the Turks, but lost his life prematurely in the battle of Varna in 1444.

Casimir IV (1447–92), hitherto duke of Lithuania alone, now re-united the Polish-Lithuania state. Cardinal Olesnicki continued influential during the early part of this reign as well. King Casimir reopened the contest with the Teutonic knights and this time the Poles doggedly prosecuted the war until the Second Peace of Torun (1466) obliged the knights to recede the Polish Corridor. At the same time the knights recognized the overlordship of the Polish monarch, and promised to terminate the unofficial German monopoly of the Order by selecting half of their members from Poland in the future. Though the Teutonic Knights now ceased to be a serious rival to Polish power, yet they chafed

under this Polish suzerainty, and eventually followed Grand Master Albert of Hohenzollern into Lutheranism. King Casimir succeeded in establishing his eldest son Ladislas on the Bohemian throne in 1471, and advanced him to the Hungarian crown as well during 1490. For a time all the Slavic monarchies of the Latin orbit had been brought under the sway of the Jagellon house. The Polish ruler also tried to curb the Polish nobility and evinced a tendency to have the decision in the nomination of the bishops.

Weakening of the monarchy, however, followed under Casimir's sons. The eldest, Ladislas (d. 1516), became king of Bohemia and Hungary; the second, St. Casimir, predeceased his father in 1484; the youngest, Frederick (d. 1503), became cardinal-archbishop of Gnesen, while John Albert (1492–1501), Alexander (1501–06), and Sigismund I (1506–48) succeeded in turn to the Polish throne. The reign of the last belongs to the era of the Protestant Revolt. From John Albert in 1496 the nobility extorted the Statute of Piotkrow which gave them a strangle hold on the monarchy at the expense of burghers and peasants. King Alexander also conceded in 1505 the Constitution of Radom which introduced the notorious *liberum veto* which allowed any one of some ten thousand noblemen to obstruct legislation. Though wise monarchs were usually able to mitigate the effects of this "constitutional anarchy," these concessions contained the political poison that eventually would destroy Polish power and independence.

B. Bohemian Nationalism (1306–1526)

(1) German Rule (1306–1439)

Dynastic change. The native Premsyld dynasty which had governed Bohemia from the dawn of its history became extinct in 1306. Four years of disputed succession ended when Emperor Henry VII bestowed the Bohemian crown on his son John to inaugurate a century of rule by the German Luxemburg house.

King John (1310–46) proved somewhat of a disappointment. He devoted his restless attention to a multitude of projects; now fighting with the Teutonic Knights in the Baltic area; then opposing imperial interests in Lombardy; next intriguing for Brandenburg with Louis of Bavaria; and finally taking the papal side against the empire. The king consequently neglected the affairs of Bohemia and did little to conciliate national sentiment. He appropriately closed a life of knight-errantry by dying at Crécy felling Englishmen for the French in 1346.

Charles (1346–78), John's son and successor, also became Holy Roman Emperor. He is often termed the "father of Bohemia and the stepfather of Germany," for he took up habitual residence at Prague and concentrated his energies on making Bohemia a strong and pros-

perous state. A cultural Renaissance followed his establishment of the University of Prague in 1348. Charles also obtained from the Holy See the removal of the see of Prague from the jurisdiction of the German metropolitan of Mainz and its erection into an archbishopric.

Wenceslas (1378–1419) was almost as ineffectual in Bohemia as he had been in Germany. Bohemian nationalism, conciliated by his father, was again alienated so that John Hus was able to secure strong support for his antiecclesiastical and anti-German agitation. For fear of losing his crown, Wenceslas at length compromised with this opposition to such an extent as to arouse suspicions of his orthodoxy among the fathers at Constance.

Sigismund (1419–37) remained little more than titular sovereign until the last year of his reign. As already noted, the Hussites held him at bay for many years, and finally the Czechs admitted him to a negotiated peace rather than as conqueror. Accepted as king by all in 1436, Sigismund died the next year without male heirs, leaving his dynastic claims to his son-in-law, Albert of Austria.

Albert (1437–39) and his son Ladislas the Posthumous (1440–57) were not able at this time to make good the permanent incorporation of Bohemia into the Habsburg dominions.

(2) Slavic Regime (1439–1526)

George Podiebrad (1439–71), a native Czech, first as regent for young King Ladislas, and after 1459 as king himself, became the most influential political leader in Bohemia. He seems to have been a cryptic heretic; at least he never gave entire satisfaction to the Holy See. Inclining toward the moderate Hussites, Podiebrad tried to reconcile them with the Catholics. But he also protected antipapal agitators, such as Gregor Heimburg, a refugee from Germany. Paul II in 1465 finally declared Podiebrad deposed, but that ruler commanded sufficient national support to defend his throne until his death.

Ladislas Jagellon (1471–1516), eldest son of Casimir IV of Poland, was then elected king of Bohemia. As a Catholic, he was welcomed by a majority of Bohemians to counteract the Hussites whom Podiebrad had favored. Ladislas, however, was unable to exterminate Hussitism. As a Slav, he was more congenial to the Bohemians than the Germans, but after his election to the Hungarian throne in 1490 he habitually resided in his new kingdom and neglected the concerns of the Czechs. This reinforced the tendency of the Bohemian nobility to form a nationalistic oligarchy which extended their lands at the expense of the Church and the crown.

Louis Jagellon (1516–26), Ladislas's son and successor in his two realms, was but ten years old at his accession. Even in full age, Louis

proved indolent and incompetent and the domination of Bohemian oligarchs continued. In August, 1526, he was defeated and killed by the Turks at Mohacs.

Habsburg succession followed in virtue of the marriage of Louis's sister to Ferdinand, duke of Austria, brother of Emperor Charles V. German rule returned, and despite a national uprising in 1618, the Czechs remained subject to the Habsburgs until 1918.

C. Hungarian Debacle (1301–1526)

(1) DYNASTIC RIVALRY (1308–1437)

Hungary also lost her native rulers at the extinction of the Arpads at the beginning of the fourteenth century. A serious struggle for the succession went on from 1295 to 1308 when Carobert of Anjou, descendant of the Neapolitan Angevins, won general acceptance through the support of the papal legates, Cardinals Boccasini and Gentile.

Carobert (1308–42) proved a strong and able ruler who reorganized Hungarian administration in co-operation with the Avignon pontiffs. He feudalized Hungary, exacting military service from priests and lords alike. After fifteen years of conflict he also subdued the magnates and imposed direct taxation. At the same time, industry and trade were promoted.

Louis the Great (1342–82), Carobert's son, continued his strong policy and besides extended Hungarian power into the Balkans. He subjected Moldavia, Wallachia, and some Serbian provinces to his rule for a time, and also made an attempt to secure the Neapolitan crown from Jane I whom he accused of murdering his younger brother Andrew. During this reign there were repeated complaints of the intrusion of the secular power into ecclesiastical affairs, and papal admonitions brought little remedy.

Mary and Sigismund. Louis left Hungary to his elder daughter Mary (1382–92), who married Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387–1437). The latter resumed Louis's ambitious designs on the Balkans, but a projected crusade against the Turks came to disaster at Nicopolis in 1396. Sigismund tried to play burghers and gentry against the magnates, who in turn imprisoned him for four months during 1401. After 1410, moreover, Sigismund was chiefly absorbed in German and Bohemian affairs and the royal power in Hungary declined, while Hussitism penetrated into the country from Bohemia.

(2) DEFENSE AGAINST THE TURK (1437–1526)

The Turkish menace dominated Hungarian foreign policy and the nobility offered the crown to anyone who would both confirm their

privileges and fight the Turks. They accepted Sigismund's son-in-law Albert (1437–39), but passed over his son to offer the throne to Ladislas of Poland (1440–44), eventually returning to Ladislas of Austria (1444–57).

John Hunyadi, the native regent, was the real power after his first victory over the Turks in 1437. He continued to oppose them sturdily until his death in defense of Belgrade in 1456. Largely in virtue of his prestige his son Matthias Corvinus could make himself king (1458–90). While holding the Turks on the defensive, Matthias maintained royal authority in Hungary. He patronized art and culture, but dissipated his resources in ultimately unsuccessful efforts to conquer Austria and Bohemia.

Jagellon decadence followed in Hungary under the Polish princes Ladislas (1490–1516) and Louis II (1516–26). Their mediocre reigns have been noted in connection with Bohemia. They failed to prepare for the Turkish onslaught which engulfed the latter at Mohacs in 1526.

Hungarian partition followed. Ferdinand of Austria and Bohemia came forward to claim the Hungarian crown as well, but was opposed by a national aspirant, John Zapolya, who as early as 1505 had introduced an anti-Habsburg exclusion bill in the Hungarian Diet. Zapolya set himself up in Transylvania as a Turkish vassal so that two thirds of the country fell directly or indirectly under Ottoman domination for a century and a half. The remaining third passed to the German Habsburgs, who ultimately were able to recover the remainder from the Turks in 1699 and then to rule over the Austro–Hungarian–Bohemian monarchy until 1918.

8. FRENCH RENAISSANCE

A. *French Ordeal* (1380–1453)

(1) DEGRADATION (1380–1429)

Charles VI (1380–1422), son of Charles the Wise, succeeded to the throne under the regency of his uncles, Louis, duke of Anjou, John, duke of Berri, and Philip, duke of Burgundy. These nobles represented the feudality, hitherto checked by a strong monarchy, who now pursued selfish interests at the expense of the nation. On coming of age the king dismissed the regents in 1388, but in 1392 experienced the first of recurring periods of insanity which soon reduced him to the condition of a semiconscious spectator of the events of his reign.

Strife of factions. Charles V had confined the English to possession of the ports, and from 1380 to 1415 the Hundred Years' War was in an inactive stage, whether the truce was informal or formal. This left the pressure groups among the nobility free to strive for the mastery of the

kingdom. After the death of Louis of Anjou (1384), and the preoccupa-
tion of his descendants with the Neapolitan inheritance, domestic fac-
tions were reduced to two. One of these was headed by the king's
younger brother, Louis of Orléans, and the latter's father-in-law, Ber-
nard of Armagnac—whence this group eventually took its popular name.
Broadly speaking, it prevailed in the south and west of France, cham-
pioned the cause of feudalism, and held fast to the Avignon claimants to
the papacy. The opposing faction was Burgundian, led since 1404 by
the late regent's son, John the Fearless. Generalizing once more, it may
be said that this party was strong in the north and east, upheld bour-
geois commercial interests in the Netherlands, and favored conciliarism.
When Queen Isabella, an immoral and mercenary woman, shifted her
favor from Burgundians to Armagnacs in 1407, Duke John retaliated by
having Louis of Orléans assassinated. Thereafter intrigue was supple-
mented by armed clashes which brought France to the brink of anarchy.

English domination. Though the conservative Armagnacs opposed
the English, trade interests induced the Burgundians, if not to favor, at
least to co-operate with the national enemy. Henry V of England took
advantage of this situation to launch a new invasion of France which
culminated in his great victory of Agincourt in 1415. This he followed
up with shrewd diplomacy resulting in the Peace of Troyes (1420). In
this pact the semilucid King Charles was prevailed upon to disinherit
his son, Dauphin Charles, recognize Henry V as crown prince regent of
France, and give him his daughter Catherine in marriage. Both Charles
VI and Henry V died in 1422, but the latter's son was duly proclaimed
king of both England and France. In the latter country the infant mon-
arch's interests were ably safeguarded by his uncle, John, duke of Bed-
ford, as regent (1422–35). The dauphin retired to Armagnac territory,
but English occupation proceeded so successfully that by 1429 even
Frenchmen had begun to refer derisively to the dauphin as the "King
of Bourges," a town within his reduced dominions. Even this seemed
about to be taken from him in 1429 as the English forces advanced con-
fidently to lay siege to the Armagnac citadel of Orléans.

(2) French Liberation (1429–53)

Ste. Jeanne d'Arc (1412–31) appeared at this moment when the
dauphin himself, a clever but weak character, had despaired of his cause.
About 1425 a pious but illiterate peasant girl of Domremy had become
aware of "voices" which bade her undertake France's redemption. Her
own doubts and discouragement by advisors delayed revelation of her
mission to the dauphin until March, 1429. His scepticism was overcome
by several fulfilled prophecies and by disclosure of a mysterious secret
which, it is believed, was the assurance of his legitimate birth—about

which Queen Isabella's conduct had raised no imprudent doubt. St. Joan was entrusted with moral leadership of the French forces, and on May 7, 1429 relieved Orléans after but a week of skirmishing. Only her earnest entreaties, however, could persuade Charles to permit a limited offensive along the Loire. St. Joan followed up new brilliant successes by arranging the dauphin's coronation at Rheims, July 17, 1429. Burgundian diplomacy then won a truce to break the *élan* of the offensive and give the English time to reorganize. As soon as the truce ended, St. Joan, not unaware of approaching personal disaster, resumed the attack, but was captured at Compiègne—armistice site in World Wars I and II—on May 24, 1430.

St. Joan's trial was a political necessity for the English according to Machiavellian norms of statecraft: her alleged supernatural mandate had to be discredited. When Charles VII failed to redeem his champion, the English dispensed a king's ransom, 10,000 livres, to her captor to obtain custody. From the first the University of Paris demanded trial by the Inquisition, and in February, 1431, St. Joan was brought before Le Maître, vice-inquisitor at Rouen. But Le Maître and the canonical assessors were overshadowed by the English quisling, Pierre Cauchon, bishop of Beauvais, himself carefully briefed by the Regent Bedford. Joan underwent a gruelling and captious cross-examination during which she defended herself against charges of witchcraft and other delusions. Although her defense had a saint's simplicity and a peasant's common sense, not an iota of justice was accorded her. Once under ill-treatment and specious advice, she made an abjuration which her judges seem to have expanded by forgery. But when confronted after the torture with this signed statement, she repudiated it, accused herself of weakness, and ever after asserted her faith in a divine mission. Sentenced as a "relapsed heretic," Joan was burned in the square at Rouen, May 30, 1431. With the cognizance of the Holy See, she was posthumously rehabilitated by a royal inquest at Paris in 1456, but Rome herself delayed any definitive verdict until 1909 when Joan was beatified by St. Pius X.

English defeat followed nonetheless on St. Joan's sacrifice. The death of Anne of Burgundy, the regent's wife, weakened the Anglo-Burgundian entente, and in 1435 Philip II of Burgundy returned to French allegiance. Bedford's death in the same year was followed in 1437 by Charles's entry into Paris. While England was rent by her own civil War of the Roses, the French evicted the demoralized English expeditionary forces. Talbot held out doggedly until 1453, but after his death in that year only Calais survived of the English holdings in France. St. Joan had ended the Hundred Years' War.

B. Rise of Gallicanism (1438–1515)

(1) THE "KING OF BOURGES" (1438–61)

Charles VII (1422–61), though now undisputed king of France, did not in another sense cease to be the "King of Bourges." For not only did "Charles the Well-Served" prove basely ungrateful to his saintly *chef-de-guerre,* but he was disloyal to the Vicar of Christ. With Charles's "Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges" began the transformation of "His Most Christian Majesty" into "His Most Gallican Majesty." From 1438 to 1789 the almost continual advance of Gallicanism in France was to alienate the "Eldest Daughter" from the Holy See, as conciliarism was already detaching Germany.

The Pragmatic Sanction emanated from a national assembly of the French clergy which Charles brought to Bourges from May to July, 1438. This synod was faced with the need of providing for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and of adopting an attitude toward the current strife between Pope Eugene IV and the rebellious Synod of Basle. Like the Germans, the French at Constance in 1418 had concluded a concordat with Pope Martin V in regard to papal provisions, and in 1436 the "French Nation" at Basle had accused both Martin V and Eugene IV of violating its terms. It is not surprising, then, that the Bourges assembly, like the German electors at Mainz, should adopt a "neutrality policy" between papacy and council. Though not formally repudiating allegiance to the Holy See, the clergy explicitly ratified the decrees of Basle in favor of conciliar supremacy above the papacy. Then under the guise of a return to tradition, the assembly abolished papal appointments to benefices in favor of election of bishops and abbots by the cathedral and monastic chapters. But this joker was added: "The assembly sees nothing harmful in kings and princes intervening in elections by their benevolent and pious prayers." What King Charles's "prayers" meant, defiant clerics soon discovered when they were deprived of their temporal goods. Though this "Pragmatic Sanction" was never ratified by the Holy See, thenceforth it served as the working arrangement for the French Church. And though the crown abandoned Basle shortly before its dissolution, it retained the Bourges assertion of the conciliar theory as a club to wrest further concessions from the papacy in the future.

Royal government resumed its march toward Absolutism during the latter years of Charles VII. In 1439 the Estates General confirmed the Great Ordinance which placed all the military forces under royal command—thus absorbing revived "free companies"—and imposed a tax on land in order to maintain them. Having once secured a standing army and control of taxation, Charles summoned the Estates but one further

time during his reign. His successors, once financially independent, were prone to adopt a similar attitude toward the French legislature, until finally from 1614 to 1789 they dispensed with the Estates General entirely. But if Charles's reign ended in material success, passage of time brought him moral degradation as St. Joan's "gentle dauphin" succumbed in mature age to Agnes Sorel and other mistresses.

(2) "King Spider" (1461–83)

Louis XI (1461–83), Charles's elder son and successor, has not undeservedly gone down in history as "King Spider," spinning a web of artful diplomacy to entrap his foes and complete the unification of France under royal supremacy. Louis has been characterized as either morbidly pious with a good measure of superstition, or as a hypocrite using religion as a cloak for political ends. It is possible that like many another man he tried to reconcile incompatible ideals. His personal piety was presumably sincere, but in callous separation of private and public morality he was Machiavellian before the theory.

Ecclesiastical policy. As long as his father lived, Louis opposed the court, thus giving clergy and nobility reason to suppose that he despised Charles VII's absolutism. Once on the throne, Louis dismissed his father's counsellors and suspended the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. But the new king's aim was to use the threat of re-enforcement of this conciliarist manifesto as a pawn or a weapon in negotiations with the Holy See. Disappointed in not receiving papal sanction for Capetian claims to the Two Sicilies, Louis XI opened a religious war (1463–65) during which he forcibly appropriated ecclesiastical property. Pope Pius II threatened him with excommunication in 1464, but Paul II came to terms in order to avert a plan of Louis to hold an antipapal council in concert with George Podiebrad of Bohemia. Next the king's demand for a civil trial of Cardinal Jean Balue, charged with treason, provoked a new conflict regarding clerical immunities. Pope Sixtus IV prevented new antipapal acts by Louis only by the concession to the French king of a veto on all papal nominations to benefices, and the privilege of presentation to benefices during six months each year. This pact pleased neither party, and papal-royal relations remained ill defined. In 1478 the king of France lent his support to Lorenzo de' Medici against Sixtus IV during the Pazzi affair, and again threatened to call an antipapal general council. The pope, after detaching Emperor Frederick III from this project by increased grants of patronage, appeased Louis XI by promising him the investiture of Naples. In 1480 Cardinal Balue was released after eleven years' imprisonment, but new diplomatic fencing was in progress when the king died, for in his view, Sixtus was "a bad pope for the House of France."

Secular policy. Louis's chief objective was to complete France's uni-fication under royal control. The main obstacle lay in Burgundy, which under Duke Charles the Rash (1467–77) dominated Alsace-Lorraine and the Netherlands. Louis used every resource of diplomacy to defeat a renewed Anglo-Burgundian alliance, but it was Louis's allies, the Swiss pikemen, who defeated and killed Charles at Nancy. Louis XI then reannexed French Burgundy and hoped to secure all of Charles's possessions, but the marriage of the latter's daughter Mary to Maximilian of Habsburg brought the remainder to the House of Austria. Then began a ring of Habsburg lands about France that would become the night-mare for Capetian diplomacy and would provoke its kings into betray-ing Christendom by pacts with the Turks and Lutherans. Louis XI, who called the Estates General but once during his long reign, never lost sight of the monarchical goal of absolutism at home.

(3) FOREIGN AMBITIONS (1483–1515)

Charles VIII (1483–98), Louis's son, succeeded to the crown under the competent regency of his sister, Anne de Beaujeau. Anne not merely divided a coalition of nobles who had sought to reverse the trend toward strong centralized monarchy, but she prepared for the acquisition of Brittany, last of the great feudal provinces still outside direct royal control. After Francis II of Brittany died (1488), his heiress was be-trothed to Maximilian of Habsburg. But this the regent, Anne de Beau-jeau, would not tolerate: she declared the engagement null without royal consent, invaded Brittany, and married off its duchess to her brother, Charles VIII. Pope Innocent VIII was prevailed upon—not without recourse to threats—to assent to the *fait accompli*. Brittany was thereby secured for the French crown, but Maximilian's wounded feelings had to be soothed by the cession of Artois and Franche Comte. On assuming personal charge of his kingdom, however, Charles VIII sought at long last to realize the French claims on Naples dating back to the previous century. Though in the long run the king's Italian in-vasion (1494–95) was unsuccessful, Italy remained a beacon for French diplomacy.

Louis XII (1498–1515), a descendant of the Louis of Orléans whose assassination in 1407 had provoked the Armagnac wars, then succeeded the childless Charles VIII on the throne. In order to preserve the con-nection of Brittany with the French Crown, King Louis was determined to marry the late king's widow, the Breton heiress Anne. Hence, Louis XII presently began to assert that he had been forced to marry his present wife, St. Jane of Valois, by her father, King Louis XI. Pre-sumably the annulment that was subsequently allowed by Pope Alex-ander VI corresponded to the facts of the case, though there was a con-

comitant political deal with Caesar Borgia that made the transaction malodorous. Allied with the Borgias, Louis XII essayed French fortunes once more in Italy. For a time he secured Milan, but was robbed of Naples by Ferdinand of Aragon. Louis expected benevolence from Julius II (1503–13) who as Cardinal della Rovere had sought French asylum against the Borgias. But Louis's power in Lombardy ran counter to Julius's program of "Italy for the Italians," and before long both the French king and his creature, the "Council of Pisa," had been run out of Italy. But though Louis XII did not live to return, his successor, Francis I, was to come back in 1515, and after the victory of Marginano was able to exact sweeping concessions from Pope Leo X in exchange for the renunciation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges: The Concordat at Bologna, 1515–16. Already during the administration of the clerical premier, Cardinal Georges D'Amboise (1498–1510), the royal hand had laid heavily upon the Church as well as the state. This cardinal—whose omnicompetence supposedly survives in "let George do it" —was made legate *a latere* for the whole of France by Pope Julius II, as a consolation prize for failing to win the tiara in the conclave of 1503. Now D'Amboise became one of those national "vice-popes"—like Wolsey in England and Lang and Hohenzollern in Germany—whose existence threatened ecclesiastical unity on the eve of the Protestant Revolt. Before that religious movement got under way, Louis XII died, January, 1515.

9. BRITISH RENAISSANCE

A. Passing of Feudal England (1377–1509)

(1) ORIGIN OF THE WAR OF THE ROSES (1377–1413)

Richard II (1377–99) succeeded his grandfather, Edward III, in 1377. The young monarch's position resembled that of Charles VI in France in 1380, for he too was under tutelage to his uncles. The new regime was threatened in 1379 by Wat Tyler's rebellion which stemmed from the Black Death and Lollardism. King Richard's personal bravery somewhat disconcerted the rioters, who dispersed under promises of redress of grievances. But this was not forthcoming and may in part explain Richard's lack of popular support in his subsequent struggle with the feudality for political power. Richard's personal rule, however, was at first enlightened and moderate in happy contrast to the selfish and negligent administration of his uncles. But early success in regaining his lapsed prerogatives seems to have unbalanced the king's sense of reality; soon he was pursuing absolutism without disguise against a proud, wealthy, and warlike nobility. While Richard II was distracted by an Irish uprising, his first cousin, Henry Bolingbroke, rebelled. The feudality flocked to Henry's standard in such numbers that Richard on

his return to England yielded without fighting. In September, 1399, Parliament declared him deposed and he seems to have been murdered the following year.

Henry IV (1399–1413) was none other than the astute Bolingbroke, king by will of parliament. Though he was Richard's next male heir according to the Salic Law, the descendants of Lionel of Clarence and Edmund of York, who had intermarried, were later able to advance a plausible claim to the throne in the elder but female line, and thereby precipitate the War of the Roses. Henry's debatable right to the crown made him anxious to have clerical support; this may explain his zeal for the statute, *De Haeretico Comburendo*, enacted against Lollards in 1401. This legislation did not remain a dead letter, and succeeded in reducing, if not entirely suppressing, the English heresy. Though Henry IV successfully defended his throne against several serious rebellions, he was forced all the more to rely upon parliamentary support. Indeed, parliament could capitalize upon the disputes among the rival branches of the Plantagenet dynasty during the fifteenth century in order to make good its claim to control, and even to depose monarchs. Henry IV had to resort to the arts of a politician to preserve his position; he pledged himself accordingly "to abandon the evil ways of Richard II," and himself to govern "by common counsel and consent." His son, the reformed Prince Hal, courted popularity, and eventually employed his military skill against France in the expectation that he might be able to unite domestic factions against a foreign foe.

(2) Course of the War of Roses (1413–85)

Henry V (1413–22) continued his father's prosecution of the Lollards as political scapegoats until the execution of their leader Oldcastle in 1417 ended their menace. In 1415 Henry's victory at Agincourt made him a national hero. Edward, Duke of York, died in the battle, and had it not been for Henry's own premature death, his Lancastrian House might have retained secure possession of the crown. Henry V, a friend of Emperor Sigismund, generally co-operated with him at the Council of Constance. In 1418 he concluded a concordat with Pope Martin V. This pact, unlike the other agreements made with the nations at the Council, was designed to be perpetual and seems to have alleviated many grievances.

Henry VI (1432–61) was less than a year old when proclaimed king of England and France in virtue of his father's conquests. While the regency in France went to his uncle, the duke of Bedford, with results already noted, the English administration was assumed by Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. The latter often clashed with the king's great-uncle, Cardinal Henry of Winchester, whose control of the English Church

elicited unavailing protests from Popes Martin V and Eugene IV. The king was meek and pious, but disturbed by recurring fits of insanity possibly inherited from his French grandfather. He left government largely to his council, but was himself a beneficent influence in ecclesiastical affairs. After the death of the Lancastrian stalwarts, Humphrey of Gloucester and Cardinal Henry, in 1447, Richard, duke of York, aspired to the regency and the throne. The king's unscrupulous spouse, Margaret of Anjou, parried intrigue with intrigue, and dreary civil conflicts went on until Richard of York was slain at Wakefield in 1460. But this was a Pyrrhic victory, for the next year Richard's son Edward turned the tables at Tewton, and persuaded parliament to replace Henry VI with himself.

Edward IV (1461–83) inaugurated an equally precarious period of Yorkist ascendancy. In 1466 a synod at York did try to revive clerical discipline, weakened by prelatial partisanship in the civil wars, but its regulations were for the most part ineffectual. In 1469 the "King-Maker," Richard of Warwick, changed sides to expel Edward and to restore Henry VI. But Edward in exile revived the profitable Burgundian alliance, and was able to regain his throne in 1471 without Warwick's favor. The Lancastrians were then almost exterminated. For the remainder of his reign King Edward was able to devote himself to patronage of the Renaissance and of Caxton's printing press.

Richard III (1483–85), Edward's brother, seems to have reached the throne by adding the murder of the late king's son, Edward V (1483), to that of Henry VI. His reputation may be somewhat blackened by partisan literature, but the legitimacy of his claims can scarcely be sustained. To oppose him the Lancastrians put forward Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond, though his claim to the throne was tenuous. But Tudor defeated and killed Richard III at Bosworth Field, August 22, 1485, amid terrible carnage of the feudal nobility—in a sense it was their twilight. The crown was found hanging on a bush and taken up by Henry Tudor, as much by might as by right.

(3) TUDOR ABSOLUTISM (1485–1509)

Henry VII (1485–1509) bolstered his military and parliamentary claims to the crown by marrying Elizabeth of York, daughter of Edward IV. Pretenders and impostors were ruthlessly suppressed and in 1499 Edward of Warwick, last male Plantagenet, was executed. Thereafter the Tudors were secure so long as they maintained prosperity. Henry was a shrewd and economical businessman who relied on the merchant class whose longing for peace had long been denied. With his assistance Henry labored to weaken the feudality, already decimated by the War of Roses. Rigid economy and advantageous trade

pacts with the Netherlands contributed to the return of prosperity. Exactions and indirect taxes—on Morton's fork—made the royal treasury largely independent of parliament, whose legislative influence correspondingly decreased. But while aiming at absolutism, Henry and his successors were usually careful to preserve the constitutional forms; they bribed or overawed or ignored parliament; they did not defy it. This shrewd tactic enabled the Tudors to have their way for a century in England.

Ecclesiastical policy. To offset the nobility, Henry VII called the prelates to assist in the government. They responded as to a patriotic duty, and prelatial subservience to absolutism succeeded prelatial partisanship of noble factions. The chief agent of Henry's financial policy was Cardinal John Morton, archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor (1487–1500), while Richard Fox, bishop of Winchester, was secretary of state from 1485 to 1516. Bishops and abbots, generally favoring good order, rallied to the king and were employed in political offices, all too often to the detriment of their spiritual duties. To compensate them, plurality of sees and benefices and resulting nonresidence came to be taken as a matter of course. The inferior clergy, often lacking episcopal supervision, sometimes emulated the prelates in seeking royal favor, or grew careless. The clergy did little to defend the commoners against royal exactions and the enclosure movement by the country aristocracy. English clerical discipline, while perhaps superior to that on the Continent, never fully recovered from the demoralizing effects of the Black Death, Lollardism, and the War of Roses. The king was careful to remain on good terms with the Holy See, for which he expected and received many favors. From 1487 the see of Worcester was reserved for an absentee Italian cleric, who in exchange for its revenues undertook to advance the royal interests at the Roman curia. In 1521 this agency was to be held by Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, who subsequently as Pope Clement VII was faced with the marriage case of Henry VIII.

About 1500, some three million English Catholics were served by an estimated ten thousand secular priests, three thousand to four thousand monks, and fifteen hundred friars—an ample provision in quantity. But as St. Thomas More would concede to Tyndale, "I wot well there be therein many lewd and naught. . . . But if the bishops would once take unto priesthood better laymen and fewer, all the matter were more than half amended." As to the enclosures in favor of sheepherding, ˈ laconically remarked through a literary character, "Sheep are eᵃ men." On the other hand, a visitation in 1530 found that four hᵘ of 585 parishes were in need of no admonition whatsoever. Bʳ scandalous, perhaps too few clerics were zealous.

B. Irish Disaffection (1366–1513)

(1) DECLINE OF PLANTAGENET POWER (1366–1485)

Resistance to the Kilkenny policy of preventing Anglo-Irish fraternization soon arose. In 1375 Art Oge MacMurrough, prince of Leinster (1376–1417), defied the law to marry Elizabeth of Norragh. When the English tried to arrest him for high treason, he went into a revolt that continued until his death by poison in 1417. By the end of the fourteenth century Art's rising had become so serious that Richard II intervened in person. The king won a paper victory by inducing MacMurrough and some eighty other chiefs to abandon royal titles and recent conquests in exchange for secure tenure of their ancestral lands. But Richard's deposition on his return to England destroyed this compromise.

The War of Roses ended all hope of an English conquest of Ireland for its duration. The Lancastrians, their hands full with revolts in England and war in France, confined their efforts in Ireland to holding the Pale. Irish chiefs recovered two thirds of their lands, though their mutual rivalries prevented any concerted movement to gain complete independence. The Yorkists were usually able to enlist Irish aid against the Lancastrians, but only at the expense of abandoning royal government in Ireland. The Kilkenny policy broke down and three Anglo-Irish families of the Butlers of Ormond and the FitzGeralds of Desmond and Kildare became strong in the south, while the O'Neills retained their hold on the north. The Anglo-Irish often sided with the "mere Irish" against England, and in 1468 the Irish parliament demanded that English statutes receive its own ratification before being applied to Ireland.

(2) TUDOR OPPORTUNISM (1485–1513)

Henry VII sought to restore royal control in Ireland. At first he was troubled by Irish support of Yorkist pretenders, but after these had been disposed of, he reverted to the Kilkenny policy. His viceroy, Sir Edward Poynings, decreed in 1495 that the Statute of Kilkenny was again in force and also that no bills might be proposed in the Irish parliament without previous authorization from the English government. This measure, "Poynings's Law," muzzled the Irish legislature for centuries.

Kildare leadership. Previous to this decree, the Irish parliament had been largely controlled by the FitzGeralds or Geraldines, earls of Kildare. Henry VII came to realize that for the present he could not dispense with them. In 1496 Poynings was recalled, and the earl of Kildare named royal deputy. With full control of the ecclesiastical and civil patronage, Kildare remained almost an uncrowned king of Ireland until his death in 1513. Although his control of parliament was gone, Kildare

could conciliate the Irish chieftains to the royal interest and his own profit. This Tudor policy was but a makeshift, but for many years nothing stronger was deemed possible. When, however, Irish factions in the Pale provoked the Earl's grandson, "Silken Thomas," to revolt, a new policy became necessary.

C. Scottish Anticlericalism (1371–1513)

(1) CONCILIARISM

Scotland followed her French ally in supporting the Avignon claimants to the papacy. This policy was upheld by Robert Stuart, duke of Albany, who controlled the Scottish government as regent or chief minister between 1388 and 1419. Albany and other lords found it easy to elicit confirmation from Avignon for their disposal of church goods. Though the Scots acknowledged the choice of Martin V by Constance, they opposed any restoration of real papal jurisdiction. In 1424 parliament imposed a tax on the clergy to ransom King James I, captive in England since childhood. Pope Martin V having refused to renounce provisions in Scotland, King James himself veered to the support of the rebel Council of Basle, and his son, James II, adhered to that assemblage until 1443. Finally under the influence of James Kenedy, bishop of St. Andrew's (d. 1465), antipapal feeling seems to have subsided for a time.

(2) JURISDICTIONAL STRIFE

But new trouble occurred during the reign of King James III (1460–88). Bishop Kenedy's successor, Patrick Graham, was an ambitious pluralist who provoked resentment. As much against him as against the Church, the Scottish parliament in 1466 laid restrictions on commendatory benefices and pensions. When St. Andrew's was raised to metropolitan rank in 1472, the king and nobles opposed the papal action, lest Graham profit by it. At last in 1478 Graham was forced to resign, and the royal nominee, Schevez, accepted in his place. Then Glasgow disputed the precedence of St. Andrew's, and could not be pacified until it also had been raised to archepiscopal rank in 1492. The alliance of monarchy and nobility against the papacy was broken when James III disputed the Homes's possession of Coldingham Priory. In 1488 parliament accused the king of plundering the Church, and the Homes and Hepburns united to defeat and kill the king, June 11, 1488.

(3) ANTIPAPAL LEGISLATION

Antipapal feeling gained control with this rebellion. The parliament of 1489 instructed the Scottish hierarchy in their proper conduct toward Rome. In 1493 parliament re-enacted old laws to protect benefices from

papal nomination and taxation, and in 1496 there was renewed insistence upon Scottish national rights and customs. King James IV, moreover, successively entrusted the primatial see of St. Andrew's to illegitimate relatives, aged twenty and nine respectively. Pope Leo X acquiesced in the nomination of bishops by the king, and the appointment to lesser benefices by the great lords. In a poor country the plunder or alienation of ecclesiastical goods went on rapidly. "By 1560 antipapal legislation had died a natural death; not because the Scots had lost interest in the matter, but because they had won the battle." [9]

10. IBERIAN UNIFICATION

A. Spanish Disunity (1276–1479)

(1) CASTILIAN DOMESTIC STRIFE (1284–1474)

Cerda disputes. The last bequest of the legalistic King Alfonso X had been a rule of primogeniture disinheriting his surviving son Sancho in favor of the sons of the deceased Crown Prince Fernando de la Cerda. Sancho indeed seized the throne at his father's death, but his reign (1284–95) and that of his son Ferdinand IV (1295–1312) were disturbed by efforts of the Cerda princes to gain the crown, first with French, and later with Aragonese assistance. Finally an arbiter, King Denis of Portugal, persuaded the pretenders to abandon their claims for a monetary compensation in 1304.

Alfonso XI (1312–50), after a minority disturbed by a cousin's rivalry and a youth distracted by amours with Eleanor de Guzmán, revived the crusades. Eleanor was abandoned at the insistence of Pope Benedict XII, and the same pontiff ended strife between Alfonso and his father-in-law, Alfonso of Portugal. In 1339 Alfonso XI relieved the siege of Tarifa by Emir Abdul of Fez, and drove him back to Africa. In 1344 he captured Algeciras, and was preparing to reduce Granada when he was carried off by the Black Death. Despite his promulgation of the code, *Siete Partidas,* the three estates of the cortes continued to check royal absolutism.

Pedro the Cruel (1350–69), Alfonso's son by his wife Maria of Portugal, strangled Eleanor de Guzmán and drove out the latter's son, Henry of Trastamara. Pedro, however, is not to be deemed a fanatical defender of Christian matrimony, for he himself deserted, and later killed, his wife, Blanche de Bourbon, in order to persist in an amour with Maria Padilla. Excommunicated by Pope Innocent VI, Pedro braved even an interdict until his subjects joined Henry of Trastamara returning from exile with French backing. Pedro was slain and Henry enthroned.

[9] W. Stanford Reid, "Origins of Anti-Papal Legislation," *Catholic Historical Review,* January, 1944, p. 468.

Trastamara doldrums (1369–1474). Henry II (1369–79) was little more than a French puppet who obediently brought Castile into line with Avignon during the Great Schism. His son Juan (1379–90) had to defend his crown against an English invasion by John of Gaunt, who had married Pedro's daughter. Henry III (1390–1406) raided Africa, opened the occupation of the Canaries, and died while contemplating a new crusade. His son Juan II (1406–54) was long under the domination of a favorite, Alvaro de Luna, and allowed royal power to be dissipated. The cortes reached the zenith of its influence during these years, but in place of the crusading spirit there was excessive toleration of Moslems and Jews for economic motives. Juan's son Henry IV (1454–74) proved no more successful in preserving order, and doubts as to the legitimacy of his supposed daughter Joanna enabled the nobility to revolt on behalf of his brother Alfonso and his sister Isabella. Alfonso died in 1468, but Isabella who had married Ferdinand of Aragon in 1469, survived to succeed Henry IV in 1474. She is Isabella the Catholic, one of the founders of modern Spain.

(2) ARAGONESE IMPERIALISM (1276–1479)

The Sicilian War (1276–1327). James the Conqueror was followed in 1276 by his son Pedro III who had married Constance von Hohenstaufen, illegitimate scion of Emperor Frederick II, and claimant to the Two Sicilies. Though Pedro does not seem to have engineered the Sicilian Vespers against Charles of Anjou, he was prepared to take advantage of it. Under the pretense of a crusade bound for Africa, he set sail for Sicily where he made common cause with the rebels. When the latter saluted him as their king, Pedro found himself excommunicated by Pope Martin IV and attacked by the Capetians, both of France and of Naples. The conflict lasted throughout Pedro's reign (1276–85), into those of his sons, Alfonso III (1285–91) and James II (1291–1327). In 1295 James II concluded with Pope Boniface VIII the Peace of Anagni which awarded him Sardinia and Corsica in place of Sicily, but his younger brother Frederick refused to ratify this pact and held out until 1302 when the pope recognized the latter's possession of Sicily under papal suzerainty. James II succeeded in occupying Sardinia in 1324, after long fights with the Genoese and Pisans, but Corsica escaped him.

Royal supremacy became the issue during the next reigns. King Alfonso IV (1327–36) was seriously handicapped by the feudal nobility, but his son Pedro the Ceremonious (1336–87) won a great victory over them in 1348. Influenced by Pedro de Luna, King Pedro and his sons, Juan (1387–95) and Martin (1395–1410), gave their allegiance to the Avignon claimants to the papacy. Martin regained Sicily at the extinc-

tion of the cadet line in 1409, but his own death the next year extinguished the Catalonian dynasty.

Trastamara ambitions. After a two-year interregnum, a younger brother of Henry III of Castile, Ferdinand I (1412–16), was installed as king of Aragon. Ferdinand's candidacy had been supported by Pedro de Luna and its success delayed the repudiation of the Avignon obedience. Alfonso V (1416–58) was, however, persuaded by St. Vincent Ferrer to abandon Avignon. Later he turned the Basle Schism to good advantage. In 1435 the decease of Jane II of Naples enabled Alfonso to occupy the mainland, and by 1443 he was glad to secure papal investiture for the reunited Two Sicilies by abandoning "Felix V" and Basle for Pope Eugene IV. King Alfonso at his death left Naples to his illegitimate son Ferrante, whose descendants held it until 1501, but Sicily passed with Sardinia and Aragon to his brother John. This King John II (1458–79) had married Queen Blanche of Navarre and spent most of his reign in an effort to incorporate Navarre into Aragonese territory. His persecution of his elder son Charles, rightful heir to Navarre, provoked resistance and a revival of Catalan feudality. Charles died in 1461 before his father, so that John II was succeeded in 1479 by his second and favorite son, Ferdinand II (1479–1516) in Aragon, while Navarre went its separate way for another generation. But Ferdinand II by his marriage to Isabella of Castile prepared the unification of that country with Aragon to form the modern kingdom of Spain.

B. Spanish Unification (1479–1516)

(1) FERDINAND AND ISABELLA

Dynastic union. In 1469 the marriage of Isabella of Castile to her second cousin, Ferdinand of Aragon, made possible Spanish unification. Though the two realms preserved their separate institutions, the royal spouses—entitled *Los Reyes Catolicos* by papal grant in 1494—displayed a close harmony in their domestic policies. Spanish unity was indeed threatened in 1497 by the death of their only son, Don Juan. Hence, at Isabella's death in 1504, Castile passed to her daughter Juana la Loca, wife of Philip the Handsome, son of Emperor Maximilian. Philip's premature death in 1506 shattered Juana's reason, and Ferdinand undertook the administration of Castile for her son Charles, still a child in Flanders. Since Ferdinand's second marriage to Germaine de Foix proved childless, Aragon as well as Castile passed at Ferdinand's death in 1516 to the first king of Spain, Charles I (1516–56), later Emperor Charles V.

Domestic reorganization. Ferdinand and Isabella strove first to curb the feudal nobility. In 1480 the Consejo de Castila began its advance toward centralized royal bureaucracy, and after 1483 the cortes were

summoned less often. From 1480 *corregidores* went out from the court to supervise local government. Feudal castles were demolished and military forces reorganized and modernized by Gonsalvo de Córdoba, Ferdinand's great captain under the crown. The military religious orders were also brought under royal control by having Ferdinand chosen as grand master as successive vacancies occurred. In co-operation with the towns, a national police force, the *santa hermanadad*, was organized to repress private warfare. The nobility, placated by titles and privileges, were drawn into the civil and military service of the crown. In 1485 the *Libro de Montalvo* began a codification of law according to the principles of Justinian's famous code. Prelates were also subjected to the control of the monarchy which virtually extorted from the Holy See the privilege of nomination. Two great primates of Toledo, Cardinals Mendoza (1482–95) and Ximenes (1495–1517), promoted the Renaissance in all its better aspects, and the latter was a resolute reformer of clerical discipline who did much to avert the shock of the Protestant Revolt.

Foreign expansion. After a protracted campaign, Ferdinand and Isabella completed the reconquest of Spain from the Moors by overrunning Granada and occupying the Alhambra by 1492. In the same year Christopher Columbus took possession of the West Indies for the Spanish crown, and gave the Spanish monarchs a prior claim to the American continents. It may be questioned whether Spain reaped any genuine economic advantage from the New World, but certainly its discovery and exploitation made Spain for a century the leading world power, and its subsequent colonial activity brought great religious and cultural benefits to American natives. After Isabella's death, Ferdinand completed Spanish peninsular unification by acquiring (1512) the southern portion of Navarre. It was a great inheritance in the Old World and the New that the regent, the dying Cardinal Ximenes, handed over to the young King Charles when he arrived in Spain from the Netherlands in 1517.

(2) THE SPANISH INQUISITION

Politico-religious aims. Two groups endangered the internal security of the new Spain, the Maranos and Moriscoes—and to these were to be added after 1517 cryptic heretics. The Maranos were Jews who had been made Christians through moral or physical force, but continued in secret to practice Judaism and to conspire with the enemies of Church and state in Spain. The Moriscoes were those Moors "converted" to Catholicity under the same unfavorable circumstances. Though both classes had included sincere converts, others continued to be subversive elements who secretly co-operated with their former co-religionists. To promote political and religious harmony, Ferdinand and Isabella in-

augurated in 1492 a policy of exiling all professed Jews and Moham-
medans, a course which practically eliminated them from Spain by the
end of a century. But the problem of distinguishing between sincere
and false Christians was more delicate; it was committed to the famous
Spanish Inquisition.

Nature of the Inquisition. The Spanish Inquisition was the ancient
medieval institution, revived on the demand of the Catholic sovereigns
of Spain. Though this was done with papal permission, the new organ-
ization was conducted for political as well as religious ends, often with
disregard for the safeguards which the Holy See wished to place upon
it. The Spanish Inquisition, then, was not a purely political machine, for
it conducted its functions under the old rules for canonical tribunals
and was administered by ecclesiastics who duly handed over those con-
demned to death to the "secular arm." On the other hand, the Spanish
Inquisition in actual operation was no responsibility of the Catholic
Church, for its abuses took place in spite of explicit papal protests and
through the intermediary of political prelates who served the crown
first and the Holy See second. These abuses were not as egregious as
the salacious Llorente would imply; they existed, but were exceptions
rather than the rule. The Inquisition was indeed a stern police system,
but it was normally conducted with far more justice and equity than
the contemporary Elizabethan "Gestapo," and its victims were far more
likely to be real criminals—all offenses against morals came under the
court's jurisdiction. Finally, the Spanish Inquisition did effect peninsular
unity at the cost of relatively few lives, while the English Inquisition
failed to preserve the Anglican establishment from civil war and pro-
longed religious dispute and secession.

Establishment. Isabella sought authorization for the tribunal from
Pope Sixtus IV, and on November 1, 1478, that pontiff, after laying
down certain regulations, granted her request. The queen nominated
Friar Tomás de Torquemada (1420–98) to head the new institution,
and the first *auto da fe* was held in February, 1481. Such a ceremony,
it must be remarked, was literally a "profession of faith," and often
involved no executions whatever, but merely canonical penances for
the repentant. Even so, Sixtus IV protested in 1483 that the Inquisition
was exceeding due moderation in its prosecutions. His protests and
those of his successors were evaded or disregarded or even suppressed
by Spanish Caesaro-papism. Cardinal Ximenes, an exemplary prelate,
was moderate in his direction of the Inquisition, and serious abuses did
not occur for nearly a century after its establishment.

C. Portuguese Separatism (1279–1521)

(1) NATIONALISM (1279–1433)

Denis the Worker (1279–1325) was the greatest of Portuguese medieval kings in promoting material prosperity. His agrarian policy put the country's economic life on a sound basis, and he also stimulated commerce, taking care to foster reciprocal relations with England. Denis did much to promote culture. In 1290 Nicholas IV sanctioned his foundation of a university at Lisbon, later transferred to Coimbra. Yet despite his marriage to the younger St. Elizabeth, a niece of St. Elizabeth of Thuringia, Denis did not prove a docile son of the Church. He began his reign involved in a censure pronounced against his father, and did not reach an understanding with the Holy See until 1289. His land reforms bore heavily on the Church, and he confiscated much of the Templars' property.

Dynastic strife. St. Elizabeth (d. 1336), both during and after her husband's reign, intervened often to allay family troubles, in part provoked by Denis's moral misconduct. Their son Alfonso IV (1325–57) had to protect his crown against an illegitimate brother Alfonso Sánchez. In defense of national independence Alfonso IV and his son Pedro (1357–67) allied with Aragon against Castile. But Pedro's liaison with Inez de Castro prepared new difficulties for his legitimate son Ferdinand (1367–83). Papal mediation brought peace with Castile in 1371, but the marriage of the king's daughter Beatrice to Juan of Castile threatened Portuguese survival.

Independence was defended by Ferdinand's illegitimate brother, John of Aviz, elected to the throne rather than allow the accession of Beatrice and Juan. As king (1385–1433), John repulsed the Castilian feudal host at Aljubarrota with the aid of English archers. The English alliance enabled John to place the House of Aviz securely on the Portuguese throne until 1580. Desultory warfare with Castile ended in 1411 with full recognition of Portugal's separate existence.

(2) IMPERIALISM (1415–1521)

Overseas expansion became Portugal's concern after the capture of Ceuta in Africa from the Moors in 1415. Three of King John's sons participated in the undertaking, and one of them, Prince Henry the Navigator (1394–1460), devoted the rest of his life to directing Portuguese exploration. Designed alike to spread the Gospel and extend Portuguese trade and political sway, these efforts laid the foundation of the maritime empire of the next century. At first the monarchs concentrated on Africa, but John II (1481–95) pushed forward more distant explorations by Díaz and Da Gama.

King Manoel the Fortunate (1495–1521) reaped the fruits of a century of discovery. In 1499 Da Gama opened the East Indies to Portuguese trade, conquest, and evangelization—unfortunately in that order. Cabral in 1500 laid a claim for Portugal to Brazil, and in 1520 the native Portuguese mariner, Magellan, circumnavigated the world. At home Manoel aped the renaissance trend toward strong monarchy in Castile and Aragon. Portugal entered the sixteenth century fully abreast with its larger Spanish rival in the race for empire, though its more limited resources were to tell against it in the end.

11. SCANDINAVIAN UNITY

A. Danish Hegemony (1300–1513)

(1) DENMARK VERSUS THE HANSA (1307–75)

The Hanseatic League was essentially a customs union of Baltic towns to facilitate commerce. After the fall of the Hohenstaufen, German merchants lacked the protection of a strong central government, and during the Great Interregnum civic leagues began to be fashioned. The Hansa can be traced to a meeting of representatives from Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg, and Danzig in 1293. This Baltic association pooled resources to protect the fishing banks and to extend commerce in the Baltic and North Seas. Gradually the League, which admitted new members, came to possess "factories," i.e., warehouses, wharves, and inns, at strategic points from London to Novgorod. Wherever possible these posts were garrisoned by agents of the League and made into extraterritorial quarters under their own laws.

Danish intervention in Hanseatic affairs dates from 1307 when Lübeck appealed for aid to King Eric Menved (1286–1319) against the count of Holstein. Royal ambition was thereby aroused to dominate the League, which had factories in Bergen in Norway, Wisby in Sweden, and on the Skanian fishing bank between Denmark and Sweden. Danish territory dominated the narrows between the North and the Baltic, and a hostile Denmark could sever Hanseatic communications. King Eric, however, overreached himself by trying to win support for his foreign policy by lavish concessions to the nobility. Christopher II (1320–32), his successor, proved incapable of controlling the nobility. He was deposed, and years of anarchy ensued during which Count Gerhard of Holstein on land, and the Hanseatic League on the sea, appropriated Danish possessions. At length Christopher's son, Waldemar III (1340–75), made good his claim to the Danish crown and restored domestic order. In 1360 he wrested the Skanian province from Sweden and increased the tax on Hanseatic fishing; in 1361 his fleet seized the Swedish island of Gothland and destroyed Wisby. The League retaliated, first by an embargo on Danish commerce, and then by war in alliance with Sweden,

Norway, and Holstein. Waldemar won a naval victory in 1363 which forced the League to acquiesce in Danish confiscations and imposts, but the League returned to the conflict with the same allies in 1367. This time Waldemar was driven from his kingdom, and he recovered his throne only by accepting the Treaty of Stralsund in 1370. This restored Hanseatic privileges and allowed the League to garrison Skania for fifteen years in order to control the narrows. The future of the Danish monarchy seemed precarious when Waldemar III died in 1375 without a male heir. The Hanseatic League continued to dominate Scandinavian commerce until the sixteenth century, and introduced considerable German influence into the area which would later provide an opening wedge for Lutheran propaganda.

(2) UNION OF KALMAR (1375–1412)

Scandinavian unity became the chief issue in the Baltic monarchies during the two centuries preceding the Lutheran revolt. Denmark, the least isolated of the kingdoms, aspired to the position of a great power, and briefly attained it under a remarkable woman, Waldemar's daughter Margaret, the "Semiramis of the North." This Danish hegemony was to be favorable to the Church in many ways, but its support by the Scandinavian clergy would leave pretexts for the Lutherans to exploit Swedish nationalism.

Margaret Valdemarsdatter (1375–1412) took charge of the Danish monarchy at the death of Waldemar III. She had married Hakon VI of Norway (1355–80), and their young son Olaf was proclaimed king of Denmark (1376–87) since the Salic Law excluded her own direct reign. Though never technically queen-regnant, Margaret remained the real ruler in Denmark until her death in 1412, and presently she brought the other Scandinavian realms under her control. When her husband died in 1380, her son Olaf was proclaimed king of Norway, so that Margaret assumed the regency of that kingdom as well. When her son died in 1387 without reaching maturity, Margaret adopted her grandnephew, Eric of Pomerania, and continued to administer Danish and Norwegian affairs during another minority. Such was her success in ruling that in 1389 the Swedes, having deposed their foreign king, Albert of Mecklenburg, offered her their throne. This personal consolidation of the three kingdoms was formally proclaimed in 1397 at Kalmar: Eric of Pomerania (1389–1439) was saluted as the common king, though he did not exercise personal control during Margaret's lifetime. A vague constitution provided for a common foreign policy and defense forces, while each country was left under its own internal laws. Under Margaret's own administration the Union of Kalmar worked quite well: she repressed the

nobles, preserved order, and regained some crown lands, though her attempt to annex German Schleswig proved a costly mistake.

Ecclesiastical progress took place under Margaret's rule. The queen was herself a pious and practicing Catholic, zealous for the good of the Church. She used her influence to stimulate the instruction of the people. The Sunday Epistles and Gospels were translated into the vernacular, and doctrinal treatises made available. She promoted proper rendition of the liturgy and contributed to the erection or restoration of churches and to the foundation of schools. It was due to her efforts that Danish clerical and monastic discipline was perhaps superior to that elsewhere on the eve of the Lutheran revolt. But her influence upon the Norwegian and Swedish clergy was proportionately less. Still Archbishop Gerhardson of Lund made use of the unification to hold the first plenary council of Scandinavia. This meeting at Helsingfors in 1394 was attended not only by bishops from the three kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, but by prelates from the Norse ruled Faroe and Orkney Islands.

(3) DIFFICULT DANISH LEADERSHIP (1412–1513)

Eric the Pomeranian (1397–1439) proved incapable of continuing Queen Margaret's successful policies. His obstinacy and violence, combined with his German birth, were not calculated to soothe the feelings of his Scandinavian subjects. His partiality toward German retainers alienated many, while the nobles were granted new privileges to enlist their assistance in the disastrous Schleswig war inherited from Margaret. This terminated in failure, for in 1432 the Hanseatic League joined Eric's foes to inflict upon him a severe defeat. In the same year the king had a sharp conflict with the chapter of Upsala, just one example of the resentment caused by his intrusion of foreigners into Swedish and Norwegian benefices. Archbishop Peter Luecke of Lund, however, held a noteworthy national council at Copenhagen (1425) and restrained Eric's aggression until his own death in 1436. Then Eric's incompetence was judged intolerable. Rebellion broke out in all three kingdoms; he fled the country in 1438 and was formally deposed a year later.

Christopher III (1440–48), Eric's nephew, was elected by the Danish council to succeed him, though Sweden delayed some months and Norway two years in recognizing him. The new king procured acknowledgement of his claims only at the expense of new concessions to the nobility which greatly paralyzed royal authority.

Christian I (1448–81), Christopher's brother-in-law, followed him on the throne, although his rule was disputed in Sweden. King Christian belonged to the Oldenburg dynasty which has continued to reign in Den-

mark until the twentieth century. He was exceptionally devoted to the Church, and went on a pilgrimage to Rome in 1474. During 1479 he set up the University of Copenhagen, which developed into a Scandinavian Renaissance center and later became a critical point in the religious disputes. The king enjoyed the friendship and loyal co-operation of Archbishop Tycho of Lund (1443–72), who disapproved of Swedish efforts to dissolve the Kalmar Union.

King Hans (1481–1513), Christian's amiable but not overly able son, maintained his titular position at the head of the Union by repeated concessions to the nobility. At the same time he aimed to exalt the prelates, though the lower clergy remained poor. Cautiously Hans tried to ally himself with the burgher class against the nobility. This policy was seconded by his son and heir, Prince Christian, who issued a charter to Oslo in 1508. This was a forerunner of a new bid for royal Absolutism which would take place during his own reign and would precipitate the religious changes. The primatial see continued in good hands. Archbishop Brostorp (1472–95) issued the first statutes for Copenhagen University, and Archbishop Gunnarsson (1497–1519) was a pious and learned prelate and as long as he lived, the Catholic faith and the rights of the clergy were stoutly defended.

B. Norwegian Subordination (1319–1513)

(1) SWEDISH DOMINATION (1319–80)

Magnus (1319–74). Norway's native Sigurdson dynasty was extinguished with the death of Hakon V in 1319. His daughter, Princess Ingeborg, had married Duke Eric of Finland, who had been slain in 1317 by his elder brother, King Birger of Sweden. This murder had led to Birger's deposition in 1319, and the proclamation of Magnus, the infant son of Eric and Ingeborg, as king of both Sweden and Norway. During his long minority the nobility intrigued with the incompetent princess-regent, and reasserted feudal freedom. When Magnus assumed personal charge in 1333, his good intentions were not matched by his ability. As a Swede, he was prone to neglect Norway for his native land, and his efforts to introduce a common legal code for both countries were unappreciated in Norway.

Hakon VI (1355–80). Some improvement came when Magnus in 1355 delegated authority in Norway to his second son Hakon, who eventually succeeded to the Norwegian crown. Nevertheless, disputes with his father and his elder brother Eric who held a similar vice-royalty in Sweden, hindered the peace. The Black Death lingered with particular virulence in Norway and added to the general misery. By his marriage with Margaret Valdemarsdatter in 1363, King Hakon became

allied to the Danish monarchy. His assistance enabled her to proclaim their son Olaf as king of Denmark at Waldemar's death in 1375, but his own demise in 1380 substituted Danish domination for Swedish.

(2) Danish Ascendancy (1380–1513)

Norwegian political eclipse followed. Practically in 1380 and formally in 1397, Norway became a subordinate part of the Danish Monarchy. Her status in the Union of Kalmar was that of a comparatively neglected outlying province, and she regained independence momentarily in 1814, merely to be handed in 1815 to Sweden to undergo another century of foreign domination. Only with the choice of another Hakon (VII) in 1905 did the Norwegians regain complete control of their government. From 1380, then, Norwegian history closely follows that of Denmark. Though the metropolitan see of Trondjem-Nidaros continued to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Norway until the Protestant Revolt, Danish court policy used its patronage in favor of alien nominees. Both Queen Margaret and Eric of Pomerania made use of papal provisions to install friends or protégés in Norwegian benefices. Most of these were Danes prone to exalt the interests of the Danish-controlled Union of Kalmar over local wishes. Though it is possible that Danish standards of clerical discipline were higher than those prevalent in Norway, improvement from without clashed with nationalism. But Norwegians, though restive under foreign rule, were long unsuccessful in throwing it off.

C. Swedish Individuality (1319–1513)

(1) Sweden before Kalmar

Magnus III (1319–65) was that son of Eric and Ingeborg whose accession to the Swedish and Norwegian thrones has just been mentioned. In Sweden, the government was often administered by aristocratic regents who obscured the royal authority. From 1335 to 1341 Magnus and his wife Blanche had the services of Madame Gudmarsson, better known as St. Bridget (1303–73). Repeatedly she admonished them for frivolity and extravagance, and the king did from time to time make partial reparation. After her departure for Rome in 1349, the court lost a plain-spoken counsellor. In bungling and inconsistent fashion Magnus tried to regain some of his royal prerogatives, but his codification of Swedish law (1347) merely crystallized aristocratic privileges. The nobility played Magnus's son Eric against him, and finally replaced the family with Albert of Mecklenburg.

Albert (1365–89) served merely as a figurehead for a nobility determined to have its own way. When they grew tired of him, the nobles

offered the throne to Margaret Valdemarsdatter. Albert was defeated and captured in trying to defend himself, and Sweden passed under the rule of the great Danish princess.

(2) SWEDEN AND KALMAR

Though some Swedish pirates held out against the Union of Kalmar until 1395, Archbishop Karlsson of Upsala (1384–1408) gave it his endorsement. In 1396 he assembled the Synod of Arborga to renew ancient statutes, and in the following year participated in the solemn coronation of Eric of Pomerania. But as in Norway, Margaret and Eric introduced too many aliens into official positions to please the local nobility. Between 1432 and 1435 the Upsala chapter resisted Eric's nominee, Arnold of Bergen, and eventually had its own provost, Olaf Larsson, confirmed by the Holy See.

In 1435 the peasant leader Engelbrektsson led a rebellion against Eric's authority and was chosen regent by the Swedish Diet. Thereafter national regencies nullified the Union of Kalmar in all but name for long periods. Karl Bonde Knuttson maintained himself as regent and king from 1449 to 1470, and thereafter until 1520 three members of the Sture family held the regency in Sweden almost uninterruptedly.

The clergy were involved in these struggles on both sides, though as a whole they favored the Union. Archbishop Ulfsson (1469–1514) took part in the foundation of Upsala University in 1477 and introduced the first Swedish printing press in 1483. But the next Swedish primate, Gustav Trolle, proved too much of a politician on behalf of the Danish ascendancy for the Swedes, and thus furnished a pretext for the last of the regents, Gustav Vasa, to declare Sweden's independence not only from Denmark, but also from Rome.

II

Exploration and Evangelization

12. THE TURKISH MENACE

A. *Threat to the West*

(1) The Italian Peril

Papal leadership. Despite the failure of the efforts of Pope Nicholas V to organize a crusade, his successor, Calixtus III (1455–58), made the realization of such an undertaking the chief objective of his pontificate. Papal resources were drained to organize an army, and shipyards were set up along the Tiber. A crusading tithe was imposed, but European princes either pocketed the money or charged that it was being collected merely to enrich the papal curia. Calixtus struggled on with what he had, subsidized Scanderbeg of Albania, and urged the pontifical fleet to do battle. Pope Pius II (1458–64) summoned an international congress to meet at Mantua in June, 1459, under his personal presidency. The pope was there on schedule, but found neither princes nor, at first, even their representatives. When a few of these straggled in after repeated invitations, they brought little more than pledges not destined to be fulfilled. In 1463 the Venetians, indeed, did declare war on the Turks in prosecution of their commercial interests. Pius II seized upon this event to launch another crusading appeal. In a supreme effort to shame the princes into doing their duty, the pope announced that he himself would lead this crusade. He proceeded to Ancona, the port appointed for the muster of the crusading armada. But the fleet failed to arrive, and Pius II, resolute to the last, died in port on August 14, 1464.

Otranto crisis. Mohammed II continued to extend his conquests in Europe and Asia, subduing the Crimea, Trebizond, and the Aegean

71]

Islands. Only Rhodes, defended by the Knights Hospitalers, was able to hold out in the eastern Mediterranean for a time. The Italian states remained immersed in their civil conflicts until they were astounded to hear in 1480 that the Turkish forces had landed on the coast of Apulia and captured Otranto in southern Italy. The land route to Rome was open. Pope Sixtus IV now at last elicited some response from the Italians; even aloof Venice halfheartedly promised a fleet. But the muster of forces was distinguished by such tragi-comic inefficiency, jealousy, and niggardliness that probably only the death of Mohammed the Conqueror in 1481 saved Italy.

Bayazet II (1481–1512), Mohammed's indolent and incapable son, permitted the Christian Don Quixote force to recapture Otranto, and withdrew all the Turkish forces from Italy. One of the reasons for Bayazet's inactivity, to be sure, was the fact that the Christians had obtained possession of a valuable hostage, the Sultan's brother, Prince Djem. The sultan's fear, it seems, was not so much lest Djem might be killed by his captors, but rather that he might not be; for Djem, released, might prove a dangerous rival for the Ottoman throne. Eventually the sultan paid for continued hospitality toward his brother in Western Europe.

(2) High Tide of Islam

Selim I (1512–20) renewed the expansion of Turkish frontiers, though his efforts were not at once directed against Christendom. After conquering Syria and Palestine, he subdued Egypt in 1517 and put an end to the last representative of the ancient Saracenic caliphate. This achievement gave the sultan great prestige among the Mohammedans, and he and his successors henceforth bore the title of caliph, successor of the Prophet. The fall of Egypt did stir Pope Leo X and the Fifth Lateran Council to issue a call for a new crusade. Emperor Maximilian pledged support, but the Lutheran revolt commencing later in the same year put a restraint upon any immediate large-scale Christian offensive.

Suleiman the Magnificent (1520–66), Selim's son and successor, saw the Ottoman power reach its zenith. He quickly became as great a threat to Christendom as Mohammed II. For Suleiman now moved into the Balkans and commenced the conquest of Hungary. In vain did the Holy See attempt to screw up the courage and energy of Louis II of Hungary. The king was out hunting when papal legates arrived; he seldom rose before noon; he had no money, and failed to exercise the least control over his unruly and factious nobles. After allowing his stronghold of Peterwardein to fall into Turkish possession, he suddenly decided to resist and took the field with a poorly equipped army. This force was routed at Mohacs in 1526, and the king drowned in a swamp while

attempting to escape. Since Louis II had no direct heirs, Archduke Ferdinand of Austria and John Zapolya, prince of Transylvania, contended for the succession, while the Turks appropriated two thirds of the unhappy country.

Emperor Charles V (1519–58) was the only Christian monarch able to challenge the sultan, but he was distracted by the Lutheran revolt and five wars with the kings of France, who did not scruple to ally themselves with the Turks. In spite of these handicaps, the emperor did his best to halt further Turkish advance. His arrival after the catastrophe at Mohacs at least saved the remaining third of Hungary, and averted a possible invasion of Germany. Charles pursued the Turks into Greece, but was recalled to deal with the Lutherans. When the Turks took Rhodes in 1522, the emperor placed the island of Malta at the Hospitalers' disposal. Here they continued to hold the Christian sea bastion, but could do little to check the Mohammedan pirates who roamed the Mediterranean almost at will. The emperor's brilliant raid upon Tunis in 1535 did clear out one of these dens of pirates, but outside interests again prevented a successful follow-up. A subsequent assault upon Algiers was unsuccessful. Charles V, then, could do little more than keep Christendom on the defensive against the Turks during his lifetime, but he left two sons, Philip II of Spain and Don Juan of Austria, who momentarily turned the tide.

B. Christian Counteroffensive

(1) Victory at Sea

Selim II (1566–74), Suleiman's son, was the first of a long line of *fainéant* rulers who succumbed to the intrigues and vices of an absolutist court, legacy from Byzantium. Yet this decline was gradual, nor was it at once manifest in a military way. For Selim II still enjoyed the services of his father's grand vizier, Mohammed Sokölli (1560–79). An expedition that had already been under preparation in Suleiman's day, the capture of Cyprus, was carried out successfully in 1570. The Mediterranean peril thus became the most serious in years.

Lepanto. This emergency had been foreseen by Pope St. Pius V who had preached a new crusade. Preparations were too slow for the relief of Cyprus, but much credit nonetheless goes to King Philip II of Spain who shouldered the lion's share of the financing of the Christian flotilla. An allied fleet of 208 galleys was finally brought together under the titular command and inspiration of the king's brother, Don Juan, but the real technical direction lay with Admiral Marcantonio Colonna. With papal blessing this fleet set out to meet the Turkish galleys of Ali Pasha. At Lepanto, off Corfu, the Christians encountered Ali Pasha's 230 vessels on October 7, 1571. In a spirited encounter the crusaders sank

eighty ships and captured 130. St. Pius, apparently miraculously informed of this triumph, ejaculated: "There was a man sent from God whose name was John." But the feast of the Holy Rosary, assigned to this day, commemorates the real patroness of victory, for nothing short of her intervention could have saved a divided Christendom which could or would do little to save itself.

(2) REPULSE ON LAND

In the Balkans, the Turkish domination continued and even was extended during the century after Lepanto. But war with the Persians prevented the decadent Sublime Porte from devoting full attention to the European sector. During the second half of the seventeenth century, however, the Kiuprili family as viziers gave the sultanate an excess of energy. War was pressed against Venice at sea and most of Crete appropriated. Intermittent wars with Austria, Poland, and Russia revealed the Turks, if not always successful, still formidable foes. A decisive contest at length broke out.

Vienna to Karlowitz. Emeric Tököly, a bigoted Calvinist subsidized by Louis XIV of France, claimed not merely Turkish but Austrian Hungary for his Transylvanian principality. Assisted by 160,000 Turkish troops led by Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa, he invaded Habsburg territory and invested Vienna. The Emperor Leopold I had but sixty thousand men available, but Pope Innocent XI induced King John Sobieski of Poland to come to his assistance. While these forces were mustered by King John and the imperial commander, Duke Charles of Lorraine, Count Rudger von Stahremberg defended the Austrian capital from July 13, 1683, until the relieving force drove away the Turks the following September 12, now commemorated as the feast of the Holy Name of Mary. This Viennese triumph was followed up by a Holy League of the Empire, Poland, and Venice. Between 1684 and 1688 Buda was retaken, avenging Mohacs, and Belgrade captured. Thereafter the imperial generals, Charles of Lorraine and Eugene of Savoy, prosecuted the war alone. The latter's victory at Zenta in 1697 was decisive, and on January 26, 1699, the Peace of Karlowitz restored all of Hungary to Christian possession. This freed most of the Catholic subjects of the Turks, though Orthodox dissidents had yet to endure two centuries more of misrule by the sultanate in the Balkans.

13. LEVANTINE MISSIONS

A. *Catholic Mission Direction*

(1) AGENCIES

The Holy See had always been the hub of missionary efforts, and during ancient and medieval times evangelists received their canonical

mission from the popes. During the Renaissance this papal direction was obscured to a degree by the patronage rights bestowed upon the sovereigns of Spain and Portugal, but all the discoverers and explorers were interested enough in the spread of the Gospel to report to the Holy See. If not in the very first expedition of exploration, missionaries followed quickly afterwards, and whatever their clashes with unchristian cupidity, none challenged their right to be there. Powerful material backing was given by the Catholic rulers, although, as will be noted below almost as a refrain, this connection with the secular arm often prejudiced the spiritual effectiveness of the missionary appeal. Renaissance missions and those of the centuries that followed tended to be conducted largely by the religious orders, both those founded in medieval times, and those springing from the Catholic Reformation. They were generally the heroic pioneers, though during a more settled colonizing stage that followed, the record was sometimes tarnished by jurisdictional disputes among themselves and with the secular clergy. Finally, the Protestant Revolt had the effect of weakening the Catholic missionary resources, and eventually of confronting non-Christian nations with discordant versions of Christian revelation. But despite all these reservations, the modern missionary record is glorious.[1]

The Congregation of Propaganda, organized as one of the departments of the Roman curia by Pope Gregory XV in 1622, was given the task of supervising this world-wide missionary effort of the Catholic Church. Besides providing priests for Catholics living under penal regulations in Protestant countries in Europe, *Propaganda Fidei* endeavored to centralize direction of the foreign missions at Rome. But here the Roman curia encountered the vested interests of the Spanish and Portuguese crowns in the extensive patronage privileges conceded them during the sixteenth century. In addition to this Erastian influence of the Catholic monarchs, the new congregation encountered some difficulty from the religious communities already in the mission fields and strongly attached to techniques which they believed to represent the fruit of experience. Roman solicitude for the formation of a native clergy in the missionary fields seldom prevailed in practice against the nationalistic attempts to Europeanize all converts, and to confine the ranks of the clergy to missionaries from the West. Foundation of the French Foreign Missionary Society in 1657 was an encouraging development: between 1660 and 1800 it sent out 317 missionaries. Presently the Congregation of Propaganda made an effort to withdraw the vicars apostolic from royal control, and to subject all the missionaries, whether religious or secular, to pontifical guidance and regular episcopal juris-

---

[1] Joseph Schmidlin, *Catholic Mission History,* trans. Matthias Braun (Techny, Ill.: S.V.D. Mission Press, 1933), p. 287.

diction. In fact, in 1678 in the brief, *Cum Haec Sancta Sedes,* Pope Innocent XI exacted a special oath of obedience from all the foreign missionaries, regular or secular, to the vicars apostolic in missionary lands. In many instances this protestation of loyalty was given but grudgingly and royal interposition eventually led to many exemptions from the pontifical directive. These exemptions were reluctantly confirmed by the Congregation of Propaganda in regard to the Jesuit missionaries in Indochina in 1689, and before long they became quite general.

(2) TECHNIQUES

Native customs proved difficult of adaptation to Christian rites, particularly in the Orient where the inhabitants prided themselves upon cultures more ancient than the European. Thus arose the controversy over the Confucian and Malabar ceremonies in China and India. The principle laid down by decision of the Holy Office in 1645, 1656, and 1669 seems to have been that "idolatrous or superstitious ceremonies were prohibited, but purely civil rites were permitted." But disputes persisted between Jesuits and Dominicans regarding the application of this principle in China, India, and Indochina. In 1704 a narrow view was taken of the use of the Chinese terms for deity and they were banned. This decision was rather unintelligently applied by the ill-informed Roman envoys, Tournon and Mezzabarba. At that time, however, pagan mentality seems indeed to have given some religious significance to these customs; hence their fusion with Christian life was interdicted until 1939 when Rome made some new interpretations in view of the gradual secularization of the Oriental viewpoint which had reduced most of these customs to merely civic and patriotic observances. But, as will be seen, these solutions were reached only after protracted and anxious investigation into alien mentality.

B. The Oriental Rites

(1) BYZANTINE DISSIDENTS UNDER TURKISH RULE

Political conditions. When they professed a preference for "the turban rather than the tiara," the Byzantine Orthodox assumed no easy yoke. The Turkish sultans regarded their Christian subjects as erring theists; the *kitabis* or "protected ones," indeed, but a *rayah* or flock to be shorn as well as "protected." The Byzantine Dissidents were styled the "millet of Rum," that is, the (Graeco-) Roman Nation, a protectorate for the religious subjects of the patriarch of Constantinople. The latter, assigned St. George's Church in the Greek quarter of Constantinople, known as the Phanar, was accorded ceremonial privileges and made autonomous civil governor of the Christians under Ottoman rule.

But in return he was required to receive confirmation—the *berat*—from the sultan for his appointment, and this was a favor never accorded without a monetary payment. Indeed, the sultan got into the habit of encouraging clerical factions to depose and re-elect patriarchs every few years, for each new confirmation elicited another fee. Much ecclesiastical property, including the magnificent Hagia Sophia, was confiscated. Ottoman military power was maintained by the *Yeni Cheri* or Janissaries, the "new troops" recruited from the Christian population by periodical extortion of a tribute of children for the military training school. The Janissaries existed from the reign of Sultan Orkhan (1326–59) until 1826, when they were abolished in favor of mechanized troops. The sultans supported the Greek patriarchs' efforts to Hellenize the Slavic churches and subject them to their jurisdiction, and by the close of the eighteenth century local autonomy had been destroyed. But this policy eventually boomeranged against the Byzantine patriarchate, for the subsequent Balkan independence movements repudiated its religious sway at the same time that political freedom was asserted.

Theological questions. Though fiercely hostile toward Rome, the Dissidents generally opposed any co-operation with Protestantism. Cyril Lukaris, educated under humanistic auspices at Venice and Padua, did attempt to introduce Calvinism during his seven brief terms as Patriarch of Constantinople. But his intrigues aroused the intense opposition of the Orthodox clergy, who finally denounced Lukaris to the Turks who strangled him (1638). When Lukaris's ideas were revived by Parthenios II (1644–46), the Greek Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheus, led seventy bishops in a conciliar condemnation of various Protestant errors during 1672. On the other hand, when Patriarch Cyril II Kontaris of Constantinople proposed reunion with Rome, he was deposed, deported to Tunis, and there slain in 1640. Although the monks of Mount Athos in Greece corresponded with Catholic scholars from time to time between 1620 and 1737, general antipathy for the Latins endured. The Greeks refused to accept the Gregorian calendar reform—until it was forced upon them by the Communists. In 1755 Patriarch Cyril V of Constantinople went so far as to declare that the sacrament of baptism as administered by infusion in the Latin and Armenian rites was invalid. Though this remained the official patriarchal attitude, many of the Greek theologians disagreed with it.

(2) Byzantine Rite Catholics

At Constantinople itself, a few Catholics, mostly of the Latin Rite, survived under the friars' ministry despite Turkish hostility. In 1583 Pope Gregory XIII sent five Jesuits there; although once driven out, the survivors returned with French protection in 1609. The Treaty of

Vienna (1615) assured Catholics the right to build churches and hold liturgical services. Despite the fact that the terms of this accord were often violated by the Turks, fifteen thousand Catholics survived until the nineteenth century when it was possible to found a Catholic parish of the Greek Rite.

The Italo-Greek-Albanians are really survivors of the Byzantine Rite who never participated in the Cerularian Schism. Their proximity to Rome in Calabria and Apulia preserved them from Byzantine reprisals, though their liturgical services suffered some admixture with Latin rites. They were approaching extinction when re-enforced after 1453 by refugees from the Balkan peninsula, and especially the Albanians. The popes long assisted Albanian efforts to defend their independence against the Turks, and guarded the customs of the Italian refugees from destruction at the hands of Latins.

Ruthenians or Ukrainians are those Russians who returned to Catholic unity at Florence (1439) with St. Isidore of Kiev, or made their submission at Brest-Litovsk (1596) with Metropolitan Ragosa of Kiev. Their history is bound up with that of Poland and Russia, where they numbered 1,500,000 before the Brest Union was declared rescinded by the czar in 1839.

Rumanians of the Byzantine Rite have been Catholic since the reconciliation of Bishop Theophilus Szerémy of Alba Julia by Father Baranyi, S.J. in 1697. Though Bishop Theophilus died shortly thereafter, Bishop Athanasius of Transylvania and many of his flock were soon reconciled so that by 1701 there were two hundred thousand Catholics. A new schism reduced this number by about half during the eighteenth century, but some hardy converts held on to the comparative toleration of the new Rumanian principality of the nineteenth century.

Serbians never entirely broke off communications with Rome, and between 1596 and 1704 nine refugee bishops were reconciled in Hungary. From 1611 a Catholic center existed at Marca when Bishop Simeon Vretanjic was recognized by the Holy See as vicar of the Latin Rite bishop of Zagreb. In 1777 the Byzantine Catholic Serbs received a diocese of their own at Crisium.

Melkites designate members of the Byzantine Rite within the ancient patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The Orthodox patriarchs of Antioch displayed persistent Romeward tendencies ever since the Council of Florence. Two groups evolved: the Syrians who favored Rome, and the Greeks who yielded to the hostile pressures from the sultan and ecumenical patriarch at Constantinople. Since 1626 a Jesuit mission had been established in Syria, and during 1724 one of their converts, Seraphim Tanas (1680–1759), a graduate of Propaganda Col-

lege at Rome, was elected patriarch of Antioch. Although the Greek faction at once chose a new dissident prelate, Tanas as Cyril VI has had an unbroken line of Catholic successors to this day, despite serious persecutions from the Turks.

(3) ARMENIAN CATHOLICS

While the dissidents tried to influence the Turks against Catholic reunion efforts, the French ambassadors at Constantinople interposed in the opposite direction, not always prudently. One victim of Turkish reprisals was the convert priest, Gomidas Keumurgian, who was beheaded in 1707—he was beatified in 1929. In spite of this persecution, reconciliations, even from the ranks of the hierarchy, continued. Bishop Tazbas Melkoun of Mardin, a former student at Propaganda, spread Catholic tenets within the Armenian Rite and converted Abraham Ardzivian (1679–1749) who was chosen Catholic patriarch in 1740. He was confirmed as such by Pope Benedict XIV two years later, and from him an unbroken line of Catholic successors has descended.

(4) SYRIAN CATHOLICS

Though the Jacobites as a group repudiated Florence, individual conversions were made, especially after the admission of Capuchin and Jesuit missionaries in 1626. A considerable number of converts to Catholicity were made at Aleppo, and here in 1656 another alumnus of Propaganda, Andrew Akidian, was installed as bishop. Though recognized as patriarch by Rome in 1662, he and his Catholic successors met with violent opposition from the Dissidents, who usually enjoyed the favor of the sultan. So serious did this persecution become during the early part of the eighteenth century, that the Uniates were unable to select a primate and had to accept the ministry of Latin missionaries for a time. But finally in 1781 a convert, Michael Garweh, revived the Catholic Syrian patriarchate, and though often in hiding or in exile, succeeded in rallying the Catholics by his holiness and energy.

The Maronites, in union with Rome since Florence, remained faithful to Catholicity, but less so to their rite, which became progressively Latinized. Renowned Maronite scholars were four members of the Assemani family, and Germanos Farhat, archbishop of Aleppo (d. 1732). Lax ecclesiastical discipline was corrected in the Council of Lebanon (1736) under Archbishop Joseph Assemani as papal legate. Yet the remainder of the eighteenth century was disturbed by some instances of jurisdictional disputes, of iconoclasm, and the vagaries of the nun of Aleppo, Anna Aggemi (d. 1798), until the Holy See firmly and successfully intervened.

(5) CHALDEAN CATHOLICS

Internal disputes for the Nestorian patriarchate led to a return to Rome of a group of Chaldeans, and John Sulaka began a patriarchal line in 1552. Though this relapsed into schism in 1692, a new Catholic episcopal succession had begun in 1672. But the Catholic body was troubled by dissension until 1830.

(6) COPTIC CATHOLICS

Catholic organization properly speaking began with the appointment by Rome of the convert Coptic bishop of Jerusalem, Amba Athanasius, as vicar apostolic for Catholics of this rite in 1741. The bishop continued to live at Jerusalem, ruling Egypt through a vicar. His successors established themselves in Egypt itself, though none received episcopal consecration until 1824, and the patriarchal title was not revived until the close of the nineteenth century.

14. RETURN TO THE OLD WORLD

A. Africa

Medieval missionary efforts had been chiefly confined to the North African coast, although contacts had been established with "Prester John's" land of Ethiopia.

Renaissance discoveries opened up coastal Africa to missionaries. In 1483 Diozo Cao landed at the Congo and brought some natives back to Portugal to receive Christian training. This Congo mission flourished for a time, and even gave a native bishop to the Church. But Moslem encroachment and lack of missionaries caused the mission to languish. Despite local triumphs, this was also the pattern in Angola where missionary work began in 1526; in Guinea where numerous chiefs were baptized in the late fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries; and in East Africa where missions from the Indian way station of Mozambique encountered resistance and persecution from Islam. Madagascar claimed the lives of numerous Vincentian missionaries between 1648 and 1674, without immediate tangible result. The Jesuits were making progress in Ethiopia when interference with the native customs caused the Negus Basilides to expel all missionaries in 1632. "Here also, as elsewhere on the Black Continent, too summary and spasmodic missionary undertakings met with eventual failure despite all the heroic efforts of the missionaries." [2] Superficial conversions, governmental interference, but probably most of all, the bad example of European traders and warriors hampered or nullified missionary endeavors.

[2] Schmidlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 245–47.

B. The Indies

(1) REDISCOVERY

"The Portuguese expeditions of discovery and conquest were simultaneously missionary journeys, and the Portuguese settlements served as so many bases for the propagation of the Faith and for ministering to the spiritual needs of the Europeans."[3] Vasco da Gama, arriving for the first time in 1498, was accompanied by missionaries. Mistaking Brahman shrines, Da Gama assumed that all non-Moslems in India were Christians, but Pedro de Covilham soon acquired the martyr's crown for bold preaching. More missionaries came out with Cabral in 1500, and with Albuquerque in 1503; and thereafter the Portuguese crown, by arrangement with the Holy See, provided a steady supply. The first viceroys, Francisco de Almeida (1505-9) and Affonso de Albuquerque (1509-15), fought off the Moslems and set up a Christian base at Goa. This was made over into a European center, but unfortunately it did not give a good example to the natives. If the colonists preserved the Faith, they were often the worst caricatures of Christian morality. The early missions were not intensive, and hierarchical organization was slow.

St. Francis Xavier (1506-52), who arrived in India by 1542, had been empowered beforehand as papal nuncio and royal inspector, although he did not assert these prerogatives against Bishop Albuquerque of Goa, who co-operated with him loyally. St. Francis indicted the settlers' example: "You preach Christ Crucified and yourselves crucify those who allow themselves to be duped by you," one of the natives had complained to him. St. Francis did achieve noteworthy but unfortunately merely temporary success in reviving the colonists' religious spirit. He then set to work among the Paravians, employing native catechists to complete the work of instruction begun in his imperfect command of the language. Next he extended his activity to Travancore, inducing its populace to destroy their idols. After a pilgrimage to the reputed tomb of St. Thomas the Apostle at Mylapur, St. Francis went on to Ceylon, Cochin, Malacca, and the Moluccas. After 1549, however, although still in supreme command of the Indian mission, he was chiefly occupied with the Far East. But after his death off the coast of China his body was brought back to Goa. Though legend has distorted and exaggerated some of his exploits, there can be no doubt that he had the gift of miracles, converted great numbers, and proved an extraordinary inspiration to foreign missionary work, both for contemporaries and those who came after.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 290.

(2) The Patronado

The Portuguese Crown by papal concession exercised patronage over all the missions in its colonial dominions. Claims to patronal privileges reached their climax in Juan Solorzano Pereira's work, *De Indiarum Iure*—placed on the Index in 1642—which asserted a royal disciplinary power to expel and punish clerics and religious, ratify appointments to sees and mission posts, give or withhold approval to transmission of papal and episcopal documents. Monsignor Ingoli, secretary of the Congregation of Propaganda (1625–44), complained in his reports of royal nomination to ecclesiastical benefices without the corresponding provision of adequate support. But little improvement occurred before the nineteenth century.

Hierarchical organization was likewise defective. Goa became a see in 1533 and an archbishopric in 1558 with jurisdiction over the whole of the East Indies and the Far East. Hampered by strict government restrictions and the immensity of their charge, these prelates were scarcely able to visit their subjects. Mass conversions were sometimes reported without adequate prior instruction, so that often the Christian practices were "crude and external." The Jesuits proved powerful auxiliaries for the bishops. By 1660 they had four hundred missionaries in India. They set up a college, novitiate, printing shop, and catechumenate at Goa. In 1580 three Jesuits even interviewed the great mogul, Akbar, though without winning him over. The first council of Goa in 1567 forbade superficial or forcible conversion measures, but royal patronage and rapacious colonists continued to hamper missionary activity.

(3) Malabar Rites Question

Early missionary efforts had chiefly been confined to the lower castes so that the influential groups in India despised Christianity. Though the Jesuits were particularly tolerant of native customs, they made no progress with intellectuals of the Brahman caste. Father Roberto Nobili, S.J., a friend of St. Robert Bellarmine, was the first to experiment with a new missionary technique in 1608. Already fluent in Hindustani, he acquired Sanskrit and studied the ancient Hindu classics. Adopting Brahman dress, customs, and caste distinctions, he strove to abide by the smallest detail of the Brahman ritual, and insisted that all visitors, even European, should do likewise. Translating St. Robert's *Catechism,* he used it to instruct the curious by the Socratic method. Though he rejected obviously idolatrous rites, he accepted or adapted all the rest. Even the Christian doctrine he advertised as the "lost fourth Veda."

Trouble began about 1610 when Nobili's confrere Fernández accused

him of blending Christian teaching with paganism, and denounced him to Rome as an apostate. After a lengthy inquiry, Pope Gregory XV sanctioned a cautious use of certain Brahmanic customs in 1623. Nobili could resume his methods with success until his retirement in 1643. He died in 1656, having, along with his associates, won an estimated one hundred thousand converts by his revolutionary methods. Thenceforth Jesuit missionaries divided into two classes: those who worked among the Brahmans alone, and those who visited all castes willing to have dealings with them. Chief among Father Nobili's disciples was Blessed John de Britto, tireless worker from his arrival in 1665 until his beheading in 1693. But opposition eventually arose from other religious orders. In particular, the newer missionaries of the French Mission Society took a conservative view of Father Nobili's accomplishments and pressed *Propaganda Fidei* for a condemnation. The papal envoy Tournon visited India in 1703 and prohibited a number of "Malabar rites": omission of various ceremonies, e.g., breathing, spittle, salt, from the baptismal rite out of deference to Hindu susceptibilities; practice of certain ablutions by Christian Brahmans; retention of some pagan puberty and marriage ceremonies, etc. The archbishop of Goa suspended Tournon's decree and appealed to Rome, where two Jesuits went to defend their policy. Clement XI, however, sustained Tournon on all fundamental points in 1711. Something approaching schism ensued as some of the bishops and missionaries withheld the papal prescriptions. Clement XII made a few slight concessions in 1739, but in 1744 Pope Benedict XIV definitively condemned use of the Malabar rites, at most permitting for ten years omission of the saliva rubric in the baptismal ceremony. All missionaries were bound by oath to rigid observance of the papal directive, and the controversy quieted down.

Missionary decline, however, proceeded by reason of the encroachments of the Protestant Dutch and English. While Portugal was under Spanish rule (1580–1640) most of the Portuguese lands in the East Indies were seized by the Dutch who quite thoroughly stamped out Catholic missions. Although Goa remained a Portuguese center, a brief of Alexander VII in 1658 suggests a deterioration of the missionary spirit among the clergy. Finally, suppression of the Society of Jesus and the persecution of Sultan Tippoo of Mysore threatened the continuance of the Indian missions toward the end of the eighteenth century.

(4) INDONESIA

The East Indian islands which had been evangelized by the Portuguese missionaries from India and had been visited by St. Francis Xavier shared the history of India. Evangelization proceeded against Moslem influence in Borneo, Java, and Sumatra, where both lords and

people were converted in large numbers and churches erected. Dutch conquest, however, brought oppressive measures which reduced the faithful Catholics to a handful, while Protestant ministers took over the mission stations. Though subject to arrest or expulsion, a few priests ventured in from time to time, but an extensive apostolate was out of the question.

The Philippines proved an exception to the missionary vicissitudes of the East Indies. Evangelization and civilization proceeded with comparative tranquility, and Spain retained its generally beneficent rule over the islands throughout the period of evangelization. Within a century of the first baptisms (1568), some two million had been received into the Church, and missionary efforts were being extended to the Marianas and Caroline Islands.

C. The Far East

(1) JAPAN

The Portuguese rediscovered China in 1517 and established contact with Japan in 1542. Eventually they set up a stronghold at Macao for a profitable trade with the Far East. The patronage privileges of the Portuguese crown were meticulously asserted over the Church in this area as well as in India.

Japanese opening. Having received a report on conditions in Japan from a Japanese neophyte, Angera, St. Francis Xavier set out from India in 1549. With Father Torres and Brother Fernández, he landed at Kagoshima the same year and obtained permission from the daimyo (feudal chief) of Satsuma to preach. He began to catechize with the assistance of interpreters, for he was unable personally to obtain a perfect command of the alien tongue. After a number of attempts, he succeeded in reaching the shogun's court at Yamaguschi and obtained a general authorization to conduct missionary work in Japan. Some Buddhist bonzes were won over, and a number of the common people had accepted the Catholic religion before St. Francis Xavier returned to his Indian headquarters in 1551.

Rapid expansion took place under St. Francis's successors, Fathers Torres and Gago, and fifteen hundred converts are reported by 1555. Shogun Nobunga encouraged the missionaries in many ways, although he did not himself accept Christianity. In 1585 he sent an embassy to the Holy See which could report that the missionaries, although still only 26 in number, could count 150,000 converts and two hundred chapels in Japan. Five daimyos had been won over and some had been bold enough to encourage the destruction of idols. Pope Sixtus V accordingly named Father Morales, S.J., the first bishop for Japan, but

the nominee died at Mozambique on the way to his designated see of Funai.

Persecution. On its return from Rome, the embassy discovered that Nobunga had died and Shogun Hieyoshi was in control. After some initial favors, this ruler turned against the Christians and in 1587 ordered the expulsion of all missionaries. This edict was not perfectly executed and the priests continued to work in obscurity. But when further missionaries continued to arrive, official alarm mounted, and in 1597 six Franciscans, three Jesuits, and seventeen of the faithful were crucified at Nagasaki. Though the next Shogun Ieyasu relented for a time, in 1612 a still more strenuous prosecution commenced. Despite severe tortures, however, multitudes preferred martyrdom to apostasy. An attempted revolt in 1637 only led to governmental reprisals which took the lives of thirty-five thousand Christians. Missionaries continued to enter Japan as late as 1643, but thereafter the rigid sealing of the ports against all foreigners cast the native Japanese Christians upon Providence and their own resources for two centuries.

(2) CHINA

Penetration. China remained St. Francis Xavier's missionary objective ever since he learned of its cultural and religious prestige among the Japanese. The saintly pioneer, however, died on the island of Sancian in 1552 without being able to penetrate into the country. Father Barretto, S.J., did succeed in entering the land in 1555, but was unable to remain, and all other missionaries who made similar attempts were arrested or deported down to 1581. In that year Father Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci finally obtained a severely restricted visa to take up residence.

Father Matteo Ricci was in some sense the Nobili of the Chinese mission. From 1581 he labored in Chow-king near Canton, though he and his associates had made only forty converts by 1586. At first he wore the garb of a bonze, or Buddhist monk, but later he changed his tactics. Assuming the garments of a mandarin or scholar, Father Ricci put his brilliant scientific talents to good use in obtaining a hearing for his missionary preaching. He made a number of missionary journeys and in 1601 secured the king's permission to settle at the capital of Peking. He and his fellow Jesuits continued to attract attention by mingling sacred and profane science, and displaying something of the attractions of Christian literature and art. Father Ricci, superior of the mission until his death in 1610, converted the royal secretary Siu-Kwangki and members of the nobility, although his converts among the populace did not exceed several hundred.

Chinese rites became a matter of controversy analogous to the Malabar disputes in India. Although Father Ricci had rejected Taoism and Buddhism as false religions, he considered Confucianism merely cultural lore, "certainly not idolatrous, perhaps not even superstitious." He deemed that certain Chinese terms for the deity might be properly employed by Catholic theologians in instructing Chinese converts. Father Langobardi, Ricci's successor, was rather hostile to the native customs, and yet made thirteen thousand converts. On the other hand, Fathers Schall and Verbiest continued Ricci's methods and contacts with the Chinese court. As early as 1626 Jesuits and Dominicans were at odds in regard to various customs, but the Congregation of Propaganda seemed at first to prefer or tolerate the more liberal views of the former.

Controversy became intense, however, when Monsignor Maigrot, vicar apostolic of Fukien, condemned the Chinese Rites in 1693 and forbade the use of the Chinese term "Tien-Shangti" to designate God. The Jesuits at Peking obtained from King Kang-Ti an endorsement of their thesis that the Confucianist rites were but "civil and political." But Pope Clement XI sustained Maigrot: while Tien Chu (Lord of Heaven) was permissible, Tien (Heaven) and Shang-Ti (Despot) were declared inadequate renditions for the idea of deity. Rome asserted that no mere question of etymology was involved, but that there was danger of an ambiguity to which the rejected terms might pander. The nuncio Tournon promulgated these decisions of the Holy See on his visit to China in 1705. Unfortunately Tournon seems to have been ill-qualified for diplomacy. His tactless dealings with Kang-Ti provoked that monarch's wrath. Maigrot was exiled and Tournon, after a period of detention in China, was handed over to the Portuguese, who promptly incarcerated the nuncio at Macao for his cavalier treatment of the *patronado*. Tournon, nominated cardinal in his prison, died in his Far Eastern captivity. Another papal representative, Archbishop Mezzabarba, made some ill-advised concessions in 1720 which the Holy See later repudiated. Pope Innocent XIII thereupon exacted categorical obedience from the Jesuits to the prescriptions of Rome, and Pope Benedict XIV upheld Tournon in substance by condemning the Chinese rites during 1742.

Persecution and confusion followed, the former from the suspicious Chinese government, and the latter among the missionaries. In 1732 all missionaries save the scholars at Peking were ordered to betake themselves to Canton or Macao, and some priests were put to death. The suppression of the Society of Jesus toward the close of the eighteenth century deprived the Far East of the region's most successful missionaries, for there were about three hundred thousand Chinese Christians in 1785 when in response to the urgent request of the Holy See, the

Vincentians arrived in the Chinese mission to substitute for the Jesuit missionaries.

15. DISCOVERY OF A NEW WORLD

A. *The Norse Vanguard*

(1) EARLY AMERICAN EXPLORATION

Scandinavian penetration of Iceland dates from the landing of Gardar in 860. Within a century thousands of settlers came, among them fugitives from the new order set up in Scandinavia with the unification of the kingdoms. Eric the Red, exiled from Norway for manslaughter, after repeating his offense in Iceland, found it prudent to sail further west. About 983 he established himself in Greenland, already visited by Gunniborn in 876. Kinsmen joined him in the new land to which he gave its name. Eric's son, Leif the Happy, converted to Christianity in Norway about 990, brought several priests with him to Greenland. About 1000, Leif Ericson sailed southward from Greenland to explore a territory that he named Vinland. Although the exact location of this has not been precisely determined, it is reasonably certain that Vinland was on the North American mainland. Commercial connections were maintained with Greenland for several centuries thereafter. The existing Arctic civilization was primitive, in want of adequate resources for industry or transport. Nonetheless the European colonists seem to have maintained for some time a fairly prosperous settlement. During the fourteenth or fifteenth century, however, a combination of factors induced decline. Aborigines, presumably Eskimos, attacked, European manpower was decimated by the Black Death, and possibly some climatic changes terminated the Norse settlements just about the time that Spaniards were rediscovering America.

(2) NORSE MISSIONARY HISTORY

See of Gardar. As Christianity took stronger hold upon the Scandinavian peoples from 1000, Greenland also became Christian. The distance of Greenland from Norway led to the erection of a bishopric at Gardar in the eleventh century. Eric Gnupsson, possibly the first bishop, died in Vinland about 1121, a circumstance that suggests extensive efforts at evangelization. At any rate, the see of Gardar was filled more or less continuously until Bishop Alf died in 1377. Sixteen parishes and several monasteries are reported. Peter's Pence was paid and a papal bull of 1279 authorized collections "as well in the diocese of Gardar as in the islands and neighboring territories." Bishop Arne (1314–49) made contributions to the Crusades, including perhaps the item described as a "cup of transatlantic wood."

Decline set in shortly thereafter and there is no record of a resident bishop after the opening of the fifteenth century. In 1448 Nicholas V directed the Icelandic hierarchy to look after Christian captives of pagans in Greenland. By 1492, when Pope Alexander VI named Matthias Knuttsson to the see of Gardar, it was alleged that the people possessed no other memorial of the Holy Eucharist than the corporal on which the last resident priest consecrated, a century previously. Bishop Knuttsson probably did not reach Greenland, and the list of titulars of Gardar ends with Vincenz Kampe in 1537. At the same time Norway was wrested from the Catholic fold. Protestants neglected Greenland until the eighteenth century, and Catholics were effectually excluded from the area until the coming of United States military personnel to man the bases during the 1940's.

B. *The West Indies*

(1) COLUMBAN DISCOVERY

First Voyage. While there is no record of a priest on Columbus's first voyage, it opened with Columbus and his crew attending Mass at Palos before embarkation. His squadron—*Santa María, Santa Clara* (nicknamed *Niña*), and *Pinta*—set sail just before sunrise, about 5:15 A.M., August 3, 1492. Columbus proceeded to the Canaries which he did not leave until September 1. His voyage was on the whole swift and tranquil, though he proved to have miscalculated. Columbus, however, was a competent navigator and proved it on the way home. It is estimated that had he adhered to his plan of heading due west, he would have been beached on the inhospitable land of Florida, but in the Caribbean he was persuaded by migratory birds to alter his course in such wise that he reached San Salvador, Watling Island, in the Bahamas, at 2:00 A.M., October 12, 1492. Awaiting daylight and circling the island to a safe harbor, he landed, knelt, gave thanks, and took possession in the presence of bewildered natives. His motto, *Jesús cum Maria, sit nobis in via*, had not failed him.[4]

Subsequent explorations. On October 14, Columbus began to search for Japan by coasting along the Caribbean with impressed native guides. He kept the natives' confidence by kind treatment and petty gifts, and held his men under good discipline. On Christmas Day, the *Santa María* went aground in Coracal Bay. It was salvaged and its timbers made into the fort of Natividad, where Columbus left Diego de Harana, his brother-in-law, and thirty-nine sailors, while he returned to Europe. Transferring to the *Niña*, Columbus succeeded in reaching Palos on March 15, 1493, just a few hours before his insubordinate lieutenant, Pinzon. After making his report to the queen, Columbus was authorized

[4] Samuel Morison, *Admiral of the Ocean Sea* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1942).

to undertake another voyage. He departed on September 25, 1493, with seventeen ships and twelve hundred men, including Fray Buil and Fray Ramón. On their arrival in November, they found the settlement in ruins, and founded a new one of Isabella, where Mass was celebrated on Epiphany, January 6, 1494. After exploring part of Cuba and Jamaica, Columbus undertook the conquest of Haiti, or Hispaniola. Complaints multiplied against his management, and Columbus returned to Spain in March, 1496, to defend himself. On May 30, 1498, he was allowed six vessels for a third voyage, much of which was devoted to exploration of the South American shores. Arrested by inspector Bobadilla in 1500, he was shipped back to Spain in chains. Freed but not restored to his governorship, Columbus sailed on a last voyage in 1502. After coasting Central America in search of a strait, he set out in failing health for Spain where he arrived on November 7, 1504. The queen's death and his own illness forced the pioneer explorer into retirement until his death at Corunna, May 20, 1506.

(2) HIERARCHICAL ESTABLISHMENT

The first mission. When Columbus had returned to Spain after his initial discovery, the news was communicated to the Holy See. On May 3, 1493, Pope Alexander VI confirmed Spain's right of possession of the new territories on condition of propagating the Christian Faith. On May 4 the pope made the first of his famous definitions of the respective spheres of influence for Spain and Portugal in regard to actual and potential discoveries. Finally, on June 25, 1493, Alexander VI by the brief, *Pius Fidelium*, named Fray Bernard Buil (or Boyle) vicar apostolic of the New World, and conferred upon him and his twelve prospective companions canonical mission and extraordinary faculties. The bishop accompanied Columbus on his second voyage, and consecrated the first church, dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Disagreement, however, soon arose between the ecclesiastical and secular hierarchy, and with the return of Buil to Spain in 1494 his jurisdiction practically lapsed; at least there was no resident bishop from 1494 to 1513. It is true that on November 15, 1504, Pope Julius II by the bull *Illius Fulciti* had erected the ecclesiastical province of Hispaniola, comprising an archbishopric and two suffragan sees. But though bishops were named to these sees by the pope, the Spanish crown demanded that the new dioceses be subjected to the metropolitan see of Seville. This dispute retarded the bishops' departures, though one of them, Alessandro Gerardini of Santo Domingo, attended the Fifth Lateran Council as the first American member of the hierarchy at an ecumenical council. At last on August 8, 1511, Julius II revoked his previous act, and set up the sees of San Domingo, Concepción de la Vega, and San Juan de Puerto Rico as suffragan to

Seville. Bishop Manso arrived in the last-named see in 1513. Other dioceses, all subject to Seville, were erected between 1518 and 1538. Only in 1545 did Paul II erect metropolitan sees in the New World: at San Domingo, Mexico City, and Lima. The prelates of the former two archbishoprics, or their suffragans, exercised jurisdiction over such portions of the United States as came under Spanish control.

(3) MISSIONARY BEGINNINGS

Bishop Buil, a friend of St. Francis of Paula, inaugurated the Spanish mission in the New World by baptizing a few converts and erecting a church. After his departure, the Franciscan friars, Juan Pérez and John of Belgium, persevered, and presently from fifteen hundred to three thousand converts are reported. But it is feared that most of the early missionaries had little knowledge of the native language, so that the early evangelization was superficial. But the mission spread to the other islands of the Caribbean, and to Cuba and the Isthmus of Panama in 1511.

Treatment of the natives, however, left much to be desired. At first the colonists enslaved them, herding them into concentration camps and mines where they died off rapidly—according to Las Casas's probably exaggerated claims, three million perished within twenty years. The early governors, Columbus and his son Diego, were too often absent, and their successors, Balboa and Avila, too preoccupied with extending Spanish power to provide efficient or just rule. As early as 1510, Friar Antonio Montesino, O.P., protested against these abuses to the crown. In 1512 King Ferdinand did enact the Laws of Burgos safeguarding the natives, but since execution of these decrees was entrusted to the exploiters themselves little real improvement resulted. Protection of the Indians became the single idea of Bartolomé de Las Casas (1474–1566), son of one of the conquistadores, who became a Dominican priest about 1510. This zealous reformer, however, in his impetuous desire to change everything at once and to treat the Indians on a basis of absolute equality, provoked opposition by rash, bitter, and exaggerated denunciations. While his idealism was a badly needed tonic, his lack of tact led to his recall. In 1515 he obtained from Cardinal Ximénes an ordinance requiring that Indians be grouped in villages and their exploitation in mines be mitigated. Abuses recurred, however, and Las Casas demanded abolition of the whole system of serfdom. Pope Paul III, indeed, condemned Indian enslavement in 1537, and Emperor Charles V in 1542 incorporated the best of the reform proposals into his "New Laws." These regulations replaced a feudal serfdom with a governmental protectorate. As legal vassals of the Spanish crown, the Indians paid an annual tribute for their protection, but under the new

system were allowed to own land, not only collectively, but individually. The courageous protests of the missionaries, therefore, saved the Indian race in Latin America from the worst instincts of the conquistadores and secured their survival under a humane, if extremely paternalistic, regime.

C. The Mainland of America

(1) FLORIDA

Florida, discovered on Easter, April 2, 1513, resisted colonization and evangelization for half a century. Ponce de León, who named this bit of the mainland Pascua Florida, attempted a colony in 1521, but at his death colonists and missionaries retired. Friar Montesino, the Indians' advocate, accompanied Ayllon in 1526, but this settlement also ended with the founder's death the same year. Juan Peréz, bishop-elect, went with Narváez on his Florida expedition of 1527, but no priest survived, nor did any return from De Soto's exploration of 1539. Florida's proto-martyr was Father Luis Cancer, O.P., who insisted upon being landed on the coast in 1549, but was slain with two companions. Missionaries accompanied a temporary settlement (1559–61) by De Luna, but permanent colonization and evangelization dates only from 1565.

(2) MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

The Aztecs seem to have invaded Mexico from the North during the fourteenth century, appropriating some features of a superior Mayan civilization already in existence. From a capital at Tenochtitlan or Mexico City they subjugated most of the tribes of modern Mexico. Their military dictatorship achieved a high material civilization, but antagonized their subjects by their extortions, not the least of which involved an annual tribute of children to be offered in sacrifice. Not too much regret, then, need be felt for the ruthlessness of the Spanish conquerors who are reported to have destroyed five hundred temples and twenty thousand idols by 1531. Despite Mexican legends of men to be expected from the East, there is no evidence that the land was evangelized prior to the coming of Spanish missionaries. Exploration of the mainland on the Isthmus of Panama had been going forward since 1509, and Spaniards were shipwrecked on the Mexican coast as early as 1511.

Hernando Cortes, Spanish officer from Cuba, departed for Yucatán without authorization during February, 1519. With less than six hundred soldiers and fourteen pieces of artillery he undertook to conquer Mexico. En route to the Mexican capital, he encouraged Aztec vassals in their hostility to their masters. On his arrival at the great city in November, he was received by the vacillating Montezuma II (1502–20), who thereafter alternated between plots and bribes in trying to

rid himself of his unwelcome guests. Cortes retaliated by seizing the chieftain and holding him as hostage. Cortes's chaplains, Diaz and Olmedo, celebrated Mass, baptized a few natives, but refrained from attacks on the Aztec religion. For the greater part of a year the Spaniards tried to win the Indians' allegiance for the Castilian crown through orders issued in the mouth of the captive Montezuma. When the Aztecs at length revolted, accidentally killing their chief in the process, Cortes and his men had to fight their way out of the city with diminished forces, June, 1520. But the Spanish captain recouped his losses by violence or diplomacy against such of his superiors or comrades as tried to replace him, and again enlisted the aid of Aztec vassals. Thus re-enforced, he returned and recaptured Mexico City after a siege, March 13, 1521.

Extension of the conquest continued under Cortes as governor, an office to which the emperor named him in 1522. At Cortes's request, Spain sent missionary aid: a band of three Franciscans arrived in 1523, and the superior, Martin de Valencia, came with eleven others in 1524. Missionaries accompanied Cortes in his expeditions, both northward and into Central America. Friar Tomás Ortiz and the Dominicans arrived in 1526, but soon fell into disputes with Governor Cortes. That vigorous leader was the object of many accusations, chief of which was that he intended to make himself an independent despot. He was recalled in 1527, and after a period of investigation and experiment, Mexico or New Spain received settled administration.

(3) PERU AND SOUTH AMERICA

The Incas had built up a powerful federation from 1100. By the time that Europeans came into contact with the land, many millions lived under a well-organized despotism, more enlightened and benevolent than that of Mexico. Of all the aborigines, the Incas displayed the greatest talents for politics and commerce. Unfortunately for them, however, civil war had broken out at the death of one of their greatest rulers, Huana Capac, in 1529, so that the Spaniards could utilize the rivalry of his sons.

Francisco Pizarro had explored this situation in 1524 with Friar Fernando de Lucque. Pizarro set out in 1531 with 180 men and two pieces of artillery to outdo Cortes. When the Inca chief Atahualpa visited his camp in November, 1532, Pizarro seized him and held him for ransom in gold. But in August, 1533, the Spanish captain executed Atahualpa and set up a puppet chief, Manco Capac II (1533–37). Thereby he gained such firm control of the Inca capital of Cuzco that a subsequent revolt during his absence failed to dislodge the Spaniards.

Spanish domination was widely extended before Pizarro's assassination in 1541. As in Mexico, a period of unrest followed, until definitive vice-regal administration was instituted in 1550.

Missionaries, headed by Reginald de Pedrazza, had come to Peru with Pizarro. The band included Pizarro's nephew, the fiery Fray Pedro de Valverde. When he protested to the emperor against his uncle's cruelty, he was named bishop of Cuzco (1536) and "protector of the Indians." He was later slain for his assault on native superstitions, but his work was carried on by others.

16. LATIN AMERICA

A. *The Spanish Colonial System*

(1) THE PATRONADO

The Spanish patronage system—and that of Portugal was similar—had certain precedents in the privileges granted to Spanish princes for their crusades against the Moors and their colonial activities in the islands, such as the Canaries. In 1493 Alexander VI had entrusted to the Spanish rulers the exclusive selection of missionaries for the Americas, and in 1501 he conceded to them the use of all the tithes from these colonies. Pope Julius II in 1508 authorized King Ferdinand to appoint to all benefices within the American colonies, subject alone to papal confirmation. The Spanish rulers utilized these concessions tenaciously and jealously: no priest might enter America without their leave; no church or school might be erected without sanction from the Spanish rulers; even the transfer of a sacristan had to be referred to them. Their decision was regarded as so final that sometimes sees were established and filled before the Holy See knew of their existence. The royal organ for the exercise of this *real patronado* was the Council of the Indies, resident at Seville, which from 1600 was supplemented by the *Camara de Indias*. Caesaro-papism demanded that all communications between America and Rome pass through Spain, and despite papal protests, the crown intercepted episcopal and conciliar reports from the New World and presumed to decide whether papal documents ought to be promulgated or not. Papal desires for the formation of a native clergy were consistently thwarted.[5]

(2) COLONIAL CONDITIONS

Spanish-American relations. As a rule, the early monarchs provided quite generously for the missions, both in men and supplies. By 1800, it is estimated, Latin America had a population of fifteen million of whom some seven million were in New Spain. There were three hun-

[5] Horatio dela Costa, S.J., "Native Clergy," *Theological Studies*, June, 1947.

dred thousand *peninsulares* or native Spaniards, about three million Creoles (colonists of Spanish descent), one million Mestitsos of mixed blood, ten million Indians, and eight hundred thousand Negroes. Their spiritual needs were served by ten metropolitan provinces and thirty-eight dioceses. But the hierarchy was almost exclusively Spanish, and all lucrative and honorable posts were nearly always held by Spaniards. The vastness of the territory often made episcopal visitation difficult, and this combined with the isolation of parishes set up on feudal haciendas weakened clerical discipline. Though the secular clergy were numerous, many of these did not have the care of souls. The regular clergy frequently quarreled with the hierarchy, and some were better known for routine administration of wealthy institutes than for missionary zeal. A native clergy was discouraged: the Third Provincial Council of Mexico (1585) and the Second of Lima (1591) made few exceptions in a flat prohibition of ordination of those lacking pure Spanish blood. Seminaries were few and mediocre. Popular piety tended to be exuberant and lavish, but also superficial and negligent, even to the extent of omitting Easter duties. But all these flaws must not blind one to the tremendous achievement as a whole, the evangelization of large portions of two continents by citizens of a European country scarcely numbering ten million people.

Indian missions were of two kinds: the *doctrinas* were largely separate national parishes for the more civilized natives, conducted by both the regular and secular clergy; the *reductiones* were reservations, especially those undertaken by the Jesuits from 1610 to 1761. These were planned cities, administered by a perpetual and minute clerical paternalism that strove to protect Indians from colonial rapacity and provide for their every spiritual and temporal need. The Indians, although not slaves and legally equal, were deemed minors under custody, and were to be obliged to work and study for their own good. This "Christian Communism," the material success of which is now universally recognized, was destroyed by the regalism of Pombal and Aranda, culminating in the expulsion and suppression of the Jesuit Order from Spanish and Portuguese dominions. On the whole, the missionaries' greatest obstacles ever lay in governmental meddling and colonial rapacity and bad example. The patronage system made for a rapid and widespread evangelization, but one that was too often superficial and dependent.

B. New Spain: Spanish North America

(1) Florida

Settlement, after a half century of effort, was achieved by Don Pedro Menéndez in 1565. The first permanent mission was founded at St. Augustine, and on September 8, 1565, the Mass of the Blessed Virgin,

said by the secular priest, Padre Martin Mendoza, inaugurated the first chapel and parish within the subsequent territory of the United States.

Development. Menéndez invited further missionaries, and Dominicans and Jesuits responded. A native renegade led an uprising in 1571, however, and all the Jesuit missionaries were slain. In 1577 Padre Alonso Reynoso revived the Florida mission with his fellow Franciscans, who remained the chief missionaries in this area down to 1763. In 1597 another Indian relapse, the Guale Island revolt, claimed the lives of five Franciscans, but others were saved by warnings from friendly Indians. After a visitation by Bishop Altamirano of Santiago de Cuba in 1606, more missionaries were sent out. From 1633 the friars began to penetrate the present state of Georgia and won five thousand converts within its confines. At its zenith, the combined Florida-Georgia mission is believed to have had forty-four missionaries, thirty-five mission stations, and thirty thousand converts. There is record of thirteen thousand confirmations by the Bishop of Santiago during his tour of 1674.

Decline. English colonists in the Carolinas, however, incited the Indians against the Spaniards. In 1702 Governor Moore of South Carolina took advantage of the War of Spanish Succession to invade Florida. Though the citadel of St. Augustine held out, the city, church, and library were destroyed, and many mission posts along the Georgia coast pillaged. Moore wreaked further havoc on another raid in 1704, during which many missionaries were slain. Catholic Indians were reduced to a few hundred in the vicinity of St. Augustine. The mission was further weakened by the English colonization of Georgia, followed by Oglethorpe's raid in 1740. Auxiliary bishops of the Diocese of Santiago, sometimes resident in Florida, tried to revive the mission, but with the cession of Florida to the British in 1763 and British violation of the stipulated religious toleration, all missionaries and most Spanish colonists departed. Catholic practices died out among the natives, though in 1768 Dr. Turnbull set up a plantation at New Smyrna to be worked by immigrants from Mediterranean lands. For their sake he secured the services of two priests, Fathers Camps and Casanovas, and the former, transferred to St. Augustine, remained until the recession of Florida to Spain in 1783. But the Spanish crown provided no further missionaries or subsidies for Florida, and the surviving Catholics had to obtain religious ministrations from New Orleans until the American annexation in 1819.

(2) MEXICO

The government of New Spain, after several governors had failed to give satisfaction, was entrusted to Don Antonio de Mendoza as first viceroy; he ruled until his transfer to the new viceroyalty of Peru in

1550. His able and just rule at last brought order to the country, and his successors continued to administer Spanish North America until Juan O'Donoju surrendered to the Mexican rebels in 1821.

Ecclesiastical organization properly began in 1527 when Friar Juan de Zummaraga was named first bishop of Mexico City by the emperor, though because of the sack of Rome papal confirmation was not forthcoming until September, 1530. The bishop-elect—he was not consecrated until 1533—arrived in 1528, defended the Indians against Nuñez de Guzmán and the Second Audiencia, and sustained Juan Diego in his account of an apparition of Our Lady at Guadalupe, December 9, 1531. This vision, which some Spaniards at first scorned, was delightedly accepted by the Indians, and became an important factor in Mexico's rapid conversion. Zummaraga returned to Spain in 1532 to defend his conduct before the Council of the Indies. He was exonerated, consecrated bishop, and returned in 1534. Unassuming, ascetic, zealous, he was a saintly pastor. In 1546 he was named archbishop and labored until his death two years later. In his pioneer organizing work he was ably seconded by the former lay official Quiroga, who became bishop of Michoacán from 1537 to 1565. He set up the Seminary of San Nicolás in his diocese, as well as schools and institutes of charity. The second archbishop, Alonso de Montafur (1553–72), opened the University of Mexico in 1553, and witnessed the introduction of the Inquisition (1569). But the Mexican Inquisition did not apply to the Indians, and there is evidence that it was less severe than the Spanish. Archbishop Pedro Moya (1572–91) was an able organizer. He presided over the Third Provincial Council whose legislation was long normative for New Spain. Subsequently, however, Old World disputes of governors and prelates, of bishops with their chapters, and of seculars versus regulars, were unfortunately transplanted to form wearisome chapters in Mexican history. On the other hand, by the end of the first century after the conquest, Mexico had a well-endowed and solidly established metropolitan province with ten suffragan sees.

Evangelization followed speedily upon the conquest. By mid-century there were some four hundred missionaries, financed by the crown. A campaign for destruction of idols began in earnest in 1525, while baptisms multiplied with great rapidity: a million are reported by 1531. Some of the early methods were superficial and criticized by Pope Paul III, but there is no reason to assume that the faith of the Indians, especially after the Guadalupe apparition, was not sincere. Missionaries ever extended the Faith: Gonzalo de Tapia was slain in 1594 in the northern province of Sinaloa, and the native Mexican, Friar Philip de Las Casas, was martyred in 1597 in Japan where he had been shipwrecked.

His holiness has been officially recognized as well as that of the lay brother, Blessed Sebastian de Aparicio.

Education was generously provided by Church and state in Mexico. The University of Mexico, chartered in 1551 and opened in 1553, was but one of ten universities in the Spanish colonies at the end of the colonial period—not to mention fifteen colleges. After the arrival of Pedro Sánchez and the Jesuits in 1572, schools, already begun, multiplied. A printing press had been set up in 1534, and books were plentiful. The missionaries taught agriculture and the practical arts to the natives, and music and painting were enlisted in the catechetical program. Literature was chiefly theological or historical, though the native Mexican, Sor Juana de la Cruz, was an original poet, and Alarcon y Mendoza, while producing his works in Spain, was Mexican born and educated. But training of the natives for the clergy was discouraged, on the grounds that they would lack both prestige and stability. Latin America would long regret this policy.

(3) New Mexico

Exploration. Interest in the Rio Grande region was aroused by survivors of Narváez's Florida expedition when Cabeza de Vaca reported "Seven Cities of Cibola," probably the Pueblos. Fray Marco de Nizza sighted the district from a distance in 1539 and his report fanned the Spaniards' enthusiasm to undertake an expedition under Coronado in 1540. This proved a disappointment, but one of the missionaries, Padre Juan Padilla, O.F.M., remained behind to preach to the Quivira Indians. He was slain somewhere in Kansas during 1544, first known missionary martyr within the confines of the United States. Soon after, two lay brothers, Juan and Luis, were killed south of this area. Another attempt by Padres Lopez and Santa Maria and Brother Rodriguez encountered a similar fate near Albuquerque between 1580 and 1582.

Occupation commenced in 1598 when Don Juan de Oñate reduced the Pueblo tribes to subjection and opened headquarters at San Gabriel, transferred to Santa Fe about 1605. Father Martínez headed a band of Franciscans accompanying Oñate, and they were periodically reenforced. Conversions, slow at first, increased after 1620 until forty thousand to eighty thousand are reported by the middle of the seventeenth century.

Revolt nonetheless followed by reason of the harshness of secular rule, dismay following famine and epidemic, and Apache raids. Under the medicine man Popé, the Pueblos rose at Santa Fe against the Spaniards in 1680, and killed 22 priests, 3 lay brothers, and 380 laymen before Governor Otermin fought his way to El Paso. Reconquest efforts

began in 1691 under Diego de Vargas, but the rebellion was not entirely crushed until 1697, for five more Franciscans were killed in 1696.

Stability was then achieved by the New Mexican missions, and by the middle of the eighteenth century they were again flourishing. In 1800 there were still thirty-four Franciscans and numerous Indian converts, but from the beginning of the Mexican revolt recruitment fell off and the missions were paralyzed by ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictional conflicts. Father Rascon, visiting the territory for the bishop of Durango in 1830, reported that the missions were then in ruinous condition. The zeal of Bishop Zubira of Durango, who visited New Mexico in 1832, 1845, and 1850, did much to sustain the Faith, until the nomination of John Lamy as vicar apostolic in 1850 opened American administration.

Arizona, part of New Mexico under Spanish-Mexican rule, was first known as Primaria Alta. Father Kino, S.J., worked out of Sonora in the region near Tuscon between 1691 and 1711, built churches, and made many converts. This mission lapsed at his death in 1711, but was revived in 1732 by his Jesuit confreres, Keler, Segesser, and Grasshoffer. When the Jesuits were expelled by the Spanish government, Franciscans replaced them. The Indians were long irresponsive: in 1750 they killed two Jesuits and the Franciscan, Father Garces; others were slain in 1781. Arizona shared the vicissitudes of the New Mexico mission during the Mexican revolution and the American wars, and most of the Spanish clergy were expelled for refusing to take an oath of allegiance to Mexico. After American annexation and the Gadsden Purchase, the Arizona area became part of Bishop Lamy's jurisdiction.

(4) TEXAS

Early contacts. Although Coronado and other explorers of New Mexico passed through Texas, Spain showed little inclination to annex the area until information was received of La Salle's explorations on the lower Mississippi and French designs on Louisiana. Indians had requested missionaries as early as 1590, when the legend of the "Blue Lady" was heard of for the first time. It is reported that several tribes of the Southwest displayed some familiarity with Christianity and claimed to have been instructed by a woman attired as a nun. Some have attributed this bilocation to the mystic, Maria de Agreda (1602–65), whose reputed revelations remain a matter of dispute. If the incident demands a supernatural explanation, an apparition of Our Lady of Guadalupe is proposed. Spasmodic missionary contacts were had with New Mexico in the visits of Father Salas in 1629, and of Salas and Ortego in 1632. About 1670 Father de Larios founded the mission of Coahuila among the Tejas Indians and was assisted by Father Dionisio in 1675.

Spanish occupation commenced with the expedition of Don Alonso de León in 1688. He was accompanied by the Franciscans under the leadership of Father Damian Mazanet, who established a number of missions among the Asinai and Tejas Indians. Pre-eminent among the newcomers was Venerable Antonio Margil, whose zealous labors were pronounced heroic in 1836. He founded missions among the Nacogdoches and Adayes, and penetrated Louisiana to set up a station called San Gabriel de Linares. Missions founded along the San Antonio River from 1717 eventually coalesced into the present city of San Antonio, which was the Texan administrative center in Spanish days. For ecclesiastical jurisdiction these missionaries were subject to the see of Guadalajara. Bishop Tejada of that diocese, familiar with conditions, visited Texas in 1759 to administer confirmation. In 1777 Texas passed under the rule of the Mexican see of Linares and Bishop Marin-Porras of that diocese was diligent in visiting Texas until expelled from his see during the Mexican Revolt.

Troubled times followed. In 1817 one Mier, bogus "Bishop of Baltimore," deceived some, while secularization of the missions by Mexico in 1825 and expulsion of the Spanish clergy in 1828 deprived Texas of priests. Irish-American settlers brought a priest, Michael Muldoon, in 1829; he was reputed quite liberal in baptizing immigrants to comply with Mexican land laws. What remained of the missions was destroyed during the Texan revolt against Mexico, and Father John Timon, C.M., sent by the Holy See in 1838 to investigate, found only two priests in Texas, and these not of exemplary character—though the worthy Friar de León had been murdered at Nacogdoches in 1834. Father Timon was named prefect apostolic (1839–41) and in that capacity introduced American missionaries and salvaged what Catholic property he could. When the Vatican recognized Texan independence (1840), the Texan Congress legally confirmed to Timon surviving mission churches. In 1841 Texas was made a vicariate-apostolic for Timon's aide, Father Odin, C.M., and in 1847, after Texan admission to the American Union, he was named first bishop of Galveston.[6]

(5) CALIFORNIA

Lower California. Indian hostility long rendered California unattractive to the Spaniards. Though missionaries accompanied Viscaino's explorations in 1596 and 1602, no lasting mission was established. This became the work of the Jesuits, aided by a subscribed "Pious Fund" (1697). In 1697 Father Juan de Salvatierra, with whom Father Kino cooperated, opened the mission of Loreto. He and his successors, among whom Father Juan de Ugarte is prominent, founded more than sixteen

[6] Ralph Bayard, C.M., *Lone-Star Vanguard* (St. Louis: Vincentian Press, 1945).

stations before their expulsion in 1768. Then Franciscans, headed by Fray Junípero Serra, were assigned to take over the Jesuit missions.

Upper California, however, became the chief scene of Padre Serra's labors when Spain decided to avert Russian expansion by occupying the region to the north (1769–86). Father Serra went with Don Portola on his first expedition, and on July 16, 1769, inaugurated the famous California mission system by his foundation at San Diego. Before his death in 1784, Father Serra founded eight other mission stations: San Carlos (1770); San Antonio and San Gabriel (1771); San Luis Obispo (1772); San Juan Capistrano and San Francisco (1776); Santa Clara (1777) and San Buenaventura (1782). Though the Santa Barbara mission had been planned by Father Serra, it could not be set up until the administration of his successor, Father Lasuen (1784–1803), who saw the establishment of Santa Barbara (1786), La Purissima (1787), Santa Cruz (1791), Soledad (1791), San Jose, San Juan Bautista, San Miguel, San Fernando (1797), and San Luis Rey (1798). Missions subsequently founded were Santa Inez (1804), San Rafael (1817), and San Francisco de Solano (1823). Of these, only the Santa Barbara Mission has been continuously in Franciscan hands.

The Indian missions in California were a triumph of grace and zeal over native inertia, rated by anthropologists as exceedingly primitive. There are records of the baptism of over fifty thousand of these Indians and of their incorporation into the life of the missions. Not only were they instructed in faith and morals, but also taught how to cultivate the soil and support themselves by local products. The converts were kept comparatively isolated from the colonists under missionary supervision; if there were defections from the ideal, they usually arose from the clash of ecclesiastical and secular jurisdiction.The Franciscans were not allowed sufficient time to work out their civilizing function and after their removal the life went out of the missions and the Indians were dispersed.

Transition began with the Bonapartist invasion of Spain, which cut off supplies, and the Mexican Revolution, which brought anticlericalism into power. The Mexican Government sequestered the Pious Fund and took the California missions from Franciscan control under pretext of confiding them to the secular clergy. Actually few clerical replacements were provided and much property was taken by the secular authorities. Government of California by religious under the discipline of their Order had minimized the disadvantages of its subjection to the distant see of Sonora. To remedy this in part, Friar Garcia Diego Moreno was named bishop of both Californias in 1840. His administration was one of retrenchment, overshadowed by the approach of war with the

United States. The bishop died in 1846, and his see remained vacant until after American annexation when Bishop Alemany, O.P., inaugurated a new era.

C. *Peru: Spanish South America*

(1) VICEROYALTY OF PERU

Organization. Dissension followed Pizarro's assassination until the Emperor's deputy, Padre Pedro de Gasca, reconciled factions and subdued the rebels. In 1550 Antonio de Mendoza arrived from Mexico to introduce the viceregal system into South America which he had so successfully initiated in Mexico. Although death quickly removed him, his successor Francisco Alvárez de Toledo (1569-81) established the new regime after a new period of disorder. Until 1821 the viceroys of Peru were the chief deputies of the Spanish crown in South America. Ecclesiastical organization followed soon after nomination of Lima as the Peruvian capital in 1541. The Dominican Hieronymus de Loaysa was the first bishop (1541-75) and archbishop (1545). His zeal was continued by his successor, St. Toribio de Mogrovejo (1580-1606), whose missionary visitations turned the tide of conversion and whose seminary provided for clerical recruitment. St. Rose of Lima (1586-1617), first canonized saint of the Americas, received her vocation during his pontificate.

Evangelization proceeded apace. Though perhaps a majority of Indians had been converted by 1700, missions continued throughout the colonial period as more remote regions were opened up to Spanish penetration. For instance, Father Baraze (d. 1702) and other Jesuits baptized forty thousand among the Moxos and Canichanas. During the eighteenth century Franciscans labored among the Chiriguanes of the Cordilleras, erecting seventeen missions, most of which were destroyed during the revolutions of the following century. Though as usual hampered by conquistadorial brutalities, the missionaries found the Incas' superior religion rendered them more amenable to Christianity. Brother Matteo of Xumilla, preaching with skull in hand, was especially successful in gaining converts from sun worship.

(2) VICEROYALTY OF NEW GRANADA

New Granada was the Spanish name for the northern coast of South America—Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela. Though search for pearls brought explorers early in the sixteenth century, this region was at first regarded as merely an area to be exploited. In 1528 German merchants undertook the colonization of Venezuela, and until the Welser patent was revoked in 1556 an unparalleled story of enslavement and exploita-

tion was unfolded. In 1549 the area became an *audiencia* subordinate to Peru; in 1718 and 1740 New Granada attained autonomous viceregal rank.

Missions. Padre Francisco de Córdoba, O.P., had preached in Venezuela in 1512, but he and his companion were slain in retaliation for the conquistadors' abduction of Indians to Haiti. Similar fates befell Dominicans and Franciscans who preached along the coast during the next years. Though twenty Dominicans accompanied the Alfinger-Welser colony in 1529, their work was hindered by the corporation's gross injustice in treatment of the natives. Extraordinary evangelical work, however, was performed by Bartolomeo de Ojeda, Luis Vero, and St. Luis Bertrand among the Indians, and Alfonso de Sandoval and St. Peter Claver among the Negroes. The latter reported baptizing three hundred thousand. By 1600, it is estimated, two thirds of the natives had been baptized. During the earlier period the region was under the jurisdiction of the diocese of Panama, but a see was erected for Venezuela in 1531 and for Colombia in 1534. Bishop Tomás de Torres of Cartagena vigorously promoted destruction of paganism in the area, and the same policy was continued by his successors, De Loaysa and Gregory of Beteta.

(3) Viceroyalty of La Plata

The La Plata region included Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay. Explored as early as 1526 by Sebastian Cabot, it was opened to colonization by Pedro de Mendoza in 1535. The usual rivalries of conquistadores went on until about 1580, when Buenos Aires was founded. These territories remained part of the viceroyalty of Peru until 1776, when they were organized into an autonomous viceroyalty.

Missions. Franciscans accompanied Pedro de Mendoza into the La Plata region and proved exceedingly active, along with the Dominicans, throughout the entire area. Bernardo de Armenta and other Franciscans went into Paraguay in 1538. In this region St. Francis Solano, who died in 1610, was an outstanding missionary. Though priests accompanied Valdavia into Chile in 1540, the Mercedarian, Antonio Correa (1548), is considered the pioneer apostle to the pagans of that region.

The Paraguay Reductions call for special notice. In existence between 1610 and 1767, the reduction system had about one hundred mission stations. An estimated million Indians were baptized and at one time there were 120,000 natives located on thirty reductions. These were villages composed exclusively of Indians in order to ensure their more rapid conversion and to protect their material interests from the colonists. The Spaniards naturally opposed this altruistic program on the ground that the number of serfs was thereby reduced. Missionaries taught the

natives how to cultivate the soil and build houses. They were initiated into practical trades, and were eventually manufacturing firearms with which they could repel any who threatened to dispossess them. General granaries ensured against times of famine. When Bishops Palafox and Cardenas opposed the system on the ground that the Jesuits were usurping episcopal jurisdiction, Pope Innocent X sent an investigating commission which (1646–47) substantially vindicated the Jesuit administration. The reductions continued to flourish for another century until they were destroyed by the masonic secularism of Portugal's Pombal and Spain's Aranda.

D. Portuguese America

(1) FOUNDATIONS

Exploration. Though the Spanish captain Pinzón sighted Brazil in 1500, it lay within the latitude awarded to Portugal by papal arbitration. And indeed, the Portuguese followed close behind, for several months later Pedro Cabral, guided by Bartholomeu Diaz, put in from Lisbon at Pôrto Seguro. On of the Franciscans aboard, Padre Henry of Coimbra, celebrated Mass on Easter, April 26. Cabral, however, refused to allow any of the friars to stay. In 1501 Amerigo Vespucci sailed by under the Portuguese flag, although he left behind little beyond a glowing report which won him the naming of the new continent. Temporary Franciscan missions were founded in 1515 and 1523.

Settlement properly began with the arrival in 1531 of an expedition led by Martim de Souza. He erected a fort and in 1532 founded the colony of São Vicente. Franciscans came to the colony and began to preach to the natives, while others under Diogo de Borba landed at Bahia in 1534. But the early system of feudal "captaincies" proved financially unsuccessful for private capital despite exploitation of the natives. In 1547 the king named Thome de Souza the first governor-general. He was accompanied to Brazil in 1549 by Manoel Nobrega and the first band of Jesuits to come to the New World. Within five years they had founded as many missions. Souza made Bahia the capital and material conditions improved during the governorship of Mem de Sa (1558–72), who founded the future metropolis of Rio de Janeiro.

Jurisdiction. During 1514 Leo X had founded the Portuguese patronage system by giving the crown privileges of nomination over all sees and benefices in its overseas dominions. This grant was extended by succeeding popes until in 1551 Julius III authorized the king to appoint all bishops, collect ecclesiastical revenues, and even receive canonical cases on appeal. Portuguese sees held jurisdiction over Brazil, even after the first diocese had been established at Bahia in 1551; not until 1671 did Brazil become a metropolitan province. The first bishop, Pedro Sardinha

(1551–76), was an incompetent prelate who brought with him a clergy ill-adapted to missionary hardships, and disposed to interfere with existing missionaries. But the bishop was about to return to Portugal to defend the cause of the Indians when they captured and ate him. The Portuguese patronage system had its advantages, though in general it was not administered with as great a regard for ecclesiastical interests as the Spanish.

(2) COLONIAL VICISSITUDES

Evangelization was undertaken by Franciscans and Jesuits, as well as the secular clergy. Between 1553 and 1597 the "Apostle of Brazil" par excellence was Padre Anchieta, who attracted the natives to the Faith and won hearts by his heroism during the epidemics of 1577 and 1581. His Casa de Misericordia at Rio provided for needy persons of every description.

Foreign rule. The Spanish occupation of Portugal from 1580 to 1640 brought Brazil under the Spanish crown, but also exposed the colony to Spain's enemies. The Dutch occupied certain portions of Brazilian territory from 1624 to 1654. This was a critical period for the missions, but the Capuchins in particular upheld the Catholic and Portuguese loyalties of the Brazilians. Eventually the Dutch themselves tried to conciliate the natives by bringing Breton Capuchins to Pernambuco.

Restoration of normal Portuguese administration led to a general reorganization of the colony and its missions. The natives were defended by the "Las Casas of Brazil," Padre Vieria, who in 1655 procured a decree reducing slavery and alleviating working conditions. But planters continued to evade the antislavery legislation, and the abolition of the reductions exposed new Indians to exploitation. Border clashes with the Spaniards and raids by the French were frequent misfortunes for the Indian missions. Suppression of the Jesuits reduced missionary strength, but Capuchins, Oratorians, Carmelites, and Mercederians did what they could to step into the breach.

17. FRENCH AMERICA

A. *General Aspect of New France*

(1) SECULAR BACKGROUND

Discovery of Newfoundland by John Cabot in the service of Henry VII of England was the precarious Anglo-Saxon claim to Canada that ultimately prevailed by force of arms. As far as France was concerned, in 1524 Verrazano coasted the Atlantic shore from New York to Maine. Jacques Cartier explored the St. Lawrence region between 1534 and 1541, distributed rosaries, and witnessed the baptism of an Indian chief by his chaplains. The Huguenot Wars in France hindered that country's

pursuit of its claims to part of the New World until 1603 when Samuel Champlain, "geographer royal," opened the continuous period of exploration and settlement. The French domain in America included Acadia or Nova Scotia, Canada proper, the original Northwest Territory of the United States, Louisiana, and the Antilles, which alone survived British triumph. Trade was the initial and prevailing motive for the private companies which exploited the St. Lawrence to Gulf waterway. Before it succumbed to Great Britain in 1760, New France had attracted some seventy-five thousand Frenchmen, and at least in Canada, their cultural influence proved lasting.

(2) ECCLESIASTICAL STATUS

Jurisdiction in New France, once the rule of the private trading companies was assumed by the crown in 1663, was shared among the governor, the intendant, and the bishop, all subjected to minute regulation by the royal bureaucracy. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction for the early missionaries was presumptively obtained from the Archbishop of Rouen at the port of embarkation. With the co-operation of Queen Henrietta of England, a prefecture apostolic was erected for Acadia and New England in 1630, but it ceased with English occupation in 1654 and does not seem to have been revived. But from 1647 there is explicit evidence of missionary superiors in Canada enjoying delegation from Rouen: both the Jesuit superior at Quebec and the Sulpician superior at Montreal were empowered as vicars-general. In 1658 the crown, with the concurrence of the Holy See, erected the vicariate apostolic of New France. The first episcopal vicar, Monsignor Laval, found his jurisdiction still challenged by Rouen, and ambiguity was not removed until 1674 when the diocese of Quebec was erected directly subject to Propaganda. Until 1763 all of French America was subject to this jurisdiction, though there were often vicars-general for the Illinois country and Louisiana.

The French mission encountered less numerous but more warlike and barbarous Indian tribes than the Spanish. Preclin and Jarry estimate the total number of native converts in 1763 at less than five thousand.[7] The heroism of the missionaries is not questioned even by secular historians; rather their missions were hindered by their "apparently inextricable alliance with political and temporal undertakings, and, definitely, their emphasized identification with French interests, which all too frequently lent to the missionaries the character of emissaries of the colonizing power behind them."[8] Colbert's mercantilist policy of making the In-

[7] E. Preclin and E. Jarry, *Histoire de l'Église* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1955), XIX, 599.

[8] Schmidlin, *op. cit.*, p. 451.

dians French was a poor substitute for ample colonization and evangelization, and Bourbon preoccupation with the Old World cost them the New.

B. French Canada

(1) ACADIA: NOVA SCOTIA AND MAINE

Missionary foundation. Acadia is here taken in its original meaning of the territory between Montreal and Philadelphia; later the term was restricted to Nova Scotia. De Monts, one of the proprietors of a royally chartered fur-trading company, and Champlain made the first French settlement in 1604 on Saint Croix Isle, just within the present Maine boundary. Here in July the secular priest, Nicholas Aubrey, erected a chapel and said the first Mass. But the next year the colony was moved to Port Royal near the present Annapolis, Nova Scotia. The Huguenot De Monts brought out Protestant as well as Catholic chaplains, and religious disputes disturbed the early settlements. Father Aubrey returned to France in 1605, but was replaced in 1610 by Father La Fleche, whose efforts were hampered by lack of knowledge of the Indian dialect. In 1611 Madame de Guercheville bought out the Huguenot proprietors and subsidized the mission of the Jesuits, Biard and Masse. They preached among the Abnakis in Maine and established Saint Sauveur mission on Mt. Desert Isle at the mouth of the Penobscot. But in 1613 the English captain, Samuel Argall, made a raid from Virginia, destroyed the mission, and deported the priests to France.

Missionary revival was undertaken in 1619 by Recollect Franciscans who in turn were forced out by the English in 1628. But in 1630 Anglo-French accord was reached on a prefecture for New England and Capuchins set up stations along the Kennebec and Penobscot. From Quebec the Jesuit Druillets visited the Abnakis in 1646, and came as trade envoy to Boston in 1650. During 1654–55 the Cromwellian Government seized Port Royal and deported twenty-three Capuchin priests and nine brothers, although Père Joseph escaped to die among the Abnakis. Aside from occasional visits by Canadian missionaries, the Acadian mission languished until the 1680's. About 1694 the zealous Father Sebastian Râle set up a mission at Norridgewock, Maine. After repeated menaces and raids, the Massachusetts colonists killed Father Râle and destroyed a chapel on the Penobscot (1724). Though deprived of resident pastors, the Abnakis remained faithful to Catholicity. French missionaries made intermittent visits from Canada until in 1785 the new American prefect apostolic, Father Carroll, was able to send them Père Ciquard as their pastor.

Acadia, meanwhile, had undergone the vicissitudes of a frontier in the Anglo-French duel for America. Irate English colonists saw all "French

and Indians" as their foes, and often their hate was vented on the missions. Restored to France in 1670, Acadia was recaptured by the English in 1710 and definitively ceded to Great Britain in 1713. Though the Treaty of Utrecht guaranteed the Acadians freedom of religion "as far as the laws of England do allow the same," this meant little, for the penal laws were still in force in England. Priests were arbitrarily imprisoned or deported, and oaths of allegiance proffered to Acadians which they could not in conscience take. For their part, the American colonists accordingly suspected the allegiance of the Acadians and in 1754 the Albany Congress seconded the design of the Governor of Nova Scotia to deport them. In 1755 and following years fifteen thousand Acadian Catholics were deported to the English colonies with little or no regard for religious or family ties.

(2) Canadian Origins

Quebec. Once Port Royal had been established, Champlain continued his explorations and in 1608 founded a settlement on the rock of Quebec, which became the citadel of New France. Until his death in 1635, he was its governor, charged with the promotion of the fur trade for the company. French commerce with the Hurons and Algonquins prepared the way for missions, but Champlain's raid on the Iroquois who controlled the waterways to the Great Lakes made them lasting antagonists of all things French. In 1614 Champlain invited Franciscan Recollects to provide missionaries, and in March, 1615, Fathers Jamay, Le Caron, and D'Olbeau arrived. The latter two began missions among the Hurons and were subsequently assisted by nine others. Père Le Caron baptized 140 Indians, but was hindered by Huguenot settlers. In 1625 the Jesuits Lalemant, Masse, and St. Jean de Brébeuf arrived, but they and all the priests were soon deported during the English occupation of Canada (1629–32). Cardinal Richelieu recovered Canada by treaty and banned Huguenots from the restored colony. For some reason the Recollects were also barred, but Fathers Le Jeune and Noué reopened the Jesuit mission which by 1637 numbered twenty-three priests and six brothers. Jesuits founded a school at Quebec in 1634, though native clerical recruitment failed by reason of the Indians' incorrigible restlessness. In 1640, moreover, the Ursulines founded a hospital.

Montreal, founded by Mainsonneuve in 1642, became another Canadian center. With powerful clerical and lay backing in France, Joan Marce and Margaret Bourgeois founded the Notre Dame Society which set up the hospice of Ville-Marie at Montreal. Father Olier, besides assisting the Notre Dame Society, sent some of his Sulpicians to the New World in 1657. Here they opened a seminary and also occupied them-

selves with missions to Indian reservations on which they eventually settled the converts whom their fellow tribesmen would not permit the practice of Christianity.

The Huron mission was resumed by St. Jean de Brébeuf in 1634 with the aid of other Jesuits. For forty years during the seventeenth century France was informed and inspired by the *Relations* of erudite and heroic missionaries among these primitive tribes. Though Père Lalemant's plan of a native seminary proved premature, Père Le Jeune's reservation of St. Joseph de Sillery, near Quebec, was quite successful. Founded in 1637, it had four hundred families by 1648, and in 1651 land was given these in legal proprietorship. Unlike the Paraguay Reductions, which were independent Jesuit protectorates excluding Europeans and only subsequently affiliated with the Spanish crown, the Canadian reservations were subordinate to the French secular authorities, some of whom were too well disposed to provide "firewater." Other missions were those of Tadoussac among the Montagnis near the mouth of the St. Lawrence (1640), and Three Rivers between Quebec and Montreal (1633). About 1640, an Indian convention, the Huron "Festival of the Dead," brought Chippewas and other tribes from the Great Lakes region to Sault Sainte Marie. Responding to an invitation, St. Isaac Jogues and Père Raymbault attended and celebrated Mass in the presence of some two thousand Indians. This was the germ for subsequent missions in the Northwest Territory, but for the moment the crisis of the Canadian mission prevented its culture.

(3) CANADIAN ORDEAL BY IROQUOIS

The Huron War. The latent animosity between the Iroquois and the Hurons and their French allies broke into the open in August, 1642, when St. Isaac Jogues and the lay oblate René Goupil were seized and tortured by the Iroquois, and a number of Huron converts slain. The Frenchmen were taken to the Iroquois camp at Ossernenon, the modern Auriesville, New York. There Goupil was martyred, but St. Isaac was helped by the Dutch to escape to Fort Orange (Albany). Well-treated by the New Netherlanders, he was allowed to return to France. At his own request, he returned to Montreal in 1644. In the same year Père Bressani was also tortured, though ransomed by the Dutch. Meanwhile the Iroquois preyed upon the Huron settlements, eventually almost annihilating that tribe.

American martyrs. Despite his treatment, St. Isaac braved the Mohawk camp a second and third time as peace commissioner. Prospects were not entirely hopeless, but on October 18, 1646, he was tomahawked along with Jean le Lande by an irresponsible warrior who, nevertheless, was later converted. The Iroquois bloodlust was roused anew and

brought martyrdom in 1648 to Daniel and Garnier, and in 1649 to Jean de Brébeuf and Gabriel Lalemant. Together with Noël Chabanel these martyrs were canonized by Pius XI in 1930. Besides these Jesuits, other priests and lay brothers were killed and numerous Catholic Hurons tortured and slain rather than yield the Faith. The few surviving Hurons withdrew to the protection of the French forts, but even these seemed incapable of survival, for by 1650 the Huron missions had been abandoned and eight Jesuits returned to France. The French colonists, estimated as no more than a thousand at this time, were driven within their fortifications until Governor Maisonneuve of Montreal brought from France military re-enforcements that saved the city. Balked of easy victory, the Iroquois negotiated peace in order to combat other Indians.

The Mohawk mission grew from this bloody seed. Out of the visits of missionaries as peace commissioners there developed a mission among the Onondagas that maintained a precarious existence (1655–58; 1660–61; 1667–87). After the Mohawks had been defeated by De Courcelles in 1666, the fiercest of the Iroquois tribes admitted missionaries and eventually Jesuits were working among them all. Noteworthy converts were Chief Garaconthe, Sachem Assendose, and the latter's niece, Catherine Tekakwitha, "Lily of the Mohawks." Eventually, as in her case, it was found necessary to transfer converts to reservations near French Canadian settlements to preserve them from persecution. One of these havens that became renowned was Sault Ste. Louis (Caughnawaga). In the course of the Mohawk mission, some two thousand may have been baptized, though many of these were moribund. After the French General Denonville's treachery in 1687, Iroquois animosity was aroused anew and the missionaries were forced to retire. Père Milet remained behind in captivity until 1694, but the mission in New York was at an end. Jesuit attempts to resume it (1702–9) were halted by the English colonists, and the same fate befell another attempt in western Pennsylvania about 1755. From 1749 the Sulpician, Père Piquet, labored among the Iroquois at Ogdensburg, New York, along the St. Lawrence, but his promising reservation was a casualty of the British conquest of Canada in 1759.

(4) CANADIAN ORGANIZATION

Hierarchical establishment. The revival of the Church in New France after the Great Huron War was due in large measure to the erection of a vicariate-apostolic in 1658. After his consecration in France, Bishop Laval arrived in Canada in 1659. This first bishop (1658–88) was ascetic, zealous, and firm, though perhaps somewhat too meticulous and tactless. His contests with Governor Lauzon regarding juridical etiquette and liturgy were frequent, and his well-advised protests against sale

of rum to Indians unpopular. With the Jesuits, whose missionary labors he enthusiastically seconded, he got along well. His episcopate was a period of rapid growth for the colony and the mission. In 1674 Monsignor Laval was named bishop of Quebec, directly subject to the Holy See. He utilized the Jesuit college at Quebec as a minor seminary and erected a major seminary which was also to serve as a clerical retreat house and hospice. Bishop Laval resigned his see in 1688 but lived until 1708, providing episcopal ministrations during the captivity at London (1700–13) of his successor.

Episcopal supervision was hindered by the frequent absences of Bishop Laval's successors: Bishop St. Vallier (1688–1727) was confined in London thirteen years; De Mornay (1727–33) never went to Canada; and there were two short-lived successors until the zealous Bishop De Pontbriand (1741–60) who died shortly after the surrender of Quebec to the British. This regime led to assumption of excessive independence by existing groups and institutes, thus provoking unfortunate rivalries. Episcopal government tried to produce a replica of France, and discipline was strict, if not Jansenist. There were few diversions and the fact that all instruction was in the hands of the Church prevented Rationalist infiltration from France. By 1765 there were eighty-eight parishes with a recorded membership of fifty-five thousand. The clergy were recruited from Europe or the colonists; no natives were ordained to the priesthood. Despite the number and quality of the missionaries— 320 Jesuits alone went to the Canadian mission—they met great difficulties in the Indians' debased morals, which were not improved by contact with the traders. But if France lagged behind Spain in converting the Indian, she no less indelibly imprinted her mark on America.

(5) Fall of New France

Anglo-French duel for empire in America had begun with Argall's raid on Acadia in 1613 and increased with the years. Count Frontenac, governor of Canada for much of the period between 1672 and 1698, intended to carry out Colbert's plan of hemming the English colonists behind the Alleghanies. Not merely did he occupy and fortify the Ohio Valley, but he abetted Indian attacks upon the English settlements. These aroused the undying enmity of the Americans who henceforth linked "French and Indian" in opprobrium. Unfortunately much of this odium fell on missionaries who frequently were chosen to act as envoys. Queen Anne's War (1702–13) resulted in the cession of Acadia and Newfoundland. King George's War (1740–48) saw the capture of Louisburg on Cape Breton Isle. The decisive struggle, the French and Indian War (1755–63), began when the French refused to retire from territory claimed by Virginia upon delivery of an ultimatum by Colonel George

Washington. In alarm the American colonies formed their first union at the Albany Congress (1754) which took measures for the common defense and demanded deportation of the Acadians. But no effective union resulted, and Americans co-operated inadequately with British expeditionary forces unfamiliar with colonial conditions of warfare. Disastrous British defeats, however, were at length retrieved by Wolfe's capture of Quebec (1759), followed by Murray's taking of Montreal (1760). The Treaty of Paris in 1763 formally delivered Canada to Great Britain.

Canadian transition. By the terms of this treaty, "His British Majesty consents to grant the inhabitants of Canada the liberty of the Catholic religion," but the fine print qualified this "insofar as the laws of England permit." An official unfriendliness was seconded by the bigotry of English and Scottish colonists who now entered Canada. English law was introduced and frequently misused by adventurers to defraud French inhabitants who did not understand its intricacies. It was not long before the British newcomers, though a minority among seventy thousand Frenchmen, had taken complete possession of the local government and even strove to introduce the English penal laws against Catholics. Religious were directed to dispose of their property to English subjects and depart, so that Canada was left to the ministrations of 146 secular priests, including twenty-eight Sulpicians. Though the Jesuit college was closed in 1768, the Sulpicians were able to keep a sort of seminary going and the Ursulines were allowed to remain. The see of Quebec remained vacant until 1766, when Monsignor Briand was recognized as "superintendent of the Roman Church in Canada." British officials insisted upon interfering in all temporal concerns of the parishes and in passing upon nominations for benefices.

The Quebec Act. These conditions continued until Sir Guy Carleton, a prudent administrator, took charge. In view of the approaching contest with the American colonies, he wished to conciliate the French Canadians. In 1774, then, he sponsored the Quebec Act which provided that henceforth the governor would be assisted by an advisory council of Canadians chosen without restriction of religion or nationality. English law was to be confined to criminal cases, but French jurisprudence restored in civil matters. Full toleration was extended to the practice of the Catholic religion, and continuance of the tithe guaranteed. In 1775 Bishop Briand wrote: "Religion is perfectly free. I can exercise my ministry without restrictions." Although all difficulties were not yet surmounted, the bishop proved influential in securing French loyalty to the British crown during the American Revolution. The French Revolution, moreover, indirectly benefited the Church in Canada in providing the land with the services of thirty-four *émigré* priests. But an accessory

clause of the Quebec Act aroused trouble in another quarter. This annexed the Northwest Territory to Canada, thereby affronting the American Colonies whose charters gave them claims to the Mississippi and beyond. Hence, the Quebec Act, the first concession of religious toleration to Catholics under the British flag, incidentally added fuel to the resentment of the American rebels, and contributed to the eventual division of the North American continent between two large political entities.

C. Louisiana

(1) THE OLD NORTHWEST

Ottawa mission. The Lake Superior Indians renewed their request for a "blackrobe," first made to St. Isaac Jogues about 1640. Père Garreau was slain by Iroquois on his way to this region in 1656, but in 1660 Père Menard succeeded in reaching Keweenaw Bay where he founded St. Theresa's mission. He died about a year later on a journey in Wisconsin. He was replaced in 1665 by the outstanding pioneer of this field, Père Claude Allouez, named vicar-general for the West by Bishop Laval in 1667. He founded Holy Spirit Mission at Chauamignon on Ashland Bay, and after a discouraging beginning won over a hundred Indians. But the Ottawas provoked the Sioux and had to flee, so that another mission was founded for them at Sault Ste. Marie. Here and at Mackinac the Jesuits fixed their headquarters.

Illinois mission. Already in 1669 Père Allouez had founded St. Xavier Mission at Green Bay, Wisconsin, for the Ilini, Foxes, and kindred tribes. Subsequently he went south to found a post named St. Jacques in 1672. Père Marquette, who had assisted Allouez since 1668, accompanied Joliet on his explorations through modern Wisconsin and Illinois. They followed the Mississippi to the Arkansas—where a dying baby was baptized—and returned by the Illinois River (1673-74). In 1675 Père Marquette returned to work among the Kaskaskia Indians near the mouth of the Illinois, but died the same year. Père Allouez replaced him until his own death in 1689. During 1678-79 La Salle passed through with several Franciscans. Of these Père Ribourd was apparently slain by Indians, and Père Hennepin carried by the Sioux to the upper Mississippi, before being released. Père Gravier, successor of Allouez as vicar-general for the Illinois country, founded Fort St. Louis and saw the establishment of Cahokia and Kaskaskia (c. 1700) before his death in 1708. Guardian Angel Mission was erected on the site of Chicago in 1696 but abandoned three years later. Despite Fox restiveness until mid-century, by that period most of the Ilini had been converted. Meanwhile the Commandant Cadillac had founded Detroit in 1701, and sought to gather the Indians for trading purposes irrespective

of religious considerations. The Franciscan Friar Delhalle served as chaplain until slain by Indians in 1706. The Jesuits Recardie (1728–43) and Portier (1743–81) later carried on the work among the Indians. French occupation and evangelization extended into Indiana where Vincennes was founded about 1735; around the same time the French crossed the Mississippi to settle Ste. Genevieve, Missouri.

American transition. The last act of the French Canadian secular administration was to deport the Jesuits from Illinois, though Père Meurin was permitted to stay until his death in 1781. British persecution induced some French settlers to cross to Ste. Genevieve and to found St. Louis (1764), where they could have the occasional services of Spanish missionaries. In practice, Quebec jurisdiction continued in the Illinois country and in 1768 Bishop Briand sent Pierre Gibault to assist Père Meurin. Gibault incurred the bishop's displeasure by espousing the American cause during the Revolution and inducing the French inhabitants to co-operate with George Rogers Clark.

(2) LOWER MISSISSIPPI DISTRICT

Origins. French explorers and missionaries who had penetrated into the Northwest Territory soon pushed on down the Mississippi River. In 1682 Cavelier de La Salle, accompanied by Franciscans headed by Père Membre, reached the Gulf of Mexico. He returned in 1684 and tried to found a colony at Matagorda Bay. This attempt was abandoned after La Salle's assassination (1687), and the murder of three missionaries by the Natchez Indians. The French were nonetheless resolved to check the advance of both the English and the Spanish frontiers, and new efforts were made by the Lemoyne family. In 1698 Pierre Lemoyne, Sieur d'Iberville, returned to the Gulf and established Fort Biloxi in 1699. His brother Jean, Sieur de Bienville, became governor of the lower Mississippi area and held the general direction of the colony until 1743. New Orleans, founded in 1718, became its capital and metropolis.

Missionaries were at first provided by the Quebec Seminary. Pères Montigny, Davion and Buisson came with Iberville in 1698 and labored among the Natchez, Yazoo and Taenza Indians, while Père Bordenave became chaplain at Fort Biloxi. Father Davion survived until 1716, but other seminary priests met violent death at the hands of Indians: Père Foucault in 1702 and Père Buisson in 1706. The Jesuit Du Ru had begun a mission to the tribes around Biloxi in 1700 and other Jesuits undertook the Natchez field. The Natchez tribe revolted in 1729, slew Pères Poisson and Souel, and was in turn almost exterminated by the French. But Father Beaubois continued to work on past mid-century among these Indians.

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction long remained a tangled problem in Louisiana. Its distance from Quebec necessitated a vicar-general whose jurisdiction was not always readily accepted by the various groups of missionaries, pastors, and military chaplains of different religious communities. From 1707 to 1713, Varlet, future Jansenist schismatic bishop, served as vicar. In 1713 Monsignor De Mornay became coadjutor of Quebec and vicar-general for Louisiana, but since he remained in Europe, deputies had to be named. The Capuchins were introduced into Louisiana and by 1722 a rough division into three districts, each with its vicar-general, was reached. The Jesuit Beaubois became vicar for the Indian missions in 1726: it was he who introduced the Ursulines in 1727 to begin a school, hospital, and orphanage. Jesuits were often named vicars in New Orleans as well, to the occasional resentment of the Capuchins. Expulsion of the Jesuits and transfer of Louisiana to Spain in 1763 left seven Capuchins in charge of some six thousand Frenchmen. The Capuchin superior, Père Dagobert, challenged the authority of the Spanish Capuchin Cyril of Barcelona, named vicar-general by the bishop of Santiago. Fray Cyril prevailed, however, and was made auxiliary bishop in 1781. He continued to be the resident superior of the Louisiana area until his abrupt recall in 1793 when Penalver-Cárdenas was made bishop of the new see of Louisiana-Florida, then containing twenty-seven priests and forty-three thousand Catholics. His transfer to Guatemala in 1801 coincided with the secret cession of Louisiana to France. At his departure, the bishop named Fathers Walsh and Hasset administrators, and the former ruled until his death in 1806 when Bishop Carroll of Baltimore assumed general direction of the new American territory.

18. ANGLO-SAXON AMERICA

A. *General Aspect of the English Colonies*

(1) BEGINNINGS

Discovery of Newfoundland by John Cabot in English service in 1497 was not followed by settlement for nearly a century. New England is a term which in a sense could be applied to all of the American colonies along the Atlantic coast, for the settlers regarded themselves as transplanted Englishmen basically equal to their fellows in the mother country. The first American representative assembly dates from 1619, and other colonies would eventually insist on Virginia's resolution that "the inhabitants of this colony are not bound to yield obedience to any law or ordinance whatever designed to impose any taxation whatsoever upon them, other than the laws and ordinances of the General Assembly aforesaid." It would be long before these became fighting words, but the realistic democracy of the American frontier would gradually form a new American nation. Paradoxically, however,

the first importation of slaves also is recorded in 1619 to belie the universality of democratic theory and practice.

(2) CATHOLIC ANTECEDENTS

Colonizing efforts were first made by Sir Humphrey Gilbert in execution of a design of Sir George Peckham and others to provide a haven for persecuted English Catholics. A patent issued by Queen Elizabeth I on June 11, 1578, authorized colonization despite the "statutes against fugitives," and assured prospective settlers that they "shall not be restrained," provided they did nothing against the "true Christian Faith" —phrases which seem to have been designed to admit Catholics without giving them any formal governmental sanction. Gilbert did bring three ships with 260 colonists to Newfoundland in 1583, but abandoned the bleak settlement the same year. He died on the return journey, assuring his sinking shipmates that "we are as nigh to God by sea as by land." His half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, colonized and named Virginia in 1584, but this settlement was also soon deserted. Weymouth's exploration of New England (1602–6) seems to have been preparatory to another Catholic colony, which was discouraged by Father Persons. Though actual settlement began at Jamestown in 1607 under Protestant auspices, Calvert's Avalon and Maryland colonies for Catholics came soon afterwards.

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction for Catholics in prospective English colonies would have emanated either from the prefect of the English mission, Cardinal Allen, or his successors, the archpriests (1598–1621) and vicars apostolic (1622–1850). Actually the vicariate was in abeyance from the retirement of Bishop Smith to Paris in 1631 and the appointment of Bishop Leyburn in 1685. Meanwhile the Jesuit missioners in Maryland presumably had faculties from their superiors, emanating from the Holy See. The first explicit record of their subjection to the vicars apostolic of the London district dates from a mixed marriage dispensation by Bishop Gifford in 1715. His successor, Bishop Petre, had some doubt of his jurisdiction, and in 1757 *Propaganda Fidei* expressly extended his faculties to the colonies for six years. These were presumably renewed for Bishop Challoner (1758–81) down to the erection of the American prefecture apostolic for Father John Carroll in 1784.

B. Individual Colonies

(1) VIRGINIA

Jamestown, founded in May, 1607, began continuous English colonization of America. Under private management until 1624 the colony's history was tumultuous as economic adventurers sought gold rather than Virginia's true wealth in its soil. After the London Company's charter had been revoked in 1624, Virginia became a royal colony.

Religious persecution, as contemplated by this first of the colonies, was unfortunately typical of the majority. The Virginia Charter (1609), by requiring the Oath of Supremacy of prospective settlers, barred conscientious Catholics. The few Catholics and Puritans who strayed into Virginia were forbidden the exercise of their religion by Governor Berkeley in 1641–42. The English "Glorious Revolution" and the Toleration Acts of 1689 altered the status of Protestant dissenters in the homeland, and Virginia adopted a similar statute in 1699 which licensed Protestant nonconformist chapels. But all "popish recusants" were deprived of the right to vote under penalty of five hundred pounds of tobacco. In 1705 they were declared incompetent as witnesses. English penal laws against owning arms or horses were also enforced. Catholics in Virginia were few and priestly ministrations from Maryland rare and secret. Yet in 1745 Lieutenant-Governor Gooch of Virginia ordered the arrest of priests who were crossing the Maryland border into Fairfax County. Gooch indeed imagined Jesuits everywhere, and in 1756 it was considered needful to demand anew the taking of the Oath of Supremacy. Before 1776, then, there was no toleration for Catholics—nor Pietists—in Virginia.

Religious toleration. During the eighteenth century, nevertheless, anti-Catholic feeling diminished in Virginia as in England. Proximity of war with England and the desire to conciliate Catholic allies on the one hand, and increasing indifference toward an Anglicanism whose colonial parsons gave bad example on the other, led to toleration. On June 12, 1776, Madison secured passage of this Declaration of Rights: "Religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love and charity towards each other." The bill had been given its final form by Madison who had rightly contended that a former reading had conceded toleration by state indulgence, whereas religious liberty was a right beyond the power of a state to confer. This Virginia resolution, made several weeks before the Declaration of Independence and fifteen years prior to federal constitutional guarantees of religious liberty, set a pattern for the nascent Republic and its component states by the early "Mother of Presidents."

(2) MARYLAND

Calvert proprietorship. George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, secretary of state under King James I, had long planned a colony where all settlers might enjoy religious liberty. In 1625 he declared his conversion to

Catholicity and resigned his office. His colony of Avalon in Newfoundland was unsuccessful, though Fathers Longvill and Smith erected a chapel and said Mass. King Charles I, however, consented to authorize a new colony to be named after the Catholic queen, Henrietta Marie. The proprietor of Maryland was to enjoy the feudal palatinate rights of the bishopric of Durham: *quidquid rex habet extra, episcopus habet intra.* When George Calvert died just before the royal signature (1632), the king delivered the charter to the heir, Cecil, second Lord Baltimore. Lord Cecil formed a company of two Jesuit priests, Andrew White (1579–1656) and Altham (d. 1640), Brother Gervase, twenty gentlemen, and some two or three hundred commoners, and embarked them on the *Ark* and the *Dove,* November 22, 1633.

St. Mary's was founded by these colonists who landed from the Potomac on March 25, 1634. The colony got off to a good start under an able governor, Leonard Calvert (1634–47), while the artisans and laborers who constituted the bulk of the settlement quickly adapted themselves to life in the New World. Father White said the first Mass on the Feast of the Annunciation, 1634, and a Catholic chapel was erected at least by 1638. In that year Father Copley-Fisher asked Lord Baltimore for a privilege for it, although the Jesuits in charge of the mission were granted no endowment nor exemptions lest bigotry be aroused. They held title to property as individuals, and served their flocks openly. When some friction arose with the proprietor, he applied to Propaganda for secular priests, and two arrived in 1642. Most of the liberty-loving colonists had occasion to object to Calvert's feudal powers, and Lord Baltimore, if not avaricious, was not liberal. A fair treaty was made with the neighboring Indians who readily took to the preaching of Father White and his aides. Chief Chilomacon of the Piscataways was baptized in 1640, and most of the Patuxet tribe had been converted before Protestant rule ruined the mission.

Religious liberty had been enjoined by Lord Baltimore in his first instructions to his brother, Governor Calvert, and the gubernatorial oath required since 1636 pledged: "I will not by myself or any other . . . trouble, molest, or discountenance any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ for, or in respect to, religion. I will make no difference of persons in conferring offices. . . ." This would seem to exclude Jews, but in practice the Jew, Doctor Jacob Lumbrozo, served as juryman without challenge. In 1638 the Catholic, William Lewis, was fined five hundred pounds of tobacco for offensive speech to two Protestant indentured servants, and in 1642 another Catholic, Thomas Gerard, was similarly penalized for taking away the key and books from the Protestant chapel. From the beginning of Catholic control, then, religious liberty existed in Maryland, and only when it had been challenged by

Protestants did an act of 1649 codify existing custom: "No person within this province professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall be in any way troubled, molested, or discountenanced in his religion, or in the free exercise thereof."

Persecution, nonetheless, was to afflict Maryland Catholics for a century. During the English Civil War, Virginians seized the opportunity to invade Maryland. Father White was sent back to England in chains—there he was acquitted on the ground that he had not entered the country freely. Other priests were either deported or fled. A Maryland assembly dominated by Puritans met in 1654 and excluded from religious toleration "popery, prelacy, or licentiousness of opinion."

Proprietary restoration followed in 1658 when Lord Baltimore gained recognition of his rights. Catholics regained toleration under the proprietor's son, governor from 1661 to 1675, and proprietor until 1692. Father Fitz Herbert reopened the Jesuit mission and Franciscans came to the colony between 1672 and 1725. Between 1700 and 1777 some seventy Jesuits labored in Maryland, loyally staying on after the suppression of their Society. They had begun a classical school in 1677, and this survived in one form or another until 1765.

Renewed discrimination against Catholics followed upon the "Glorious Revolution" in England. In 1692 Calvert's charter was revoked, and Maryland was ruled by royal governors until 1720. Catholics were at once excluded from civil rights and priests were threatened with imprisonment. In 1702 the British Toleration Act of 1689 was extended to Maryland, and in 1704 St. Mary's Chapel was confiscated. Queen Anne did mitigate this legislation to the extent of permitting Catholic services in private homes, and the Jesuits, continuing to own property as individuals, were able to carry on. In 1720 a Calvert heir regained the proprietorship at the expense of apostasy, so that the change helped Catholics but little. Catholics remained under various disabilities, therefore, down to 1774 when Maryland responded to an appeal of the First Continental Congress to cease discrimination. Catholics in the colony then numbered about fifteen thousand, and included statesmen prominent in national affairs.

(3) NEW ENGLAND

Intolerance was the prevalent note in New England, with a few rare exceptions. The Pilgrims landed at Plymouth in 1620 and there followed other groups, mostly dissenting Protestants. Their settlements later coalesced into the colonies of Massachusetts (and Maine), Connecticut, New Hampshire (and Vermont), and Rhode Island. In all but the last of these colonies the Congregational sect was established and a puritanical theocracy prevailed. In 1631 the General Court of Massachusetts

decreed that "no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politics but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same." Catholics were officially barred from entering any of these colonies save Rhode Island, and in the latter colony the famous 1663 charter of toleration was not interpreted in favor of Catholics.

Catholics were nonetheless to be found in small numbers in New England. Visits by some of the settlers to French Canada periodically were suspected of Catholicity. Shipwrecked mariners, impressed Irish seamen, and after 1755, Acadians, wandered in from time to time, but as they had neither priests nor churches, many intermarried with Protestants to avoid the bar of illegitimacy for their children, who were soon lost to the Faith in the compulsory Congregationalist schools. In 1659 the celebration of Christmas was banned as savoring of "popery." John Adams probably sums up the Catholic status in New England well enough when he declared in 1765 that "Roman Catholics are as scarce as a comet or an earthquake." Burning of the pope in effigy continued at Boston down to General Washington's prohibition in 1775.

(4) New York and New Jersey

The Dutch (1633–64) established Calvinism in New Netherland, but did not treat badly a few Catholic stragglers. Governor Kieft gave asylum to St. Isaac Jogues in 1642, and the latter found a few Catholics living quietly at New Amsterdam, though without any formal religious guarantees.

The English after 1664 administered the colony under the direction of James, duke of York, later King James II. This Catholic prince, while imposing a tax for Anglican support, decreed that "no person shall be molested, fined, or imprisoned for differing in judgement in matters of religion, who professes Christianity." Catholics are known to have resided at Albany and New York. Brockhalls, deputy governor from 1674 to 1683, was a Catholic, as was Governor Thomas Dongan (1683–88); and the latter had a toleration statute enacted in 1683. Jesuits from Maryland opened a temporary chapel and school, but were deported after Jacob Leisler's anti-Catholic uprising. Though Leisler's irregular rule was terminated by King William III's officials, the Whig type of toleration introduced in 1691 expressly denied the "Romish religion" any share. In 1700 Governor Bellomont extended the penal code to New York. Catholics had to go underground. In 1741 the dissident minister, John Ury, was hanged on the suspicion—false—that he was a priest. Yet a genuine priest, the German Jesuit Steinmayer, visited New York Catholics secretly under the alias of Farmer, and Catholics met for worship in a private house on Wall Street, as yet without financial implications.

New Jersey, separated from New Netherland in 1664, experienced some discrimination under its proprietors, Berkeley and Carteret. From 1682 to 1702 the Quakers gained a controlling interest, and Catholics shared the benign regime of Pennsylvania. When royal government was introduced in 1702, it allowed "liberty of conscience to all persons, except papists." Yet here also Father Steinmayer labored, along with Father Schneider.

(5) PENNSYLVANIA AND DELAWARE

The Quaker regime in these two colonies allowed Catholics unqualified and universal religious liberty. William Penn, the founder, who arrived in 1682, had been in correspondence with the Jesuits, and entirely endorsed the ideal of religious freedom. Irish and German immigrants were well received, and the latter were visited by Franciscan missionaries at an early date.

Royal intervention suspended Penn's proprietorship in 1692. Though his rights were restored in 1695, a Test Act barring Catholics from public office was imposed over his protests. This remained in force until the constitution of 1776, but the Quakers continued to concede complete religious liberty, preventing the enforcement of the English penal code against Catholics.

Catholic missions in Pennsylvania were, in consequence, second only to Maryland in size. There is report of a chapel in Philadelphia in 1729; one certainly existed there in 1747. This chapel, dedicated to St. Joseph, was the first legally authorized in the English colonies. Another, St. Mary's, was erected in 1763, and Delaware Catholics had a public chapel in 1772. English and German Jesuits discharged their ministry freely.

(6) THE SOUTHERN COLONIES

Colonial charters of the Carolinas (1663) and Georgia (1732) expressly excluded "papists," and proximity to Catholic Florida heightened the apprehension in these settlements. Many Irishmen settled in these colonies, and though most of them lost the Faith, they seem in practice not to have been too severe upon their fellow countrymen who preserved it. Anything like religious liberty, however, had to await the formulation of the new state constitutions. Here, as throughout most of the English Colonies, the American Revolution marked the beginning of the end of legal disabilities, so that Catholics were able to emerge from their ghetto.

Conclusion. At the opening of the American Revolution, there were not more than twenty-five priests and twenty-five thousand Catholics in the English colonies. The suppression of the Society of Jesus threat-

ened to cut off the supply of clergy, though for the present the ex-Jesuits continued to labor as secular priests under their former superior, Father Lewis, named vicar-general by Bishop Challoner in 1773. But the Jesuit suppression also brought back to his native land in 1774 Father John Carroll, whom Providence had designated to be founder and organizer of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States of America.

Section II

THEOLOGICAL HUMANISM

1517-1648

III

The Protestant Revolution

19. CAUSES OF PROTESTANTISM

A. *Intellectual Causes*

(1) HUMANIST REORIENTATION

The Protestant Revolt in common historical parlance ushered in "Modern Europe." Yet it was less a progressive reformation than a reaction to pagan naturalism in its secular aspect, while in its religious features it represented certain curious affinities for the Old Testament. In the pagan Renaissance was revealed openly and defiantly a latent attitude submerged since Christianity had won the Roman Empire and had brought the invading barbarians under its influence. Now this radical potentiality was stirred by some nostalgic yearnings of Humanists for the "Classical Age." These led to a series of intellectual developments, gradually externalized in ecclesiastical and political history, which widened the breach begun by the "*los von Rom*" movement of Bible Christianity into a bottomless pit of first a humanistic "Christianity," then Rationalist Deism, followed by Agnostic Indifferentism, politely termed "Liberalism," to terminate in blatantly atheistic Materialism. For the first revolt against the Vicar of Christ would in due time entail rebellion against Christ Himself, against Divine Providence, against God's very existence; indeed, it would culminate in the antithesis of legitimate Humanism: a socialistic repudiation of man's rational dignity.

Nature of theological Humanism. In the restricted theological sense here taken, Humanism, however, is not the cult of the liberal arts nor the study of the "humanities"; these are but by-products. Essentially,

theological Humanism is a concentration upon man rather than on God, an overstress of the natural at the expense of the supernatural. It resulted in a world anthropocentric rather than theocentric, for the basic principle of Luther, Calvin, and Tudor was that man choose his religion for himself, instead of accepting a religion revealed and dictated by God. Luther's superior-general, Giles of Viterbo, had well observed that "men should be changed by religion, and not religion by men." Though the heresiarchs would not fully admit it, a corollary of their own subjective choice of religious truths would be a religion varying with individuals. A second principle of theological Humanism, then, became an individualism tending to anarchical subjectivism. Protestantism involved a desire to have the supernatural on one's own terms, or failing that, contentment with the natural in the face of a divine invitation to the supernatural. Well were the initiators of this movement called "Protestants," for basically they protested against too much subjection to God.

Genesis of theological humanism. Why did this attitude appear and attain such success? The history of the Renaissance with its rebirth of sensuality and scepticism has already supplied a partial explanation. Revival of pagan classics afforded a powerful inducement. License of thought and morals furnished ground for the germination of novel theological ideas. Yet examples are occasions rather than motives. Other more profound causes for the success of the Revolt must now be sought, without denying truth to the well-known estimate of the humanist Erasmus: "He laid the egg Luther hatched."

(2) SCHOLASTIC DETERIORATION

The Scholastics were supposed to guard the outer theological defenses of the Catholic Faith. Against the revival of Humanism should have been opposed a new stress upon the supernatural, and to the irrationalist vagaries of the "Reformers" a sound philosophy ought to have been offered. But many Scholastics had forgotten the proper use of the powerful weapons at their disposal. They had deserted essentials for minutiae, and had obscured the proper interrelation of Faith and reason. Some Scholastics had adopted a stubborn and condemnatory attitude toward new ideas, or had ignored them instead of correcting or adapting them. This had been especially the case in regard to data of the physical sciences. In consequence, Scholasticism had been despised by renaissance scholars as completely outmoded. Had the hierarchy and the clergy been sufficiently aware that their arms had become blunted, they might have effected a thoroughgoing reformation of their intellectual resources. But they were lulled to sleep by the circumstance that some well-meaning but confused thinkers sapped the outer defenses of the Faith while refraining from any overt assault on faith itself. Instead

of denying Catholic dogmas, Humanists usually claimed merely to criticize concomitant abuses; in place of contradicting clear propositions, they preferred to differ privately or mentally, presenting their own views under the guise of tentative academic theses with a routine profession of ultimate submission to authority. Many still had a healthy respect for the old theocratic censures, and even Luther hesitated momentarily before challenging the ancient "two swords" of Christendom, papal theocracy and the Holy Roman Empire. When, however, he did pull aside the veil, once he was sustained by the secular power, many crypto-heretics emerged from hiding. Christendom was already honeycombed with mental treason.

Scholastic doctrine, as generally presented to the youthful heresiarchs and their contemporaries, was unfortunately seldom the pure teaching of St. Thomas. Though the Angelic Doctor retained the allegiance of a restricted Dominican circle, his was scarcely the most popular or influential treatment. Instead, Nominalism in places had practically monopolized the title of Scholasticism. Though it had by no means received official sanction, it prevailed in universities increasingly secular. While Nominalists, no more than their humanist adversaries, were openly heretical, theirs was an insinuation of error by improper emphasis. With daring rationalism, Nominalists attenuated the supernatural order, hinting that reason might sometimes conflict with Faith. They minimized the effects of original sin, insinuating that grace was not entirely necessary. They speculated idly whether God's existence could be proved by reason alone, and whether some rationalist theories of Christian mysteries, though against Faith, were not intrinsically more plausible. And the subtler the dialectical reasoning, the more brilliant the savant.

(3) Pseudo-Mystic Trend

Moral reaction against the shameless sensuality of humanist secularism and the sterile quibbling of decadent Scholasticism soon appeared. A mystic school had endured in scholastic theology which had deprecated preoccupation with philosophy and stressed the ascetical aspects of theology. In this tradition had been the theologians of St. Victor, the Seraphic Doctor, St. Bonaventure, and more recently, the Brethren of the Common Life. Thomas à Kempis made many severe and legitimate criticisms of decadent Scholasticism in his popular *Imitation of Christ*. Much of this true mysticism was wholesome, and served as a useful counterpoise to speculation.

Mysticism, however, is a difficult and obscure field open to pitfalls. The difficulty of expressing contemplative experience in human language led to the use of metaphors susceptible of misunderstanding.

Even though all did not reveal the latent Pantheism and Quietism of Meister Eckhart, others, such as John Tauler and Blessed Henry Suso, employed phrases that the unwary or the malicious might twist to their own destruction. Mystical theology, of course, could not be abandoned because some misused it, but in the undisciplined research of the universities not enough care was taken to prevent inquisitive and self-confident renaissance students from being misled by such material. Luther, in particular, was not so much influenced by the nominalist theology that he had been taught, as reacting against it and fortifying his stand with citations from mystic or pseudo-mystic works.

Pseudo-mysticism, then, was an important factor in the Revolt. Many theologians could not be persuaded to abandon St. Augustine for St. Thomas, nor Scotistic voluntarism for intellectualism. Yet St. Augustine was of all the Fathers the most vulnerable to misinterpretation, and the Subtle Doctor Scotus had been distorted by his own disciple, Ockham. Theologians of the pietistic or pseudo-mystic tendency thought that they did honor to God and the supernatural by exalting Faith at the expense of reason. Bradwardine had proclaimed theistic determinism, and John Mirecourt carried this opinion even to divine volition of sin. Nicholas of Cusa applied Eckhart's principles of philosophy to reach an intellectual scepticism that could not but breed a voluntarist quietism. All this the devotees substantiated by specious passages from St. Augustine that denied human freedom and asserted the force of concupiscence. With the incautious revival of Platonism and neoplatonism, moreover, the way was open for aberrations that finally went as far as Pantheism. No need to tell such hardy inquirers that St. Augustine rightly interpreted was in substantial accord with St. Thomas, for many renaissance minds believed that they had discovered things unsuspected by men of the past. Generations of Christians could be utterly wrong, it seemed, as the man of the Renaissance confidently advanced to set the world aright.

B. *Disciplinary Causes*

(1) PRELATIAL WEAKNESSES

The papal theocracy was the "Old Regime" to the Protestant Revolution. Papal primacy in Church and state was still acknowledged in theory, but at least in its latter prerogative practically disregarded. The failure of nationalist monarchs to pay more than lip service to the Sacerdotium and Imperium had been demonstrated in their indifference toward the Crusade, their cynicism regarding ecclesiastical admonitions or even censures, and their espousal of Machiavellianism by returning to large-scale civil war within Christendom. And theirs was no longer the ignorant and brutal violence of petty feudal lords, for the supposedly enlightened self-interest of these budding benevolent despots could

muster powerful physical force and dominate public opinion. And it must be said of the papal theocracy that, unlike the Old Regime of 1789, it exercised its control through moral rather than physical power. All that sustained it in its position as the acknowledged international court of Christendom was reverence for its spiritual primacy; should this be repudiated, the whole social order would be shaken. Though questioning of the temporal position of the papacy did not intrinsically involve rejection of papal spiritual leadership, distinction was not easy for a Europeon mentality which had so long fused and confused spiritual and temporal in the Christian Commonwealth, the unique "City of God."

Preoccupation of renaissance popes with Italian politics contributed to this confusion, especially when viewed by an ultramontane clergy and laity subjected to a nationalistic monarch or propaganda. The ordinary means for securing moral unanimity in the Church on basic questions, the ecumenical council, had been rendered suspect by the abuse of the conciliar theory at Constance and Basle. The exercise, if not the very existence, of papal spiritual primacy had been challenged, and might be easily brought into question again. Hence, the frequent appeals of the heterodox, the rebellious, or the selfish scholar or ruler to the decisions of a "future general council" in order to evade present submission to papal authority. Finally, excessive compromise with the Renaissance by certain popes, either in their own lives or in the conduct of their subordinates, had failed to regain for the theocracy either the intellectual or the moral leadership that it had once enjoyed. The theocracy had been born of reform; now reformation would be tried in spite of it.

(2) Clerical Moral Failings

Clerical morality continued to invite revolt. A sufficiently large number of prelates and clerics were neglecting to counteract the charm of renaissance sensuality by exemplary lives. Some were even giving bad example, aping the Humanists themselves in immorality. Others were so devoted to secular pursuits and their own ease, that, although their personal character was beyond serious reproach, they had little care for their flocks. Enough has been said to indicate that disregard of clerical dress and clerical celibacy was common; that prelates like Hermann von Wied, archbishop of Cologne, paralyzed reform efforts—he said Mass but three times in his life, and those times dubiously, for he knew no Latin. George of Bavaria was fairly typical of imperial prince-bishops with his hoard of sees, abbeys, and canonries at the age of thirteen. For what they are worth, the moral statistics retailed by Father Hughes are worth consideration once more. It is rather significant that

whereas between 1049 and 1274, there were seventy-four canonized bishops, only four secular prelates received this honor between 1274 and 1521. Again, of 150 saints or *beati* between 1378 and 1521, those from the mendicant orders numbered 115.[1] Of course no statistics can measure the state of grace or God's hidden workings, but these are at least in accord with the common rumor of contemporaries. It would seem that lay domination of the secular clergy was stifling sanctity, and that only a free clergy could be a holy one.

Clerical wealth has been estimated in the German Empire as comprising a third of the total,[2] although this must include those corporate possessions which were really held in trust for the social and charitable works of Christendom. But the income of the Roman curia from Germany, estimated at 220,000 gulders annually, far exceeded the imperial revenues. Prelacies and better benefices were monopolized by the nobility, leaving lesser clerics to constitute a "spiritual proletariat." A majority of the 1,400,000 clerics and nuns were not concerned with parochial ministrations in Germany—in Breslau in 1500 two churches had 236 clerics attached! [3] Elsewhere, the sees of Rouen and Winchester had revenues of 12,000 florins, while Aquileia, Cologne, Mainz, Trier, Salzburg, Canterbury, and York had over 10,000. Some forty European sees had revenues in excess of 3,000 florins. On the other hand, the Italian sees, constituting about three hundred of the existing 717 sees in 1418, were comparatively poor.[4] And it was the princely sees that were most in the public eye, had the greatest capacity for good, and proved the greatest temptation to avaricious men. Though the poor and sick were still benefiting by this wealth in clerical hands, many of the administrators were now regarded as useless parasites by lay plutocrats who, however, had little intention of assuming this public burden when they exclaimed: "Why cannot this be sold and given to the poor?"

C. Political Causes

(1) Governmental Theories

Dynastic nationalism was the dominating trait of the political scene. This was the nationalism of royal families striving to make each state its own ultimate norm. This type of nationalism had been developing during the Renaissance; by the time of the Protestant Revolt, the process was virtually complete in England, France, and Spain. What contrib-

[1] Philip Hughes, *History of the Catholic Church* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1947), III, 484.

[2] Charles Poulet and Sidney Raemers, *Church History* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1934), II, 3.

[3] Joseph Lortz, *Die Reformation in Deutschland* (third edition; Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1949), I, 86.

[4] Hughes, *op. cit.,* pp. 539–40.

uted to its rise was the failure of the feudal nobility. Feudalism had at length degenerated into a nobility of privilege rather than of service. National monarchs, assisted by an alert and ambitious *bourgeoisie*, were taking over many of the nobles' military and governmental functions, in the countries just indicated. But the nobles, deprived of their reason for existence, still exacted feudal dues from their serfs, for though reduced to a subordinate position, they were still too powerful to be destroyed. They, too, were a sort of parasite, but a very dangerous one. Though generally worsted in their struggles with the kings, they had not yet abandoned all hope of recovering their position. As courtiers plotting against the throne they could disturb, if not overthrow, national stability, and to placate them the monarchs left them social and proprietary privileges. They were apt for revolutionary teachings, avid of ecclesiastical wealth to bolster their own waning prestige and power. And in Germany, where the Holy Roman Empire had hindered the formation of national political unity, the magnates had become local despots at the expense of lesser lords and knights. Selfish advocates of "states' rights" against national and international unity, they ensured that the religious revolt would produce a disruption of Christendom.

Anticlerical nationalism proceeded from this same spirit of antagonism toward supranational institutions. No organization was more international than the Catholic Church. As long as prelates, clergy, and laity recognized a spiritual primate outside the homeland's borders, as long as the Church possessed its own language and literature, law and courts and taxing machinery, no national monarch nor local dynast could become what he longed to be, sole fountain of authority. It is natural, then, that various rulers would regard a new religion which would submit to their dictation as a potential ally, first to frighten and then to defy the theocracy. They might embrace it themselves or toy with the notion of forming a schismatical church.

Royal Absolutism was by far the prevalent theory, although in the form of one man acting as the personification of the state. Machiavelli had proposed a sketch of an absolute monarch responsible merely to his interpretation of the divine will, superior even to the moral law in "state questions," acting from enlightened self-interest to impose his will upon his subjects by any means that might serve that end. Christian kings had already begun to resort to Machiavellianism in practice; only that very monarchical and yet democratic institution, the Catholic Church, stood in the way of open avowal. Having proceeded far toward controlling men's bodies and goods, national despots aspired to dominate their minds as well. Gladly would they welcome Luther's assertion that a "prince may be a Christian, but he should govern, not as a Christian, but as a prince." This was virtually to make of the ruler a pagan

or Moslem potentate. Abdication by Luther and Cranmer of ecclesiastical independence proved most welcome to unscrupulous princes who were to devise the slogan: *cujus regio, ejus religio.* And those rulers whose piety or interest barred them from apostasy, were prone to demand as a price of loyalty nearly equivalent disciplinary and financial autonomy from Rome. Many reformers called upon Caesar; and to Caesar, willingly or no, they were soon obliged to go.

(2) Economic Factors

Commercial advance was stimulated by the discoveries which opened new fields for exploitation. The lure of immense riches put further strain upon the ecclesiastical prohibitions of usury and profiteering, and the scramble for colonies disregarded papal efforts at mediation. The missionaries, it has been seen, found their work prejudiced by the impression created among the natives by greedy or tyrannical merchants, planters, or slave drivers. When Protestantism extended an indirect blessing to the new capitalistic order in Europe, many merchants and bankers and producers were readily persuaded to seek pretexts for religious change.

Ecclesiastical wealth would appeal to the same class as prospective loot. Princes, nobles, and burghers coveted property which, they felt, would bring greater returns under more efficient secular management. Such efficiency usually involved repudiation of the charitable uses to which the vested capital of sees and abbeys was still devoted with reasonable fidelity. And once confiscation had taken place in deliberation or in passion, an entrenched class of newly rich proprietors would find possession doubly sweet. They would be inclined to offer tenacious opposition to any restoration of the Catholic religion, which maturer deliberation might dictate on purely religious or moral considerations. Such men, reluctantly sometimes, but nonetheless surely, would sell their religion for gain.

Serfdom in many countries, notably in England and in Germany, had been giving way to a system of tenant farmers. But accompanying, if not precisely caused by the religious rebellion, agrarian uprisings were staged which proved unsuccessful. The enclosure movement began in England in favor of the landlords and capitalistic herders; in Germany and Denmark, peasant risings were suppressed by the magnates and serfdom reimposed. Perhaps one hundred thousand Germans had been slain. In both urban and rural districts, therefore, the religious revolts were accompanied by developments prejudicial to the economic interests of the majority.

Plutocracy. The assertion, "the Reformation was the rising of the rich against the poor," therefore, contains a certain amount of truth. Though

the great financial houses of the sixteenth century, the Medici and Fuggers, remained in the service of the Catholic Church, it might be argued that they were more of a liability than a help. The guilds were in a state of decline and became price-fixing and labor-regulating tools of the masters of capital. Secularism and more secularism was the progressive outcome of a society where economic interest readily became paramount. Such a society was diametrically opposed to the social spirit of Christianity. Luther's revolt, followed by the staggering blows dealt by Calvin and Tudor, placed the Catholic Church on the defensive, forced her to adopt quasi-martial law, and obliged her to concentrate upon survival of her essential spiritual mission. Survive and reform she did, but for centuries she was denied a regulatory or even influential place in public life—to the loss of the poor and the lowly.

20. EMPEROR CHARLES OF EUROPE

A. *The Imperial Colossus*

(1) THE EMPIRE

The empire of Charles V amply vindicated Wyndham Lewis's designation of its master as "Charles of Europe." [5] For at the height of his power, Karl von Habsburg was Holy Roman Emperor, king of Germany, Italy, and Burgundy, king of Spain and the Two Sicilies, prince of the Netherlands, archduke of Austria, lord of both Americas. As head of the imperial dynasty he enjoyed influence over relatives: his brother Ferdinand was king of Hungary and Bohemia; his wife Isabella was princess of Portugal; his son Philip became for a time king-consort of England, and his sister Isabella was briefly queen of the Scandinavian Union of Kalmar. In Western Europe, only France lay outside his orbit.

Charles's effective power, however, was considerably less than what one might imagine from this array of possessions. As Holy Roman Emperor, he was titular suzerain of Christendom, but only his dynastic possessions gave any substance to his prerogative. Though king of Germany, he had little real power over the territorial magnates. Despite his control of the richest industrial area of the Old World, the Netherlands, and his imports of treasure from the American New World, the emperor was seldom, if ever, out of debt; usually his revenues were pledged or mortgaged far in advance to the Fuggers or other financiers. The Spaniards might be the leading soldiers of the day, but they were averse to fighting foreign wars. But even when these and other liabilities are discounted, Charles's prestige was immense and his influence formidable as ruler of the first "empire on which the sun never sets."

[5] D. B. Wyndham Lewis, *Charles of Europe* (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1931), Title.

(2) THE EMPEROR

Karl von Habsburg (1500–58) was born at Ghent, son of Philip and Juana of Castile, grandson alike of Emperor Maximilian and of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. He received a good education, Adrian Dedel, later Pope Adrian VI, acting as one of his tutors. He grew up reserved, taciturn, energetic, and determined, though reasonable and penetrating in judgment of men. Magnanimous and cultured, he did not lack a quiet and subtle humor. Tenacious of what he believed to be his rights, he remained modest and had some genuine humility. His Catholic faith was firm, and he was prepared to sacrifice all for it. His morality was not faultless, though he was ever faithful to his wife, that Empress Isabella whose beauty and charm so impressed St. Francis Borgia as courtier. To the ideal of a united Christendom Charles applied excellent talents of administration, shrewd diplomacy, and at times competent personal leadership in battle. In good faith he often erred by Caesaro-papism and excessive compromise, but he did persevere in the Catholic Church against what Napoleon in retrospect would judge his own political interest. Neither saint nor ogre, but above the average renaissance morality, he ended up a sincere penitent. Having come closest, perhaps, to "gaining the whole world," he yet failed to create a European unity, though he did preserve his inherited territories intact. He failed to suppress Protestantism, but saved Catholicity from a destruction that, humanly speaking, seemed inevitable. Finally he gave the world a rare example of voluntary abdication, and "did not suffer the loss of his own soul."

(3) IMPERIAL OBJECTIVES

International unity bulked large in Charles's plans. He was medieval enough to cherish the ideal of the Holy Roman Empire, and realistic enough to acknowledge that it remained but a "shadow" of its former self. But he dedicated the inherited resources of his fortunate legacies to infuse new life into the ancient institution. This infusion proved no lasting cure, but imperial majesty was prolonged so that Charles V may be considered the last emperor in fact as well as in name.

Catholic defense. Charles considered a duty incumbent upon him in virtue of his position as temporal head of Christendom. He quickly declared for the religion of his forefathers, and rejected what he deemed the presumption of an apostate monk in opposing his judgment to the views of a thousand years of Christendom. To this cause he pledged in knightly fashion all that he had, and if he was not above calculation and occasional niggardliness in execution of his vow, he did remain faithful to its substance until death.

(4) IMPERIAL ADVERSARIES

The Turks under Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent (1520–66) were then at the height of their power, and made their supreme offensive on land and sea during the sixteenth century. As has been noted, the emperor checked them on land before Vienna, and by his raid on Tunis prepared for his sons' victory at sea: Lepanto (1571). But defense was the most that Charles could manage, and the recurring Mohammedan menace proved to be a major obstacle to his suppression of Lutheranism.

German magnates, jealous of their local autonomy, either supported Luther or were lukewarm in the repression of heresy, lest imperial power be enhanced by effective police action. Once Charles overcame them on the battlefield, but eventually was betrayed by the treason of Maurice of Saxony.

The Valois dynasty in France, dreading the absorption of their realm into the encircling Habsburg dominions in Germany, Italy, and Spain, attacked Charles no less than five times. The emperor held his own, recovered Lombardy, and during the last year of his life heard of the French rout at St. Quentin, which confirmed Spanish ascendancy for a century. But by their alliances with both the Turks and the German Lutherans, Kings Francis I (1515–47) and Henry II (1547–59) made impossible the preservation of the religious and political unity of Christendom.

The Tudors in England weakly and inconsistently seconded the Valois and added to Christendom's trials the fostering of both schism and heresy. English military intervention was minor and her naval power not yet developed, but Wolsey and Henry VIII did inaugurate something of the modern British diplomacy of balance of power on the Continent. Charles won a personal victory over Henry VIII by establishing the Catholic Mary and his own son Philip on the English throne. It was no fault of his that Elizabeth apostatized after his death, and Philip allowed himself to be taken in by her artful diplomacy.

B. *The Imperial Burden*

(1) DEFENSE OF ITALY (1515–30)

Francis I of France opened a half century of Habsburg-Valois conflict in 1515 by invading northern Italy. Victorious at Marignano, he acquired the imperial fief of the Milanese, key to Lombardy, and communications link between the Habsburg dominions in Spain and Germany. In 1516 Francis used his position to wrest from Pope Leo X the Concordat of Bologna, giving him control of French ecclesiastical patronage. Charles, who became king of Spain in January, 1516, felt obliged

to acquiesce for the time being in the French conquest at the Peace of Noyon (1516).

Charles I of Spain (1516–56) was at first occupied in securing possession of his kingdom, threatened by a serious uprising of the *comuneros* until 1523. At the death of Emperor Maximilian (1519), Charles, Francis, and Henry VIII of England became candidates for the imperial throne. The pope supported Francis in an effort to offset Habsburg preponderance, but German patriotic sentiment, fanned by Humanists and knights—and Fugger credit—prevailed on the Electors to choose Charles, June 18, 1519. Francis and Henry pondered an alliance at the Field of Cloth of Gold (1520), but Charles, pausing in England en route to Germany, won his uncle-in-law to adhere to benevolent neutrality. Crowned king of Germany at Aachen in October, 1520, Charles V called the Diet of Worms for the following spring. When the Diet or Reichstag convened, Charles rejected Luther's appeal and placed the heresiarch under the ban of the empire. But the magnates displayed no zeal in executing the ban, and Charles was recalled to Spain by a critical phase of the Spanish disaffection. Deputizing his younger brother Ferdinand to act as his regent in Germany, Charles for a decade concentrated upon his Spanish and Italian problems.

The Milanese contest (1521–26) arose out of Francis's desire to annex Navarre and Naples. But Charles's troops completely turned the tables by recapturing the Milanese (1522), and Francis was defeated and captured at Pavia in leading a counterattack (1525). The king of France was released on his word of honor to preserve the peace; if he did not, he admitted, "hold me a worthless cad." He proved to be a cad nevertheless and resumed the war, though without success. Meanwhile the Peasants' Revolt in Germany and the Turkish victory over the Hungarians at Mohacs (1526) threatened central Europe.

Sack of Rome. Clement VII, another Medici, allied himself with King Francis to his own misfortune. For in 1527 Charles V's unpaid troops mutinied under the French deserter, the duke of Bourbon, and compensated themselves by seizing Rome. Presence of Lutherans among the German contingents added to a desecration and destruction that shocked Christendom. Though Charles had not authorized the attack, he found himself the pope's captor. He was not averse to extorting political concessions from Clement VII, but the situation enabled Francis I and Henry VIII to pose as liberators. Fortunately pope and emperor reached an understanding on their own, which was confirmed on Charles's birthday by his imperial coronation at Bologna in 1530. It was the last papal coronation of an emperor-elect, and Charles was technically as well as practically "last of the emperors." For the moment,

Francis's mother, Louise of Savoy, arranged a peace which confirmed Italy in Spanish possession for centuries. Charles V was now at last free to deal with Germany.

(2) GERMAN RECKONING (1530–47)

Lutheran stalemate. At the Diet of Augsburg, June, 1530, the emperor personally appeared and overruled Ferdinand and the magnates who wished to prolong the suspension of the ban against the Lutherans. These had already "protested" against Charles's anticipated intransigence, and now formed the Schmalkaldic League of "Protestant" princes to resist enforcement by force of arms. Headed by Luther's protector, Elector John of Saxony, and Philip of Hesse, a good general, the League was a serious danger in itself—even if it had not been abetted by Francis of France. Charles was disposed to attack notwithstanding, when news arrived that the Turks, whom he had already beaten back from Vienna in 1529, were again advancing in force. The emperor had no choice other than to postpone hostilities against the Lutherans by the Truce of Nuremburg, July, 1532, which left the religious status alone pending a still unsummoned ecumenical council. Then Catholics and Lutherans alike enlisted for the Balkan expedition. Actually, the Turkish and French perils to his dominions would prevent Charles from terminating the Truce of Nuremburg before 1544.

Anti-Moslem crusade. Charles marched against the Turks, who, after a defeat, retreated rapidly. Austria and part of Hungary were saved, but the emperor dared not invade the Balkans with his heterogeneous army. Instead he used his reliable Spanish troops to deliver a blow in another area. In 1535 Charles and Admiral Andrea Doria stormed and captured Tunis, freed Christian captives, and temporarily relieved the pressure of the Barbary pirates in the western Mediterranean. But another raid on Algiers (1541) proved a failure.

French defeat. Charles had just returned from Tunis when Francis declared war for the fourth time. After an indecisive contest (1536–38), Charles offered generous terms of peace in order to allow him to put down a revolt in the Netherlands, heavily taxed to support the imperial expeditions. This done (1540), Charles V was about to turn his attention to Germany when Francis opened his fifth and last war (1541–44). Charles this time marched to the Marne, thirty-six miles from Paris, and extorted from the frightened Francis a peace, which death prevented him from breaking again.

Imperial "dies irae." Now like a star halfback bottled up until the final quarter, Charles ran wild at last over the isolated Schmalkaldic League. In June, 1546, Charles had repromulgated the ban, and when the League defied it, mustered inferior imperial forces against the fifty-seven thou-

sand Leaguers. But personal leadership by the emperor and the duke of Alba disrupted the forces of the League, which were brought to bay at Mühlberg, less than forty miles from the Lutheran center of Wittenberg. Surprising the Lutherans by forced marches, the imperialists charged across the river and routed them in an all-day battle, April 23, 1547. Charles, twenty-four hours in the saddle, announced: "I came, I saw, and God conquered." Presently he rode into Wittenberg a year too late: Luther had died the preceding year. Asked to have the body disinterred, Charles retorted: "I war against the living, not the dead." But the League was also dead, John Frederick of Saxony deposed, and Philip of Hesse in prison. At the Diet of Augsburg, September, 1547, the cowed rebels submitted and promised to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent which had at last opened its sessions in December, 1545.

(3) RELIGIOUS COMPROMISE (1547–58)

Papal-imperial dissension robbed Christendom of the fruits of victory. Paul III had two grievances against Charles. The first was his justifiable dread of a dominant Habsburg Caesaro-papism that had already meddled in conciliar transactions. The second was an unjustifiable antipathy toward Charles because Paul's illegitimate grandson had been killed in a petty attack on the Milanese. Instead of pressing forward negotiations with the Lutherans, Paul suspended the council and opened talks with Henry II of France, whose conciliar meddling had at least equaled that of Charles V, since he had prevented the attendance of the French hierarchy. But at Augsburg, Charles V, like another King Saul, sensed that the people were slipping away from him while he awaited the belated high priest. His exasperation is understandable; still, neither Saul nor Charles were justified in usurping priestly functions. In May, 1548, Charles upon his own authority issued the *Interim of Augsburg* which, pending conciliar decision, allowed the Lutherans to retain a married ministry and communion under both species. Although even the pope had spoken privately "off the record" of the expediency of making some such disciplinary concessions, Paul III was legitimately angered to see his consent presumed.

Lutheran escape. After Paul III's death, his successor, Pope Julius III (1550–55), recalled Trent and even took the Interim under advisement in friendly correspondence with Charles V. But it was too late. Maurice of Saxony, who had first deserted the Lutherans to gain the electorate from Charles's hand, now reached a secret understanding with Henry II of France. Simultaneously in 1551 they attacked. Both Charles and the Council of Trent narrowly escaped capture, and the Lutheran magnates were emboldened to retake the field. Charles and his brother Ferdinand rallied to the extent of restoring something of the Catholic position prior

to Mühlberg, but all hope of immediate suppression of Lutheranism had vanished and imperial supremacy was shattered. Weary and sick, Charles V allowed his brother who was already king of the Romans, to negotiate the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. For the moment it is enough to note in this brief political preview that this divided Germany between Catholic and Lutheran princes, according to the norm, *cujus regio ejus religio.* Though Charles refused the pact his formal approbation and withdrew from direct control of German affairs, this halfway compromise came into effect by default. It was perhaps the best that Catholics in Germany could have expected for that century, and the arrangement endured precariously until 1618.

Imperial twilight. Charles V, who had long realized that the responsibilities of his imperial and dynastic position were excessive for one man, had prepared a division of his dominions. According to the arrangements of 1555–56, his brother Ferdinand was to inherit the Austro-Bohemian-Hungarian territories, with the titles of king of Germany and Holy Roman Emperor—actually technicalities prevented Charles's formal resignation as emperor until the spring of 1558. Thus arose the line of Austrian Habsburgs which, with its Habsburg-Lorraine continuation, ruled in Vienna until 1918. To his son Philip (II), Charles V made over the Netherlands, Italy, Spain, and its American possessions. Even after his retirement to the monastery of Yuste in Spain (1556), Charles V remained the supreme Habsburg political mentor until his death. His last efforts were directed to the recovery of England through the accession of Mary Tudor, to whom he married his son Philip II. For his own lifetime the Catholic restoration was effected. It is interesting to speculate on the course of Christian unity had England, germ of the United States and the British Commonwealth, been permanently regained for the Catholic Church. During his years of retirement the last of the Valois-Habsburg Wars was victoriously brought toward its conclusion by the Spanish victories of St. Quentin (1557) and Gravelines (1558). Charles V ended the life that at abdication he had termed "one long voyage" on September 21, 1558, after piously receiving the last sacraments. At least one panegyrist was found: St. Francis Borgia, who had known Charles both as courtier and Jesuit, wrote: "We have seen the end of the greatest man in the world."

21. LUTHER AND LUTHERANISM

A. *Antecedents*

(1) LUTHER'S EARLY CAREER

"The German Reformation is to a great extent Martin Luther." [6] Martin Luder (1483–1546), son of Hans Luder and Margaret Ziegler,

[6] Lortz, *op. cit.,* p. 148.

was born at Eisleben, Saxony on November 10, 1483. Luther ever manifested the coarse traits of the medieval Saxon peasant in his speech and manner. His parents did not spare the rod, but their puritanical cruelty is reported to have antagonized their son: "One day my father beat me so mercilessly that I was frightened and ran away from home. I was so embittered against him that he had to win me to himself again. And once my mother, on account of an insignificant nut, beat me till the blood ran." Martin may have been fortunate enough, for it was said that Hans once slew a man in anger. Margaret was pious, but gloomy: "We grew pale at the mere thought of Christ, for He was represented to us as a terrible and angry judge." [7]

Education. Hans Luder began as a poor miner but eventually prospered. Martin's early training in the schools was a repetition of his home discipline, unless we are dealing with a persecution complex: "I was beaten fifteen times in succession during one morning at school, to the best of my knowledge without any fault of my own." About his fourteenth year he received some instruction from the Brethren of the Common Life at Magdeburg, where for a time he begged bread by singing from door to door. A year later he went to Eisenach for Latin studies, and was befriended by a charitable woman, Ursula Cotta. By 1501 his father's circumstances had so far improved that Martin was sent to Erfurt University to study the arts and law. The environment was immoral; whether Luther shared in this depravity is not certainly known, though once he seemed to admit as much to Emser.

Monasticism. At twenty Luther fell ill from excessive study, and during convalescence got tangled up in his sword, nearly killing himself. He attributed his escape to the Blessed Virgin. Then a friend's death in a duel shocked him, and while still in this mood was terrified by a severe storm. When a bolt of lightning struck near by, he reported that he vowed: "St. Anne, save me, and I'll become a monk." Against his father's doubts as to the genuine nature of his vocation, Luther fulfilled his pledge on July 17, 1505, by entering the Erfurt convent of the Augustinian Order. A year later he made his vows as "Friar Augustine." The new religious had already received a master's degree and was now rapidly advanced. On April 3, 1507, he was ordained to the priesthood, although he had scarcely begun theology. Overwhelmed by fear of rubrical error, he delayed his first Mass a month and then had to be restrained from leaving the altar. His father, grudgingly present, again voiced an opinion that Martin's monasticism was a delusion. After some eighteen months of theological study, Luther was sent to Wittenberg University to study Scripture and to lecture on philosophy. In 1509 he received a bachelor's degree in Scripture and commenced lectures on

[7] Hartmann Grisar, *Luther* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1914), I, 3–9 ff.

the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. Finally on October 18, 1512, he was accorded a doctorate in theology and assigned to teach Scripture at Wittenberg in succession to his provincial, Father Staupitz, at the beginning of the following year.

(2) LUTHER'S CHARACTER

Scrupulosity is the first marked trait in Luther's character. His vocation seems to have partaken of the superstitious, and once a monk, Luther remained scrupulous over his confessions, repeating them continually until his novice master reminded him: "Recall the article of the Creed: I believe in the forgiveness of sins." Recurring terrors seized him. Besides the incident of his first Mass, it is alleged that during a reading of the Gospel of the man possessed, he fell on the floor, exclaiming: "It is not I; it is not I." Scrupulosity reappears in his concern for emotional assurance of salvation. But it would be erroneous to consider Luther as ever beset with scruples, for he seems to have left his worries behind him whenever he plunged into active work. By reaction his conscience became, if anything, lax.

Colossal egotism was deeply rooted. From the first he was a glib, caustic lecturer, given to scurrilous and bitter attacks upon others, infallibly interpreting their motives, seeking laughs by vulgar or even obscene jokes. Later he poured forth unrestrained abuse, obscenity, and filth against the papacy, the bishops, and priests; against anyone, even of his own party, who opposed him. His rhetoric was heavy, vulgar, exaggerated, repetitious, for he wrote or spoke hastily on the spur of the moment or in the grasp of passion. Vain and jealous, he easily yielded to flattery. When he avowed faults, it might be accompanied with comparisons to those of the saints. At the height of his power he was dictatorial: "Dr. Martin Luther, God's own notary and witness of His Gospel. . . . I am the prophet of the Germans. . . . I understand the Scripture a great deal better than the pope and all his people. . . . Not for a thousand years has God bestowed such great gifts on any bishops as He has on me. . . . I am not far behind many of the fathers." [8]

Congenital lying is manifest before and after his break with the Church. Though some of his lies may have been the consequence of gradual self-deception, many more were clearly deliberate. He forged papal documents and misrepresented Catholic doctrine: "No pope, father, or bishop ever preached Christ; the Church taught that all were saved through Aristotle; that works alone counted; in the Church there was no personal contact with Christ, but all went through the hierarchy; the popes forbade marriage and considered it sinful." To be

[8] *Ibid.*, IV, 327 ff.

sure, Luther was an expansive and voluble speaker who often used hyperbole and exaggeration. Yet convicted to his face of falsehood on several occasions, he merely poured forth loud torrents of abuse. He scrupled not to give contradictory advice and then later deny responsibility, as in the case of Philip of Hesse's "dispensation" for bigamy.[9]

In general, judged by his own words alone, Luther's character left much to be desired—though allowance must be made for his bravado and bombast. When one has enumerated his lack of avarice that endeared him to the common people, his bluff, hearty good-fellowship, his rough good humor when not vexed, his good qualities are nearly exhausted. Mentally he was brilliant, but superficial: a frenzied student, he later abandoned profound study and coasted easily on ready eloquence. A pioneer, if not the creator, of good modern literary German, he boggled not at slipshod or dishonest principles of translation in his version of the Bible. He was a man of little prayer, and that without resignation to the divine will. He preached mortification, but did not practice it after his break with the Church. As a monk, his self-description of excessive penances is contradicted by the testimony of fellow monks. Luther seems externally to have been an average monk, neither the saint of his own imaginings nor the demon of contemporary Catholic controversialists. It is greatly to be feared that he stifled his conscience in 1521–22, 1527–28, and 1537. At these times he fought what he describes as "temptations" which, he says, were violent at first and in later years ebbed away, though leaving a recurrent melancholy. It is not for the historian to examine Luther's conscience; here it may merely be remarked that Luther reported the gist of these "inner voices" as follows: "Who called upon you to do things such as no man ever did before? . . . You are not called. . . . Even though the papacy be not without its sins and errors, what about you? Are you infallible? Are you without sin? . . . See how much evil arises from your doctrine. . . . Are you alone wise and are all others mistaken? Is it likely that so many centuries were all in the wrong? . . . It will not be well with you when you die. Go back, go back; submit, submit." [10]

B. *Lutheran Teaching*

(1) EVOLUTION

Predispositions. Though the humanism of Erfurt and theological nominalism of Occam, D'Ailly, and Biel were important negative influences against which Luther reacted, pseudo-mysticism furnished the chief positive impulse. From Tauler and other mystics Luther drew quietist conclusions that the spiritual man ought to await grace by faith

[9] *Ibid.,* II, 80 ff.
[10] *Ibid.,* II, 79; V, 319 ff.

alone without resort to prayer or good works. He interpreted his own scruples as some sort of "dark night of the soul"; his belittling of "pharisaic" external good works became "docility to the Holy Ghost"; his sweeping repudiation of any intrinsic justification of the human soul was his interpretation of Tauler's *Deus omnia in nobis operatur.* Much also he drew from an anonymous tract, *Theologia Deutch,* which he erroneously attributed to Tauler. Luther deemed St. Augustine's treatise, *De Spiritu et Littera,* not as contrasting inward grace, *spiritus,* with exterior, *littera;* but as teaching an absolute opposition between grace and faith to external good works.

Inadequate guidance by his provincial, Johann von Staupitz, prevented Luther from recognizing the errors into which he was falling. Staupitz himself was a Humanist, pious enough, inadequately trained in theology, imprudent and vacillating, and burdened with a thousand cares of office. Luther became his protégé: apparently Staupitz pushed the brilliant young monk through his course, dismissed his doubts blandly, resigned his scriptural professorship to the neophyte, promoted him to the second dignity in the province, that of rural vicar, and repeatedly defended or excused him to higher authorities. Although Staupitz never left the Church and was subsequently disillusioned about Luther, he long served as a buffer between the rebel and premature correction. He permitted Luther to undertake a multitude of labors beyond his emotional strength, and presently Luther was simultaneously lecturing on Scripture in the University, preaching in the parish church, supervising the rural houses, writing tracts and carrying on academic controversies. Luther admitted that in this hyperactivity he seldom found time any longer for saying his Mass or divine office: he was becoming physically wasted and nervously tense.

The Observantine quarrel seems to have been Luther's point of departure. The congregation which he had joined was a reformed branch of the Augustinian Order, which enjoyed autonomy for that reason. Staupitz proposed reincorporation with the main body, hoping, it seems, thereby to become vicar-general for all the German Augustinians. This move was resisted by the Observantine group who upheld the intentions of the founder, Andreas Proles (d. 1503). Luther at first adhered to this faction and went to Rome (1510–11) on their behalf. But soon after his return he changed over to Staupitz's side and became professor of Scripture—it is hard to resist the surmise of a "deal." At any rate, Luther seemed self-conscious about his change of sides, and defended himself by branding the Observantines as pharisaic worshippers of external minutiae. He regaled the young students with caricatures of the Observantines, and gradually extended his accusations to other religious orders, the secular clergy, and the hierarchy.

Doctrinal development. Meanwhile in his Scriptural lectures and commentaries, Luther was groping for his own speculative idea. His development from "extraneous righteousness" to "fiducial faith" may be traced in his lectures on the *Psalms, Romans,* and *Galatians* between 1513 and 1519. The process was gradual; according to Luther, not until 1519 did he make his vaunted "discovery" of fiducial faith alone: "Our salvation or rejection depends entirely on whether we believe or do not believe in Christ." God does all; man does not even co-operate; indeed, his every act is a sin, though if he retains faith, God will cover his iniquities over as with a cloak. His conclusion—expressed with hyperbole not to be taken quite literally—*pecca fortiter; crede fortius.*

(2) Lutheran Grace and Justification

Pessimistic side. Luther practically identified original sin and concupiscence; in other words, confused sin with its effect. Since all were aware from experience that concupiscence remains even after the sacraments of baptism and penance, Luther concluded that these sacraments were unable to remove either original or personal sin. This led him to four pessimistic assertions: 1) Original sin remains after justification. 2) All movements of concupiscence are sins, since the soul is entirely subject to the body, which in turn is wholly dominated by concupiscence. 3) This being the case, it is impossible to obey God's law. 4) Hence, concupiscence is invincible and the human will is entirely enslaved.

Optimistic assumptions. The only genuine justification, Luther at length decided, is by means of faith. His justifying faith is essentially a complete confidence in the mercy conceded to man by Christ's merits. It is of the utmost importance that each one consider this as applied to himself in particular: to experience faith, to feel it. But when asked in what this faith consisted, Luther replied vaguely that the anguished desire to have faith is faith; the acknowledgement of complete impotence before concupiscence is faith, etc., and his own faith would cause him continual anxiety through life. Often he bade his disciples to renew, to stir up their faith. Is, then, justification a process of renovation of the interior man? No, this renewal is merely an impulse toward the merits of Christ whereby a man believes more firmly. On the contrary, "the Christian is just and holy by a foreign and extrinsic holiness; he is just by God's mercy and grace. . . . This mercy and this grace are not in man; faith is not a habit or quality in the heart; it is a divine benefit. It consists in an external indulgence toward us. The Christian is not formally just. Doubtless sin is no longer condemned, but it remains. You discover no trace of purification, but only a satanic blackness," that is, in the soul. When it was objected that faith must be a quality of some sort, he replied: "Doubtless faith *is* a quality as well, but it does not

justify as a quality; it is only by its relation to Christ's merits." In a strictly Lutheran system of justification, then, man seized the justice of God by faith, and it was imputed to him thereafter as a protective covering for the sins which still actually remained in his soul.

Role of grace. Though Luther retained the use of the theological term, "grace," his teaching practically destroyed it in the Catholic sense. When Luther speaks of actual grace he is so vague that no trustworthy statement can be garnered. He seems to despise a mere created help and speaks of the Holy Ghost operating in man in such wise as to border upon pantheism. Habitual grace, as Scholastic teaching described it, was for Luther an absurdity. His most precise statement is perhaps the following: "I understand grace in the sense of a favor of God, but not in the notion of a quality in the soul. It is any exterior good, that is, the favor of God as opposed to His anger." Although Luther's explanation of *gratia* is etymologically correct, he erred theologically in asserting that for man to be in the state of grace meant no more than to be in God's "good graces." Lutheran grace is God's favor, imputed extrinsically to man, but not productive of any real intrinsic justification.[11]

(3) Means of Sanctification

The Church for Luther is "altogether in the spirit . . . altogether a spiritual thing." Like Wycliffe and Hus, Luther contended that the Church was essentially an invisible society of "true believers": "The Church is believed in but not seen; . . . she is a society of hearts in faith." Hence, there was no real need for a hierarchy or priesthood, and he reduced his clergy to mere "ministers of the word . . . without jurisdiction in the legal sense." But after his early hopes for voluntary organization of Lutheran congregations were disappointed, Luther acquiesced in state control in that he termed the prince *membrum praecipuum ecclesiae.* Subsequent Lutheran "bishops" were practically state superintendents. Luther, moreover, took the Church out of public life; well could he say: "In the past the pope was all in all; now the prince is all in all." Yet Luther was intolerant of all who disagreed with him and introduced for such his own brand of excommunication, committing Catholics and Anabaptists alike to the abyss. Once he jokingly referred to himself as the "Lutheran pope," by which remark, the Protestant Paulsen justly observed, he reduced himself *ad absurdum,* for all his antipapal activity and strictures redounded on himself.

The Bible, as interpreted by Luther, was to be the sole rule of faith: "Dogma is true only insofar as it agrees with Scripture; in itself it is of no authority. But the truth of Scripture is one, that is, attested internally.

[11] J. Paquier, "Luther," *Dictionnaire de Theologie,* XVIII, 1146 ff.

. . . The Scripture must rhyme with faith; . . . without Scripture faith soon goes." Dr. Luther had no detailed theory of inspiration and admitted historical errancy; the canon of Scripture amounted to his own judgment. He cast out the Epistles of James and Hebrews along with the Old Testament "apocrypha," and rated other books "A" or "B" insofar as they best expressed Lutheran teaching. Though Catholic translations had preceded Luther's German rendition, his was the first that was of high literary merit. Yet it was often deliberately unfaithful to the original, the most notorious case being his addition of "alone" to "faith" in Romans (3:20; 4:5).

The sacraments remained for Luther but symbols to excite faith, though he inconsistently retained baptism and the Eucharist as necessary. To obviate the difficulty that faith could not be excited in infant baptism—which he retained on the authority of tradition against the Anabaptists—Luther argued that these infants were given a moment of reason. Throughout his life he defended a garbled notion of the Real Presence, and supported his position with arguments from tradition and reason which he otherwise repudiated. His explanations involved "impanation": Christ's body remains with or in the substance of bread; and "ubiquity": Christ's body is omnipresent, although present "to you" only at the moment of the Supper. But he rejected transubstantiation and the sacrificial character of the Mass as prejudicial to Christ's passion. Though Luther clung to the pathetic relics of his belief in the Real Eucharistic Presence, Melanchthon had discarded such views even during Luther's lifetime. Nonsacramental confession, without absolution, Luther regarded as optional; needless to say, it did not survive. Matrimony was for Luther a mere civil contract, in all things subject to the civil law. Under certain circumstances he admitted divorce. He tolerated concubinage "in exceptional cases," and once advised bigamy to Henry VIII, while actually giving it his secret approbation in the case of Philip of Hesse.

Secularism received a powerful stimulus from Luther through his exaltation of the civil authority to the degree of absolutism, and his favoritism of lay over clerical callings. He himself abandoned his vows to marry the ex-nun, Catherine Bora, and he condemned virginity as impossible and monasticism as a fraud. To the relief of the poor, Luther was sincerely devoted, but he was grieved to see the nobility pay slight attention to their needs. Destruction of Catholic schools in northern Germany long proved irreparable; Erasmus asserted: "Wherever Lutheranism prevails, there we see the downfall of learning." Yet Luther never really understood the world. He would speak contemptuously of whole classes, of lawyers, and of merchants. He defended serfdom. He

condemned usury, indeed, but also the taking of any interest whatsoever. It was a strange legacy of otherworldliness and laicism that Luther left to his disciples.

22. GERMAN LUTHERAN REVOLT

A. *The Indulgence Controversy* (1517–18)

(1) INDULGENCE TRANSACTION

Remote occasion. About 1506 Bramante approached Pope Julius II with a plan for erecting the largest church in the world, a new St. Peter's. This project, even more grandiose in original design than in eventual execution, was adopted, for the existing thousand-year-old structure was beyond repair. But immense sums would be needed. According to long-standing legitimate custom, indulgences were granted to those who would contribute to this work and fulfill the usual conditions of confession and Communion. At length the Christian Tower of Babel was raised, and may yet survive the Lutheran revolt that it unwittingly provoked.

Proximate occasion. Leo X renewed his predecessor's indulgence but such was the resentment of German princes and prelates to inroads upon their revenues, that by 1514 only a few dioceses were open to indulgence preaching. But Archbishop von Gemmingen of Mainz died in March, 1514, and advancement to this primatial see with direct jurisdiction over half of Germany was ardently sought by Albrecht von Hohenzollern. This young prelate was already archbishop of Magdeburg and bishop of Halberstadt, palatinates which he wished to retain because their lands adjoined those of his brother, Elector Joachim of Brandenburg. Though heavily in debt to the Fuggers, Albrecht secured election to Mainz on the understanding that payment would soon be made. The tax for installation in Mainz was 14,000 ducats, and the papal chancery would require an additional 10,000 to issue a dispensation for plural holding of sees—in all, a sum estimated at $2,500,000 would have to be raised. Genial Jacob Fugger, however, recalled that Leo X had belonged to the Medici banking house; surely he would appreciate a sound investment. Accordingly Herr Fugger offered to advance his bond for 29,000 Rhenish gulden at once to the papal chancery, if the new archbishop would allow indulgence preachers to enter his as yet untapped jurisdiction. Then when the collection was in, Fugger would take half to reimburse himself for his loan and risk. Leo X did prove agreeable; in fact, in view of the unexpectedly low returns in the wake of Luther's agitation, it turned out to be a good financial transaction for the papal treasury. Albrecht paid his debts, was named cardinal in 1518, and enjoyed his three sees till his death in 1545. But it proved to be a very bad deal for millions of souls.

Execution. Though the papal bull authorizing indulgence preaching for Mainz-Magdeburg was issued on March 31, 1515, the archbishop did not put it into operation until assured that his deal was safe. Not until January, 1517, did his subcommissioner, Friar Johann Tetzel (1465–1519), actually commence his preaching. Though Tetzel knew the doctrine of indulgences well enough, he was not averse to a little inaccurate dramatization by way of salesmanship on the theme: "As soon as the coin in the basket rings, the soul out of purgatory springs." One day Staupitz smilingly reported Tetzel's antics to his vicar, Martin Luther. The latter rejoined bitterly: "This Tetzel, I'd like to punch a hole in his drum." He did—in a memorable Halloween prank.

(2) Luther's Attack on Indulgences

Wittenberg manifesto. Though Luther had preached in an orthodox fashion on indulgences as late as 1516, this was not the case with the ninety-five *Theses* which he posted on the door of the church of the ducal castle at Wittenberg on All Saints' Eve, October 31, 1517. These "tentative propositions" of a professor of the local university contained the assertions that the indulgence has no value before God, that it remits merely canonical penalties, and that the Church possesses no treasury of merit. While copies of these *Theses* were widely circulated, Luther sent similar *Resolutiones* to the archbishop of Mainz and Bishop Scultetus of Brandenburg, professing entire submission to their authority in what he termed a protest against curial abuses. The archbishop, unable to obtain any definitive opinion on Luther's views from his own theologians, sent them on to Rome. Bishop Scultetus requested Luther not to publish his pronouncements, but the latter forgot his previous declaration to abide by the episcopal good pleasure.

Luther's popularity. His protest against abuses had struck a responsive chord among many Germans who had little understanding of the theological issues involved. Within a short time Luther was saluted as a national hero by the humanists and others. Tetzel, indeed, came out with 110 *Antitheses* early in 1518 in which he defended Catholic doctrine, although including in this category some scholastic opinions. Luther's popularity, however, made it impossible for Tetzel to continue his preaching, and he retired to his Dominican convent at Leipsic where he soon died brokenhearted at the consequences of his imprudent statements. In his "Sermon on Indulgences" Luther dismissed him with an ironical remark; his challenge to debate unaccepted, he seemed master of the field.

A rebel's immunity. By January, 1518, the summary of Luther's ideas forwarded by the archbishop of Mainz had reached Rome. The pope evidently gave it but slight attention, and turned it over to Gabrielle

della Volta, the Augustinian general, with instructions to admonish Luther about refraining from further preaching. Volta sent corresponding directives to Staupitz who, if he mentioned the matter to Luther at all, made light of it. In the elections of the Proles Congregation during April, 1518, Luther's friend Lang was chosen to succeed him as rural vicar. Far from being rebuked, Luther was permitted on this occasion to stage a debate to defend these theses: 1) Man's works are all mortal sins, since his free will is powerless to do good. 2) To receive grace one must first despair of himself. 3) Not good works, but belief in Christ denotes the truly just man. At another debate at Wittenberg, Luther publicized his "theology of the Cross": the just man lives by faith and not good works. Yet in May he was still writing submissively to the pope and emperor, avowing that "all the heretics fell through inordinate love of their own ideas." At the same time through the influence of the court chaplain, George Spalatin (1484–1545), a future Lutheran, he established himself in the good graces of his territorial sovereign, Elector Frederick "the Wise" of Saxony (1486–1525). By the summer of 1518, then, Luther was still the idol of the hour, and so far as the German public knew, in good standing.

B. *Break with Authority* (*1518–21*)

(1) Papal Intervention (1518–19)

Curial inquiry. During March, 1518, the Dominicans had denounced Luther to Rome and in June Friar Silvestro Mazzolini, alias Prieras, prepared a hasty, exaggerated, and caustic indictment of the *Theses* to the apostolic camera. In July Luther was cited to appear at Rome within sixty days. He received this summons on August 7 along with Prieras's pamphlet. After asking the elector to have the investigation held in Germany, Luther denounced Prieras's vulnerable critique. Meanwhile the elector secured papal permission for a discussion at Augsburg before the papal envoy then in the city for the imperial diet. This envoy was Tommaso de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan (1469–1534), Thomist of Thomists.

Augsburg trial. Armed with an imperial safe-conduct and an electoral recommendation, Luther arrived at Augsburg on October 7, 1518. He was in an exalted frame of mind, convinced of his doctrine, and resolved not to recant, even if he must "die like Hus." From October 13 to 15, the cultured cardinal listened patiently and not unkindly to the incoherent ravings—*extra formam,* too—of this "German beast," as he later called him. At last Cajetan condensed his demands to retractation by Luther of his denial of a treasury of merit in the Church as a basis of indulgences, and of his assertion that the sacraments are efficacious only by faith. But Luther refused unless refuted by Scripture, tradition, or reason. Since

he would not listen to any of these when they differed from his own opinions, Cajetan laid down this ultimatum: "I do not ask many phrases of you; I demand from you merely a single six letter word: *revoco*." This was too much for Luther who, with Staupitz's connivance, left the town secretly on October 20. All that remained of Luther in Augsburg was a placard appealing from "the pope badly informed and the judges chosen by him, to a pope who should be better informed." Cajetan reported the results of the inquiry to the elector, advising him to send Luther to Rome or banish him. Frederick replied that he was not yet convinced of Luther's error, and that he feared to bring ill repute on Wittenberg University. Meanwhile Luther had prepared another stand by issuing a new appeal on November 28, 1518, "from the pope ever subject to error, to an ecumenical council." On December 13, however, the cardinal promulgated a papal bull of the preceding November which clearly defined papal power to remit guilt and punishment due to actual sins through indulgences in virtue of the treasury of merit of Christ and His saints: to the living *per modum absolutionis;* to the dead, *per modum suffragii.*

Altenburg conference. Pope Leo X now sought Luther's submission through diplomatic channels. He sent the lay chamberlain, Karl von Miltitz, with the Golden Rose decoration for Elector Frederick in an effort to persuade Luther's protector to permit examination of the case at Rome. Miltitz, a superficial and liberal Humanist, represented the whole dispute as trifling at a conference with Luther during January, 1519. Exceeding his instructions, Miltitz persuaded Luther to submit his case to the "arbitration" of some German bishop. Luther promised to keep silence and to write a submissive letter to the Holy See; he did neither.

(2) LUTHERAN DEFIANCE (1519–20)

Imperial interlude. Emperor Maximilian died on January 12, 1519, and Leo X, lulled into inactivity by the groundless optimism of Miltitz, devoted his chief attention to defeating the candidacy of Charles of Spain. The pope favored the election of either Francis of France or of Elector Frederick—so little did he realize the latter's vital support of Luther. Albert of Mainz, already cardinal, was also offered legatine power over all Germany in exchange for his electoral vote. But the cardinal now shared the aroused German patriotism—or did not dare defy it—and he refused. On June 28, 1519, Charles was elected unanimously.

Leipsic debate. Meanwhile Bishop Eyb of Eichstädt urged a professor of Ingolstadt University, Johann Eck (1486–1543), to challenge Luther. Eck, who until the Council of Trent carried on the anti-

Lutheran campaign almost singlehanded, attacked Luther early in 1519 in a work called *Obelisks* from the marks used to indicate Lutheran errors. Luther replied in the same vein with *Asterisks* and dared Eck to debate. The contest was held from June 27 to July 14, 1519, at Leipsic, before the elector's cousin, George of Saxony-Meissen. For the first four days, Luther's ally, Andreas Bodenstein alias Carlstadt (1480–1541) was routed by Eck when he tried to prove that man cannot do any good work, whether in the state of grace or not. On July 4 Luther replaced Carlstadt to defend his indictment of papal primacy. Whereas Carlstadt had been hurried and confused, Luther displayed an insolent rhetoric, while Eck went the whole route in a sonorous voice and trenchant logic. He forced Luther into open admissions that he held neither papal primacy nor infallibility to be of faith; that ecumenical councils can err and have erred; that individual Christians might be right against ecclesiastical authority; that the Bible was open to private interpretation; and that he approved of some Hussite condemned propositions. Eck was the evident victor; the forthright Margrave George, arms akimbo, snorted at Luther's teaching: "A plague on it." Eck had at last pinned Luther down, and sent this incontrovertible evidence on to Rome.

Lutheran propaganda. Aware that the die must soon be cast, Luther, by now assured through Sickingen and Hutten of armed support from the knights and humanists, grew bold in inflammatory polemics during 1520. In rapid succession appeared *Von dem Papsttum zu Rome,* branding the pope as Antichrist, denouncing curial exactions, and appealing to an invisible German Church independent of papal and episcopal direction; *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation,* again denouncing papal abuses, hinting at a lay priesthood, and appealing to the emperor and princes to break with Rome; and *Von der Babylonischen Gefangenschaft,* proposing to free Germany from the "papal and sacerdotal bondage." In pseudo-mystic strain he wrote his *Freedom of a Christian Man,* asserting: "I say that no pope or bishop or any other man has a right to impose even one syllable upon a Christian man except with his consent." Luther waxed more confident; he wrote Spalatin: "*alea jacta est;* Franz von Sickingen and Sylvester von Schaumburg have freed me from every fear; I no longer desire any reconciliation with the Romans for all eternity."

(3) Lutheran Condemnation (1520–21)

Papal excommunication. Urged on by Cardinal Giulio de' Medici and Johann Eck, Pope Leo X on June 15, 1520, at last issued the clarion call that prepared for the Catholic revival: *Exurge Domine et judica causam tuam.* This papal bull condemned forty-one Lutheran errors, directed him to burn his books, cease teaching, and submit within sixty

days under pain of *ipso facto* excommunication. On the other hand, mercy was promised for prompt compliance. Promulgation was entrusted to Eck. This proved unfortunate, for Luther, though he well knew that the bull was genuine, could pretend for a while that it was a forgery of his adversary. Yet he tried to avert condemnation by writing an apologetic letter to the pope—antedated September 6 to make it fall within the sixty days of grace—in which he charged that Eck had calumniated him for "some insignificant chance expressions on the papacy." But by November Luther was again appealing to a "free Christian council," and on December 10 burned the papal bull, the Code of Canon Law, and Eck's writings. During the Christmas holidays he encouraged the students of the university in a dramatic parody of the papal court. But on January 3, 1521, Leo X pronounced definitive sentence of excommunication in the bull, *Decet Romanum Pontificem.*

Imperial ban. That same month Emperor Charles V opened his first Diet or Reichstag at Worms. On February 13 following the papal legate to this assembly, Monsignor Girolamo Aleander (1480–1542) reminded the body of its duty concerning the repression of all notorious heretics, such as Luther had now become. And indeed Luther was duly cited to Worms on March 6, although assured of a safe-conduct to and fro. Luther set out under great emotional strain for what proved to be a triumphal progress. Like Hitler during his early campaigns against the unpopular *"Dictat von Versailles,"* Luther denounced "Roman tyranny" in fanatical tirades to cheering crowds hypnotized by his appeals to German patriotism against the foreigner. Yet on his first appearance at Worms, April 16, Luther seemed hesitant and fearful, and asked time to reconsider. Assured during the interval of the continued support of the elector and the Knights, he displayed a brazen defiance on April 18. Asserting that the Germans were victims of papal laws and teachings of merely human authority, he also claimed that German property was being devoured by curial rapacity. He concluded: "If I have spoken evil, give testimony of the evil. . . . I have spoken." Since he was again deaf to invitations to recant, the emperor on April 26 bade him depart, warning him that his safe-conduct had but twenty-one days to run. On May 8 Charles V placed the ban of the empire upon Luther, declaring him an outlaw under death sentence. Luther's protests of an unfair hearing and violation of his safe-conduct are patent falsehoods. He was in no danger, for on May 4, by prearranged plan, the elector's retainers kidnapped him and hid him in the remote Saxon castle of Wartburg until March, 1522. This ruse was adopted to enable the elector to plead ignorance of Luther's whereabouts. As has been seen, it was soon unnecessary, for not until the year of Luther's death was the emperor to be free to take up arms against the Lutherans.

23. GERMAN LUTHERAN ESTABLISHMENT

A. *Lutheran Inaugural* (1521–32)

(1) SOCIAL UPRISINGS

Knights' War. Luther had accepted Sickingen's support, but because of the elector's opposition to the knights' political aims, he was chary of his promises of approbation to their movement. Yet his words had been incentives to revolt: "Would it be a wonder if princes, nobles, and laymen were to knock pope, bishops, parsons, monks, on the head and drive them out of the land—not that I wish to incite the laity against the clergy." The knights can be pardoned for not comprehending the pacific intent of this appeal, and Luther shares responsibility for Sickingen's attack upon the archbishop of Trier in September, 1522, and the ensuing war of the knights upon prelates and princes. Although the rebel leaders made use of the religious issue, their purpose was chiefly political, their own voice in the state and formation of closer national unity. This was anathema to the magnates, who rallied to crush the revolt, which subsided after the deaths of Sickingen and Hutten during 1523.

Anabaptist rising. While Luther remained in retirement at Wartburg, translating the Bible and boasting of his courage in letters to disciples—and perhaps repressing pangs of conscience—some of these disciples were drawing the natural consequences from his teaching. On October 1, 1521, his adherents among the Augustinians had ceased to say Mass. The following Christmas, Carlstadt celebrated an improvised liturgy in which there were omissions in the canon of the Mass, and the laity were given the chalice after being assured that no previous sacramental confession was necessary. One of Luther's most dishonest tactics before going to Worms had been to urge his followers to conceal their views from or even lie to their confessors while making their Easter confession; now the innovators were taking no more chances with the internal forum. In January, 1522, the rabble destroyed altars and statues in Wittenberg, and iconoclasm was soon in full swing elsewhere. The elector in alarm requested Luther to restore order. Descending from his "Patmos" at Wartburg, Luther moved forward to curb the innovators with the assurance: "Follow me; I was the first whom God set to work at this program; I have never failed in the past." His influence proved sufficient to induce the majority of his followers to calm down and to set about inaugurating a liturgy and ministry in which all would be done "decently and in good order."

More radical followers, however, men like Carlstadt, Münzer, Storch, and Pfeiffer, saw no reason for drawing a line in revolution. Though called "Anabaptists" because of their insistence upon rebaptism of those

baptized in infancy, their basic idea was to destroy everything not found in apostolic times as they conceived them. Thus they objected to Luther's retention of certain traditional doctrines and practices, and were duly excommunicated by him. Münzer's retort is the movement in brief: "We can cite Scripture as well as you, you pope of Wittenberg."

Peasants' Revolt. Already roused by Luther, now urged on by Anabaptist radicals, and smarting under their grievances against the magnates and feudal landlords, the peasants began to rise to sweep away all oppressive rulers. As late as April, 1525, Luther was urging them on with observations such as, "tyrants seldom die in their beds; they perish a bloody death." But when the magnates came out to suppress the peasants, Luther, well aware of his obligations to the princely protectors of his sect, changed his tune. Just a month later, in May, 1525, he issued a tract entitled *Against the Murderous Peasants* in which he authorized the princes "to kill them as you would a mad dog." The lords needed little urging; with heavy slaughter they repressed the uprising: perhaps as many as one hundred thousand peasants perished in Germany.

Parting of the ways. In several respects these years were decisive. The peasants never forgot Luther's betrayal of their cause, and in his own generation Luther's name was anathema to the German common man. But the princes were now securely in the saddle, and the peasant ex-monk was henceforth their obedient, if reluctant, servant. The same period (1524–25) witnessed Luther's literary duel with the humanist patriarch, Erasmus. Hitherto the latter had approved of the reform aspects of Luther's protests, but now he definitely broke with the innovators by writing his defense, *De Libero Arbitrio*. And Luther, who had thus far courted the esteemed humanist, struck back with his forthright, *De Servo Arbitrio*. This opened the eyes of any true humanist scholars to the irrational elements of the new movement with its naked denial of human reason and free will. Throughout Germany moderate men began to open their eyes as from a trance; a parting of the ways had begun. With exasperating and tragic slowness the sleeping giant of traditional Catholicity began to stir.

(2) LUTHERAN ORGANIZATION

Government. At first Luther had wished a voluntary grouping of a "holy brotherhood knowing no restraint but charity, with a ministry without power." Ministers were to be chosen and ordained by the congregation, which also might correct an erring clergyman. All were to preach the "pure Gospel," which would necessarily ever agree with Luther's since "his mouth is the mouth of Christ." But after the Anabaptist anarchy had reduced this "evangelical freedom" to a mockery,

Luther was persuaded to give the secular rulers jurisdiction over the ministers and to permit the nomination of clerical superintendents, later termed "bishops." Luther's own visitation of 1527 introduced state control in place of the original congregational self-government, and along with other visitors named by the elector, he supervised preaching and finances. After encountering utter indifference and poverty, these visitors advised state subsidies to support ministers named by the elector. Finally in 1539 consistories nominated by the elector were given the supreme direction of the sect.

Ritual. Although Luther himself seems to have said Mass for the last time on the way to Augsburg in 1518, he had opposed Carlstadt's radical liturgical changes in 1522. Doctrinally he would have the Real Presence at the communion alone. Externally he preserved certain features of the Mass to avoid exciting opposition among the common people, but he gave private instructions to his ministers to change the intention of the words of consecration, henceforth pronounced merely by way of narration. In private Luther avowed: "If I succeed in doing away with the Mass, I have completely conquered the pope." He rejoiced also that "in indifferent matters our churches are so arranged that a layman . . . seeing our Mass, choir, organs, bells, chantries, etc., would surely say that it was a regular papist church." To this end Latin was at first retained for the "Lord's Supper," but the offertory was omitted, the canon said aloud, the consecration merely recited, and the communion stressed as the most essential part. Lutheran services varied in different localities as to the prayers and vestments retained. The service was subordinated to preaching and catechizing, and even at Wittenberg most of the people left after the sermon was ended. Since the nobles and the burghers had appropriated most of the goods of the ancient Church, Lutheran ritual was necessarily drab.

Morality. Luther labored to augment his ranks by exhorting bishops and priests to take wives openly or secretly, by promoting "convent breaks," and by inciting the mob against such institutions as remained loyal to the Church. Admitting himself that "his fervor was waning," Luther was more given to levity, wine, gambling, female companionship, and ostentatious finery. The vulgarity of his sermons scandalized Humanists, who were no prudes. To put an end to the scandal that some of his earlier followers were taking at his conduct, Luther in June, 1525, had Bugenhagen perform a marriage ceremony for ex-friar Augustine and ex-nun Catherine. "Kathie" did much to make Luther "respectable," staid, and home-loving—in a portion of his old religious house. But he often expressed a fear that the general standard of morality among his disciples might be "far worse than under popery."

(3) Lutheran Doctrinal Formulation

Expansion of Lutheran doctrines from the Saxon center proceeded rapidly. In 1525 Philip of Hesse had been won over, introduced Lutheranism into his dominions, and became the military bulwark of the sect. Shortly thereafter the dukes of Mecklenburg became Lutheran and in 1528 most of Brunswick, the Hanover of the future, was won, though Duke Henry IV (1509–67) held out for Catholicity until death. In 1525 the Hohenzollern grand master of the Teutonic Order apostatized with most of his religious. Though the other Hohenzollerns, Archbishop Albert and Elector Joachim I (1491–1535), still remained loyal, the latter's son Joachim II apostatized soon after his accession and brought Brandenburg and Magdeburg into the Lutheran camp: Franz von Waldeck, prince-bishop of Münster, Minden, and Osnabrück, went over to the new doctrines. Not only had most of the north German states become Lutheran by Luther's death (1546), but Duke Ulric of Würtemburg (1504–50) had introduced the new teachings into the otherwise Catholic "solid South."

Augsburg Confession. This congeries of state churches had at first no official doctrine, though their protests against the imperial ban gave them the negative appellation of "Protestants." When the emperor, prior to a new attempt at enforcing the ban through the Augsburg Diet of 1530, made another attempt at reconciliation, Luther delegated the conciliatory Melanchthon to draw up a statement of their teachings. The resulting *Augsburg Confession* contained twenty-one articles and became the official Lutheran creed, although Melanchthon, in some cases with Luther's connivance, and in others on his own initiative, concealed many Lutheran tenets under ambiguous phrases. Thus Melanchthon went so far as to declare: "We have no dogmas which differ from the Roman Church; . . . we reverence the authority of the pope of Rome." Luther, to do him justice, did not believe this, but he permitted his disciple and envoy to publish it, remarking: "When once we have evaded the peril and are at peace, then we can easily atone for our tricks." But such theological "tricks" did not deceive Cardinal Campeggio and Johann Eck, who advised the emperor to reject the *Augsburg Confession* for the heresy it really was.

The Schmalkaldic League, long urged by Luther, was formed in December, 1530, after the failure of the *Augsburg Confession* to avert imperial prosecution. Lutheran fortunes were now entrusted to the military power of the Lutheran princes, thus completing the last phase of sectarian evolution into a state-dominated religion. But "states' rights" still prevented the emperor from securing sufficient assistance from the

Catholic princes to enforce the ban, and the complications of the Turkish advance obliged him to conclude the Truce of Nuremburg on July 1, 1532. This suspended the ban against Lutheranism until a forthcoming general council, thereby permitting the new sect still more time to entrench itself in Germany. Though the pretense was still kept up that Lutherans were merely disaffected Catholics whose grievances would eventually be settled by an international conference, in fact they had become a new sect irrevocably separated from Rome in organization and doctrine.

B. *Lutheran Survival* (*1532–55*)

(1) RELIGIOUS TRUCE (1532–41)

Papal overtures. Clement VII sustained imperial policy to the extent of promising (1533) a "free and universal council" to Luther's protector, Elector John Frederick of Saxony (1532–47). In 1535 Paul III sent the legate Vergerio to interview Luther at Wittenberg regarding participation in this council. The envoy had no success, and himself later apostatized to Lutheranism. In 1536 a papal invitation to attend the proposed council at Mantua was rejected by the Schmalkald princes at Luther's insistence. Though a few Lutherans did appear eventually for a short time at Trent, they came only to argue and disrupt proceedings. Luther had gotten beyond appeals to a council, and the breach was not to be closed.

Lutheran divisions, however, imperilled the movement. Though attempts were made to unite with the new Protestant communities of Zwinglianism and Calvinism in Switzerland, Luther's opposition prevented accord. Yet the negotiations induced Melanchthon and other Lutherans to accept teachings at variance with Luther's. Melanchthon's "Synergism" virtually repudiated Lutheran determinism, and his "Crypto-Calvinism" rejected impanation for symbolism—though he avoided any frank contradiction of Luther during his lifetime. Agricola claimed that the Decalogue contradicted fiducial faith and need not be observed; Osiander modified the doctrine on justification. Luther was usually able to discipline or outshout his adversaries in public, but only the need of presenting a common front against the Catholics kept irreconcilable controversies from developing. After Luther's death in February, 1546, many of his cherished beliefs were repudiated so that Flaccius, his last uncompromising disciple, died in exile in 1575. Luther was thus almost the last Lutheran.

(2) RELIGIOUS WAR (1541–53)

Lutheran offensive. As the Schmalkaldic League won recruits, it became bolder. In 1541 the Lutherans seized Halle and Naumburg, and

Hermann von Wied, the archbishop of Cologne, secretly declared his sympathy with them. In 1542 the League expelled the Catholic Duke Henry from Brunswick. In these and other seizures, the spoils went to the lay protectors over Luther's pleas for his ministers and for the poor. Quite disillusioned, Luther died not long after, apparently from apoplexy during the night.

Imperial chastisement. In June, 1546, the emperor at last invoked the Edict of Worms and within a year was the master of Germany. The League was declared dissolved. Elector John Frederick was deposed, to be replaced by the hypocritical convert to Catholicity, his cousin Maurice. Philip of Hesse was imprisoned, and Hermann von Wied forced to resign Cologne. Cowed Lutheran rebels made their submission and professed willingness to accept the forthcoming Tridentine decrees. Charles V's impatience with the delay of Paul III in implementing this pledge ruined what chance of reconciliation existed after the imperial victory. The imperial Interim of Augsburg (1548) permitting Lutherans a married clergy and lay reception of the chalice, angered the Catholics without appeasing the Lutherans.

Lutheran rebellion followed quickly on the treason of Maurice of Saxony in 1551. In March, 1552, Maurice and the revived League almost captured the emperor and put to flight the second period of Trent Aided by Henry II of France, the Lutheran leaders regained their possessions and threatened to become masters of Germany in their turn. But Charles was as great in adversity as he had been imprudent in prosperity; fighting doggedly, he prevented the collapse of Catholic Germany. In July, 1552, he concluded a truce to gain time, but his brother Ferdinand exceeded instructions by negotiating for a definitive peace. Maurice's death in 1553 removed an obstacle to a settlement, and the emperor's mounting illness resigned him to the inevitable. Ferdinand was therefore empowered to arrange the affairs of the realm that he was soon to rule.

✓ (3) RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT (1555)

The Peace of Augsburg, ratified by King Ferdinand on September 25, 1555, marked the definitive establishment of Lutheranism in Germany. Its principal provisions were: 1) Religious peace: Catholics and Lutherans were henceforth to settle their differences by arbitration rather than by arms. For this purpose the imperial court was to be composed of an equal number of Catholic and of Lutheran members when treating of cases bearing upon religion. 2) Qualified toleration: Lutherans, but not other Protestants, were to enjoy toleration in those territories where the lord or civic authorities should declare Lutheranism the state religion. Any Catholic residents would be allowed to emigrate. This was,

indeed, the consecration of the unsound principle of *cujus regio, ejus religio.* Yet at the time it favored Catholics more than Lutherans, for Lutheranism was making such strides in Germany that three-fourths of the population were reported as disaffected. Whereas the Lutheran lands constituted a solid bloc, Lutheran enclaves existed in Catholic states. After the revival of the Counter-Reformation, however, the numerical balance was restored and the principle worked against the Catholics. An exception to this provision was the *ecclesiasticum reservatum,* which provided that any prince-bishop who might apostatize would be obliged to resign his see, retaining merely his personal and not his ecclesiastical property. Lutheran violation of this clause would become one of the causes of the Thirty Years' War which finally disrupted the Augsburg settlement in 1618. 3) Condonation of confiscation of property seized by Lutherans from the Catholic Church prior to the Passau Truce, August, 1552, was granted. In the weakened state of Catholic forces, this concession was almost unavoidable.

Conclusion. Luther had, then, failed to win Germany entirely for Protestantism, nor had the Church succeeded in suppressing his revolt. Germany was to remain permanently divided in religion to the great detriment of national unity. The Peace of Augsburg, moreover, was a portent of the final result of the whole Protestant Revolution: a Europe divided in religion and politics emerged. The Catholic Church had not fallen; shaken, she was to awake, "like a strong man awaking from sleep," to true and lasting reform. But the greatest society that the world had yet known, Medieval Catholic Christendom, was mortally wounded. Gone were the days of unity on first principles; coming were centuries of division and doubt, even among well-meaning men.

24. SCANDINAVIAN LUTHERANISM

A. *The Danish Monarchy (1513–1648)*

(1) PREDISPOSITIONS TO LUTHERANISM (1513–23)

The Union of Kalmar, effected in 1397 by Margaret Valdemarsdatter, had joined the three Scandinavian kingdoms under Danish hegemony. Norway and Iceland continued under Danish rule until the nineteenth century, but Sweden-Finland, although formally part of the Union until 1523, was already manifesting a separatist tendency. For the most part the Union had been favorable to ecclesiastical interests insofar as it gave leadership to a superior Danish culture and discipline, but this opened the way for accusations of lack of national patriotism against Swedish and Norwegian clerics.

King Christian II (1481–1559) succeeded his amiable and indulgent father Hans in 1513. Christian was a strong-willed, unscrupulous ruler who sought to make himself absolute over the two estates of prelates

and nobles who restricted the royal power. Before marrying Isabella (1501–26), a sister of Emperor Charles V, Christian had taken a Norge-Dutch mistress, Duiveke Willems. Throughout his reign the king remained under the fantastic domination of his mother-not-in-law, Sigbrit Willems. Sigbrit, a shrewd Dutchwoman who had emigrated to Bergen, had remarkable insight into commerce and finance, and influenced Christian to counteract prelatial and lordly prestige by favoring the middle class.

Anticlericalism. Though held in check for a time by the worthy Archbishop Gunnarsson of Lund, the king interfered in the Church after that prelate's death in 1519. During four years he intruded five clerics into the primatial see. Archbishop Jörgen Skotberg (1520–32), the only one of these nominees who received papal confirmation, was in exile from 1521. Next the king promulgated new edicts regulating clerical property and subjecting episcopal jurisdiction to the crown. Although apparently not a Lutheran, the king was willing to make use of some of the Lutheran criticisms of the hierarchy to enforce his demands. When Archbishop Skotberg brought the royal policy to the attention of Pope Leo X, the latter sent a nuncio, Arcimboldo, to collect indulgence donations and mediate between Christian II and his Swedish subjects who were then defying his authority. On a charge that the nuncio had favored the Swedes in the negotiations, the king confiscated the collection. About 1521 also, the king, whose mother Christina was a sister of Luther's protector, Frederick of Saxony, invited the Lutheran Martin Reinhard to enter the faculty of Copenhagen University. Despite episcopal protests, Reinhard and others were allowed freedom to proselytize. Christian seems, however, merely to have intended to frighten the prelates into acquiescing in confiscation of church goods. But when on Sigbrit's advice, he promulgated in 1522 an absolutist code of regulations, all of the lords, both spiritual and temporal, revolted to halt application to Denmark of the general European tendency to Absolutism. Christian II was deposed, and the nobility replaced him with his uncle, Frederick, duke of Schleswig-Holstein. At the same time, as will be noted presently, Gustavus Vasa, the Swedish regent, seized the opportunity to assert Sweden's independence of the Kalmar Union.

(2) Lutheran Progress (1523–36)

King Frederick I (1523–33) had been supported by the prelates as well as the nobles, and took the traditional coronation oath to support the Church and to repress heresy. But whereas Christian II was but a humanistic anticlerical, Frederick was already a secret Lutheran. Before long he violated his pledges on the pretext that they did not include toleration of "abuses." He invited an apostate Benedictine, Hans

Tausen (1494–1561), from Wittenberg to conduct the reform. At first secretly, but after 1526 openly, Tausen proclaimed Lutheran ideas at Copenhagen. Other Lutheran preachers were active at Malmo, and Christian Pederson prepared a Lutheran version of the Bible in Danish.

Odensee schism. In August, 1527, the king summoned the Diet to Odensee to regulate religious affairs. He had already secured the lay lords' support by restricting confiscation to ecclesiastical lands. The ensuing Ordinance of Odensee: (1) transferred confirmation of bishops from the Holy See to the crown; (2) permitted clerical marriage; (3) granted royal protection alike to Catholic and to Lutheran preachers; (4) proclaimed complete freedom of conscience. The hierarchy, their primate still in exile, could not vote down this legislation. Intimidated and self-seeking, they protested but feebly against what amounted to schism for the Catholic Church in Denmark.

Lutheran propaganda simultaneously was vigorously pushed forward. During 1529 the king arranged a debate between the Catholics and the Lutherans at Copenhagen. Since no Danish bishop nor theologian came forward, the Catholics in Denmark invited Johann Eck to defend their cause. Eck, his hands full in Germany, substituted Friar Stagefyr from Cologne. Whereas the German champion could not speak Danish and the Lutherans refused to employ Latin, the debate was called off. But when Stagefyr presented a written defense of the Catholic position based on the Fathers and the councils, Frederick arbitrarily decided in favor of the Lutherans, who the following year issued a *Confessio Hansica* as if it were the official Danish cult. When the king died in 1533, there could be no doubt that the court was Lutheran, the bishops servile schismatics, and the vast majority of the populace Catholic.

Civil war. The Catholics now prepared to make their last stand. A new archbishop, Thorben Bilde, had succeeded to Lund on Skotberg's resignation in 1532. In October, 1531, the deposed Christian II, prompted by the emperor, attempted to regain his throne with Catholic support, but was captured in July, 1532. Nonetheless the Catholics preferred him to Frederick's son Christian (III), who had been an avowed Lutheran since 1521. Recalling that the throne was elective, the Catholics rejected him and rallied to Count Christopher of Oldenburg, cousin and agent of Christian II. The count captured Copenhagen in 1534 and held it for two years with the aid of the clergy and burghers. But the nobles for the most part accepted Christian III as king and with help from Gustavus Vasa of Sweden took Copenhagen on July 29, 1536. Christian III was soon master of Denmark, while Norwegian resistance collapsed in 1537 with the flight of Archbishop Olaf Engelbertsson of Trondjem.

(3) LUTHERAN ENTRENCHMENT (1536–1648)

Christian III (1534–58) at once proceeded to destroy the Catholic Church in his dominions. Having won aristocratic support by promises of a share in the spoils, the king had all the bishops arrested on August 20, 1536. The prelates were offered their freedom and a small pension on condition of resigning their sees and treasuries into royal keeping and of promising to offer no further resistance to religious change. The bishops, most of them nominees of Frederick I, purchased their liberty on these terms, with the exception of Bishop Rönnow of Röskilde, who accordingly was kept imprisoned until his death in 1544. But Archbishop Bilde of Lund soon showed repentance by fleeing abroad; he died in 1553 as the last survivor of the Danish Catholic hierarchy. In 1537 Luther's right-hand man, Bugenhagen, was invited to supervise the establishment of Lutheranism. He crowned Christian III and prepared a plan of organization.

Official change. In 1539 a new Diet of Odensee gave official sanction to Bugenhagen's program. Lutheran teachings were imposed and the episcopal hierarchy replaced by superintendents, later called "bishops." The former term, however, more accurately describes their merely disciplinary functions. Priests who refused to introduce the new religion were deprived of their parishes, and all monasteries were suppressed. Since some of the clergy and laity continued to oppose the new regime, subsequent diets in 1544 and 1546 took rigorous measures. The remaining ecclesiastical property was confiscated, all Catholic priests exiled under pain of death in case of return, and all Catholic laymen deprived of the right to hold office or to transmit property to their heirs. Thereafter the external vestiges of Catholicity disappeared from Denmark until 1849.

In Norway and Iceland, introduction of Lutheranism encountered somewhat more opposition and greater force had to be employed. Two bishops were imprisoned and many monks chose exile to apostasy. In Iceland, Bishop John Aresson of Holum held out with popular backing until 1551 when he was executed and Lutheranism introduced.

Years of shadow. Doubtless many laymen died in the Faith in Denmark, Norway, and Iceland, but priestly ministration almost ceased. Though the nunciature of Cologne and later that of Brussels were charged with providing missionaries, governmental vigilance at the ports made their introduction almost impossible. A Dominican actually got into Norway, but was deported within a month. More completely than elsewhere, the Faith died out and its modest revival in the nineteenth century seems to have come from foreign contacts, e.g., Catholic

embassies or travelers. By the end of Christian III's reign native Catholicity was being stifled. Christian IV (1588–1648), like his father Frederick II (1558–88), was a less savage persecutor simply because the Catholic generation had died out and conformity had become general. By retaining many external vestiges of Catholic liturgy, the adherence of younger generations was more easily won. Christian IV intervened, though unsuccessfully, on behalf of the German Lutherans during the Thirty Years' War. When Father Lüpke, after a thousand governmental obstacles, was allowed into Denmark in 1841, he found but 865 Catholics in the entire country.

B. The Swedish Monarchy (1512–1654)

(1) NATIONALIST REVOLT (1513–23)

The issue. Sweden was an undeveloped country scarcely emerged from the Dark Ages. The nobility would brook little control, least of all from a foreign king, and there remained a large class of independent freemen. Society was almost exclusively agrarian, for all trade was in the hands of the Danes or of the Hanseatic League. The Union of Kalmar was not popular, and the Danish monarchs usually neglected their Swedish subjects, allowing native regents to act for them. Thus, from 1470 to 1520 Sweden was practically administered most of the time by the native Sture family. When Christian II (1513–23) resolved to assert his royal supremacy throughout the Kalmar Union, the regent in Sweden was Sten Sture II (1512–20). The leader of the royalist, and therefore in Swedish eyes unpatriotic, party was Gustav Trolle, archbishop of Upsala since 1515. This prelate also had a private quarrel with the regent, and when the latter arrested him, the archbishop appealed to pope and king. For such action he was branded as a traitor by the Swedish Diet, and declared deposed in 1517. Upon being informed of the action of the nationalist party, Pope Leo X excommunicated Sten Sture.

Revolt. King Christian gladly offered to act as executor of the papal censure. Though the Swedes repulsed Danish invasions during 1516 and 1517, the king was victorious at the Battle of Asunden Lake (frozen) during January, 1520, and the regent died of his wounds. Sture's widow defended Stockholm until November when she surrendered on promise of amnesty. But the king was in a vengeful mood and on the advice of the liberated Archbishop Trolle insisted upon reprisals. Between November 8 and 10, 1520, the Danish occupation forces perpetrated a massacre in which two bishops and ninety nobles were slain. Then leaving Archbishop Trolle as his deputy, the king returned to Denmark. Under the circumstances, the prelate was the last

man to conciliate the Swedes to the new regime, for rightly or wrongly, they believed him the author of their recent misfortunes. In 1521 Gustavus Vasa, whose father had been killed in the Stockholm massacre, was proclaimed regent and renewed the rebellion. During June, 1523, he captured Stockholm, declared the Union of Kalmar dissolved, and was proclaimed king of Sweden. Scandinavian unity was for all practical purposes at an end, for Christian II was deposed during the same year and his successors made no serious effort to reassert their claims, although Swedish-Danish enmity endured for a long time afterwards.

(2) Religious Rebellion (1523-60)

Gustavus Vasa (1523-60) had to pay the expenses of the war and discharge a debt to the Hanseatic League which had furnished the ships. The thrifty and individualistic freemen and peasants were exceedingly loath to vote taxes; the country was poor; and hence the new king's thoughts turned toward ecclesiastical property. As a refugee in Germany, Gustavus had examined, if not adopted, Lutheran ideas. Though at first professing Catholicity, he did insist upon the deposition of Archbishop Trolle and "other unworthy bishops," and confiscated much church property. Pope Clement VII not only refused his assent to Trolle's removal, but named an Italian to the Swedish see of Skara. Gustavus Vasa, a coarse brutal man of great physical strength and little learning, had Luther's manners with the pride of a Swedish nobleman. In anger, he turned to the new religion.

Lutheran introduction. Gustavus invited Lutheran preachers to Sweden, staged the usual arbitrary debates, and promptly awarded the verdict to the Lutheran protagonists. His aides were Olaus Petersson, an alumnus of Wittenberg, and Lars Andersson, apostate archdeacon of Upsala. In 1527 the king presented his financial needs to the Diet of Westeraes and under threat of resignation extorted from the assembly endorsement of confiscation of "surplus" ecclesiastical goods. But royal visitors began to take what they pleased, and Bishops Magnus Knut and Peter Jakobsson were put to death for resisting. Then in 1529 the Diet of Odebro formally established a national church with a hierarchy subordinate to the crown, a vernacular liturgy, and a married clergy. No explicit doctrinal statement appeared until 1593, and liturgical rites were only gradually modified. Yet high clerical offices were filled exclusively by Lutherans and Lutheran tenets were everywhere insinuated. Gustavus made it clear that the new National Church was his creature, for both of his high aides, Petersson and Andersson, were fined and deposed for criticism. When the king died in 1560, he was master of all that he surveyed in Church and state.

(3) Doctrinal Vacillation (1560–99)

Eric "XIV" (1560–68), Gustavus's eldest son, was induced by Denis Beurre, a disciple of Calvin, to promote the religion of Geneva. This innovation was stoutly resisted by the Lutheran clergy, and other tyrannical acts raised opposition. Finally the king, who had become mentally deranged, was replaced by his younger brother John.

John III (1568–92), Gustavus's second son, now succeeded. He had married the Polish Catholic princess, Catherine Jagellon, who had stipulated that she be permitted a Catholic chaplain. The latter, Father Herbst, S.J., interested the king in Catholic doctrine. Without as yet adopting Catholicity, King John began gradually to retrace his father's steps: the liturgy became somewhat "High Anglican," disguised Jesuits were admitted to Sweden, and in 1571 bishops were installed with a Catholic ritual. Negotiations were begun with the Holy See in the course of which the king demanded for Sweden Mass in the vernacular, a married clergy, and lay communion under both species. These concessions Pope Gregory XIII refused, though promising discussions went on for several years. But after the queen's death (1583), John III began to veer from Catholicity under the influence of his second and Lutheran wife, Guneila Bjelke. He remained, however, of a "high church" persuasion until his death in 1592.

(4) Lutheran Victory

Karl of Soedermanland, Gustavus's third son, now assumed the regancy for John's Catholic son, Sigismund, then absent in Poland, to whose throne he had been elected in 1587. The duke-regent promptly abolished King John's innovations and imposed an uncompromising Lutheran regime. All of the hierarchy, including John's nominees, yielded. Though King Sigismund returned to Sweden in 1593, he discovered that Lutheranism was so entrenched that he was powerless to effect a change. Until 1598 he bided his time, and then brought an army from Poland with which he won a few successes. But when it became clear that Catholicity could not be re-established save through a severe and dubious civil conflict, Sigismund permitted a referendum. The Swedish Diet of Jonköping of January, 1599, declared that Sigismund might retain his crown on condition of adopting Lutheranism. Sigismund retorted: "I do not value an earthly crown so highly as to give a heavenly one in exchange for it." He retired once more to Poland, and Karl was successively declared regent and king. He inaugurated a bigoted regime that denied the remaining Catholics civil and religious rights until 1860—indeed, not before 1952 were all disabilities removed.

Gustavus II Adolphus (1611–32), Karl's son, continued this policy and also inaugurated an aggressive foreign policy. Ambition as much as zeal for Protestantism led him to intervene on the Protestant side in the German Thirty Years' War. His participation proved disastrous for the Catholic cause until he was killed at the battle of Lützen in 1632.

Catholic atavism. The Protestant champion's daughter, Queen Christina (1632–54), proved to be a curious throwback to Sweden's religious past. Under alien Catholic influences, among them the philosopher René Descartes, she gained a knowledge of and attraction for Catholicity. Aware that she could not profess this religion on the Swedish throne, this eccentric and strong-willed, but entirely sincere princess resigned the crown. Until her death at Rome in 1689, she remained a steadfast, if meddlesome, convert.

25. CALVIN AND CALVINISM

A. *Calvinist Antecedents*

(1) CALVIN'S BACKGROUND

Jean Cauvin (1509–64) was to prove the second most influential of the heresiarchs. Though at first indebted to Luther, Calvin presents a decided contrast to him. Luther was a coarse German peasant, for all his education; Calvin, a cultured French bourgeois. Luther was of violent, sanguine temperament, rash, eloquent, with a certain crude humor; Calvin was calm, phlegmatic, cautious, a cold classical reasoner, and practically without humor. Though intellectually brilliant, Luther scorned logic and research to become an active popular leader. Calvin, on the other hand, was a rigorous logician who exerted his influence by writing and instructing smaller groups. With none of Luther's pseudo-mystic enthusiasm or demagogy, Calvin was nonetheless to impress his ideas more firmly on the movement that he initiated than Luther had done on his.

Family troubles. Calvin's parents were Gerard Cauvin, lawyer, and Jeanne LeFranc, who gave birth to her son Jean on July 10, 1509, at Noyon, Picardy. Jean's mother is known to have led her son to various shrines, but as she died when he was still young, her influence may have been secondary. His father, however, was more intent on his son's material than his spiritual welfare. The senior Cauvin and Jean's elder brother Charles were fiscal procurators of the see of Noyon, and became involved in financial difficulties with the cathedral chapter. In the course of this dispute they were excommunicated and eventually denied ecclesiastical burial. Such domestic tragedies could scarcely have failed to embitter Jean Cauvin against ecclesiastical authority.

Education. Before these troubles had commenced, however, Calvin had profited by the patronage of the local lord, DeHangest, to receive

benefices that financed his education. Though never in major orders, Calvin between 1521 and 1534 enjoyed the revenues of a chaplaincy and a parish. From 1523 to 1527 he pursued the arts course at the University of Paris; from 1527 to 1531 at his sire's insistence he studied law at Bourges-Orléans where he received a licentiate in the latter year. After his father's death in that year, Calvin followed his own bent to study theology. George Cop, royal physician and humanist enthusiast, was one of his patrons, and his Hebrew professor, François Vatable, was a member of the liberal cenacle of Meaux. At Bourges, Calvin's Greek professor, Melchior Wolmar, is known to have been a Lutheran. As a student, Calvin seemed to his companions reserved, timid, studious, and austere. Charges against his morality are probably due to partisan polemics; all through his life Calvin exhibited a puritanical self-righteousness—his classmates had nicknamed him "the accusative case."

(2) RELIGIOUS EVOLUTION

Conversion. Even Calvin's intimate aides were apparently uncertain when he imbibed Lutheranism, though Theodore Beza is plausible in his ascribing this to Calvin's cousin, Pierre d'Olivetan, who had studied at Strasburg under the Lutherans Bucer and Capito. Calvin himself never manifested much outward fervor, but his regulated exterior may have concealed suppressed sensibility: "The more I considered myself, the more my conscience was pricked with sharp darts, so that I retained but one consolation, which was to deceive myself by forgetting about me." About 1529 he reports a sort of "conversion": "I was obliged to study law. No matter how diligently I tried to apply myself to this subject, God's hidden providence always directed me toward another way. . . . Once I had gained a knowledge and taste for true piety, I was immediately inspired with a keen longing for it, so that without deserting other studies, I pursued them with less attention." Among initiates, "true piety" often indicated Lutheranism in a sixteenth-century context. Such tendencies must have been accentuated when Calvin returned to Paris, although no heresy is manifest in his commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia* which appeared in 1532. Its would-be reconciliation of Christianity and Stoicism, however, does reveal the latitudinarianism of the Cenacle of Meaux, which had Lutheran connections.

Manifestation. Calvin first revealed his new opinions, so far as is known, on All Saints' Day, November 1, 1533, by collaborating with Nicholas Cop, his patron's son, in the latter's inaugural address as the new rector of the University of Paris. This discourse seems to have attempted to combine the most daring texts from Erasmus with the least offensive of Luther, probably with an intention of insinuating that their authors were in basic accord. Two Lutheran tenets were stressed:

opposition between the Gospel (of Luther) and the Law (of the Church); and substitution of justification by faith alone for good works. Calvin, Cop and a group meeting at the house of Étienne de la Forge may have been encouraged by the patronage of the king's sister, Queen Margaret of Navarre. But this time they had gone too far. King, *parlement* and university were instantly aroused to indignation and alarm. Many suspects were arrested and La Forge was burned at the stake in 1535. Cop, pleading clerical immunity, resigned and retired to Switzerland. After some months as a fugitive in France, Calvin followed him to Basle early in 1535.

Culmination. From this asylum, Calvin hurled defiance at King Francis I in August, 1535, rebuking him for proscribing Protestant teaching without examining it. The better to enlighten the royal mind, Calvin drew up a methodical statement of the new teachings, which he published in Latin at Basle in May, 1536. The essential points of his own doctrine are to be found in these *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* later revised and translated, as well as put into execution at Geneva. Calvin's career as a religious innovator will be treated subsequently; here it seems sufficient to note that after short sojourns in Italy and France, he settled at Geneva. He married Idelette De Bure, the widow of an Anabaptist minister. She died in 1549, having borne Calvin one child who died in infancy. Thereafter, constantly studying, lecturing, and preaching, Calvin would find his entire life work in Calvinism.

B. Calvinist Doctrine

(1) PREDESTINARIANISM

Introduction. Calvin built upon Lutheranism. With Luther, Calvin held for extrinsic imputed justification independently of good works: "We explain justification as an acceptance . . . and make it consist in remission of sins and imputation of the righteousness of Christ." But whereas Luther wished men to be sure of their justification, Calvin went further to insist that they must also be certain of their salvation. Hence, he based his teaching upon two principles, inadmissibility of grace and absolute predestinarianism.

Inadmissibility of grace. For Calvin, as for Luther, grace is something external gained by faith and not by the sacraments, which are merely external signs. Grace once conferred, he maintained, could not be lost, since the Holy Spirit, once received by faith, is received once and for all. The authority for this and many other assertions is ultimately nothing else than the infallibility of John Calvin, for "God has condescended to reveal to me what is good and what is evil." Yet Calvin did invoke Scripture in support for his argument. According to him, the text, "Anyone who comes to Me I will not cast out," means that

anyone who arrives at justification by the imputed merits of Christ remains justified forever. He contended, moreover, that since "every tree not planted by My Father shall be rooted out," then every soul planted by the Father in justice must remain fixed always.

Absolute predestinarianism. Calvin also held that God by an eternal and immutable decree positively saves or destroys souls. He wills Adam's sin at least externally; by a curious *sotto voce* He would also will against it—for there is for Calvin no distinction between causing and permitting moral evil. His only explanation is that God's honor requires this, so that in the case of sinners He may reveal His glory in their damnation. Everything, in Calvin's view, depends upon an eternal divine decree whereby "God foreordains what shall be the fate of each individual. Since all are not created for one and the same end, some will have everlasting joy, while others undergo an endless suffering. Insofar as man is created for the enjoyment of the one or the suffering of the other, he may be said to be thereby predestined to life or to death."

Moral consequences. This predestination in Calvin's teaching was quite independent of any human exertion or co-operation, for "the will is so wholly vitiated and depraved that it is incapable of producing anything but evil." For fallen man, therefore, the question is not how he can obtain forgiveness and remission of his sins, but rather how "though unworthy and unrighteous, we may yet be considered righteous." Through faith each one does not "receive" God's favor—which is all that Calvin means by grace—but instead he "perceives" that he already has it. This, however, in no way prevents the predestined person from sinning constantly. The only remedy for this distressing situation is complete abandonment to the confidence that God will not exact the full rigor of the death sentence to which the predestined are liable at every moment.[12]

(2) SACRAMENTARIANISM

General teaching. This doctrine left little efficacy for the Christian sacraments. For Calvin, a sacrament had no intrinsic virtue; rather, a "sacrament is added like a seal to a document, not to give force to the promise, but only to ratify in regard to us, so that we may esteem it more certain." Sacraments were thus reduced to mere symbols, supernumerary reassurances enabling the predestined to "perceive" more clearly that they had already been saved by faith.

Baptism remained in Calvin's view a means of increasing faith and of signifying purification. If a man sins after he has been baptized,

---

[12] A. Baudrillart, "Calvin," *Dictionnaire de Theologie,* IV, 1422; E. Vacandard, "Calvin," *Dictionnaire de Connaissance Religieuse,* I, 1031.

remembrance of this sign will renew his confidence, for baptism "is not effaced by subsequent sins." Rather, its value depends upon the believer's faith. It should, however, be received early as a "sign of our regeneration and spiritual birth."

The Lord's Supper is in Calvin's teaching only a method of confessing one's faith, an assurance that "the body of Our Savior Jesus Christ has been so delivered for us once that now and forever He is ours." Zwingli had already declared that the Real Presence "exists in the thoughts of the contemplative mind." Modifying this opinion slightly under Bucer's influence, Calvin eventually taught that though the bread and wine are not changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by the words of consecration, yet at the communion a divine power emanated from Christ's Body in heaven into the believer's soul. Though he sometimes described this power as "substantial," Calvin certainly repudiated the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Weekly communion of this sort was advised to reawaken faith, but Calvin claimed that the Mass dishonored the "unique" sacrifice of Christ on the Cross.

"**False sacraments,**" in Calvin's opinion, were confirmation, a useless rite invented by the bishops; auricular confession, which was "pestilential and pernicious for the Church"; extreme unction, "a mockery," since cures ceased with the apostles; holy orders, "a damnable sacrilege" inasmuch as Christ is the only priest; and marriage, instituted indeed by God, but not a Christian sacrament.

(3) Ecclesiastical Teaching

The true Church, Calvin held, is to be discovered by these marks: "Wherever we see the word of God purely preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to Christ's institution, there without doubt is the Church." Long concealed by Satan, this true Church had now been rediscovered by John Calvin. It is the society of the predestined elect, and hence excommunication is necessary to free it from sinners, lest "it be contaminated by rotten members." As for the Church of Rome, it is "Babylon."

The Bible is the rule of faith, to be interpreted literally and not allegorically. The only tradition that may throw light upon it is primitive: the Apostles' Creed, St. Paul, and the first councils. But "Calvin withdraws from the faithful the free interpretation of Scripture; he himself was able, as Luther and Melanchthon, to interpret the Bible according to his conscience—or dialectic—but once tradition was restored [by Calvin] it could not again be discussed." [13] Calvin was as sure as Luther

[13] Pierre Jourda, *Histoire de l'Église* (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1950), XVI, 213–14.

of the correctness of his interpretation: "I speak by the Master's mouth." He had profited by Luther's experiences with the Anabaptists to curb the exercise of private interpretation of the Bible.

The ministry. Calvin's sacramental theory eliminated any notion of a sacrificial priesthood. His clergy were to be but "ministers of the word," that is, preachers of the Bible as interpreted by Calvin. But whereas Luther had but vague notions of a ministry, Calvin definitely, if inconsistently, held to a divinely established clerical state. In keeping with his predestinarian doctrine, he held that his ministers were called by God through the voice of the congregation. Though Lutherans eventually admitted bishops in the sense of superintendents, Calvin held store only by a "presbytery" or college of elders, assisted by deacons.

The new theocracy. All this made for an aristocratic religion and a local theocracy, familiar to Americans from the history of New England. While Lutheranism succumbed to state control, Calvinism sought to dominate the state. In either case Church and state became practically identified, but in Calvinism it remained the former which was the leading partner. The Geneva Consistory, although never attaining to the international sway of the medieval papal theocracy, did retain the extreme curialist views of direct power of spiritual authority over temporal society. Thus was erected a "Protestant Rome," even a "welfare church," designed in virtue of its predestinarian tenets to provide for men "from the cradle to beyond the grave." Where this proved impossible to establish, Calvinism opposed royal absolutism, and tended to ally itself with parliamentary democracy. In practice, despite Calvin's original objectives, there was founded a sort of worldly-wise church, composed of staid, industrious, and eminently respectable citizens, prone to be a little too smug regarding the foibles of lesser mortals.

(4) CALVINIST CULTURAL TRADITION

Moral activism. "Behind western democracy there lies the spiritual world of Calvinism and the Free Church which is . . . completely different in its political and social outlook from the world of Lutheranism. . . . There is in the teaching of Calvin the same pessimism with regard to human nature and human will, the same other-worldliness and the same exaltation of divine power and even arbitrariness that is to be found in Luther. Nevertheless all these conceptions were transformed by the intense spirit of moral activism which characterized Calvin and Calvinism. The genius of Calvin was that of an organizer and legislator, severe, logical, and inflexible in purpose, and consequently it was he and not Luther who inspired Protestantism with the will to dominate the world and to change society and culture. Hence, though Calvinism has

always been regarded as the antithesis of Catholicism to a far greater extent than Lutheranism, it stands much nearer to Catholicism in its conception of the relation of Church and state and in its assertion of the independence and supremacy of the spiritual power . . .

Individualism. "But these theocratic claims were not hierarchic and impersonal as in the medieval Church; they were based on an intense individualism deriving from the certainty of election and the duty of the individual Christian to co-operate in realizing the divine purpose against a sinful and hostile world. Thus Calvinism is at once aristocratic and democratic; aristocratic inasmuch as the 'saints' were an elect minority chosen from the mass of fallen humanity and infinitely superior to the children of this world; but democratic in that each was directly responsible to God who is no respecter of persons." [14]

26. SWISS PURITANISM

A. *The Swiss Environment*

(1) ORIGINS

The territory occupied by modern Switzerland, once the Carolingian Empire broke up, was divided between the German tribal duchies of Swabia and Burgundy. Though both were eventually incorporated into the German revival of the Holy Roman Empire, Burgundy rapidly dissolved into petty states owing scant allegiance to any temporal superior. Swabia, however, became the patrimony of the Hohenstaufen from 1080 to 1268. After this family mounted the imperial throne in 1138, wider interests claimed its attention so that the Swabians enjoyed a large amount of liberty. When the Hohenstaufen fell, Rudolf von Habsburg, count of Alsace, raised a claim to the ducal dignity in Swabia. In so doing he came into conflict with the three "Forest Cantons": Schwyz—still the German name for Switzerland—Uri, and Unterwalden, situated on the Swabian side of the Lake of Lucerne. They countered Rudolf's claims with a privilege granted them in 1231 by Emperor Frederick II which made them immediately subject to the empire—no great concession so long as the Duke of Swabia was himself emperor.

(2) SWISS AUTONOMY

Habsburg ambitions to subject this tiny Swiss Confederation to their rule were the source of prolonged but intermittent conflict. Rudolf's election to the imperial throne in 1273 diverted his attention from Swiss affairs. His son Albert, prior to his own imperial election, revived his father's plans. Against him the Forest Cantons made a defensive league

[14] Christopher Dawson, *Judgment of the Nations* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1942), pp. 44–46.

which proved the nucleus of an extension of the nascent Confederation. Albert's choice as emperor turned his concern elsewhere before a decision had been reached on Habsburg overlordship. During the fourteenth century while the Habsburgs struggled for permanent possession of the imperial crown, the Cantons purchased privileges of autonomy from emperors of rival families. About 1330 Lucerne on the Burgundian side of the lake revolted against the Habsburgs to join the Confederation. This and other accessions greatly increased the strength of this loose association. Decisive Habsburg action became urgent and in 1386 Duke Leopold of Austria made an all-out attack on Swiss home rule. But he met defeat and death at the battle of Sempach, and by treaty (1389) the Habsburgs deemed it expedient to renounce their feudal claims to Swiss lands and acknowledge that they were indeed immediately subject to the imperial government. The Confederation defended and confirmed this autonomous status until the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) recognized its full independence of the German Empire. The Swiss successfully defended their position against Duke Charles of Burgundy, who suffered Leopold's fate in 1477. By 1513 the Confederation was therefore practically a sovereign state, and had acquired most of its present territory, except the city of Geneva.

B. Zwinglian Prelude

(1) ORIGINS OF ZWINGLIANISM

Ulric Zwingli (1484–1531) was the son of a yeoman of the Canton of St. Gall near Constance. After study in the classics and theology at Vienna and Basle, he was ordained priest in 1504 and became pastor of Glarus. Through the favor of the papal legate, he was able to continue his studies, which he punctuated with periods of service as chaplain to the Swiss mercenaries in Italy. Later he aroused considerable popular sympathy by opposing Swiss enlistment as foreign mercenaries, though personally he profited by his service to the extent of a papal pension. He also took considerable interest in Humanism, corresponded with Erasmus, and put his not insignificant talents to the writing of political tracts, anti-French and propapal. These terminated in 1516 when a pro-French party gained control in Glarus. He removed to Einsiedeln where he later claimed to have anticipated Luther in preaching a new doctrine. If this be so, it was not generally known, for he continued to draw his papal pension until 1517, and was named papal chamberlain in 1518, and remained on cordial terms with Cardinal Matthias Schinner. His revolutionary career cannot be publicly traced before his arrival at Zurich in 1519 to campaign for clerical reform—with good reason, it seems, for he had been forced to resign his Einsiedeln curacy for notorious immorality.

(2) ZWINGLIAN TEACHING

Zwinglianism was a more radical type of Protestantism than Luther's. Zwingli indeed agreed with Luther in his travesty of Augustinian doctrine: human nature had been so vitiated by Adam's sin that man is no longer free to resist sin, and therefore fatalistically subject to God's control. But whereas Luther argued from Quietism and frowned on Humanism, Zwingli manifested a rationalistic spirit verging on Pantheism: "Everything is in God, everything which exists is God, and nothing exists which is not God. The Lord is merciful to whomever He wishes to show mercy, and hardens the heart of him whom He wishes to destroy. There is only one thing in this world, namely, the invincible will of God." Even more exclusively than Luther, Zwingli insisted on the Bible alone as the source of faith. On this ground he would not tolerate the statues, images, and altars that Luther permitted. Declaring the sacraments to be mere symbols, and repudiating the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Zwingli encouraged a violent iconoclasm which reduced the Mass to a reading from the Bible, a sermon, and distribution of bread from a plain table. Luther, who retained much of the Catholic liturgy, repudiated Zwingli: "I look upon Zwingli with all his teaching as unchristian." But Zwingli won over two prominent Lutherans, Carlstadt and Johann Heussgen, alias Oecolampadius.

Zurich became the Zwinglian center after the founder opened a course of sermons on New Year's Day, 1519. During 1521 he was cited to Rome, for his initial attack on the indulgence preaching of Bernardino Sanson had gone on to a demand for the Bible as the sole source of faith. Sustained by the city council, Zwingli not only defied the papal authority but took his mistress Anne Reinhardt openly as his concubine. Along with other clerical renegades he now denounced celibacy as impossible. In January, 1523, the city council gave official approval to Zwingli's teachings, and by 1525 all external signs of Catholicity had been destroyed in Zurich and the movement threatened to spread.

(3) CATHOLIC REACTION

The Forest Cantons had preserved much of their primitive simplicity and were shocked by these innovations. As Zwinglianism extended its influence from Zurich, the Catholics formed a league which soon embraced seven cantons. Johann Eck was invited to challenge Zwingli to debate. Eck arrived, and though Zwingli did not enter the lists, routed Oecolampadius. But the Zwinglians had passed the debating stage; they now sought to impose their views by a military alliance. Against this chiefly urban group, the Catholic stronghold lay in the rural areas. These called upon the Austrian Habsburgs for assistance. At first the Zwinglians

confined themselves to harassing the convoys of arms and supplies sent by Ferdinand of Austria, but in October, 1531, they essayed battle. The Catholics, however, were victorious and Zwingli himself was killed. The resulting Peace of Kappel provided that henceforth each canton might preserve liberty of worship without interference from without. The Swiss version of *cujus regio, ejus religio* remained substantially unaltered down to the French Revolution.

(4) ZWINGLIAN TRANSFORMATION

Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75), Zwingli's son-in-law and successor, after vainly attempting to reach doctrinal accord with the Lutherans, turned toward Calvinism. From 1543 his writings show strong Calvinist influence and by 1566 Zwinglianism was absorbed by the newer religion.

C. Swiss Calvinist Establishment

(1) THE GENEVAN ENVIRONMENT

Geneva was an ancient city admirably situated on the lake of that name. Originally part of Burgundy, it had come under the domination of the Savoyard dynasty which installed its members or protégés in the bishopric of Geneva which enjoyed as well the temporal lordship of the town. Bishop Pierre de la Baume (1523–44) had inherited a conflict with the commune about temporal jurisdiction which prepared the way for religious revolt. Against Savoyard domination a group of Genevan patriots, known as "Libertines," had formed, and these sought support from the Swiss Confederation in their contest. The Zwinglians took advantage of this dispute to introduce various preachers, among whom Guillaume Farel (1489–1565) became the moving spirit. In 1532 he appeared in Geneva and induced the town council to enjoin the "pure Gospel." Catholic resistance led to riots, but after the bishop had interdicted Protestant worship, Farel seized a Franciscan chapel in January, 1534, and fought back. The bishop was soon forced to leave the town for Annecy and to invoke Savoyard assistance. The Libertines then threw in their lot with the Zwinglians and the combined forces defeated the Savoyards in 1536. The situation, however, was still critical when Calvin chanced by during August, 1536.

(2) CALVINIST DICTATORSHIP

Inaugural. Calvin had merely contemplated an overnight stop in Geneva, but claims that Farel "by a frightful adjuration" insisted that he join the new regime. Soon Calvin and Farel were inaugurating an all-pervading dictatorship designed at first to crush the vestiges of Catholic sentiment, and later to realize the somber ideal of a community of the predestined. At their bidding the Council in January, 1537, passed the

Ordonnance which prescribed that though the "Lord's Supper" should be held but four times a year, Sunday must be strictly observed. Congregational singing and reading of the catechism were to be engaged in by all inhabitants at specified times and places under the supervision of the superintendents of the twenty-six Genevan wards.

Libertine opposition. The Libertines after all had revolted originally to secure temporal independence from the bishop, and the new regime was more than even Protestants had bargained for. Their party won a majority in the city council during 1538 and exiled Calvin and Farel. Until 1541 Calvin resided at Strasburg. In his absence Catholic efforts to regain control of Geneva again divided the Libertines. When these warring factions seemed incapable of preventing a return to the old regime, substantial citizens decided to recall Calvin as the only leader capable of enforcing unity of action.

Calvinist victory. John Calvin accordingly returned on November 20, 1541, and an obedient council reimposed his regulations with some revisions. Calvin ruthlessly stamped out libertine fondness for relics and images, shrines and pilgrimages. Geneva reverted to the Old Testament, patriarchal names being imposed in baptism. The Libertines continued to be an obstructionist minority until 1555 when death or exile had reduced their numbers. Between 1546 and 1564 in a town of twenty thousand there were fifty-eight executions, seventy-three sentences of exile, and nine hundred of imprisonment. The Protestant population was increased by refugees, but these too had to conform to Genevan orthodoxy. Michael Servetus, fleeing the dread Spanish Inquisition, was burned at the stake at Geneva in 1553 for his Trinitarian heresy. Thomas Lieber, styled Erastus, an irreconcilable Zwinglian, objected to Calvinist appeals to the power of excommunication, and proposed subjection to secular authority. These "Erastian" views remained anathema at Geneva, but later found favor in England.

Organization. The definitive Calvinist system of 1541–64 called for four classes of officials: 1) The pastors were the chief ministers, headed by Calvin. They constituted an autocratic "presbytery" of the visible establishment "outside of which," Calvin affirmed, "there is no salvation." 2) The "ancients" or elders were "to watch over the lives of all individuals, and amiably to admonish those who defaulted in anything or led disorderly lives. . . . They were to be stationed in every quarter of the city, so that nothing could escape their eyes." Twelve of these lay elders joined the chief pastors in the Consistory, which was a tribunal of censorship that might punish by death idolatry, blasphemy, adultery, and heresy, and meted out severe penalties for dancing, gluttony, extravagance, etc. It also licensed five taverns—all owned by predestined Calvinists—to have exclusive charge of the dispensing of spirits for approved

reasons. 3) The doctors were teachers and catechists. 4) The deacons took care of the poor, sick, and aged.

(3) CALVINIST DEVELOPMENT

The Academy, later known as the University of Geneva, was founded by Calvin and Theodore Beza (1519–1605) in 1558. It became in time the Holy Office, central seminary, missionary nucleus and center of learning for the Calvinist movement in Europe. It served as the mecca for Calvinists in other lands, and from it proceeded the ministers who spread Calvinism abroad. By reason of the Academy, there came to be "Huguenots" in France, "Dutch Reformed" in Holland, "Presbyterians" in Scotland, and "Puritans" in England and New England. Beza was especially occupied in editing versions of the Scripture and promoting apologetic history, in which his inaccuracy and bias has since become patent even to non-Catholics. Beza made strenuous efforts to win over Queen Catherine de' Medici in France, but was rebuffed in a conference with the Tridentine theologian, Jaime Laynez. St. Francis de Sales, before his promotion to the see of Geneva—in exile—secretly visited the town several times, and had three fruitless interviews with Beza.

Later history. The puritanical dictatorship was most evident in Calvin's lifetime. But Beza, his successor as Calvinist patriarch, was the last who might so be described, for at the opening of the seventeenth century the Arminian disputes in Holland, which challenged the fundamental predestinarian teaching of Calvin, began. At Geneva the rule of the elders continued until Church and state were separated in 1906. Long before, however, Rationalism and Indifferentism had so destroyed respect for the predestined elite that the town protested the Calvinist tercentenary in 1864.

27. FRENCH HUGUENOTS

A. *Insouciant Regime* *(1515–33)*

(1) THE FRENCH STATE

King Francis I (1515–47), more than any other Catholic monarch, has the responsibility for Protestant success. A typical man of the Renaissance, he was a dilettante in art, government, and war, though master only in unscrupulous diplomacy. At first he was under the influence of his mother, Louise of Savoy, a worldly, meddling, compromising Catholic; then came the reign of his elder sister Margaret, sentimental, immoral, frivolous and free-thinking, if not an outright Lutheran. Two acknowledged mistresses, the countess of Chateaubriant and the duchesse d'Étampes, did little to foster noble ideals. The latter secured the appointment of four relatives to sees and abbeys. Francis's foreign policy

was dictated by an obsession of Habsburg encirclement of France. This he vainly attacked during five wars. Despite treasonable alliance with the Sultan, the Barbary pirates, the German Lutherans, and schismatic Henry VIII of England, Francis failed in everything except the preservation of Protestantism. But he deceived no one; Sailer, Lutheran deputy at Augsburg, remarked: "We here know the French king well. He cares little for religion or even for morality. Playing the hypocrite with the pope he gives the Germans the smooth side of his tongue, thinking of nothing but how to cheat them of the hopes he gives them. His only aim is to crush the emperor." As statesman and individual, Francis I had no other objective than self-interest, but of this he was a remarkably poor judge.

(2) THE FRENCH CHURCH

The Concordat of Bologna was the most important event in French canonical history between 1516 and 1789. It provided a major explanation why the French monarchy, which had already displayed schismatic tendencies in issuing the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), did not, like the English, go over to the Protestant religion entirely. After King Francis's recapture of Milan in 1515, he prevailed upon Pope Leo X to make concessions that Capetian monarchs had been demanding for a century. In return for a formal and definitive repudiation of the Pragmatic Sanction, Francis received the privilege of nomination to all the French prelacies: ten archbishoprics, eighty-three bishoprics, and 527 abbeys. The payment of the annates to the Roman curia was reduced to an insignificant sum, and expectancies and papal reservation of benefices almost abolished. The number of cases admitting of appeal to Rome were restricted to a minimum, thus assuring that the bulk of this lucrative legal business would remain in France. Hence the French king had little temptation to personal revolt, for he had received already all that Henry VIII of England and other princes hoped to gain by it. Since the French prelates lacked civil jurisdiction, they were made quite dependent upon the monarchy. Henceforth it was to the royal interest to keep the French hierarchy subject at once to the Holy See and to the crown. Within a century many French prelates had developed a blind chauvinism known as Gallicanism.

(3) SUBVERSIVE INFILTRATION

Jacques Lefèvre (1455–1537), known as Favre d'Étaples, was the leading French Humanist, rivaling Erasmus in reputation. In 1507 he was offered abode at the Abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés near Paris, by its Abbot, Guillaume Briçonnet (1472–1534), a legitimate son of Cardinal

Briçonnet (1450–1514), primate, pluralist, royal director of finances, and patron of the Renaissance. Like the Cardinal, Abbot Briçonnet fostered the new learnng and under his patronage Lefèvre devoted himself to scriptural studies, editing a version of the Psalter and commentaries in which, despite absence of specific errors, a subjectivist spirit is manifest. About him gathered a humanist circle: François Vatable, Hebraist; Guillaume Budé, Hellenist; Josse Clichtove, theologian; Guillaume Farel, Calvin's future collaborator at Geneva; and others.

The Cenacle of Meaux was formed in 1516 when Abbot Briçonnet on becoming bishop of Meaux, nominated Lefèvre his vicar-general, and gathered his humanist protégés about him. Princess Margaret also extended her patronage to this group, which now professed to labor for ecclesiastical reform in all its phases. In 1517 Lefèvre advanced the theory that the "Three Maries" of the New Testament were not identical; which debatable, but certainly not vital point was denounced as heretical by the dean of the Sorbonne, Noel Bedier. This was the least of Lefèvre's missteps, for he was beginning to show an affinity for Luther's scriptural theories and methods in his translations and commentaries. The Sorbonne condemned these as well in 1523, but the princess shielded the Cenacle of Meaux from prosecution.

Disruption of the Cenacle. The situation changed early in 1525 when the king was defeated and captured by the emperor at Pavia. For a year he was absent in a Spanish prison, while his mother assumed the regency and took action against heretics in her blunt way. At her request, Pope Clement VII authorized members of the clergy and the *parlements* to conduct an investigation into heretical symptoms in France. Before the regent acted against the Cenacle, Farel fled to Switzerland and Clichtove retracted some temerarious views. This left the rest of the Cenacle in an ambiguous position, and violent acts by some of its partisans brought it into suspicion. Jean Le Clerc, a resident of Meaux, tore up a papal document. Disciplined, he fled to Metz where the imperial authorities executed him for smashing a statue of the Blessed Virgin. Pavannes, another associate of the Cenacle, was burned for heresy in 1526, the first known execution for Lutheranism in France. Bishop Briçonnet excommunicated the perpetrators of insults to papal and parliamentary mandates, established his own innocence at an inquest, and ceased to countenance the innovators. Most of the Cenacle followed his example. Lefèvre, without committing himself to either side, retired to Strasburg and later to Margaret's court at Navarre. By the time the king returned to France the Cenacle had been disrupted. Francis halted the persecution and resumed his careless attitude, and protests from University and *parlement* were ignored by the king until the revelation of incipient Calvinism in 1533 at the University of Paris itself.

B. *Vacillating Regime* (1533–47)

(1) ROYAL VARIATIONS (1533–38)

Repression. In October, 1533, the king had an interview at Marseilles with Pope Clement VII to conclude a marriage alliance between Prince Henry and the pope's niece, Catherine de' Medici. At this time the pope exacted of Francis a pledge to take more vigorous measures against heresy. On his return, the king learned that the Sorbonne had condemned his sister's book, *Miroir de l'Ame Pecheresse,* which advocated religious toleration, and that the students had parodied Margaret on the stage. Francis deposed and exiled the heresy-hunting dean, Bedier, and pressed forward negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League which had been pending since 1531. It is not improbable that these circumstances induced Cop and Calvin to send up their trial balloon in November, 1533. But they pushed the king farther than he desired, and a roundup and prosecution of suspects followed, climaxed with La Forge's execution in 1535. Popular indignation seconded the royal action by burning a cleric, Le Court, at Rouen for derogatory remarks about the veneration of relics. The royal ire was waning when Calvin's manifesto and heretical placards against the Mass elicited an edict for the suppression of religious novelties in 1535.

Relaxation, however, followed soon when the king concluded his alliance with Schmalkald and prepared to attack the emperor anew. In July, 1535, he granted a general amnesty and put a stop to prosecution. Further concessions were made in 1536, and during the imperial war (1536–38) no measures were taken against French heretics lest the German Lutherans be offended. During the same years Calvin was planning the conquest of France for his theology.

(2) PERSECUTING OUTBURSTS (1538–47)

François de Tournon (1489–1562), archbishop of Lyons, had become virtually prime minister in 1537. At the conclusion of the Peace of Aigues-Mortes (1538) his advice pledged France to join a "holy league" against heretics. New repressive measures were now taken, culminating in the Edict of Fountainbleau, June 1, 1540, which set up a general code of prosecution. Tournon and the grand inquisitor, Friar Ory, were authorized to pursue the heretics.

Vaudois massacre. During his last war with the emperor (1542–44), the king's ardor for prosecution changed once more and he resisted all of Tournon's urgings against the Vaudois, a group of Waldenses who had accepted some Zwinglian tenets. Cardinal Sadoleto, bishop of Avignon, near their residence, was a sincere advocate of tolerance, but during his absence and after the disastrous end of the imperial contest, the now

ailing king was induced to proceed against the Vaudois. During two months in 1545 royal troops and hired thugs killed three thousand men, women, and children in cold blood, besides deporting and enslaving others. This incident, which Francis regretted ever after, only infuriated the French Protestants and embittered the subsequent Huguenot Wars. The reign ended as it began, with the spotlight on Meaux, where Étienne Dolet, convicted of printing subversive books, was burned at the stake along with thirteen others, April and October, 1546.

C. Repressive Regime (1547–59)

(1) Domestic Rigor

King Henry II (1547–59), Francis's sole surviving son, succeeded him in March, 1547. Henry was less witty and scintillating than his father, but otherwise resembled him. He posed as a patron of the arts and neglected his wife, Catherine de' Medici, in favor of a mistress, Diana of Poitiers. But this did not make him more tolerant, for whereas Henry's wife had a compromising religious policy, the mistress was a bigot. Hence, the king took for his motto the boast: "If Henry II had not reigned, the Church would have perished." But since his foreign policy was to continue the alliance with the Lutheran Schmalkaldic League, it might have been more true to say: "If Henry had not reigned, Lutheranism would have perished."

"La Chambre Ardente." One of the king's first decrees was to set up a special court to judge cases of heresy. During its three years of existence it won the name of "burning chamber" by passing sixty-six death sentences. Tournon, still influential, imposed a rigid consorship on books. But the "Chambre Ardente" eventually proved insufficient for the king's desires. The *parlement*, which had consistently opposed royal wishes so long as these—under Francis I—had favored leniency, now in sheer perversity veered toward conciliation. Its lawyers objected alike to royal Absolutism and supposed deference to the papal court.

"La Grande Chambre." After parliamentary judges had attempted to mitigate the royal measures, the king issued his Edict of Compiègne (1557) which made a death sentence for heretics mandatory. A new "Grand Chambre" was inaugurated and made itself odious by arbitrary and heartless methods so that condemned heretics reviled the king who came to witness their execution. Pope Paul IV even requested introduction of the Roman Inquisition to ensure fairer procedure, but *parlement* indignantly rejected this type of leniency because it came from without the country. Meanwhile repression, far from discouraging the religious dissenters, made them bolder. In 1559 they dared to hold a representative assembly of fifty French Calvinist communities and to draw up a "Confession of Faith of French Churches." They likewise enjoyed the

support of members of the royal family, Antoine de Bourbon, king-consort of Navarre, and his brother, Louis of Conde. The failure of the royal policy of repression became evident on June 15, 1559. King Henry attempted to overawe the opposition of *parlement* by personally entering the chamber—somewhat after the manner that Charles I of England did in 1642. Several members were emboldened to defy him to his face, and Du Bourg protested in favor of toleration. The irate monarch had his opponents arrested, but he had suffered a moral defeat. Less than a month later, July 10, he was killed in a tournament accident by Captain Montgomery, a Scotsman who "played for keeps," it would seem.

(2) FOREIGN REVERSES

Anti-Habsburg War. King Henry's foreign policy was a direct successor to that of his father: to attack the Habsburgs by every means at his disposal. It has already been noted that he allied himself with the German traitor, Maurice of Saxony, in order to overthrow an imperial settlement favorable to the Austrians and Catholics. Although the ensuing war was in the beginning quite successful for the French, it terminated disastrously. The emperor and his son, Philip II of Spain, defeated the French decisively at St. Quentin (1557) and Gravelines (1558), and at last ended the series of Habsburg-Valois conflicts in favor of the former.

Habsburg Hoch! Though the emperor died in September, 1558, King Philip garnered the fruits of the victorious Peace of Cateau-Cambrénsis, April 3, 1559. According to its provisions, the French monarch was obliged to yield all territories in dispute between the Habsburg and the Valois, and to follow Habsburg wishes in regard to the repression of heresy in Europe. This latter provision accorded well with Henry's domestic policy. Though Henry II can scarcely be regarded as an able monarch, his sudden death in the prime of life deprived France of experienced administration at a critical hour. His widow, the compromising Catherine de' Medici, secured the regency for a series of youthful and weak heirs. There followed a series of nine Huguenot wars, during which both Catholics and Protestants appealed to foreign powers for assistance. Divided at home, for half a century France was forced to take second place to Spain, to whom the European primacy fell for nearly a century.

28. ENGLISH ALIENATION

A. *The Defender of the Faith* (1509–25)

(1) REFORM TENDENCIES

Lollardism, the only English heresy during the Middle Ages, was described by Erasmus in 1523 as "conquered but not extinguished." Just as Hussitism furnished a springboard for Luther, Lollardism in England

seems to have preserved a tenuous continuity for heterodoxy between Wycliffe and the first Lutheran infiltration.

The Oxford group. English renaissance studies were given a reformist and antischolastic trend by John Colet (1467–1519), an Oxford scholar who in 1504 became dean of St. Paul's and a popular preacher. While not convicted of heresy, Colet castigated the abuses of the clergy in tones reminiscent of Savonarola, whom he had admired on an Italian tour. For Colet, it was sufficient to "abide by the Bible and the apostles, and let the theologians dispute among themselves." Colet did not celebrate Mass on weekdays, and directed his pupils to spend the time of the daily conventual Mass studying in their rooms, merely pausing at the consecration bell. Desiderius Erasmus (1465–1536), a frequent visitor to Oxford, voiced many of his strictures on the clergy, the monks and the Scholastics in England. Bold in speech and timid in action, he was forging weapons for the Protestants by cynical, exaggerated, and rash criticism of a regime that he personally did nothing to reform. Associated with these critics in the early days was the lay jurist, St. Thomas More (1477–1535). He, too, made sly sallies against clerical as well as lay abuses in his *Utopia* (1516). But his criticisms were leavened with a sense of humor and an earnest personal effort in the cause of reform. His keen intellect never confused reform with revolt at a time when venal and political motives, muddled thinking and unsound training were about to produce disaster. He would yet indicate the right direction in his own blood, but for the moment he was so intimate with Erasmus and Colet that they were described as the "Cenacle of Oxford." The University had as chancellor from 1506 to 1532 the cautious William Warham (1450–1532), the archbishop of Canterbury.

The Cambridge circle was less famous during the early years, but ultimately more productive of heresy. Here also renaissance studies flourished under the prudent chancellorship of St. John Fisher (1459–1535), bishop of Rochester, who would prove to be a notable exception to hierarchical servility. There also Erasmus was a welcome visitor, especially to Hugh Latimer (1485–1555) who went beyond Erasmus to adopt Lutheranism. From 1521 a band of crypto-heretics, including William Tyndale (1490–1536) and possibly Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556), were meeting at White Horse Inn near Cambridge. Tyndale would edit the Lutheran version of the English Bible, but Cambridge as well as Oxford would find that Protestantism in the long run proved a serious setback for scholarship. As for the clergy, St. Thomas More would eventually acknowledge to Tyndale, "I wot well there be therein many lewd and naught . . . but now if the bishops would once take unto priesthood better laymen and fewer, all the matter were more than half

amended." As for the better educated, St. Thomas More deemed them "a weak clergy lacking grace constantly to stand to their learning."

(2) HENRY VIII, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH

Henry Tudor (1491–1547) began his momentous reign in April, 1509, when he became absolute monarch of all Englishmen save himself. God had given him a strong constitution, a handsome appearance, a bluff good nature, and a keen intelligence. But the king never learned to use his talents rightly; his was the strong but unstable will of a man emotionally immature. He strove to reconcile a piety expressed in hearing several Masses daily with indulgence in his passions by frequent dalliance with a series of mistresses. Dissipation eventually reduced him to a gross hulk, the dupe of designing women and courtiers. Though by no means a figurehead, Henry was more interested in the trappings of royalty than in personally directing a consistent policy to success. He needed deputies, but was a poor judge of them: Cromwell and Cranmer betrayed him; and Wolsey, though devoted, was too high a price to pay for the good of England.

Diplomatic currents. When Henry VIII married Catherine of Aragon in May, 1509, she had been for two years her father Ferdinand's ambassador. Until 1525 her political influence, still considerable, was always exerted in favor of Spain. From 1511 to 1514 Henry participated in the "Holy League" of Julius II, Emperor Maximilian, and Ferdinand of Aragon against Venice and France, and invaded the latter country in 1513. During his absence Catherine and Norfolk repelled a Scottish invasion. After Flodden (1513) the Scots were no longer formidable in a military way, but their young King James V (1513–42) or his heirs would succeed to the English throne should Henry VIII fail to leave children —and he had only one sickly daughter, Mary. Under Wolsey's influence (1515–29), the king of England essayed something of a balance of power between Spain and France, adhering uncertainly to this policy until the end of his reign.

Ecclesiastical policy. From the time of the Holy League, Henry posed as a special champion of the Holy See, joining in papal political pacts. In 1521 he received from Leo X the title, *"Defensor Fidei,"* for his *Defense of the Seven Sacraments* against Luther. Henry backed Wolsey's papal candidacy in 1521 and 1523, but was easily satisfied with the choice of Giulio de' Medici as Clement VII. For Medici as absentee bishop of Worcester had been Henry's Roman agent; surely he could continue complacent to the royal wishes. Clement, indeed, renewed Wolsey's extensive legatine powers and gave him leave to suppress several monasteries on the alleged purpose of devoting their revenues to the

endowment of Oxford. Against popular opposition, Wolsey's deputies, Allen and Cromwell, exceeded his delegation or interpreted it broadly to his own advantage. It is not unlikely that the king, now becoming financially pressed, here received the first hint for his future course of confiscation. Within the realm all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and preferment passed through Wolsey's hands. While enriching himself and violating clerical discipline personally, Wolsey did little to uphold it. But this negligence did not extend to heresy. Archbishop Warham's vigilance in his earlier years also led to numerous arrests. It is estimated that from 1504 to 1517 there were 365 prosecutions for heresy in England, and 27 executions. During 1521 some 342 arrests were made, though there is no record of execution. Yet the "fires of Smithfield" failed to halt Lutheran infiltration, for between 1527 and 1533 there were eleven further executions for heresy. In this sense, at least, Henry VIII was defending the Faith.

B. *The Scrupulous Divorcee* (*1525–34*)

(1) ORIGINS OF THE DIVORCE PLAN (1525–27)

Motives. By 1525, infidelity, despair of having a son by Catherine, and reaction against her Spanish politics had estranged Henry from his wife. Should Princess Mary die, the Scottish Stuarts would rule England— a nightmare for sixteenth-century Englishmen. In 1525 the king created his illegitimate son Henry Fitzroy (1519–36) duke of Richmond, an affront which increased the estrangement from Catherine. Unconfirmed rumors indicate that the king was meditating an annulment without having reached a decision. What made him decide was Anne Boleyn (1507–36), a relatively homely but vivacious girl whom rumor linked with the king's affections from 1526. But Anne would not be Henry's mistress—her elder sister Mary was already Henry's castoff—and insisted on being queen. Wolsey, Belloc opines, never realized this, and fell in with annulment proceedings on the assumption that the ultimate objective was a French matrimonial alliance. But Anne kept control of the situation and drew Henry on until his vanity would not permit him to draw back from the affair.

Means. Papal difficulties after the Sack of Rome, May, 1527, seem to have emboldened Henry to manifest his scruples that he had contracted an invalid marriage with Catherine. Cherishing a reputation for piety, a little sorry for Catherine, and very much afraid of her nephew, the emperor, Henry wanted a legal way out. Wolsey lent assistance on the understanding that he would be backed for the papacy or a papal vicariate during Pope Clement's captivity. In May, 1527, Cardinal Wolsey, briefed by Henry, cited the king to appear before his legatine tribunal to answer charges of invalid cohabitation. At the ensuing private

investigation, Henry alleged that the papal dispensation of Pope Julius II in 1503 had been insufficient to remove a biblical (Leviticus 20:21) impediment of affinity between himself and Catherine, as widow of his elder brother, Arthur, prince of Wales. The queen's defenders retorted that this did not apply, since her first marriage with Arthur had never been consummated before the prince's early death. Wolsey might have made quick work of this objection, but his cojudge, Archbishop Warham, interposed that the case was doubtful and ought to be submitted to Rome. The king then authorized Wolsey to obtain sanction from the Holy See, and three weeks after the investigation separated from Catherine.

The case depended on whether the impediment between a widow and her deceased husband's brother was of natural or ecclesiastical law. As early as the Council of Constance, canonists had assured Pope Martin V that neither the natural nor divine positive law prevented papal dispensation. Yet the Holy See had been conservative in granting such concessions, and Pope Julius II's dispensation in 1503 to the English royal family had been only the second or third on record. The pope, then, could validly and legitimately have dispensed Henry. Had he done so? Was the dispensation ample enough to meet the case, or had it been fraudulently secured? While Wolsey was in France, Henry by-passed him through his agent Knight with the clumsy demands: a papal dispensation for bigamy, or failing that, a dispensation from public honesty—for Mary Boleyn had been Henry's mistress and this impediment then extended to the collateral line. The first demand flaunted all Christian tradition; the second questions Henry's sincerity, for he was requesting dissolution of one marriage as contrary to a supposed natural law of affinity, only to contract a new union in violation of an analogous impediment. Before Knight's negotiations had been completed, Wolsey learned that Anne Boleyn was the king's desired, and himself took charge of the proceedings.

(2) ANNULMENT COMMISSION (1527-29)

The decretal bull. Wolsey's new agents, Gardiner and Fox, were instructed to obtain instead from Clement VII an extensive papal decree which would authorize a single papal commissioner, one Cardinal Wolsey, to pronounce definitive sentence of nullity on Henry's union with Catherine provided the following conditions were verified: 1) Though the Julian dispensation stated that Henry VIII desired the match, actually Henry VII had sought it without his son's knowledge. 2) The alleged reason, peace between England and Spain, was null since they had not been at war. 3) The same reason had been nullified by the death prior to the marriage of Henry and Catherine of Queen Isabella,

one of those to be pacified. 4) Henry in 1503 had been only twelve years old and incapable of a marriage dispensation. 5) He had protested against the marriage before its consummation and had renounced the dispensation. What Wolsey did not add was that once given irrevocable delegation by the pope to annul Henry's marriage on certain conditions, Wolsey would see to it that the conditions were verified by hook or by crook. The pope was still in a delicate position: Francis of France sustained Henry's request, and the emperor was urging that Catherine be tried away from England. After lengthy parrying, Clement VII in June, 1528, conceded a decretal bull for a commission consisting of Wolsey together with the curial cardinal, Campeggio. The latter, an experienced canonist, was instructed by the pope never to permit the papal document to leave his possession—later the most that Campeggio would ever do was to read passages in the presence of Henry and Wolsey. Neither is it certain whether the commission enjoyed a final delegation. Clement VII, who believed that time healed all things, urged Campeggio not to hurry. And he proved an expert in delay: leaving Rome in July, 1528, he did not open the formal hearings until June, 1529.

Imperial brief. Meanwhile, about November, 1528, a bombshell threatened Henry's case: Catherine had received a copy of a papal brief which the emperor had discovered in the Spanish archives. This new document made clear that Pope Julius II had granted the dispensation now challenged in the event of consummation of the marriage with Arthur, and "on other definite grounds." This amounted to a papal *motu proprio*, which would guarantee the validity of the dispensation even if some of the petitioners' reasons had been insufficient. Henry, indeed, professed gratification: would Catherine write for the original? That guileless lady did so, but the worldly-wise emperor sent the document for safekeeping to Rome, where Clement VII refused to declare it a forgery, when importuned by Wolsey.

English trial. Before opening the hearings in England, Cardinal Campeggio tried to persuade Catherine to abandon the contest and retire to a convent, but she refused. At the formal inquest, June 18 to 21, 1529, she challenged the partiality of the legatine court. The hearing was something of a dress rehearsal for the coming schism. Archbishop Warham adduced signatures of all the English bishops in favor of the king's plea. "That is not my hand and seal," snapped St. John Fisher. Warham, as much as admitting a forgery, intimated that the signature which had been supplied was in accord with the mind of the bishop of Rochester. "There is nothing more untrue, my lord," retorted St. John. Henry, while undoubtedly noting the dissenter for the future, passed over the incident by remarking that a single dissent did not disturb

the majority opinion. Then Wolsey pressed for an immediate verdict, but Campeggio took care to adjourn the court until October. Meanwhile Catherine appealed to the Holy See, and Clement admitted her request, July, 1529, summoning the case to Rome. Kings, queens, emperors, cardinals, bishops, even the compromising Giulio de' Medici faded into the background; there remained only a defenseless woman seeking justice from the Vicar of Christ.

(3) PAPAL PROCESS (1530–34)

The Rota. During October, 1529, while Campeggio left England without ever having yielded the decretal, the king vented his wrath on Wolsey whom only death saved from imprisonment and possible execution. Henry in February, 1530, made a desperate appeal for outright annulment to the pope and emperor at Bologna. The pope only seized this opportunity to cite Henry's envoy, an inappropriate person, Anne Boleyn's father, as proxy to represent the king before the Roman Rota whither the case was remanded on March 7, 1530. But there the matter rested as Henry's Roman agent, Carne, delayed the proceedings for over two years on one pretext or another.

Royal defiance. Meanwhile the king on the advice of the Boleyn chaplain, Cranmer, defied the Rota by seeking favorable decisions from European universities. Coercion won over Cambridge and Oxford; Francis I, then Henry's ally, delivered the votes of Toulouse and Orléans, and bribery won those of Padua, Pavia, and Ferrara. At Salamanca, Vittoria bluntly rebutted the royal claim. The king presented the university opinions to the Rota in July, 1530, but the pope reminded Henry that Rome would try the case impartially. In August, 1531, Henry introduced Anne Boleyn into the royal apartments; papal threats of censure unless she were dismissed fell on deaf ears. Anne soon became pregnant and Henry had to act quickly to maintain his pose of injured innocence. Probably on January 25, 1533, he secretly went through a marriage rite with Anne, though he did not publicly acknowledge her as queen until April 12. Cranmer, named archbishop of Canterbury, on March 30, followed explicit royal instructions to pronounce Henry's marriage with Catherine null on May 23. Then on May 28 he pronounced Henry's union with Anne valid, and she was crowned queen of England on June 1.

Papal verdict. Clement had long intimated to Henry that the Rota's decision would be adverse, and had hoped that the king would retire gracefully. Now he could delay no longer. On July 11, 1533, Rota and Consistory decided against the royal plea, pronounced Henry's marriage with Catherine valid, declared his union with Anne therefore illicit, and any possible progeny illegitimate. Clement VII suspended the

sentence of execution several times until March 23, 1534, when with the assent of twenty-two cardinals he ratified the Rota decision—obliging Henry to the costs! The king, already well advanced in his revolt against Rome, went into schism.

Marital postscript. Catherine of Aragon, shifted from one castle to another to avoid popular demonstrations in her favor, died on January 7, 1536. Anne Boleyn gave birth to a daughter, Elizabeth, on September 7, 1533, but soon fell out with the king. After Cranmer had pronounced her marriage invalid *ab initio*, she was executed for adultery on May 19, 1536. The next day Henry married Jane Seymour (1510–37) who died in giving birth to Prince Edward. Anne of Cleves (1515–51) was married in January, 1540, and divorced the following July, bringing death to her sponsor, Thomas Cromwell. Catherine Howard (1520–42) married Henry the month of the Cleves divorce and was executed on a charge of adultery two years later. In 1543 Henry married his sixth mate, Catherine Parr (1513–48), who managed him in his dotage and succeeded in surviving him. But such tragi-comedy had little direct influence upon the schism which Anne Boleyn had done much to occasion and precipitate.

29. ENGLISH SCHISM

A. Separation from Rome (1529–35)

(1) SEPARATIST TREND (1529–32)

The "Reform Parliament" was in session from 1529 to 1536. Its membership, though not hand-picked by the king, was quite complacent toward the royal wishes. Indeed, Henry did not need to use much persuasion to induce parliament to embark upon some mild anticlerical legislation during its first session, for he confined his demands to genuine abuses reprobated by public opinion. In October, 1529, the king replaced Cardinal Wolsey in the chancellorship by St. Thomas More. The appointment of a layman to this office had usually presaged anticlerical measures, and this instance proved no exception. The Probate Act protested against delay and excessive fees for probating wills in the canonical courts; the Mortuaries Act criticized burial dues; finally, the Pluralities Act denounced plurality of benefices, nonresidence of beneficiaries, and clerical worldly pursuits. Though crying abuses were involved, reform came with ill grace from Henry who had himself condoned some of these failings by the benefices that he had lavished on his clerical ministers, especially Wolsey.

Clerical coercion was the objective of the revival of the Statute of *Praemunire* forbidding the exercise of authority emanating from a foreign power without royal consent. Although the king had abetted Wolsey's cumulation of powers through delegation of the Holy See,

Henry now intimated to the English clergy that by recognizing Wolsey's legatine prerogatives they had fallen foul of this long disused fourteenth-century enactment. The king, however, professed a willingness to overlook this, if he were given £100,000. The convocation of the clergy, February, 1531, hastily voted him a donative to that amount. Next Henry VIII suggested that any future difficulties that might arise from the customary prelatial oaths of obedience to the Holy See might be obviated if they would go on record to this effect: (1) "We recognize that His Majesty is the special protector, the sole and supreme lord, and the supreme head of the Church and clergy of England"; and (2) "the care of souls will be entrusted to His Majesty." The Canterbury Convocation endorsed the royal proposals with the saving clause appended by St. John Fisher, "so far as the law of Christ allows." But the York Convocation, once Bishop Tunstall of Durham had been reassured by Henry that he had no antipapal intent, seems to have made no explicit amendment.

Submission of the clergy. When parliament reconvened in January, 1532, the king engineered a "Supplication Against the Ordinaries" which complained of the ecclesiastical courts as derogatory to royal interest, and in March proposed a Mortmain Act that restricted clerical property rights and reduced papal annates. St. Thomas More resigned the same month, a safe barometer of the hostile intent of the new legislation. Archbishop Warham was roused to a last protest against the royal demands in February, but on May 15, 1532, nonetheless, led the clergy in unqualified acquiescence to royal proposals to subordinate the canonical courts to secular review. This "submission of the clergy" practically ended any independent jurisdiction of the clerical estate—the cause for which St. Thomas à Becket had been martyred. A new regime was coming in, for Archbishop Warham died in August, 1532, and was presently succeeded by Thomas Cranmer. Sts. John Fisher and Thomas More went into retirement and Thomas Cromwell was groomed to be the king's new ecclesiastical vicar *"in temporalibus."*

(2) Separatist Consummation (1533–35)

Archbishop Cranmer (1533–56) was only nominally a Catholic primate. Though his nomination was confirmed by Clement VII as a final concession to avert royal rebellion, Cranmer took the oath of obedience to the Holy See, March, 1533, only after he had privately asserted in writing that he deemed this oath a mere formality which could not bind him to oppose any changes intended by the king. What these were to be he well knew, for he began a visitation of his province to exact clerical signatures to the proposition: "According to Scripture, the pope has no more authority in England than any other bishop." Yet many were will-

ing to subscribe with the childish defense that England is not mentioned in the Bible. Propaganda simultaneously attacked the Holy See with impunity. When, however, Elizabeth Barton (1506–34), the "Holy Maid of Kent," a reputed mystic, protested "in the name and by the authority of God" against the king's divorce, Cranmer had her executed with five companions in April, 1534. Sts. John Fisher and Thomas More were circumspect in her regard and the Church has never pronounced on her reliability, but the only word about her alleged recantation comes from Cranmer and Cromwell—scarcely unexceptionable testimony.

Process of separation. In April, 1533, parliament had passed an act restraining appeals to Rome, which implicitly repudiated papal primacy: "This realm of England is an empire . . . governed by one supreme head and king . . . unto whom people divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality be bounden and ought to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience." Parliament followed this in April, 1534, with an Act of Succession invalidating Henry's marriage to Catherine and declaring Elizabeth, Anne Boleyn's daughter, legitimate and heiress presumptive. Refusal to take an oath to this effect would be deemed high treason. Accordingly Sts. Fisher and More were imprisoned. St. Thomas, indeed, had granted parliament's right to designate an heir to the throne, but refused to accept its authority in pronouncing on the validity of a marriage. This apt distinction, however, was not accepted by the royal prosecution. Finally in November, 1534, parliament sanctioned the Act of Supremacy: "Be it enacted by the authority of this present parliament that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia," with corresponding authority to "visit, repress, redress, record, order, correct, restrain, and amend" whatever "by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought to be reformed; . . . any usage, foreign law, foreign authority, to the contrary notwithstanding." The accompanying oath of supremacy required subjects to "swear allegiance, fidelity, and obedience to His Majesty the King alone . . . and not to any foreign power." The king formally assumed his new title in January, 1535, and during the following February the English hierarchy, after explicitly renouncing the divine institution of the papacy, were obliged to exchange the papal bulls of appointment for royal warrants. By this latter action, at the latest, the consummation of the English schism was reached.

Enforcement. Prominent clerics and laymen were now required to take the oath of supremacy under penalty of high treason. In May, 1535, three Carthusians, a monk, and a secular priest were executed for refusing to do so—Houghton, Webster, Lawrence, Reynolds, and Hale

are their immortal names. St. John Fisher, put to death on June 22, was the only English bishop to resist, although Bishop Ateca of Llandaff, the Spanish confessor of Queen Catherine of Aragon, also remained true. St. Thomas More, the ex-chancellor, was executed on July 6, and several Franciscans were implicated with Elizabeth Barton. But for the most part, nobles and prelates, clerics and professors, resorted to mental reservations, argued that papal primacy was not formally defined, or found loopholes in the oath. Conciliarism had bred erroneous notions and Wolsey's excessive and universal legatine powers had long eliminated the habit of recourse to Rome. Englishmen knew that the papacy and the monarchy had been at odds before, and later had been reconciled. Many felt that this dispute, too, would pass, and meanwhile why lose life or benefice for a "scruple"? The king was upholding all Catholic doctrines in regard to the sacraments. True, on April 30, 1535, Pope Paul III read in secret consistory a bull excommunicating and deposing Henry VIII should he not submit within ninety days, but for want of executors, he failed to promulgate it. Neither Emperor Charles V nor Francis I of France was ready for a crusade across the Channel.

B. *The Schismatic Church* (1535–47)

(1) SUPPRESSION OF THE MONASTERIES (1535–40)

Previous condition. The monastic orders were particularly influential and wealthy in England which had received the Faith from Benedictine missionaries. Eight or nine sees, including Canterbury, were at the disposal of monastic chapters, and many secular clerics received their benefices from some monastic authority. Thirty-one mitred abbots sat in the House of Lords, where they outnumbered the bishops, and along with them they constituted fifty-two votes against a lay membership which varied between thirty-six and fifty-one. Since the regular clergy were directly subject to the Holy See, the king realized that they might not be pushed too far, while their legal majority in the upper house of parliament might prove embarrassing to steam-rolling tactics. There was another consideration also. Cardinal Gasquet has computed the total value of monastic value at more than $250,000,000 in pre-1914 values; this was perhaps one-third of the landed wealth of England. Although the English monastic and religious houses were not free from prevailing renaissance abuses, Gasquet seems to have established that in general the monks were lax rather than vicious, that religious duties were still being discharged regularly, and that social welfare was being provided with conscientious fidelity. The basic causes of monastic suppression remain: royal avarice sharpened by bankruptcy; outspoken opposition of some religious to Henry's divorce; and the ambition of the nobility and burgesses to control parliament, Church, and crown.

Suppression. Cromwell, named vicar-general, received a commission in January, 1535, to undertake a general visitation. With his brutal deputies, Rice and Leigh, he hastened through it in a few months. He then presented parliament with what seems to have been a series of forged or exaggerated charges against the small monasteries with less than twelve members, though they acknowledged that in the larger houses "religion was right well kept." Presumably zeal for the liturgy induced parliament in February, 1536, to suppress 375 of these lesser houses and put their resources at the disposal of the crown.

Protest. It is a strong argument in the monks' favor that the people were at last goaded to take up arms in their behalf. Though social and political grievances played their part, the religious motive was paramount in October, 1536, when the yeomen of Lincolnshire rose, and Yorkshire inaugurated an armed "Pilgrimage of Grace" to induce the king to change his mind. Norfolk, the helpless royal general, disbanded the rebels by royal promises of redress. These were not kept, the trustful leaders of the uprising were executed, and during 1537 bloody vengeance was taken on the disbanded militia. But this disturbance gave the king an excuse to proceed to the suppression of the remaining monasteries. Charging that their abbots had sympathized with the movement, Henry VIII demanded their resignation under penalty of attainder. All but three of them were willing to exchange their temporalities for a pension. How the dissenters fared we may judge from Cromwell's diary: "Item: the abbot of Glaston to be tried at Glaston, and also executed there"—remarkable foresight of the sentence. Thus between 1538 and 1540 the remaining abbeys and convents were taken care of, bringing the total number of houses suppressed to more than eight hundred.

Results. Though a few favorites received pensions, the vast majority of the 6,500 monks and friars and fifteen hundred nuns were thrown upon their own resources. This total of eight thousand religious displaced persons is augmented to nearly one hundred thousand when account is taken of the monastery dependents: aged, orphans, sick, etc., who were now thrown upon society. In succeeding reigns the problem of social welfare became acute. And these monks and nuns, though thrown back on the world, were forbidden by the canon-civil law of Henry's Church to contract marriage. To the credit of the nuns, about whom most information is available, they were generally faithful to their obligations. Yet little of this monastic loot became permanent royal property. Henry was swindled out of immense sums by his agents, or anticipated by neighbors. What he did receive he squandered on luxuries, favorites, foreign wars; to secure the support of the lay lords for his religious program he may have given away or sold at cut-rate prices two-thirds of his share. By Mary Tudor's time (1553–58) this

wealth had largely passed to a new plutocracy, a vested interest pledged to maintain the religious change, and possessing enhanced economic power which would enable them first to control parliament, and then to restrict royal prerogatives: by the close of Elizabeth Tudor's reign (1558–1603) the new oligarchy was beginning to apply the pressure against a hitherto practically absolute monarchy.

(2) PROTESTANT TENDENCIES (1535–40)

Lutheran infiltration. Doctrinal ferment was also in process. While secret Protestants, Cranmer and Latimer, condoned heresy as much as they dared, Catholics were beginning to protest. Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500–58) in 1536 published his *De Unitate Ecclesiae* which flatly contradicted the Henrician position, and found alarming favor with the "pilgrims of grace" of that year. Henry VIII struck back by executing the cardinal's mother, Countess Margaret of Salisbury, a niece of Edward IV, though the cardinal was beyond his reach. Threat of a pro-papal rising or invasion seems to have driven Henry momentarily into the hands of the Lutherans. While meditating an alliance with the Schmalkaldic League, he imposed on the clerical convocation of June, 1536, a creed of *Ten Articles*. Though orthodox as far as they went, these propositions implied Lutheranism by omission or innuendo; thus, only baptism, penance, and the "Lord's Supper" were enumerated as the ordinary means of justification. Bishop Tunstall of Durham led the conservatives among the Henrician hierarchy in a revision which supplied the missing sacraments and added the Ten Commandments and a Catholic exposition of justification. Henry merely tolerated use of this revision, which was accordingly dubbed the *Bishops' Book* (1537).

Scriptural aberrations. Yet Henry, and Cranmer at his bidding, continued to execute radical Protestants, and he rejected the Protestant translations of the Bible by Tyndale and Coverdale. In 1538, however, the king was hoodwinked by Cranmer and Cromwell into sanctioning the "Great Bible." Under the fictitious name of Thomas Matthew this preserved ninety per cent of Tyndale's original version.

(3) ORTHODOX REACTION (1540–47)

The Six Articles. About 1539, however, Henry VIII veered again toward an imperial alliance, and in April of that year took a more definitely orthodox stand in his *Six Articles*. These (1) upheld the Real Presence and Transubstantiation; (2) declared lay communion under one species sufficient; (3) enforced clerical celibacy; (4) upheld the vow of chastity as an impediment to matrimony; (5) deemed private Masses "meet and necessary," and (6) auricular confession "expedient and necessary." Protestants might grumble against this "whip of six

strings," but for the rest of the reign the *Six Articles* were enforced under pain of death.

Royal persecution was thenceforth directed against Protestants refusing to subscribe to the *Six Articles*, and Catholics who failed to take the Oath of Supremacy. Executions on charges of "treason" became commonplace; it is estimated that on one charge or another Henry put to death some seventy thousand persons during his reign. The proportion of true martyrs defies exact computation, but surely there were more than the six hundred beatified victims of English persecution between 1535 and 1681. Yet compromisers remained in the majority: Gardiner, Bonner, and Tunstall accepted the *Six Articles* while rejecting papal supremacy, Cranmer outwardly acquiescing in an orthodoxy which he did not really hold. Surrounded by sycophants and timeservers, Henry clung to his halfway stand, resisting alike papal invitations and heretical blandishments, growing daily more suspicious and cruel.

End of the reign. By the time that Henry had reached the fifty-sixth year of his age and the thirty-eighth of his reign he had gained the fear and contempt of all in England and abroad. His sixth mate was a secret Protestant. In December, 1546, he still feared plots against the throne and arrested the Howards. But before sentence could be carried out against the duke of Norfolk, the king died on January 22, 1547, assisted by Cranmer in his last moments. No certain "last words" are available; only the Invisible Head of the Church knows what became of the "Supreme Head in earth of the Church of England."

C. Irish Schism (1509–47)

(1) COERCION OF THE PALE: DUBLIN

Imported secularism. The Henrician policy in regard to the see of Dublin was a faithful image of the English religious trend. In 1529 Wolsey's protégé John Allen was named archbishop and given vicelegatine jurisdiction, though the latter was correctly repudiated by the Irish on the ground that Wolsey's legation extended to England alone. Wolsey's fall made the question academic, and Allen escaped implication in his ruin only by paying a fine for alleged violation of *Praemunire*. Allen promoted the royal political policy by siding with the Butlers against the Geraldines—until the latter had him murdered in 1534.

Borrowed schism. George Browne, as archbishop of Dublin (1536–53), became the instrument of Henry's new religious policy. He had preached in favor of Henry's divorce, and was named to Dublin by royal fiat and consecrated by Cranmer. Before Browne's arrival in Dublin, the king coerced the Irish parliament into voting—not without dissenting voices—the Act of Supremacy and abolition of papal annates and appeals. Browne encountered much opposition in trying to enforce

the Henrician program, but in 1537 secured an act from the Irish parliament repudiating papal jurisdiction and authorizing monastic suppression. This was carried out, but the loot proved vastly inferior to that taken in England.

(2) EXTENSION OF HENRICIAN SYSTEM: ARMAGH

Episcopal subservience. In 1509 there were four archbishoprics and twenty-eight suffragan sees in Ireland. Of bishops named through the king before and after the schism, twenty-two of thirty admitted the royal supremacy, only one certainly refused, and the attitude of the others is unknown or ambiguous. Even when the Holy See began to make direct episcopal appointments to Irish sees after the inception of the schism, some of the papal nominees submitted to the crown in order to secure possession of the temporalities. In the primatial see of Armagh, George Cromer, a pliant royal appointee, was denounced to Rome for heresy. Robert Wauchope was named by the Holy See to succeed Cromer. In 1543 Henry named George Dowdall to Armagh; later he revolted against Edwardian heresy and fled to Rome. Wauchope after one perilous and fruitless trip to Ireland as papal legate died in 1551 without obtaining possession of his see. Irish prelates, then, were but slightly less submissive to the Henrician schism than the English; only the Edwardian heresy prompted a general return to papal allegiance.

Political repercussions. Since Henry's schism had destroyed the basis for English lordship of Ireland under papal suzerainty, Henry in 1540 assumed the new title of "King of Ireland." During 1541 the Irish parliament in the Pale was coerced into ratifying his new style, and the king was fairly successful in persuading Irish chiefs beyond the Pale to exchange clan interests for an English title of nobility. This involved recognition of the royal ecclesiastical supremacy. Scions of these conformist families, moreover, were educated in England to be indoctrinated with Henry's policies in regard to religion and politics.

30. ENGLISH HERESY

A. Edwardian Protestantism (1547–53)

(1) CONSERVATIVE LUTHERANISM (1547–49)

Edward VI (1547–53), son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, succeeded to the English throne in accordance with the royal will ratified by parliament. Edward was but ten years old, and though precocious, remained a puppet of various advisors throughout his reign. At the outset, England was under the rule of his maternal uncle, Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset. He was a liberal idealist who strove to be moderate in government, and seems to have had some honest intentions of social welfare.

Lutheran innovations. Both the Lord Protector and Archbishop Cranmer had been secret Lutherans, and for them the only religious question was the choice of apt means of introducing their views. No executions for religion took place under Seymour's administration, and his first parliament, meeting in November, 1547, repealed the *Six Articles.* An immediate consequence of this mild policy was the invasion of England by heretics from the Continent who were given leave to attack the existing religious establishment in speech, though premature vandalism was repressed. Indeed, from July, 1547, the *Injunctions* of Edward VI had despatched royal visitors to simplify the liturgy, discourage shrines and pilgrimages, and shorten the office. Gardiner and Bonner resisted; the former was imprisoned and the latter yielded under pressure. Not until December, 1547, did Seymour present parliament with his program for doctrinal change, though his Chantries Act prepared for the destruction of landed endowment of schools and Cranmer's *Book of Homilies* presented Lutheran views on justification. In December, 1547, parliament was induced to pass the "Act of the Holy Sacrament," enjoining lay communion under both species, though without any Hussite implications. By March, 1548, Cranmer had a *Communion Book* ready to implement the new decree. Based on the work of the Lutheranizing Hermann von Wied, it had heretical implications in regard to confession and Communion: the "Confiteor" in the Mass would suffice for reception of the Lord's Supper. In the fall of 1548, Cranmer presented to parliament his (first) *Book of Common Prayer*, a literary but not a theological masterpiece. Eight of the Henrician bishops and three lay lords voted to reject it, but on January 21, 1549, the majority of both houses of parliament imposed the new ritual for the following June. This *Book* proposed to regulate the "Lord's Supper, commonly called the Mass." This title indicates its content: it presented a vernacular simulacrum of the Sarum Rite of the Mass in the hope of deceiving conservatives into believing that the ancient sacrifice had been substantially retained. But while the Mass of the Catechumens was but slightly altered, the offertory and canon omitted references to sacrifice. Though mention was made of the Lutheran "real corporeal presence," nothing allowed one to suppose any true sacrificial transubstantiation. Vestments, however, were retained in an effort to stress externally continuity with the ancient Mass.

Popular revolt. Bonner evaded the new prescriptions and encouraged clerical defiance in London. More serious was a rising in Cornwall the day after the new liturgy went into effect, for this spread to the Western counties. These rebels protested: "We will not receive the new service, because it is like a Christmas game, but will have our old service of Matins, Evensong, and Procession in Latin, as of yore. And so we

Cornish men, whereof some understand no English, utterly refuse this new English." The rising in Cornwall was complicated by a social revolt in the Northeast. Though Seymour sympathized with the commoners, he was forced by his council to name Warwick defense minister. The latter suppressed the revolts with German and Italian mercenaries, and then backed by the nobility, deposed Seymour in October, 1549. Spared for the moment, the latter was executed in 1552.

(2) RADICAL CALVINISM (1549–53)

John Dudley, earl of Warwick, now became duke of Northumberland and regent in all but the title. He was an unscrupulous politician willing to sacrifice Church and state to selfish ambition. He had hitherto been regarded as a religious conservative—he was to die a Catholic—and was content to be taken for such until he secured power. Then, however, he was easily convinced that his economic interests, based on monastic confiscations, demanded espousal of Protestantism. Cranmer had by now advanced to more radical Calvinist doctrines and together they inaugurated a puritanical dictatorship, though Dudley and his lay adherents were chiefly interested in plunder. A new wave of vandalism and iconoclasm "picked the bones" of the already plundered English Church until even Cranmer protested, though in vain. The chantries suffered in particular and education and religious worship were beset by poverty for many years to come.

Doctrinal changes. On January 31, 1550, parliament obligingly voted a "new form of making and consecrating archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons." This Edwardian *Ordinal,* as revised in 1552 and readopted by Elizabeth I in 1559, invalidated subsequent Anglican orders. It was deliberately designed to destroy any idea of a sacrificial priesthood. In intention, and until the seventeenth century in form also, it was defective and incapable of perpetuating the apostolic succession of episcopacy and of holy orders. Significantly in April, 1550, Ridley, who had been substituted for the conservative Bonner in London, extinguished the sanctuary lamp. Next Cranmer offered his (second) *Book of Common Prayer,* revised according to views of Bucer who steered between Lutheranism and Zwinglianism: the Eucharist is bread to the senses, but Christ's body to the mind. This new liturgy revolutionized the former deceitful compromise to an extent that it could no longer be mistaken for the Mass, nor was any attempt made to call it such. Now the Canon practically disappeared along with all rites reminiscent of sacrifice. Reference to "real corporeal presence" even in the Lutheran sense was omitted. A table replaced the altar, and all vestments other than a surplice were banned. For long a certain "Black Rubric" on kneeling for communion caused confusion: the conservatives knelt; radicals sat down

defiantly; middle-of-the-roaders felt that the decent thing to do was to stand. The *Book* also reduced the "true sacraments" to baptism and the "Supper," and outlawed sacramentals. This rite was imposed by a second Act of Uniformity, April 14, 1552, and made obligatory from November 1. Most of the Henrician bishops were arrested for opposing this and other innovations. Finally in June, 1553, appeared the *Forty-Two Articles,* an official hodgepodge of Edwardian dogma. About half of the articles retained Catholic teachings regarding the Trinity, the Incarnation, etc. For the rest, Cranmer followed Lutheran and Calvinist models while steering clear of Anabaptist extremism. Neither Lutheran denial of freedom nor Calvinist predestinarianism were unequivocally adopted. With some modifications, these became the basis for the Elizabethan *Thirty-Nine Articles.*

Insurrection was brewing even before the king's illness rendered Dudley's position precarious. To prevent the succession of the Catholic Mary Tudor, Dudley induced the dying king to change his father's will by designating as his heir Lady Jane Grey, a granddaughter of Henry VIII's sister. Lady Jane, hastily wed to his own son Guilford Dudley, was proclaimed queen by Dudley when the king died on July 6, 1553. Dudley prepared to rule in the name of the youthful pair, but Mary Tudor, supported by the majority of Englishmen and enjoying the encouragement of Emperor Charles V, set up her standard. Lady Jane reigned but nine days, for Dudley's following melted away and Mary entered London as unchallenged queen on August 3, 1553.

B. Catholic Reaction (1553–58)

(1) RELIGIOUS REVERSAL (1553–55)

Mary Tudor, a staunch Catholic, thus mounted her father's throne at the age of thirty-seven. Neglected for many years, she had become a lonely, misunderstood woman, greatly in need of advice. For this she turned to her grandfather's policy of the Spanish alliance. The emperor responded with alacrity. Though declining to marry her himself, he suggested a match with his son Philip. Philip and Mary contracted a political marriage dutifully enough, but on his side there was little affection for this woman eleven years his senior. Negotiations were delayed by English fear of Spanish influence, but finally it was agreed that though Philip might enjoy the royal title, Mary would conduct the government. The marriage was celebrated on July 25, 1554, and England was temporarily brought into the Habsburg imperial orbit.

Amnesty. "Be a good Englishwoman," the emperor had advised, and Mary at first followed his counsel. Lady Jane was spared, Cranmer merely dismissed with a pension, and most of the conspirators, save Dudley, pardoned. Every effort was made to conciliate the public by a

patriotic and moderate policy conducted by the liberated Bishop Gardiner as chancellor (1553–55).

Edwardian repeal. Since at least nine-tenths of Englishmen were still devoted to the Mass, the undoing of the religious changes under Edward VI encountered no great opposition. Although in August, 1553, the queen directed that existing arrangements remain until the convocation of a new parliament, the celebration of Mass had been spontaneously resumed, and only in London was there any Protestant recrimination. The parliament that met in October, 1553, was as Catholic as it could be without the pope. Mary's "Omnibus Bill" proposing repeal of all changes during the two preceding reigns encountered opposition, until the queen substituted two new bills which, ignoring alike papal and royal supremacy, merely repealed Edwardian legislation on religion and confirmed Mary's legitimacy. These measures were readily accepted, the Mass officially replaced the *Book of Common Prayer* in December, 1553, and England retrogressed from heresy to schism.

Henrician repeal. The major hurdle remained the reversal of Henry VIII's Act of Supremacy. Not only was there no great enthusiasm for Rome, but possessors of monastic goods feared that any reunion might involve loss of their new property. The emperor urged the pope to condone the seizure and held up the papal legate, Cardinal Pole, in the Netherlands until Mary's marriage had been settled and Julius III had given the desired commutation for the confiscated ecclesiastical goods. This done, the cardinal proceeded on to London, where on November 30, 1554, he solemnly absolved the king, queen, and both houses of parliament from all censures and restored England to Catholic communion. Once he had announced the papal concession, the arrangement was ratified with only two dissenting votes in parliament. Cardinal Pole remained as papal legate to preside over the ecclesiastical restoration of the country.

(2) CATHOLIC RESTORATION (1555–58)

Persecution. Disaffected elements remained, for Protestants continued to offer public insults to religion and to plot against the queen. Though the emperor preferred prosecution of malcontents on a charge of treason, the forthright Mary Tudor was wholly medieval in outlook. In January, 1555, she revived the statute *De Haeretico Comburendo*, and presently commenced the executions which continued throughout her reign. Gardiner, who was averse to this program, died in 1555, and Cardinal Pole, long absent from England, was blind to some of the perils that beset this course in the forum of public opinion. Queen Mary proceeded unhindered in her honest but inexpedient course that sent Cranmer and some two hundred others to the stake. By modern standards of toler-

ance, she earned her nickname of "Bloody Mary." But it is inconsistent to give her a monopoly of the term, while denying it to Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. They persecuted from political motives; Mary followed her conscience.

Divided counsels. Cardinal Pole, who succeeded Cranmer to become the last Catholic archbishop of Canterbury (1555–58), worked diligently to repair the damage of twenty years. Synodal decrees ordered residence for all bishops and pastors; care in examining candidates for orders and benefices; conscientious visitation to maintain clerical discipline; the supervision of university teaching and the founding of a seminary. Care was to be taken to preach and catechize. But the cardinal had little time given him and that little was disturbed by the antipathies of Pope Paul IV for the Habsburgs. This pope pursued temporarily the inexplicable policy of supporting Catholic France in a war with Catholic Spain at a time when southern Germany and England has just been restored to the Catholic fold. Mary's precarious regime was included in Paul IV's enmity for the Habsburgs, while the pope also entertained unfounded suspicions regarding Cardinal Pole's orthodoxy. The country was drawn into an unpopular war against France in which anti-Spanish prejudice led to a neglect of Philip's warning of an impending French attack on Calais. Calais, England's last foothold on the Continent, was consequently lost to the great discredit of Mary's government, already unpopular because of its religious persecution and policy of economic retrenchment.

Sunset. The end of a generation was fast approaching. The emperor died in September, 1558, and Philip made a mistake destined to plague him for the rest of his life. When Mary's health began to fail, he rather callously used his influence to promote Princess Elizabeth's succession to the childless Queen. Elizabeth deceived Philip by her newly acquired Catholic habits, and held out hope that she might marry him. At any rate, Philip prevailed on the reluctant Queen Mary to accept at face value Elizabeth's assurances that she would maintain the Catholic restoration. The queen and Cardinal Pole died on the same day, November 17, 1558. The new Queen Elizabeth dissembled her religious views until after her coronation at the beginning of the following year, but then her renewal of the Act of Supremacy, February 24, 1559, served notice that England would soon relapse into both schism and heresy.

C. Irish Contrasts (1547–58)

(1) RESISTANCE TO PROTESTANTISM (1547–53)

Conservative Protestantism. At Edward's accession, Dowdall of Armagh, Browne of Dublin, and other timeservers in the Irish hierarchy were expected to do the protector's bidding. Edward VI's *Injunc-*

tions were made obligatory in all districts subject to English rule, and pulpit campaigns against the Mass and Catholic practices inaugurated. Neither Dowdall nor Browne manifested much enthusiasm for the new movement, however, and the Lord Deputy St. Leger contented himself with publishing Edwardian decrees without attempting to enforce them. Meanwhile Robert Wauchope, *de jure* archbishop of Armagh, tried to secure French military assistance to rally the Irish Catholics.

Radical Protestantism. The extremists on gaining power in England recalled St. Leger and insisted on the introduction of the *Book of Common Prayer*. The Henrician Dowdall refused to accept this and fled the country. Irish ecclesiastical primacy was transferred by the crown to Dublin where Browne proved more compliant. Hugh Goodacre, consecrated according to the new *Ordinal* as the first Protestant prelate of Armagh, was prevented by the O'Neills from taking possession.

(2) Qualified Catholic Restoration (1553–58)

Religious policy. On Mary's accession, therefore, Catholic restoration presented no difficulty in a land where the vast majority had opposed the Edwardian innovations. Dowdall was restored to Armagh, this time with papal approval. Browne and his cohorts were deposed. In 1557 under promises of immunity from penalties for confiscated church goods, the Irish parliament annulled all acts prejudicial to the papacy. The parliament also enacted statutes against heresy (1557), but the new Lord Deputy, the earl of Sussex 1556–66), proved averse to persecution, both under Mary and her successor Elizabeth. Practical toleration in Ireland, then, contrasted with persecution in England; in fact, some Englishmen fled to the Pale to escape the English heresy laws.

Political aims. Mary's political program, however, did not differ from that of her Tudor predecessors. In 1555 she obtained from the pope confirmation of the title "King of Ireland" usurped by Henry VIII. A system of plantations designed to subjugate Ireland to English colonization was inaugurated, so that Archbishop Dowdall complained that Ireland was far from improved economically by Mary's rule.

31. SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANISM

A. *Presbyterian Origins* (1513–60)

(1) Stuart Regime (1513–42)

King James V (1513–42) came to the throne on the morrow of the Scots' defeat by the English at Flodden. Since James was but a year old, the regency was entrusted to a cousin, John Stuart, duke of Albany (1481–1536). The regent, though an honorable man and capable administrator, was an incompetent general. Absent on the Continent for long periods, he exerted his authority chiefly with French troops. His

task was complicated by the fact that the queen mother, a Tudor, had married Douglas, Earl of Angus, and protected the English interest. It was not until 1528 that the young king threw off the Angus tutelage and drove the Douglas clan from Scotland. James, portrayed by Scott in the *Lady of the Lake,* allied with the lower classes against the nobility. To protect Scotland against Henry VIII, he strengthened the traditional alliance with France by marrying first Princess Madeline, and second, Mary of Guise, who bore him his only surviving legitimate child, the famous Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots (1542–87). James died shortly after her birth, heartbroken at a border reverse of the Scots at English hands at Solway Moss.

Heretical manifestations first appeared in 1525 when the Scottish parliament saw fit to prohibit the importation of Lutheran books. King James V resisted all invitations to participate in the English schism and instead severely repressed religious dissent at home. In 1528 Patrick Hamilton, abbot of Ferne, was put to death for heresy; in 1533 Henry Forest, a Benedictine, was likewise condemned, and others met the same fate or were exiled. Hence, John Knox (1505–72), future Presbyterian leader, did not declare himself so long as the king lived. Ordained to the priesthood in 1530, Knox had acquired heretical notions during frequent trips to England and Switzerland, but for a time he spread these secretly.

(2) HAMILTON ADMINISTRATION (1542–54)

James Hamilton (1515–75), earl of Arran, as grandson of a sister of James III, was heir presumptive to the throne of the infant Mary, queen of Scots. While she was sent to France to be educated—she did not return until 1561—Hamilton conducted the government in Scotland. He was favorable to the English alliance which Henry VIII and his successors were making every effort to effect, and not averse to the newer religious views. Hence he was supported by the Douglas clan, returned from England, and other nobles. But the regent's policy was opposed by the Scottish patriot, Cardinal David Beaton (1494–1546), archbishop of St. Andrew's since 1539, and the latter gained considerable support against the nobles' alliance with the hereditary national foe.

Cardinal Beaton was an able but dubiously moral prelate, who rose to his duties to the Faith, but was immersed in politics. In 1543 the regent imprisoned the cardinal and licensed the reading of the English Bible. But when Hamilton tried to arrange a marriage alliance between Edward VI and Mary, clergy and people freed the cardinal and forced the regent to declare his allegiance to the Church. An English attack in 1544 further alienated the people from the Hamiltonian policy and put Beaton in the ascendancy. He used his power to suppress heresy rigor-

ously. His execution of George Wishart (1505-45), Protestant preacher and English agent, provoked the Leslies to retaliate by murdering the cardinal on May 29, 1546—a "godly deed" in the view of John Knox, then resident in England.

Catholic reaction to the assassination forced the regent into the patriot camp. He named his illegitimate brother, John Hamilton (1511-71), to succeed Beaton at St. Andrew's and tried to effect a reformation in the Scottish Church. The archbishop was devoted to the Faith, but his moral character and unscrupulous politics made him an unhappy choice. In any event, his reform measures were now "too little and too late" while the fiery Knox tiraded against ecclesiastical abuses with the backing of many of the nobles. Another English invasion by Protector Somerset (1547) brought the queen dowager, Mary of Guise, to the fore. She procured troops from France to expel the English by 1550. With French assistance she was now dominant in Scotland, and Hamilton was persuaded to resign the regency in her favor in exchange for the rich duchy of Chatelherault in France. John Knox was put in the French galleys for two years.

(3) GUISE ADMINISTRATION (1554-60)

The Catholic party of Mary of Guise, however, was no longer the patriotic side since it relied on French troops. Since Mary Tudor was by now reigning in England, Knox issued a polemic (1556) entitled, *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regimen of Women.* He endeavored therein to prove that "the rule of women is repugnant to nature, contrary to God's ordinances, and subversive of good order, equity, and justice"—at least when the women were Catholics. But he did most of his "blasting" *in absentia,* for though invited to Scotland by some of the nobility, he soon left for Geneva to imbibe a thorough-going Calvinism which he would propagate at a more propitious time.

The Lords of Congregation, a quasi-military league of Protestant nobles similar to that of Schmalkald, was formed in December, 1557, to promote the English type of Protestantism in territories subject to their influence. They were led by Archibald Campbell, earl of Argyle, James Douglas, earl of Morton, and James, earl of Moray or Murray, a natural son of James V. When these lords introduced the "pure evangelical doctrine" on their estates, the queen regent, at odds with Primate Hamilton, grew fearful and granted them privileges for private worship. In the same year (1558) Walter Milne, an ex-priest, was the last executed for heresy. The Protestants were emboldened by the regent's concessions to denounce Catholic practices during a national assembly at Edinburgh, April, 1559. The regent resorted to repressive measures, but could not win a decisive victory over the lords, now supported by Queen Elizabeth

of England. Armed truce prevailed in June, 1560, when Mary of Guise died.

B. Presbyterian Triumph (1560–67)

(1) PRESBYTERIAN ESTABLISHMENT (1560–61)

The Lords of Congregation seized on the queen's death to effect their innovations. Until Mary Stuart, now of age, should arrive to assume personal government, it was decreed that a council headed by her half brother, the earl of Moray, should conduct the government. Parliament met in August, 1560, with the Lords of Congregation in control and John Knox as religious mentor. Knox proposed a "Confession of Faith" which substituted Calvinism for Catholic doctrine and discipline. The Catholic hierarchy protested that the parliament lacked royal approbation, and the Catholic lords absented themselves. These delaying tactics had no effect on the confident Protestant leaders who on August 24 enacted three decrees: 1) Papal and episcopal jurisdiction were repudiated. 2) All previous acts contrary to Calvinism were repealed. 3) Mass was declared illegal under penalty of confiscation and imprisonment, and if need be, of exile and death.

A Presbyterian assembly met in December, 1560, to legislate for the new establishment. Knox's views were embodied in the *Book of Discipline* and *Book of Common Order,* later imposed by parliament. All sacraments save baptism and a Calvinist "Supper" were declared abolished. Episcopal jurisdiction was replaced by a consistory of presbyters, assisted by elders and deacons. Ecclesiastical property was declared confiscated, and iconoclastic scenes followed. Though Knox decreed that all the confiscated property should go to the new Presbyterian "Kirk," many noblemen quietly enriched themselves. Catholics were able to maintain themselves on their own lands, but the prelates were generally cowed so that the new regime was established with but little violence.

(2) ROYAL TEMPORIZING (1561–65)

Mary's return. Mary Stuart had hoped to restore Catholicity with the aid of her husband, King Francis II of France. But his death in December, 1560, required her to make the attempt alone. She landed in Scotland in August, 1561, and gave her confidence to her half brother, a Machiavellian seeking his own interest and possibly the throne.

Religious compromise. The queen decided to accept the Presbyterian *status quo* until she could get her bearings, build up a personal following, and obtain foreign assistance. In exchange for noninterference with the Kirk, Mary was allowed her household Catholic worship, though only over Knox's protests. Pope Pius IV became alarmed and sent the Jesuit Gouda in disguise to Scotland. The queen assured him of her un-

wavering fidelity, but pleaded her present difficulties. Indeed, the Catholic leaders were afraid to meet the papal envoy even in secret. The only public defenders of Catholicity were Quintin Kennedy (1520-64), abbot of Crossraguel, John Leslie (1527-96), who debated with Knox in 1560, and Ninian Winzet, later abbot of Regensburg in exile. The queen showed scant favor to the Catholic lay leader, the earl of Huntly, who was provoked to revolt. But Huntly was slain and several nobles implicated in the rising executed (1562-63). Archbishop Hamilton and fifty priests were arrested for celebrating Mass in violation of the law, which the queen insisted must be observed. Yet she assured the Council of Trent of her personal attachment to the Church.

(3) MARITAL DIPLOMACY (1565-67)

Darnley marriage. Fearing to subject Scotland to a foreign power by marrying an alien prince, Mary suddenly decided in July, 1565, to marry her cousin, Henry Stuart, lord Darnley (1546-67). King Henry, as he was now called, wished to act as regent rather than consort, but for this he lacked all qualifications besides the handsome presence that had captivated a woman four years his senior. It would seem that Elizabeth permitted Darnley, a Catholic of sorts, to go to Scotland to prevent a Habsburg alliance. Mary's marriage provoked Moray and other Lords of the Congregation to revolt, but the queen mustered forces that drove them across the English border. For a time the Catholic cause seemed to prosper. Huntly's heir was restored to his father's lands, Leslie was named bishop of Ross and royal councilor, and Mass began to be said quite openly. This accord was disrupted by Darnley. The queen had become disillusioned about the unintelligent debauchee that she had married and excluded him from her counsels. Darnley, on the other hand, exaggerated the political importance of her secretary, David Rizzio, and went so far as to accuse him of immoral relations with the queen. With the connivance of various lords, Darnley had Rizzio murdered on March 9, 1566. Learning belatedly that he had been duped by Moray, Darnley revealed the extent of the plot to the queen. With the assistance of loyal noblemen, including James Hepburn, earl of Bothwell (1536-78), Mary foiled the conspirators. Though Mary gave birth to her son James on June 19, 1566, she and her husband were now utterly estranged. At midnight, February 9, 1567, Darnley was blown up by gunpowder while lying sick in a lonely house near Edinburgh. Darnley's father accused Bothwell of murder, and though circumstantial evidence seemed to sustain the charge, Bothwell was acquitted after some suppression of evidence, in which the queen seems to have participated. She may also have been accessory in some degree to her husband's murder, if we may believe the controversial "Casket Letters."

Bothwell alliance. Five days after his acquittal, April, 1567, Bothwell, possibly with the queen's connivance, carried her off to his castle at Dunbar. After he had forced a divorce from his wife, Huntly's sister, Bothwell had the apostate bishop of Orkney marry him to the queen with Protestant rites, May 15. This act gave scandal, real or pharisaic, to all parties in Scotland. The papal envoy judged that Mary was about to desert the Faith, and the Protestant lords rose to avenge King Henry. Their forces met those of the queen and Bothwell at Carbery Hill in June, 1567. Mary surrendered on condition that Bothwell be allowed to escape—he died in Danish exile a decade later. The captive queen was obliged to abdicate in favor of her infant son James on July 24, 1567, and was imprisoned at Loch Leven. She escaped in May, 1568, only to be defeated at Langside near Glasgow. She then fled across the English border there to begin a lifelong captivity at the hands of Queen Elizabeth. In prison she resolutely adhered to the Catholic faith and was the object of intrigues for the restoration of Catholicity in both Scotland and England. She was at length beheaded on February 8, 1587, her son, James VI, who aspired to succeed Elizabeth in England, scarcely raising a finger to save her.

(4) KING JAMES VI (1567–1625)

The regency (1567–78). James, earl of Moray, was regent from 1567 to 1570 for the infant king who had been crowned with Calvinist rites a few days after his mother's abdication. Although baptized a Catholic, James was educated as Scotland's first Protestant monarch. The queen's chapel at Holyrood was destroyed and the Catholic clergy forced into exile or hiding, though the regent was sparing of the death penalty. But when he outlawed Archbishop Hamilton, one of the Hamilton clan shot him dead on January 23, 1570. English troops crushed an incipient revolt in Mary's favor, and installed Darnley's father as regent. He had conveniently apostatized and proved his devotion to the new religion by summarily hanging Archbishop Hamilton in his pontifical robes. In February, 1572 a new pro-English regent, James Douglas, earl of Morton, forced on the Kirk an episcopalian system similar to that imposed by Queen Elizabeth on England. This was enough to send John Knox to his grave in November, 1572, but his successor, Andrew Melville (1545–1622) and most Presbyterians continued to oppose this form of church government. Morton ruled with an iron hand until a coalition forced him to resign in March, 1578.

James VI, "wisest fool in Christendom," was now declared of age, but for some time longer remained the prey of factions. During this period he passed through a dreary round of plots, captures, and escapes without committing himself irrevocably to any group. Episcopalianism was

overthrown and restored. There were rumors of Catholic restoration, but the Catholic lords led by Huntly submitted to the Kirk in 1597 in order to regain their estates. The Faith continued to survive in outlying districts, kept alive by missionaries from the Scottish colleges at Tournai since 1578 and at Rome after 1600.

Under the advice of the "Scottish Cecil," John Maitland, Baron Lethington (1545–95), the king steered a moderate course in his later years. Though persuaded to permit formal sanction of Presbyterianism, James remained convinced that "no bishop, no king; presbyter is just old priest writ large." After he became king of England in 1603 he tried to introduce the entire Anglican system and to unite Scotland politically and ecclesiastically to England. Despite his sending of Melville to the Tower in 1607, he could not prevail. Although a form of episcopalianism remained in Scotland, all real authority was retained by the Presbyterian Synod. Another attempt by James's son, Charles I, failed and provoked civil war. At the restoration (1660), King Charles II nominally reestablished episcopalianism, but it went out for good in 1689 and the union of Scotland and England in 1707 was made on the condition that the Presbyterian Kirk be formally recognized as the established religion of Scotland.

IV

The Catholic Reformation

32. THE PAPAL REFORM

A. Pre-Tridentine Period (1522–34)

(1) ADRIAN VI (1522–23)

Cardinal Hadrian Dedel (1459–1523) was elected to succeed Pope Leo X on January 9, 1522. The new pontiff had been born at Utrecht, then within the German Empire, and has been the last non-Italian to date to become pope. Trained by the Brethren of the Common Life, he had been a professor at Louvain University and a tutor of Charles von Habsburg. The emperor always respected this austere ecclesiastic and had named him regent for Spain during his trip to Germany. Adrian was still in Spain when news of his election was brought him.

Thwarted reform. The new pope did not enter Rome until August, 1522. The Romans, charmed by Medicean Humanism, were unprepared for a foreign reformer. Nor were they pleased when Adrian VI, waving the arts away with a *"Proh! idola barbarorum,"* vigorously and perhaps intemperately attacked entrenched abuses of nepotism and preferment. The pope's efforts were blocked, sometimes by open defiance, more often by tacit disregard. Pope Adrian did everything in his power to allay discontent in Germany. Through his nuncio Chiergati he informed the Diet of Nuremburg (1522) that he would reform the papal curia, redress grievances and, if need be, convoke a general council. He frankly admitted that current ills may have had their source in the Roman court. But at his death, September 14, 1523, Adrian VI gloomily directed that his epitaph should acknowledge: "How unfortunate that there are times when the best intentioned man is obliged to yield."

[208

(2) CLEMENT VII (1523-34)

Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (1478-1534) was promptly chosen for the papal office on November 18, 1523. Illegitimate son of the Medici slain in the Pazzi Conspiracy, he had been legitimated in virtue of his parents' *sponsalia* and admitted to a clerical career. His cousin Leo X had named him cardinal and one of his chief aides. Though without flagrant vices, Cardinal Medici had not been ordained until 1519. Once pope, he reverted to the more easygoing regime of Leo X, whom he came to resemble in his halting and ambiguous diplomacy.

Lessons of adversity. Though Clement VII may have hoped to restore Leonine Humanism, the times would no longer permit it. Woefully misinformed about German conditions, the Italian Pontiff was prone to employ political more than moral means. The Sack of Rome (1527) was the result and rebuke of such pettiness. In 1524 the emperor had requested a general council, and German diets continued to demand a "free general council held in Germany." Though Clement so far yielded as to issue a summons for a council in 1530, neither time, place, nor mode of assembly were specified. Having failed to reconcile either Germans or English, and still fearful of convoking a general council, Clement VII died on September 25, 1534. If Adrian VI had tried to proceed too fast, Clement VII demonstrated that excessive tact was not the remedy either. Germany and England had rebelled against the papacy, and France's monarch was of uncertain loyalty.

B. *The Tridentine Period (1534-65)*

(1) PAUL III (1534-49)

Alessandro Farnese (1468-1549) was elected to the papacy on October 12, 1534, by a conclave comparatively free from pressure. His early life had been immoral, and though a cardinal since 1493, he had not been ordained to the priesthood until 1519. Thereafter, however, he had become one of the rare converts of the Fifth Lateran reform program; excessive nepotism toward his illegitimate progeny was the only major fault to be laid to his charge during his long pontificate.

Papal initiative. It is greatly to Pope Paul III's credit that he resolutely challenged inertia in the papal curia so that reform, not merely in desire and gesture, but in reality, began during his reign. The Church had been receiving the type of popes that it did because the majority of the cardinals were indifferent to reform. Beginning in 1535, Paul III nominated enough worthy men to tip the balance in favor of reform. Among these were Gasparo Contarini (1483-1542), Giovanni Morone (1509-80), and Reginald Pole (1500-58). During the same year the pope expressed his willingness to summon an ecumenical council. Although it did not ac-

tually convene until a decade later, it was largely due to papal perseverance that Trent ever got under way at all.

Reform measures. In March, 1537, a reform commission, named by Paul III the preceding year, made its report on abuses and did not spare the Roman curia and its canonists in its indictment. The pope faithfully followed up its recommendations: clerical discipline was tightened; absentee clerics were admonished in no uncertain terms; abuses in indulgences and censures were curbed; the Inquisition was reorganized with particular vigilance for the censorship of books. During the same year a papal document, *Sublimis Deus,* forbade enslavement of the American Indian. At the same time St. Philip Neri, as yet a layman, arrived to become the "second apostle" of Rome. Reform began to penetrate Roman laxity and was not halted by the apostasy of Ochino, the Capuchin superior-general, in 1542, nor that of Vergerio, papal legate to Germany, in 1549. Little profit came from the imperially sponsored theological discussions with the Lutherans at Regensburg (1540–41) and Augsburg (1548), and papal-imperial relations were strained. The death of the pope's grandson, Pierluigi Farnese, at imperialist hands, and Charles V's doctrinal usurpation in the Interim (1548) severed relations and paralyzed Trent. Aged and vexed, the great pontiff died at Rome, November 10, 1549.

(2) JULIUS III (1550–55)

Giovan-Maria del Monte (1487–1555), senior Tridentine legate during the first period of sessions, was elected to succeed Paul III on February 7, 1550. The new pope was a sincere but unstable reformer, whose unpleasing mannerisms somewhat prejudiced his influence. He, too, resorted to nepotism by making his youthful adopted son his cardinal-secretary.

Reform nevertheless went forward amid more cordial papal-imperial relations. The council was reassembled at Trent, though the rebellion of Maurice of Saxony brought it to a premature suspension. The Jesuit German seminary, founded in 1552, became the nucleus of the Collegium Germanicum, first of a series of pontifical institutes designed to provide clergy for Catholics in Protestant territories. The pope loyally supported Mary Tudor and Cardinal Pole in the restoration of England to Catholic unity. During his last two years, however, illness hampered the effectiveness of the pope's reform labors. Julius III died on March 23, 1555.

(3) MARCELLUS II (1555)

Marcello Cervini (1501–55), junior Tridentine legate during the first period, was then chosen pope on April 8, 1555. He had been a zealous and learned worker for ecclesiastical reform and high hopes were placed

in him. But his efforts were cut short by death twenty-one days later, May 6, 1555. His influence survived in his nephew, St. Robert Bellarmine, doctor of the Church, and his name in Palestrina's Mass.

(4) PAUL IV (1555–59)

Giovanni Pietro Caraffa (1476–1559) was promptly elected on May 23 to fill the vacant Roman see. This zealot of seventy-nine was an ardent and austere reformer, still possessed of boundless energy. He was also an Italian patriot anxious to restore the "good old days" of his youth before the foreign interventions beginning in 1494. His political obsessions, together with credulous reliance upon unworthy relatives, were to prejudice much of his work as pope.

Reform. With inexorable vigor the pope promoted the reform already initiated without the assistance of the Council of Trent, which his autocratic spirit readily dispensed with. He took a vigorous interest in the Inquisition, and did not draw the line at torture. In 1559 the irate pontiff for half an hour rebuked Cardinal Ghislieri—the St. Pius V of the future—for supposedly being too indulgent toward a petition on behalf of the suspect archbishop of Toledo, Carranza. The pope also arrested the conciliatory Cardinal Morone and prosecuted him for heresy. The same fate would have befallen Cardinal Pole if Queen Mary had agreed to surrender him. The Jesuits, confirmed by Paul III, incurred the displeasure of Paul IV, who proceeded to remodel their institute.

Reverses. The pontiff had cut down his own and the cardinals' revenues by two thirds, only finally to be informed that his nephew, Cardinal Carlo Caraffa, had brought papal finances near disaster. Another nephew, Galeazzo Caracciolo, joined the Lutherans in 1551. Once disillusioned about his relatives, Paul IV was seen weeping and praying in St. Peter's; resolutely he renounced nepotism in his last year. After warring against the Habsburgs, Paul IV was "respectfully defeated" by the duke of Alba. Surprised by the moderation of Habsburg terms, the pope relented a bit of his enmity. He died on August 18, 1559.

(5) PIUS IV (1559–65)

Gian-Angelo Medici (1499–1565) was chosen in December, 1559, by a conclave seeking a character diametrically opposed to that of Paul IV. The new pontiff was mild, cultured, and not overly energetic. There might have been a reversion to Medicean Humanism had not Pius's moderate nepotism included the promotion of St. Charles Borromeo (1538–84) as cardinal secretary. Pope and cardinal thereupon collaborated in a fruitful pontificate.

Consolidation of reform was sought by Pius IV and Borromeo in reassembling the Council of Trent and conducting it to a successful

conclusion. The Tridentine decrees, approved by Pius IV, could now begin their work of leavening, labor in which St. Charles Borromeo took the lead in his see of Milan. The pope had to curb the Caraffa relatives, but issued an amnesty for political prisoners, and restored cordial diplomatic relations with Catholic states. Well-beloved and well-served, Pius IV died on December 9, 1565.

C. Post-Tridentine Period (1566–85)

(1) St. Pius V (1566–72)

Cardinal Michele Ghislieri (1504–72) was elected on January 7, 1566, largely through the influence of St. Charles Borromeo. The Church has officially testified that St. Charles's confidence in his candidate was not misplaced. Like Pius X four centuries later, this Dominican cardinal—from whose pontificate dates the papal white cassock—was a poor boy who reached the papal throne after a distinguished and faithful career in lesser clerical offices.

Reform measures. St. Pius provided the greatest stimulus to reform by the power of his own example. Resolutely he opposed granting of excessive dispensations to the higher clergy. He carefully supervised episcopal residence and parochial care of souls. He strove for harmony between the secular and regular clergy, and resisted the abuses in patronage and usurpations of clerical rights and property. As well as he could, he sustained St. Charles at Milan against the Spanish court, in-sisted on Carranza's surrender by the king to Roman judgment, and delayed the grant of tithes to enforce compliance from Philip II. St. Pius supported St. Peter Canisius in his patient heroism in the revival of German Catholicity, and exacted oaths of obedience from bishops and professors. Not only was the pope personally diligent in Rome in the care of souls, but he secured prompt revision and publication of the most needed ecclesiastical books, the missal, breviary, and catechism.

Theocratic twilight. In the ancient theocratic tradition St. Pius V in 1568 ordered annual public reading of the document, *In Cena Domini.* This pronounced excommunication upon all heretics, schismatics, con-fiscators of church property, and monarchs in league with heretics or infidels. It was unfavorably received by absolute monarchs intent on national or personal aggrandizement by any means. Fearing a reversion to the spirit of *Unam Sanctam,* Catholic princes largely disregarded *In Cena Domini* down to its revocation on the eve of the French Revolu-tion. Had it been sustained, however, prelatial subservience would not have degenerated into Gallicanism and Febronianism. A concrete in-stance of St. Pius's resort to theocratic weapons is his deposition of Elizabeth of England; its utter failure revealed that theocratic prestige

was nearly gone. Neither could he effect the recall of the oppressive *Monarchia Sicula* from Philip II as monarch of the Two Sicilies.

Naval crusade. St. Pius organized the crusade which turned back a Turkish advance to Italy and the central Mediterranean. Through his legate Commendone, the pope kept Emperor Maximilian II in line and urged him to defend Hungary against the Mohammedans. Philip II of Spain financed and organized, with aid from the papal and Venetian fleets, the flotilla which Don Juan of Austria and Marc Antonio Colonna led to victory at Lepanto, October 7, 1571. The feast of the Holy Rosary commemorates this triumph. Having given the Catholic Reformation an impetus that it never again wholly lost, St. Pius V died on May 1, 1572.

(2) GREGORY XIII (1572-85)

Ugo Buoncompagni (1502-85) was selected as St. Pius's successor on May 13. The new pope presented a considerable contrast to his predecessor. His early life had been immoral and his clerical career had been somewhat lax. As pope, however, he strove to reform his life, and his pontificate merits no grave censure, although he himself winced before the rigorous standards of St. Charles Borromeo.

Reform. Gregory XIII was an able canonist and his reforms were more of a curial than parochial nature. He was instrumental in establishing or reorganizing twenty-three colleges throughout Europe. At Rome he developed the Jesuit College into a truly international university. He aided the German and English colleges for the relief of Catholics in Protestant-dominated areas. For the Oriental Church, he displayed a new solicitude, setting up Greek and Maronite institutes, together with a printing press for the eastern languages. Through his efforts appeared revised editions of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* (1582) and the *Martyrologium Romanum*. Nor was secular learning neglected: the present calendar bears his name since he gave authoritative currency to the reform of the Julian Calendar, then ten days in arrears, by Luigi Lilio and Clavius.

Temporal administration. The pope also devoted considerable care to the promotion of art and architecture at Rome. Financial penury and the needs of social justice, however, induced him to attempt the reduction of feudalism throughout the Pontifical States by reappropriating castles, lands, and other properties from such nobles as had failed to render their obligatory service. In his effort to create a modernized government for the papal temporalities, however, Pope Gregory XIII was largely unsuccessful. During his pontificate rebellion became chronic: an estimated fifteen thousand brigands were at large and the temporal administration had nearly broken down when Gregory died, April 10, 1585. Yet his innovations, experiments, and very mistakes in temporal

administration indicated the way for his successor's vigorous restoration of order.

Conclusion. In terminating the discussion of papal reform leadership at the year 1585, it is not meant to imply that the work of reform did not continue at the papal court during the succeeding pontificates. But by this time the most glaring abuses had been corrected, and during the next period of papal administration, while the prosecution of reform measures remained important, stress may be shifted to the militant Catholic revival, sometimes called the Counter Reformation. The foregoing, moreover, is intended merely as a survey or listing of the chief changes in some chronological order; more detailed treatment of various types of reform will follow in the next topics.

33. TRIDENTINE REFORM

A. *Conciliar Proceedings (1545–64)*

(1) First Period (1545–47): Sessions 1 to 10

Convocation. After papal diplomacy had overcome a decade of disheartening obstacles, wars and national jealousies, and after attempts to convene at Mantua and Vicenza had fallen through, an ecumenical council opened at Trent, a Tyrolese town on the German-Italian frontier. On the day of convocation, December 13, 1545, there were present besides the papal legates, Cardinals Del Monte, Cervini, and Pole, only four archbishops, twenty-one bishops, five superiors-general, three abbots, and some fifty theologians and canonists.

Organization. It was decided that three commissions of theologians and canonists were to prepare schemata of subjects for discussion. Their proposals were then to be discussed by general congregations of bishops, and the conclusions of the latter were to be formally voted on in the public sessions. Unlike Constance and Basle, voting was to be by individuals, and definitive suffrage was restricted to cardinals, bishops, religious generals, and certain abbots. Angelo Massarelli (1510–66) remained secretary throughout all the sessions. The second session of January 7, 1546, revealed disagreement as to the order of discussion. Though the pope wished to give precedence to doctrinal matters, the emperor sought priority for disciplinary questions likely to conciliate the Protestants. After much argument, a compromise was reached to take up some dogmatic and a few disciplinary topics at each session. It was with some difficulty, moreover, that the council was induced to reject the formula proposed by Bishop Martelli, *universalem Ecclesiam repraesentans,* as savoring too much of conciliarism. Papal direction through the cardinal legates, if at times heatedly challenged, remained a reality during the conciliar sessions.

Discussions. Before papal-imperial disagreement suspended the first

period of deliberations, the Tridentine Council endorsed the Nicene Creed and Latin Vulgate, defined the nature of original sin and its justification, began a doctrinal review of the sacraments, and laid down decrees regarding preaching, episcopal residence, and benefices. Seripando's "double justification" theory, partly extrinsic and partly intrinsic, was rejected by the bishops who followed the Thomistic Jesuit theologians, Lainez and Salmeron, in favor of true intrinsic justification. But when Bishop Martelli attacked the independence of religious preachers, Seripando, while conceding the primary rights of the ordinaries, defended the orders and obtained a compromise granting regulars virtual freedom in their own churches, but requiring episcopal license to preach in secular parishes. Some of the most heated debates concerned not so much episcopal duty of residence as the nature of the obligation, whether of divine or ecclesiastical law. Implicit in this question—which was never definitively settled—was the further dispute whether bishops received their jurisdiction immediately from Christ, or mediately through the Roman pontiff. The discussions of the first period, transferred to Bologna in April, 1547, practically ended the following June as the papal-imperial disagreements became acute.

(2) SECOND PERIOD (1551–52): SESSIONS 11 TO 16

Deliberations. By summons from the new Pope Julius III, the Tridentine Council reassembled on May 1, 1551, under the presidency of Cardinal Crescenzio as chief legate. French objections to the continuity of the council and delay in the arrival of the bishops prevented serious business until October. Then the assembled fathers issued important dogmatic decrees regarding the Holy Eucharist and penance and extreme unction, and various points of clerical discipline were discussed. But Maurice of Saxony's rebellion prorogued the council in April, 1552, and it was not reassembled for a decade.

(3) THIRD PERIOD (1562–63): SESSIONS 17 TO 25

Reform crisis. Though summoned back to session by Pius IV in November, 1560, the council did not actually reopen until January, 1562, with Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga as chief legate. Before and after convocation lengthy disputes went on between imperialists and French partisans as to whether Trent's new sessions ought to be considered a new council or not. Catherine de' Medici, the French regent, finally abandoned demands for a revision of the decrees of the preceding periods, and permitted the French hierarchy to participate. To the pope's alarm, the two leading legates, Gonzaga and Seripando, allowed Archbishop Guerero to reopen the heated discussion on episcopal residence. When a bloc of fifty-five French, Spanish, and Imperialist prelates demanded

vindication of episcopal jurisdiction *jure divino,* discussions verged on conciliarism. After both Cardinals Gonzaga and Seripando had died of their exertions, a deadlock was reached in March, 1563. Pius IV then named Cardinal Morone, but recently freed from the prison of Paul IV, chief legate. This experienced and tactful diplomat quickly repaired his predecessors' well-meaning blunders. Conciliarism was rejected by all— *pace* Guerrero—and the troublesome but academic question of the source of the obligation of episcopal residence shelved. The conciliar fathers could then resume work on the doctrine and discipline of the sacraments: the Holy Eucharist, holy orders, and matrimony. During a final two-day session, December 3–4, 1563, the council at last got around to indulgences, along with purgatory and invocation of saints. Doctrinally Trent ended where Luther began, with the question of indulgences. Then a vote of *placet* was given by 255 members of the council to the papal dissolution of the council—though Guerrero insisted that the decrees needed no papal confirmation.

Confirmation came nonetheless on January 26, 1564, when by the bull *Benedictus Deus* Pius IV approved the conciliar decrees. A profession of faith was prepared for subscription by all bishops and professors. Promulgation of the Tridentine decrees followed immediately in Italy. Philip II seconded by publishing them in his own dominions "insofar as not derogatory to royal authority." Portugal and Poland adopted them in 1564 without reservation. Emperor Maximilian II ratified the decrees for Germany in 1566, but the French monarchy held out, and the decrees were not promulgated in France until 1615, and then by hierarchical initiative. In Protestant countries promulgation was impossible, giving rise to certain differences in matrimonial discipline. But the labors and disappointments of nineteen years had resulted in a thoroughgoing reform for the universal Church, "in head and members."

B. Tridentine Doctrinal Decrees

(1) FONTS OF REVELATION

Holy Scripture was declared a primary source, but as contained in the canonical books explicitly enumerated by the council. These included the deutero-canonical books rejected by the Protestants as *apocrypha.* Authentic expression of Holy Writ was to be found in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. Though this was declared without error in faith and morals, the council did not deny that other discrepancies might have been introduced by copyists, and directed that these be eradicated as much as possible in a new authentic version.

Tradition, as found in patristic writings and the decrees of popes and councils, was declared the only legitimate guide to scriptural interpreta-

tion, to the exclusion of private judgment not in harmony with it. Scholastic theology was not to be repudiated but reformed according to the norms of St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica,* placed on the same table in the council with the Bible and the Sacred Canons.

(2) SUPERNATURAL ORDER

Original sin was defined in accord with tradition: Canon 1 stated that Adam lost original justice, incurring death and concupiscence by an original sin. Canon 2 asserted that Adam's sin had passed to his posterity, just as original justice would have been transmitted had he remained faithful. Canon 3 defined that baptism alone removes original sin, individually possessed by every son of Adam. Canon 4 asserted that infants have original sin so that they must be baptized, though canon 5 stated that baptism truly and completely removed sins and did not merely cover them over; concupiscence surviving baptism is not original sin. Canon 6 excepted the Blessed Virgin Mary from the foregoing declarations, although her immaculate conception was not then defined in order to avoid contemporary theological controversies.

Justification is of God with man's free co-operation. It effects a true remission of sin, and not a mere extrinsic imputation of justice. Justification also involves positive infusion of grace and virtues. Of these virtues, faith alone cannot justify without hope and charity, nor can it afford assurance of salvation which, without special private revelation, is granted to none in this life. Grace is an indispensable and sufficient principle of supernatural life which man can use or abuse. It is gratuitous in its initial bestowal and final preservation by perseverance, although man can, with grace, merit an increase of it. Grace is lost by mortal sin, though faith is driven out only by infidelity. Grace is given to all, and not merely to the elect, so that there is no positive reprobation to hell independently of man's deserts. With grace, man can work out his salvation, though he cannot render himself sinless. Lost grace can be regained through penance, though purgatorial punishment may be necessary. Human co-operation in no way derogates from Christ's universal and all-sufficient redemptive work.

(3) SACRAMENTAL CHANNELS OF GRACE

The sacraments are means of justification instituted by Christ to the number of seven expressly enumerated. They are efficacious independently of the faith and virtue, though not of the intention of the minister. They confer grace *ex opere operato* on all who do not place an obstacle, without prejudice to grace *ex opere operantis* according to the dispositions of the recipient. Three designated sacraments confer an indelible character and therefore cannot be repeated. The sacraments, then, are

not merely signs of the grace or devotion excited in the recipient, but true instruments, and in certain cases, indispensable means and causes of grace by divine power. Their administration is not in all cases common to all Christians, nor are the liturgical usages accompanying their bestowal merely optional.

Baptism, distinct from that of John the Baptist, was instituted by Christ as a necessary means for the salvation of all, infants or adults. When rightly administered with natural water and the invocation of the Holy Trinity—even by heretics—it remits all sin to those properly disposed, and cannot be repeated.

Confirmation is a true sacrament, distinct from that of baptism, instituted by Christ and not by the Church. Its ordinary minister is a bishop and not a simple priest; like baptism, it cannot be repeated.

The Holy Eucharist is a true sacrament in which Christ's body and blood are really and substantially contained together with His divinity. Christ is whole and entire under both species of bread and wine, and in each of their parts. The substances of bread and wine are wholly changed into Christ's body and blood in what is aptly termed "transubstantiation."

The Mass is a true sacrifice, unbloody image of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary, offered to God by the apostles and their successors in the priesthood. It applies the merits of Christ's Passion to the living and the dead in a way not prejudicial to the sacrifice on Calvary. The rites of the Church contain no doctrinal error and are to be preserved.

Penance was instituted for the remission of sins committed after baptism in the words, "Whose sins you shall forgive, etc." Absolution is a judicial act imparted only by a validly ordained priest having jurisdiction, though not necessarily in the state of grace. A penitent is required to have supernatural sorrow, make a reasonably complete confession of unconfessed mortal sins as far as possible under the circumstances, and perform satisfaction for the temporal punishment usually remaining. Auricular confession is necessary by divine right and truly remits sin. The Church also has the power to retain sins, and her bishops to reserve cases.

Extreme Unction is a true sacrament, instituted by Christ, insinuated by St. Mark (6:13) and promulgated by St. James (5:14). It removes from the soul remaining effects of sins already forgiven, and gives special grace to those mortally sick. If necessary, it can remit sin; if expedient, it can restore health. The matter is olive oil blessed by the bishop, and its form consists in prayers used in applying the matter to the different senses by the priest, who is the ordinary minister of this sacrament.

Holy Orders were instituted by Christ at the Last Supper when He

constituted the apostles priests in the words, "Do this for a commemoration of Me," to offer the Eucharist. The hierarchy of bishops, priests, and ministers is divinely instituted. Bishops are superior to priests and have power to ordain and confirm. Priestly character is indelible. Other orders in the Church are preparatory grades to the priesthood.

Matrimony is a true sacrament instituted by Christ and subject accordingly to the Church rather than the state. A consummated valid marriage is indissoluble save by death, and bigamy is rejected by the divine law. The Church may place impedient and diriment impediments, dissolve a merely ratified marriage and grant separation without divorce. But the Church's traditional interpretation of the prohibition of dissolution in case of adultery must be maintained. Though good and licit, matrimony is not to be regarded as a state superior to virginity.

(4) CERTAIN CHALLENGED DOCTRINES

Purgatory really exists and its tenants can be helped by prayer, especially by the sacrifice of the Mass. While preachers should exhort the faithful to believe in its purgative character, they ought to avoid subtle questions regarding its nature.

Veneration of saints is licit and profitable, and Masses in their honor are no derogation to the adoration due God alone, nor to the unique redemptive work of Christ. Relics of the saints are justly honored. Sacred images have no intrinsic power, but should be honored as a mark of respect to the prototype. Abuses will be avoided by following ecclesiastical tradition.

Indulgences. The power of granting indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church and she has exercised it from ancient times. Hence, the council teaches and directs that the practice of granting indulgences be continued, and anathematizes those who deny her power or who contend that indulgences are useless.

C. Tridentine Disciplinary Decrees

(1) THE HIERARCHY

Episcopal selection. Though the episcopate is of divine institution, it is recognized that the choice of bishops and cardinals pertains to the pope, who can likewise depose them, especially for contumacy in regard to the decree on residence. The Holy See is requested to choose as cardinals worthy men from every nation. In the case of vacant sees where the Holy See has granted the privilege of election, the chapter shall act prudently and disinterestedly. Care must be taken to examine the qualifications of candidates, and a faithful attestation of the nominee's merits should be sent to the Holy See for confirmation. Consecration is to be received within three months.

Episcopal residence. Bishops, including cardinals, patriarchs, and archbishops having the care of souls, are obliged to reside in their dioceses at least nine months in the year, and always during Advent and Lent unless legitimately excused. Unexcused absence for six continuous months would cause the offender to forfeit a quarter of his revenues, and further penalties, including deposition, were provided for continued defiance. Though Archbishop Guerrero had heatedly debated whether the obligation of residence was derived from divine or ecclesiastical law, the council made no decision.

Episcopal visitation. Pastoral vigilance was to be exercised by bishops in visiting their dioceses every two years to inquire into observance of discipline and reformation of morals. Even exempt religious were subjected to this canonical visitation, for which detailed norms were laid down. Provided the bishop did not transgress diocesan limits, his judgment must prevail, with appeal only to the Holy See whose prerogative it is to judge bishops. Hospitals and other foundations are to be visited as well and their stewards obliged to render an account.

Administration. Bishops are personally bound to preach, and if legitimately excused, to provide worthy substitutes. They are not to ordain in another diocese, nor ordain a subject of another bishop, without permission. They ought to examine candidates for ordination and benefices, provide a title of ordination with adequate support, observe the canonical age, and issue dimissorial letters gratis. They are to assign definite boundaries to parishes and supervise their administration. They alone shall approve both regulars and seculars for preaching and hearing confessions of seculars within the diocese. Diocesan synods are to be held annually, and unless there is legitimate excuse, provincial councils ought to assemble every three years—extended to twenty years by canon 283 of the 1918 Code.

(2) SECULAR CLERGY

Benefices. None shall receive a benefice unless fourteen years of age. The beneficiary must receive tonsure and wear the clerical garb. He shall be subject to the decree on residence, especially if he has care of souls, and provide substitutes if legitimately excused. Benefices, especially those with care of souls, shall not be multiplied without legitimate dispensation. Expectancies shall no longer be conceded.

Parishes. None shall be promoted pastor without due inquiry into his qualifications, nor without the ordinary's approbation. Those not in holy orders shall have no voice in cathedral or collegiate chapters. All shall wear the clerical garb under penalty of suspension and give an example of holy life. Due regard must be had to conscientious ministry, especially in regard to teaching catechism and giving homilies on Sunday.

Grave crimes will merit degradation, and concubinage will be punished by forfeiture of revenues, suspension, or even excommunication.

Seminaries are to be erected for the proper training of clerics in every diocese; where this is impossible, regional institutes shall be provided. Clerics shall be so trained from the age of twelve, having received tonsure and clerical attire. Only legitimate children shall be accepted—it had been a favorite device to pawn off illegitimate children on the Church as a sort of foundling hospital. Clerics are to be recruited from the poor who can read and write and display an inclination for the clerical state. They should make their way through successive classes. Bishops are to supervise their seminaries through a capable rector and two canons of proven life. For the seminary's support, the bishop may levy a special tax on all benefices, secular and religious, except those of the mendicants and the military orders.

(3) Religious Observance

Regular clerics should reside in their houses under pain of episcopal correction and should adhere strictly to their vows and rules. They ought not to be professed until they have completed a year of probation and attained the age of sixteen. Secular servants, huntsmen, buffoons, etc., must go, and begging vagrants must be regulated. Monasteries are no longer to be held *in commendam*. Abbots, once regularly elected, may confer minor orders on their subjects, but in external functions, such as preaching and administering the sacraments, even exempt religious are subject to the bishop's regulations. No religious house shall be erected without his leave, and all are in varying degrees subject to his visitation. Diocesan fasts and censures should be observed. Monastic superiors are also to be diligent in correcting abuses by visitation, and this without delay.

Nuns shall observe strict enclosure, and all, even those immediately subject to the Holy See, are liable to episcopal visitation. Abuses noted above in regard to monasteries must be abolished also in convents. Girls under twelve should not be admitted to profession, nor forced into the convent. Nuns should confess and communicate at least monthly, and extraordinary confessors ought to be provided for all. Profession shall not take place without previous examination by the ordinary. None shall be elected abbess who is not thirty years old and five years professed; no abbess shall rule two convents. The Eucharist is to be reserved in the public church and not in the choir.

(4) Lay Discipline

Clandestine marriage was banned by the decree, *Tametsi,* which required that Catholics must be married before the pastor of the contract-

ing parties and two witnesses. Regulations were made for marriage of vagrants, and impediments revised. Ecclesiastical authority over Christian marriage cases was reaffirmed and public sinners might be liable to condign penance.

Patronage was restricted as much as possible, and rights of presentation to benefices subjected to episcopal veto. None might be granted patronage in future unless they established an entirely new foundation. Usurpers of ecclesiastical patronage and property were subject to deprivation of their presumed rights and to excommunication. Princes in particular were forbidden to interfere with ecclesiastical jurisdiction, though Cardinal Morone sadly acknowledged: "They are men, not angels. We must deal with the princes as with the heretics: lead them by good example and not by threats, proceeding in all things with wisdom, piety, and Christian prudence."

Other precepts affecting the laity were the censorship of books, the regulation of feasts and fasts, the threat of public penance for public sinners, the enforcement of payment of tithes under penalty of excommunication, and the strict prohibition of dueling.

The fathers who had provided this thorough review of ecclesiastical doctrine and discipline were justified in responding "Amen" to the final ruling from the conciliar president: "Go in peace."

34. CLERICAL TRIDENTINE EXECUTION

A. *Repression of Heresy*

(1) THE INQUISITION

Roman tribunal. By the bull, *Licet Ab Initio* (1542), Pope Paul III had revived the dormant medieval inquisition and had subjected it to a commission of cardinals under papal personal presidency. St. Pius V, who had headed this Holy Office as a cardinal, extended its powers, and Sixtus V in 1587 made it the first of his reorganized fifteen curial congregations. None were exempt from this tribunal: Paul IV arraigned before it Cardinal Morone, and St. Pius V tried Archbishop Carranza, the primate of Toledo. Procedure was basically the same as in the medieval papal inquisition, and execution was still committed to the secular power. But renaissance princes, unlike their medieval predecessors, had to be restrained rather than stimulated in the use of the inquisition against religious dissent. Throughout Italy the civil authorities were generally amenable to Rome, though Venice acted with an independence comparable to the conduct of the Spanish monarchy. The most notorious victim of the Roman Inquisition was Giordano Bruno (1548–1600), an apostate priest burned at the stake for pantheistic and anti-Christian, indeed, antimoral teachings. The scientist Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) was imprisoned more for disobedience and temerity than

for his scientific views, though the prudence of the curial decision left much to be desired. But as the Church's position became more secure in the Italian peninsula, the Roman Inquisition ceased to exact the death penalty and evolved into the modern Holy Office.

Spanish prosecution of heresy, however, was somewhat more rigorous. The nature and origin of this tribunal has already been treated. Despite his compromising policy toward German Lutherans, Emperor Charles V was an ardent advocate of the use of the Inquisition in Spain and the Netherlands. Yet he reproached himself on his deathbed for excessive leniency and charged his son and heir, Philip II, to root out heresy. Philip himself directed a roundup of heretical leaders from 1557, and on his return to Spain in 1559 conducted five *autos-da-fé* within two years. Melchior Cano preached at the first of these, at which fourteen were condemned to death. Similar scenes were enacted to the end of the century, after which Protestantism seems to have been stamped out in Spain. Refugees fled to Italy, but often went on to Germany, Switzerland, or Poland, where discipline was milder. Use of the Spanish inquisitorial system in the Netherlands, however, finally provided one of the causes of the Dutch revolt.

(2) THE INDEX

The **Index of Forbidden Books** was an adjunct of the Roman Inquisition. Though prohibitive measures had been taken since the fifth century, the invention of printing required revised legislation. Pope Alexander VI was the first to take action (1501) by the bull, *Inter Multiplices*. The first printed Index appeared at Venice in 1543. In pursuance of a Tridentine decree, a curial commission revised this list and published rules for enforcement. Pius IV promulgated the revised Index in 1564 and Pius V named a supervisory board in 1571. These regulations remained substantially intact until 1897 when Leo XIII undertook a complete revision.

B. Clerical Reform

(1) MILANESE MODEL

St. **Charles Borromeo** (1538–84), though pious from boyhood, began his career as a typical renaissance ecclesiastical aristocrat. In youth he held abbeys in trust; at the age of twenty-two he was named cardinal by his uncle, Pius IV, and before ordination to the priesthood was made archbishop of Milan and secretary of state. It is typical of the yet but partially regenerate times that when his elder brother died in 1562, the cardinal was expected to resign, marry, and become Count Borromeo. St. Charles, however, made a definitive choice of the ecclesiastical state by receiving priestly ordination and episcopal consecration. He now

bethought himself of the decree of episcopal residence, so often a dead letter in the past. Though his uncle would not spare him, St. Pius V permitted St. Charles to take up permanent residence in Milan.

The Milanese situation was similar to that of many dioceses. Milan had not so much as seen a resident ordinary for some sixty years, and this neglect had been enervating for the clergy. St. Charles found clerics being educated in universities, living alone in boarding houses like secular students. Even at that, such clerics were likely to become professors, curial officials or court chaplains. The rank and file of the parochial clergy were trained in parish rectories, receiving such education as the learning, time, and whim of the pastor might give them. Vocations were too often decided by parents who assigned sons to the Church irrespective of their inclinations or qualifications. Though most of these might acquiesce to the parental disposition for sheer need of livelihood, they seldom gave more than a minimum of attention to their unwanted calling.

The Borromean reform took the shape of giving practical effect to the Tridentine decree on seminaries. A series of synods introduced this clerical reform to the great Milanese province that embraced northern Italy and parts of Switzerland. Not content with being the first bishop actually to set up a seminary, St. Charles led the way in working out the details of administration. He provided spiritual direction to train seminarians in the daily practice of mental prayer, examination of conscience, mortification, and frequentation of the sacraments. Each student was obliged to make a retreat and general confession on entrance, each year of his course, and before receiving sacred orders. St. Charles was inflexible in overcoming opposition from canons and pastors. Religious claimed exemption from the seminary tax and one of the Humiliati fired at him. Though the powder burn was seen and the impact felt, the saint suffered no harm—not so the Humiliati, who were suppressed by the Holy See. Personal visitation of his diocese took St. Charles even to the Alpine hamlets. Despite the hardships of his pastoral duties, this "Iron Man" practiced severe voluntary mortification and even St. Peter Canisius once pleaded off accompanying him. During the Great Plague in Milan St. Charles's ministrations attained heroism. Through a tireless episcopate of nearly twenty years he proved conclusively that the Tridentine reform could be put into execution, and need not remain a dead letter like so many previous conciliar decrees.

(2) SPREAD OF SEMINARIES

Pope Gregory XIII (1502–85) has already been noted as providing good example in establishing various institutes for the training of the clergy. Not only did he form the Jesuit Roman College into an inter-

national university, but he set up national houses to train clerics for missions among Western heretics or Oriental schismatics.

Bartolomeo Fernández (1514–90), usually known as *A Martyribus*, was archbishop of Braga in Portugal from 1558. A Tridentine father and a friend and correspondent of St. Charles, this zealous Dominican labored for the introduction of the conciliar decrees in his diocese, and set up the first Portuguese seminary.

Reginald Pole (1500–58), last Catholic archbishop of Canterbury, was preparing to establish a seminary as the culmination of his restoration revival when he died. Elizabethan persecution made native institutions impossible, but Cardinal William Allen (1532–94) carried on the work of training English missionaries at his foundation at Douay from 1567.

The Jesuits, besides the Collegium Germanicum at Rome, also established or organized pontifical seminaries at Vienna, Gratz and Olmütz, all Habsburg towns. Between 1556 and 1604, moreover, they erected sixteen colleges in Germany and Bohemia, before going on to Poland and Hungary. While all of these institutions were not primarily for clerical training, they did contribute directly or indirectly to that end.

Charles of Lorraine (1524–74), Cardinal archbishop of Rheims, and captain of the French delegation at Trent, set up a seminary at Rheims in 1567, and several other French bishops followed his example. But the disasters of the Huguenot Wars and the hostility of the French court toward promulgation of the Tridentine decrees destroyed these promising beginnings.

Pierre de Berulle (1575–1629), cardinal and founder of the French Oratory, provided the lasting stimulus to French clerical reform. His conferences to priests inspired the introduction of the Tridentine decrees by action of the French hierarchy in 1615, and persuaded many holy priests to specialize in the establishment of seminaries. At one time or another Berulle had under his guidance St. Vincent de Paul (1580–1660), St. John Eudes (1601–80), Jean Olier (1608–57), Charles de Condren (1588–1641), and Adrian Bourdoise (1584–1665). Of these, St. Vincent founded a minor seminary at the College des Bons Enfants in 1636, and developed a major seminary by 1642, though he had conducted clerical conferences at St. Lazare from 1633. His Congregation of the Mission continued his work. Father de Condren and St. John Eudes co-operated in a seminary which opened at Caen in 1643, and Father Olier began the justly famous St. Sulpice in 1643. Adrian Bourdoise was something of a fanatic for immediate results by the experimental method: he established a clerical school in his parish of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet. Sometimes, however, he tended to exalt the secular priesthood by belittling monasticism, whereas the Sulpicians,

Eudists, and Vincentians stressed the Tridentine spirit of co-operation between the secular and regular clergy.

C. Re-evangelization of Europe

(1) ITALY

The Oratory of Divine Love seems to have been founded at Genoa in 1497, but was transferred to Rome where its statutes were approved by Leo X in 1514. Inspired by St. Cajetan, it became the parent of many reform movements, such as the Theatine Congregation and the Confraternity of Charity, both of which were set up in 1519.

Gian-Matteo Giberti (1495–1543), illegitimate son of a Genoese admiral, became a protégé of the Medici: from 1512 he was employed as Humanist and papal diplomat. In 1524 he joined the Theatine Society and became bishop of Verona, though retained in the Roman curia as datary. After the Sack of Rome in 1527 he overcame all obstacles to taking up residence in his see. There he prompted clerical and liturgical reforms, while as a member of Clementine and Pauline reform commissions, he anticipated many of the Tridentine measures.

St. Philip Neri (1515–95), yet to be treated as a religious founder, deserves mention here as "second apostle" of Rome. Advisor of popes, missionaries, and religious founders, he was patriarch of the Tridentine reform movement among both clergy and laity of Rome. Everywhere his practical charity extended: holding conferences for priests, preaching and hearing confessions, visiting hospitals and workshops, supplying the needs of the poor, instructing the young, finding work for the unemployed. Among his friends were St. Michele Ghislieri, later Pius V, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Ignatius Loyola, and St. Camillus de Lellis.

(2) GERMANY

St. Peter Canisius (1521–97) was foremost among zealous missionaries who saved half of Germany for the Faith. Though but one of many Jesuit confreres, he, too, merits the title of a "second apostle." Born at Nijmegen, Holland, and trained at Cologne and Louvain, he became a Jesuit in 1543. After his ordination in 1546, he assisted in the theological and diplomatic work of the first period of Trent. His German apostolate began in 1549 at the Bavarian University of Ingolstadt. Within five years he was the most influential man in Germany: teacher and rector at Ingolstadt and Vienna, preacher extraordinary, confessor and advisor of emperors and Catholic magnates, consultor at the imperial diets, papal theologian at Trent, administrator of the diocese of Vienna for a year, founder of parish sodalities—all this in the Swiss cantons as well as Germany proper. His polemical tracts met every attack, and his

catechisms came in all sizes. His intervention was paramount in averting the apostasy of the Lutheranizing Emperor Maximilian II, a defection which might have entailed that of all of central Europe. St. Peter Canisius, hard-working rather than brilliant, was an example capable of imitation, and he was imitated.

(3) SWITZERLAND-SAVOY-FRANCE

St. Francis de Sales (1567–1622) made his influence felt in the Calvinist stronghold, whence it expanded to France as well. From his sacerdotal ordination in 1593 he preached in the smallest towns and after disheartening beginnings won thousands back from Calvinism. In 1599 he became coadjutor-bishop of Geneva and succeeded to the see in 1602. Resident at Annecy, he yet converted two of the Calvinist leaders, Poncet and D'Avully, and even shook the resolution of Beza momentarily. Though unable to establish a seminary, St. Francis tried to reform his clergy, and encouraged Cardinal de Berulle and others. His mildness became proverbial, and it had lasting influence upon the laity in writing, preaching, and spiritual direction.

St. Vincent de Paul (1580–1660) was by common consent the central figure of the French Reformation, for his all-embracing charity and gift of organization were called upon to head or assist in most of the projects of his day. Chaplain in the houses of ex-Queen Margaret and Madame de Gondi, he was permitted periods of parochial activity by his spiritual advisor, De Berulle. His apostolate to the poor began with a mission sermon on the De Gondi estates in 1617. The next year he began the organization of the Ladies of Charity, who enlisted the nobility and the gentry in the needs of the poor. In 1622 St. Francis de Sales committed to him the direction of St. Jane de Chantal's Visitandine Nuns. It was in 1625 that St. Vincent founded his own Congregation of the Mission to conduct retreats for priests in addition to missions among the poor country people. Under his guidance developed the Tuesday Conferences for zealous secular priests of Paris and the neighborhood. Seminaries were undertaken while the central house of St. Lazare became a "Noe's Ark" for every sort of charitable undertaking. With St. Louise de Marillac, he organized in 1632 the Daughters of Charity, first of the modern sisterhoods working in the world. Queen Anne named him to the Council of Conscience, which passed upon royal prelatial nominations; he was also by royal commission chaplain of the galley slaves, and director of relief for devastated provinces. He acted as mediator during the Fronde and will reappear as the foe of Jansenism. Though mentor of France, he refused all dignities and died a model of humility and charity.

(4) Eastern Europe

Mention should also be made of Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius (1504–79), bishop of Ermland, Tridentine theologian, and greatest single human factor in saving Poland for the Faith. Another German, St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen (1577–1622), labored in Austria and Switzerland and became the proto-martyr of the new Roman congregation of *Propaganda Fidei.* St. Josaphat Kunceyvic (1580–1623), archbishop of Polotsk, was martyred after a successful mission among the Poles and Lithuanians of the Ruthenian Rite. In Hungary, Peter Pazmany (1570–1637), archbishop of Gran, was outstanding; in Poland, Peter Skarga (1536–1612), Jesuit missionary, had a remarkable career.

"Thus was the Catholic Reformation, here as well as on the shores of the Mediterranean, a movement towards the moral regeneration, not of the clergy alone, but of the whole of the Christian people as well; and its efforts, not unparalleled by those of Calvinist puritanism, tended to chasten the barbaric brutality of the North, no less than the pagan lasciviousness of the South." [1]

35. RELIGIOUS REFORM
A. *Résumé of Religious Communities*
(1) Pre-Reformation Developments

The history of the religious life in the Church is not necessarily an evolution from an imperfect to a more perfect state. Rather it reveals successive adaptations of Christ's evangelical counsels to changing circumstances, earlier forms continuing to flourish along with the later. The first stage was that of apostolic communism, practiced by the primitive group at Jerusalem, which held both its spiritual exercises and worldly goods in common. Never general even in the apostolic age, this type soon disappeared as the Church expanded throughout the Graeco-Roman world. Pious individuals replaced it by a domestic asceticism, wherein men or women lived a retired life amid their families, from which they would emerge only to attend the liturgical services or to perform works of charity. Among these were the virgins and widows with private vows of chastity. This mode has been continuous in the Church, reappearing in the twentieth-century secular institutes. During the third century arose the eremitical life when some Christians sought solitude in flight from persecution and paganism. It was soon followed by the cenobitical existence: hermits living in silent companionship under personal rules, though meeting for spiritual exercises. Personal monastic life appeared when cenobites subjected themselves to a com-

[1] Pierre Janelle, *The Catholic Reformation* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1949), p. 274.

mon superior. Regular monasticism differed from this merely in that the superior governed, not according to his own judgment, but by rule: that of St. Basil in the East, and that of St. Benedict in the West. The tenth-century Cluniac movement placed the hitherto autonomous monasteries under an abbot-general; this first of religious orders properly so called, was imitated by other medieval institutes, such as the Cistercians. The mendicant orders, finally, had combined monastic asceticism with a missionary apostolate.

(2) Reformation Innovations

Combination of prayer and apostolate, already attempted by the medieval Premonstratensians, became a special objective of modern religious communities in a less tranquil age. The Jesuits sacrificed choir for study and preaching, though retaining solemn vows. Religious communities of simple vows followed in which private property was regulated in its use rather than renounced. Specialization of apostolate, already manifest in the mendicants, now became more pronounced. Another variation appeared in secular communities without vows. St. Philip Neri founded his Oratory in this fashion, and its way of life was imitated by the Sulpicians and many others down to the Maryknollers of the twentieth century. Such groups remained voluntary associations of secular priests, with or without promises or oaths of stability. St. Vincent de Paul presented a compromise: a community whose members take the usual perpetual vows, yet remain technically seculars since these are not publicly accepted in the name of the Church. These variations of status have occasionally in modern times preserved various communities from the scope of anticlerical legislation, while they have afforded opportunities for utilization of many characters and talents in Christ's service.

B. Pre-Tridentine Foundations

(1) Theatines (1516)

St. Cajetan of Tiene (1480–1547) inspired the first of the newer religious communities, though its organization was largely done by the cofounder, Pietro Caraffa (1476–1559), bishop of Chieti, whose see— *Theate* in Latin—gave name to the group. Clement VII confirmed the institute on June 24, 1524. Members distributed all but essential funds to relatives and the poor, and maintained rigid, if not abject poverty. Their special work was liturgical reform, but they also gave missions and retreats. By avoiding all solicitation of funds, the Theatines acquired a reputation of being disinterested reformers in Italy, Spain, Germany, and Poland where they labored. Famous for his vow of daily progress was the Theatine, St. Andrea Avellini (1521–1608).

(2) BARNABITES (1530)

St. Anthony Zaccaria (1502–39) founded the Clerks Regular of St. Paul, usually known as Barnabites from their connection with the Church of St. Barnabas in Milan. Specializing in preaching and teaching in university cities, they, catechized throughout Italy, France, Savoy, Bohemia, and Austria. From 1527 they promoted vigorously the evolving Forty Hours' Devotion. Clement VII approved them in 1533, and they began to take solemn vows in 1535.

(3) THE SOMASCHI (1532)

St. Jerome Aemiliani (1481–1537), after a career devoted to the sick poor, especially orphans, founded a religious community to carry on this work near Somasche, Lombardy. Paul III approved them in 1540, and Pius V in 1568 transformed them into a religious order with solemn vows.

(4) THE URSULINES (1535)

St. Angela Merici (1474–1540) developed a successful method of instructing girls, although she did not gather a company of twelve young teachers at Brescia until 1535. The foundress's primitive rule was adapted by Paul III in confirming the community in 1544. Such was the looseness of organization and popularity and utility of their work that many groups called Ursulines arose, adhering to St. Angela's general aims. Leo XIII federated a hundred of these in 1900.

(5) BROTHERS HOSPITALERS (1540)

St. John of God (1495–1550), a poor Portuguese peasant of profound piety, spent much of his life trying to learn his vocation: he was shepherd, crusader, peddler of religious goods, and pilgrim penitent. About 1540, advised by the missionary Blessed John of Avila, he began to serve the sick and the poor. Two scoffers, who had scandalized Granada, became his chief assistants. The Brothers Hospitalers were still only informally organized at St. John's death, but were subsequently approved as religious by Pope Pius V in 1572.

(6) THE JESUITS (1540)

St. Ignatius Loyola (1491–1556), a wounded soldier, was attracted to Christ's service by Ludolf the Carthusian's *Life of Christ* read during convalescence. His convictions were strengthened by a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Montserrat, and a year's retreat at Manresa. The fruit of his meditations was the first outline of his *Spiritual Exercises*, a religious manual of arms. For some years St. Ignatius remained a pilgrim penitent. Denied permanent abode at Jerusalem, he returned to Spain. The

better to be of service to souls, he plodded through the equivalent of the primary, secondary, and advanced grades of education, until he won a master's degree at the University of Paris.

Companions of his charitable life at Paris proved lasting; these included his fellow Basque, St. Francis Xavier, future apostle to the Orient; Jaime Lainez and Nicolas Salmeron, the Tridentine theologians, and Blessed Pierre Favre. On the feast of the Assumption, 1534, the first seven companions bound themselves by private vows in a Montmartre chapel to corporate service of the Church. When their original design of going to Jerusalem was blocked by a Venetian-Turkish war, the ever-growing company placed themselves at the disposal of Pope Paul III. Papal approval was delayed by Cardinal Ghinucci's opposition, but numerous Jesuit Masses changed his mind so that on September 27, 1540, Pope Paul III erected the "Inigists" into the Society of Jesus by the aptly and presciently entitled bull, *Regimini Militantis Ecclesiae.*

Jesuit membership was achieved by profession, preceded by two years of novitiate—an innovation over the usual single year. After rigorous spiritual training, the candidate took the usual religious vows which, though simple, enjoyed special privileges of stability. Then followed long years in the study and teaching of the classics, and from four to six years of theology. Priestly ordination, thus usually delayed beyond the age of thirty, was followed when possible by tertianship, an advanced novitiate which added sacerdotal ministrations to the usual spiritual exercises. Then followed the classification, according to the judgment of superiors, into professed of solemn vows or spiritual coadjutors. The former constituted an aristocratic minority from whom alone officials were selected; the latter performed more routine clerical duties, assisted in turn by temporal coadjutors or lay brothers. This aristocracy reflected the *grandeza* of its Spanish founders.

Jesuit government centered in a general elected for life by the votes of the provincials and two professed members from each province. Once in office, the Jesuit general had supreme power to appoint all the superiors of the community and to supervise their work. Eventually he was given four assistants, who might constitute his council and, if need be, summon a general assembly to depose him. Jesuit traditions were fixed by remarkable early generals: St. Ignatius himself (1541–56), Jaime Lainez (1558–65), and St. Francis Borgia (1565–72). To counteract a tendency of Spain to monopolize the government, Pope Gregory XIII suggested the Belgian, Everard Mercurian, as next general (1573–80). Against him began the grumbling of a group of Iberian "Malcontents." Disaffection continued into the administration of the able Italian general, Claudio Aquaviva (1580–1615), until Paul V intervened to put an end to the Malcontents' claims to special privileges suggested by King

Philip II. Thereafter the Society was truly international. Jesuits consider Jerome Nadal (d. 1580), St. Ignatius's deputy, as a second founder by reason of his defense of the founder's ideas. Jesuit history will henceforth be prominently interwoven with that of the "Church Militant," and Jesuits would suffer much in the regalistic era from their devotion to the Holy See. Though the Society was suppressed in 1773, it was restored in 1814.

C. Post-Tridentine Foundations

(1) ORATORIANS (1564)

St. Philip Neri (1515–95) arrived in Rome about 1534. Even as a layman he was active in catechetical instruction and the organization of converts into sodalities. Not until 1551 was his diffidence overcome to receive ordination. Thereafter he became the most renowned confessor in Rome. Disciples gathered and received some organization in 1564 when he became pastor of the Church of the Florentines in Rome. In 1575 his new institute was approved by Gregory XIII as the Congregation of the Oratory, owing its name to the conference room of its first members.

The Oratorian way of life, though not formally codified until 1607, was gradually fashioned. It contemplated an association of secular priests "founded on charity and the spirit of the first Christians." Its government was the antithesis of Jesuit monarchy. Members lived without vows, retaining all their own property and providing for all needs except lodging. All, including the superior, took their turns at preaching and household chores alike. Indeed the superior was more of a chairman since no public act could be decided without approbation of a majority of the community. Each house remained independent, although, of course, St. Philip's influence was unique.

The French Oratory was therefore a distinct society. It was established by Pierre de Berulle (1575–1629) in Paris in 1611. He followed St. Philip's ascetical principles, but the French Oratorians were federated. The French Oratory promoted the Tridentine reforms and influenced many religious leaders.

(2) OBLATES (1578)

St. Charles Borromeo (1538–84) organized the Oblates of St. Ambrose at Milan in 1578 on the Oratorian model. Members were of the diocesan clergy who placed themselves especially at the bishop's disposal for giving retreats, preaching missions, and teaching in schools. Gregory XIII sanctioned their rule in 1579. By their very nature as local auxiliaries they were imitated in other dioceses.

(3) CAMILLANS (1584)

St. Camillus de Lellis (1550–1614), ex-soldier and inveterate gambler, turned, about 1570, to divine service. In 1584 he had organized the "Fathers of a Good Death" who received papal approbation in 1586. The members took a special vow to devote themselves to the sick, including the plague-stricken. St. Camillus gave them an example of tireless self-sacrifice, and his followers included many martyrs of charity.

(4) DOCTRINAIRES (1592)

Cesare de Bus (1544–1607), another ex-soldier and a penitent cleric, devoted himself to preaching and catechizing. In 1592 he founded the Secular Priests of Christian Doctrine near Avignon. This group received papal sanction in 1597 and expanded into Italy.

(5) PIARISTS (1597)

St. Joseph Calasanctius (1556–1648), for a time an associate of St. Camillus, was later inspired to establish the Congregation of Pious Schools. His was a group of priests devoting themselves to providing a good Christian education for the poor. Though St. Joseph was victimized by factions and died in apparent disgrace, his prediction of his Society's expansion was fulfilled.

(6) VISITANDINES (1610)

St. Jane de Chantal (1572–1641) under the guidance of St. Francis de Sales established the Congregation of the Visitation at Annecy. Their original purpose was to visit and help the poor and sick, but this innovation of nuns outside the cloister provoked such criticism that St. Francis deemed it prudent to reconstitute the community in 1618 as a cloistered order. Thereafter the nuns concerned themselves with contemplative prayer and the teaching of girls, ever subject to the local ordinary.

(7) DAUGHTERS OF CHARITY (1633)

St. Louise de Marillac (1591–1660), under the direction of St. Vincent de Paul, found it possible to realize St. Jane's original intention. Peasant girls were banded together to assist the Ladies of Charity in the service of the poor, and developed into a community of religious women known as the Daughters of Charity (1633). They continue under the direction of St. Vincent's successor, and constitute with the Congregation of the Mission (1617), the Double Family of St. Vincent.

(8) SULPICIANS (1642)

Jean Jacques Olier (1608–57) graduated from the French Oratory to become pastor of the Church of St. Sulpice in Paris. This declining parish he transformed into one of the most active and fervent. To staff his works he established a seminary, and to conduct the latter founded in 1642 the Society which has taken its name from the parish. Sulpicians were organized into a community of secular priests without vows, who eventually specialized in seminary work. Special emphasis was laid on a method of prayer advocated by Father Olier, and completed by Father Tronson. Both before and after the French Revolution the Sulpicians have been leading educators of the clergy.

(9) EUDISTS (1643)

St. John Eudes (1601–80), another alumnus of the Oratory, became a rural missionary, founder of a seminary, and finally in 1643 organizer of the Society of Jesus and Mary, which devoted itself to missions and seminaries.

D. *Reform of Existing Orders*

(1) THE MENDICANT ORDERS

The Dominicans, revived by the work of Blessed Raymond of Capua (d. 1399), director of St. Catherine of Siena, were less in need of moral reform than intellectual. Cardinal Cajetan (d. 1534), as will be seen in the following topic, inaugurated a new era of Scholasticism with special stress on the teaching of St. Thomas.

The Franciscans witnessed many trends toward a more strict discipline. Observantine renewal was effected in Spain by St. Pedro de Alcantara (1499–1562), and in Italy by Fra Matteo da Bascio (1495–1552). His movement, however, evolved into the distinct Capuchin community which survived the apostasy of a superior-general, Bernardino Ochino (1542), to become an active and popular force. Distinguished members were St. Felix (1515–87) and St. Lawrence of Brindisi (1559–1619).

The Augustinians, weakened by the defection of Martin Luther, were revived by the reforming generals, Giles of Viterbo (d. 1532) and Giralamo Seripando (1539–51), later cardinal and papal legate. In Spain the reform was led by St. Thomas of Villanova (1488–1555), provincial and bishop of Valencia.

The Carmelites were favored by the reforms of two remarkable personalities, St. John of the Cross (1542–91), doctor of the Church, and St. Theresa of Avila (1515–82), "Doctress of Prayer." Though they

suffered grievously from political and factional opposition, their Discalced reform was granted separate papal recognition in 1580.

(2) MONASTIC REFORMS

The **Benedictines** experienced some revival from Didier, prior of St. Vanne Abbey in Lorraine. A reformed congregation received papal approval in 1604. An offshoot of this group were the Maurists who played an influential role in French ecclesiastical science down to the French Revolution. Though they did not survive the French Revolution, Dom Gueranger's Solesme Congregation is in a sense their heir.

Camaldolese from 1520 benefited by the reforming efforts of Paolo Giustiniani (1476–1528).

Cistercians in France formed a reformed group, the Feuillants, under the leadership of Jean de la Barriere (1544–1600).

Canons Regular were given a pattern for reform in the work of St. Peter Fourier (1565–1640) in Lorraine. Premonstratensians and Trinitarians also experienced reforms.

36. THEOLOGICAL REVIVAL

A. *Scholastic Schools*

(1) THOMISTIC REVIVAL

Cardinal Cajetan (1469–1534). Tommaso de Vio Gaetani was born at Gaeta, entered the Dominican Order in 1485, and became its general in 1508. In 1517 he was named cardinal. Throughout his life he was often employed by the Holy See as nuncio and theologian to treat with the emperors, Christian of Denmark and Lewis of Hungary, and Martin Luther. But he is chiefly remembered today as a pioneer in a return to the unexpurgated doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas. Between 1507 and 1522 he composed a commentary on the *Summa Theologica*, initiating a trend toward substitution of St. Thomas's masterpiece for the Lombard's *Sentences* as the basic theological text. Cajetan's defense of the distinctions between essence and existence, and between subsistence and existence laid the foundations for a rigid Thomism. Besides stimulating his brethren in this Thomistic revival, Cajetan departed from the lethargy of decadent Scholasticism by boldly treating new questions.

Francisco de Vittoria (1488–1546) was a second founder of the revival in Spain. After entering the Dominican Order, Vittoria was educated at the University of Paris. Returning to his native Spain, he was put at the head of the theological faculty at the University of Salamanca in 1524. There he utilized the *Summa* as the basis of his lectures, and through his influence his disciples, the Salamantacenses, rendered this method common. Occasionally led into trouble by Parisian Humanism,

Vittoria remained orthodox. He pioneered in the field of international law and politics, not fearing to criticize the Spanish conquistadores.

Melchior Cano (1509–60), also a Dominican, was Vittoria's immediate successor at Salamanca from 1546 to 1552. Named bishop of the Canaries, he resigned only to be involved in disputes which gained him the king's disfavor. His classic *De Locis Theologicis,* however, directed the scholastic revival toward a wholesome respect for tradition.

Dominique Soto (1494–1560), a disciple of Vittoria at Paris, did not join the Dominicans until 1525. In 1532 he became professor and in 1552 dean of the theological faculty at Salamanca. He was also a Tridentine consultant and confessor of Emperor Charles V. He resolutely upheld Thomistic teaching at Trent with his *De Natura et Gratia.* His *Summulae* made a distinct advance in the clear presentation of logic, and other commentaries improved the philosophical approach to theology.

Bartolomé de Medina (1527–81), another Dominican luminary at Salamanca, also wrote commentaries on St. Thomas's works. He will be referred to again as reputed formulator of Probabilism.

Domingo Bannez (1528–1604), Dominican dean of theology at Salamanca, as spiritual director of St. Theresa of Avila, brought the Carmelites into the Thomistic theological school. Bannez is chiefly known for his defense of Thomistic doctrine on grace and free will against Molina. Molinists accused him of founding a Neo-Thomistic "Bannezian" school, but Bannez stoutly asserted: "By not so much as a fingernail's breadth have I ever departed from St. Thomas's teaching."

(2) MOLINIST INNOVATIONS

The **Tridentine theologians,** Jaime Lainez (1512–65) and Nicolas Salmeron (1515–85), were pre-Molinist Jesuits who should be classed with the Thomistic school for their successful exposition of St. Thomas's doctrines at the Council of Trent. Other Jesuits, however, tended to constitute a new theological attitude.

Cardinal Francisco Toletano (1532–96), precursor of a continuous Jesuit theological school, was a noted theologian and diplomat. Though educated at Salamanca under Soto, Toletano professed to see in St. Augustine justification for predestination *post praevisa merita,* thus initiating a trend from rigid Thomism.

Pedro de Fonseca (1528–99) in pondering the questions raised by Toletano, proposed a *scientia media* as a solution, though his views were further developed by his disciple Molina.

Luis de Molina (1535–1601) founded a new approach with his *Concordia Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiae Donis* (1588). He taught that sufficient grace became efficacious only through the consent of the human

free will. Grace, then, would be an endowment which man educes from potency to act by his native power; it would be extrinsically efficacious through a divine *scientia media* which arranged the co-operation of human liberty. Though Molina thus sought to defend human freedom against Luther and Calvin, his teaching skirted the borders of semi-Pelagianism. His view was deemed rash by General Aquaviva and ordered replaced by Congruism which held that grace was also in some way intrinsically efficacious.

Gabriel Vásquez (1549–1604) inaugurated a series of congruist variations which sought to escape the consequences of pure Molinism without essentially altering its explanation. Vásquez would have God know free futures in their "eternal verity" as a movie preview.

Francisco Suarez (1548–1617) proposed prevision in a "logical medium" or disjunctive proposition. Though the Suarezian solution was sanctioned in 1613 by Father Aquaviva, later Jesuit theologians resorted to new devices. Suarez also rejected Arisotelian real potency and consequently repudiated the distinction between essence and existence. In law and political theory Suarez developed many of Vittoria's ideas.

St. Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) was a moderate, not fully appreciated by contemporary extremists. This doctor of the Church, while adopting some Molinist views, was well ahead of his school in the severe criticism that he leveled against strict Molinism and in his approach to Thomism in trying to mitigate differences. In the field of law and politics, he abandoned the theory of direct papal temporal power to return to the patristic notion of indirect power. He also opposed scholastic democratic theory to the divine right theory of monarchy defended by James Stuart and others. In vain did he warn against the rash condemnation of Galileo's solar theory by the Roman curia.

Leonard Lessius (1554–1623), however, carried most Jesuits along with him in strict adherence to the congruist evolution of Molinism. Lessius's specialty, however, was the field of moral theology.

(3) OTHER SCHOLASTIC TEACHERS

St. Ignatius Loyola (1491–1556), although not primarily a writer, must be mentioned here for his lasting influence through his *Spiritual Exercises*, begun in 1521 and published in 1548. These have been specially commended for retreats.

Louis of Granada (1504–88), in his *Sinner's Guide* and other works, provided Dominican ascetical treatises of enduring popularity. His homely style found echoes in the *Practice of Christian Perfection*, a primer for novitiates written by the Jesuit Alfonso Rodríguez.

St. Peter Canisius (1521–97) revived the science of catechetics. His *Catechism* eventually came out in editions adapted to every age and

mentality, and was not outmoded by the Tridentine opus. Doctor of the Church, St. Peter yet sought simple, earnest exposition which avoided controversy as much as possible.

Cardinal Cesare Baronio (1538–1607) deserves a unique place among scholastic revivalists as the second father, after Eusebius of Caesarea, of ecclesiastical history. Born at Sora in the Two Sicilies, Baronio came to Rome where he joined the disciples of St. Philip Neri. Disinherited for entering the Oratory, Baronio worked in poverty among the Roman poor both before and after his ordination to the priesthood in 1564. When the Protestants began to falsify history with their *Centuries of Magdeburg* (1559), Father Baronio, at St. Philip's insistence, began the composition of his monumental *Annales Ecclesiastici* in refutation. Distracted by a thousand cares and inconveniences, occupied with active priestly ministry as well as cooking in the kitchen, Baronio devoted all his remaining moments beyond four hours of sleep to research and writing. From 1569 to his death he labored, writing, revising, proofreading every page by his own hand, as well as personally seeing the manuscript through primitive presses. Late in life came recognition: he was made cardinal in 1595 and prefect of the Vatican Library in 1597; only his strenuous efforts averted his election to the papacy in 1605. He had brought his *Annales* to the year 1198 when he died in 1607; the work was continued by Rainaldus. This early example of modern scientific ecclesiastical history is not faultless, but it routed contemporary foes by its superior objectivity and greater attention to original sources. It traced the path for better revisions. Cardinal Baronio was declared Venerable in 1745.

St. John of the Cross (1542–91), doctor of the Church, and distinguished collaborator of St. Theresa of Avila in Carmelite reform, provided a whole course in sound mystical theology in his works, *Ascent of Carmel, Dark Night, Living Flame, Spiritual Canticle,* etc. With St. Theresa of Avila, he provided an antidote for Lutheran Quietism and the aberrations of the seventeenth century, Jansenism and Quietism.

St. Francis de Sales (1567–1622), another doctor of the Church, had special talent in making asceticism attractive for the laity. His *Introduction to the Devout Life* and other popular works set a tradition for discovering many ways of adapting the ancient teachings to contemporary needs.

B. *Theological Controversies*

(1) BAIANISM

Michel de Bay, or Baius (1513–89), was born at Melun in the Belgian Netherlands and educated at Louvain University. After his ordination and reception of a doctorate in theology, he taught philosophy and

theology at his alma mater—later, he gained some distinction as one of the university's theologians assigned to attend the Council of Trent. But about 1555 he began to publish *Opuscula* that raised questions concerning his orthodoxy.

Teaching. Baius believed that the best cure for Scholastic decadence lay in a return to the Bible and the Fathers. But, like so many before him, he concentrated upon and misinterpreted St. Augustine. Thus, he came up with the rash assertion that man had been created in the supernatural order so that grace became practically an essential part of human nature. Man's fall, then, positively and radically vitiated his essential constitution. Grace, for Baius, did not restore man to his supernatural state, but merely conferred on him a relatively superior assistance in order to restrain concupiscence. Concupiscence, which Baius, like Luther, identified with original sin, remained to dominate and nearly destroy human freedom: "All the works of infidels are sins; all the virtues of philosophers are vices." Baius stressed the need of actual grace to triumph over concupiscence; whether he deemed habitual grace necessary is uncertain.

Condemnation. As early as 1552, Ruard Tapper, Chancellor of Louvain University, had begun to suspect De Bay's teaching. Before his death in 1559, Tapper ordered De Bay to desist, and the Franciscans denounced fourteen of the latter's propositions to the Sorbonne. But Cardinal Graneville, governor of the Netherlands, imposed silence on both sides. Despite a warning from Pope Pius IV in 1561 to beware of doctrinal innovations, De Bay confidently attended Trent with Graneville's backing. Though his views met with disfavor during the conciliar discussions, no disciplinary action was taken. But when De Bay began to write and teach once more in favor of his opinions at Louvain, the new Chancellor Ravenstein denounced him to the Holy See (1564). St. Pius V at length on October 1, 1567, in *Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus* censured seventy-nine Baianist propositions without indicating their author by name. Though professing submission, Baius and his friends questioned the interpretation of his writings found in the papal document. When the pope demanded unquestioning submission in 1569, Baius did make a generic oral recantation. Apparently again in good standing, he was chosen to succeed Ravenstein as rector. But by 1579 new suspicions of his orthodoxy had been raised. Pope Gregory XIII now confirmed the previous papal condemnation, and exacted of Baius a detailed profession of faith. Once again Baius submitted to pontifical authority, and as far as is known, died in communion with the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, seeds of his teaching remained at Louvain among Baianist disciples on the faculty, and would reappear in Jansenism.

(2) THOMIST-MOLINIST CLASH

Origins. The first rumblings of storm are seen in 1581 when Bannez objected to certain theses on grace proposed by the Jesuit theologian, Prudencio de Montemayor. In 1587 the Baianist clique, apparently in revenge, condemned certain propositions drawn from Jesuit theologians who had opposed their own opinions. These accusations were answered by Lessius until the papal nuncio commanded silence in 1588. But in the same year Molina's *Concordia* was published at Coimbra University. Bannez prevailed on the Spanish viceroy, Archduke Albert, to ban the sale of the book but Molina obtained sanction from the Portuguese Inquisition to republish the work in 1589. "It denies efficacious grace," objected Thomists. "It does not; you preach determinism," retorted Molinists. Charges and countercharges mounted to a crescendo of anathemas against "Pelagianism" and "Calvinism" respectively. In 1594 the peace was so disturbed by public debates, that the papal nuncio at Madrid referred the affair to Rome.

Papal nondecision. Papal commissions were named to investigate the dispute, but their findings were challenged. Pope Clement VIII formed a new *Congregatio de Auxiliis* which occupied itself with the case from 1598 to 1607. After two months of inquiry, however, the congregation, under the lead of Cardinals Madrucci and Arrigone, recommended condemnation of the *Concordia*. But the pope ordered more leisurely consideration. When a similar recommendation was submitted six months later, the pope summoned the Dominican and Jesuit generals to name defenders. The debate resumed with the Jesuit theologians Gregorio de Valencia, Pedro de Arrubal, Fernando de Bastida, and Juan de Sales sustaining the prosecution by the Dominicans, Diego Álvarez and Tomás de Lemos. By 1601 the majority vote of the congregation once again pronounced in favor of condemnation of Molinism, but Clement VIII denied his approbation. Debate recommenced, reaching its climax on November 30, 1602, when Valencia collapsed in the course of argument. Still refusing to accept a technical knockout, the pope began to referee the debates personally. These went on for three more years until the patient pontiff died. Pope Paul V also heard seventeen more debates within two years, and then decided that not even Spanish theologians could have anything more to say. On August 28, 1607, he suspended the congregation *sine die*, and announced that a decision would be rendered at the proper time. To date the "proper time" has not arrived, though, shorn of its animosity, the debate occasionally rumbles on in the lecture halls. For a time, however, the decree of silence (1611) imposed on disputes about grace complicated the detection of the next heresy regarding the supernatural principles, Jansenism.

37. LITURGICAL RENAISSANCE

A. *Liturgical Changes*

(1) THE MISSAL

Great diversity of usage had developed during the Middle Ages when individual dioceses and religious orders followed their peculiar modifications of the basic Latin Rite. The Council of Trent "clearly distinguished between truth and error and declared the objective character of the Mass. . . . A special commission . . . took another course by establishing the wished-for uniform missal. . . . The new missal had, in round numbers, 150 days free of feasts, not counting octaves. This was achieved by retaining only those feasts which were kept in Rome itself up to the eleventh century. Of the countless feasts later introduced, especially under the influence of the Franciscans, only a small number were preserved, and a few of these of saints outside Italy. . . . Besides the memorial days of the four Latin Fathers who were alone acknowledged in the Middle Ages, those of the Greeks were also included. . . . This book was to be from then on the standard in every church and . . . no changes were to be made therein. Only churches which could demonstrate a two-hundred years' custom for their own usage, were permitted to retain that usage." [2]

Pope St. Pius V, in sanctioning a revised *Missale Romanum* by a bull of July 14, 1570, prescribed its use wherever the aforementioned custom had not been proved to the contrary. Dominicans conserved their Missal, while the Franciscans renounced their peculiar usages. With few exceptions, the new Missal was adopted by the majority of the regular and secular clergy. It made obligatory recitation of the Introibo and Confiteor at the beginning of Mass, and of the Placeat and St. John's Gospel at the end, thus completing the evolution of the Mass to the twentieth century, although minor rubrical revisions have since been introduced. Pope Sixtus V by a decree of January, 1588, set up the Congregation of Rites to supervise the new changes, but in the view of some liturgists a period of liturgical rigidity ensued. Clement XIII (1758–69) prescribed the Preface of the Trinity for Sundays, and Leo XIII (1878–1903) ordered prayers to be said after Low Mass. From 1661 to 1897 there was a prohibition by the Index of translations of the Canon of the Mass into the vernacular, and in place of the Missal the "prayer-book" took its place in the hands of most of the literate laity, until the twentieth century.

[2] Josef Jungmann and Francis Brunner, *Missarum Solemnia* (New York: Benziger Bros., 1950), I, 34–35.

(2) THE BREVIARY

Reform of the Breviary had been stimulated by an untraditional "Humanist Office" allowed by Leo X, and the "Simplified Breviary" proposed to Paul III, which streamlined everything to psalms and lessons. Both were bitterly attacked at the Council of Trent. "The Council of Trent began reform which Pius V brought to a close with the publication of the revised Breviary, *Breviarium Pianum*. The spade work for this revision was done, behind the scenes, by the cofounders of the Theatines. . . . The number of feasts was reduced, the devotional Offices—Office of the Dead, the Little Office, and the Gradual psalms— which were slowly becoming obligatory, were suppressed or abrogated. The yearly reading of the entire Scriptures and the weekly recitation of the Psalter were restored. The apocryphal lives of the saints were either expunged or amended, and finally a general list of rubrics was appended." [3]

Thus, the Sunday and ferial offices were restored to a more prominent position. "In the next few centuries, various improvements were made on the Breviary of Pius V but they were only of secondary importance. Clement VIII amended the lives of the saints, altered the rank of many feasts, and revised the Vulgate text of the Bible. Of great consequence, however, was the attempt of Urban VIII to revise the hymns. In an effort to lend a classic polish of meter and prosody to the hymns, he tried to improve the hymns of Prudentius, Fortunatus, and St. Ambrose. Altogether 952 'mistakes' were 'corrected.' . . . Meanwhile, since the time of Pius V, nearly a hundred feasts had crept into the calendar." [4] Aside from these modifications, the Breviary remained substantially unchanged until the general revision begun and partially completed by Pope St. Pius X.

(3) THE VULGATE

The Council of Trent had ordered a new edition of the Vulgate prepared which would remove readings at variance with the version of St. Jerome's original. The execution of this decree proved exceedingly difficult. A first commission was named by Pius IV in 1561, and a second by Pius V in 1569. But in the absence of any determined critical principles, neither could accomplish much. A third commission, appointed by Sixtus V in 1586, did complete a revision within two years, but its work was rejected by the pope. Sixtus V now published a hasty version of his own, but this was almost immediately withdrawn after his death. The fourth commission, named by Gregory XIV, was permitted to issue

---

[3] Pius Parsch, *The Breviary Explained* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1952), p. 11.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

a version in 1592, but new emendations followed. As finally completed in 1604, the Sixtine-Clementine edition proved to be a compromise between a critical and a popular text. It is still in use, pending a general revision committed to the Benedictines by Pius X.

Other revised ecclesiastical books that appeared were those of the *Pontifical* (1596) and the *Episcopal Ceremonial* (1600). The Tridentine *Catechism,* printed by Paolo Manucci in Latin, was translated into Italian, French, and German.

B. Administrative Reform

(1) CURIAL REORGANIZATION

The Roman congregations were first divided into separate departments by Pope Sixtus V in his constitution, *Immensa,* of January 22, 1588. This provided for fifteen divisions: (1) the Inquisition or Holy Office; (2) the Signature of Grace; (3) the Congregation for Erection of Churches and Consistorial Provisions; (4) the Congregation for Temporal Administration; (5) Congregation of Rites and Ceremonies; (6) Department of Army and Navy for the Pontifical State; (7) Index of Forbidden Books; (8) Interpretation and Execution of Tridentine Decrees; (9) Relief of Ills of the Papal States; (10) University of Roman Study; (11) Congregation for Religious Orders; (12) Congregation for Regulation of Prelates; (13) Bureau of Roads, Bridges, and Waters; (14) the Vatican Printing Press; and (15) the Department for Regulation of Temporal Affairs. Though alterations were inevitably made during the course of the following centuries, the Sixtine system endured without radical change until the general reorganization by St. Pius X in 1908.

(2) CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

Principles. "At Trent, three principles denied by Protestantism were reaffirmed: (a) the intermediation of the Church in the relations of man with God, a doctrinal and sacramental mediation, which not only does not destroy, but perfects our direct contacts with God; (b) the affirmation of free will and the necessity of good works as the practical outcome of faith, as an inward conformity to the divine precepts, and as a means of acquiring merits for the reward; (c) the value of tradition, equal to that of Holy Scripture and interpreting Holy Scripture itself, both being authoritatively taught and defined by the magistracy of the teaching Church. The consequences of these principles . . . extended to social life and the relations between the power of the Church and that of the state." [5]

[5] Don Luigi Sturzo, *Church and State,* trans. Barbara Carter (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939), p. 228.

C. Artistic Reform

(1) AGE OF THE BAROQUE

"The seventeenth century was the age of the baroque. Originally that term was confined to art and architecture, but in our own day it has come to be used increasingly as a period term, like Gothic or Renaissance, to describe the culture of the church and the princely courts from the mid-sixteenth to the eighteenth century. . . . Early baroque . . . was in its beginnings the artistic counterpart of the Catholic Reformation. Spanish gold and energy, Italian genius, and the lofty idealism of the Roman Catholic Church, purified and rejuvenated by reforming popes, prelates, and princes, produced the first fruits of the baroque style. It was associated with the papacy in Rome, with the Jesuits, with the court at Madrid, with the upsurge of energy that reconquered so much of Europe for the Roman Church." [6] Admittedly, the baroque age and art were secularized in time by expansion to Germany and the France of Versailles.

(2) FINE ARTS

Renaissance painting, whatever its excellences, had become too much influenced by pagan models. Under the prodding of the Tridentine Reform, art in the service of the Church gradually returned to Christian traditions. In 1573 Paolo Veronese was cited before the Holy Office for failure to do so in his "Last Supper." Better success was had by the Bologna School, founded by the Carracci, which produced Ludovico Carracci's "Ecce Homo," Domenichino's "Communion of St. Jerome," Guido's Madonnas, and the Bargieri religious paintings.

Architecture experienced an evolution of disputed merit. Vignola's Church of the Gesu, begun for the Roman Jesuits in 1568, initiated a vogue of baroque style imitated in many other Jesuit and parochial churches. Baroque is probably derived from *baroco:* "complicated"; it concentrated on a richly decorated façade.

Music, even in ecclesiastical services, had been invaded by the worldly and theatrical. Gregorian Chant had been first abridged and then largely abandoned. These developments evoked protests in the Council of Trent, but so great seemed the task of reform that for a time Pius IV meditated the discontinuance of church music. From this alternative the curia was rescued by Pietro Luigi Palestrina (1526–94), onetime choirmaster for the papal choir. His "Mass of Pope Marcellus" proved a convincing sample of his genius, and he was commissioned to undertake a reform of ecclesiastical music. Something of Gregorian

---

[6] John Wolf, *Emergence of the Great Powers* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1951), p. 244.

inspiration survived in Palestrina, while St. Philip's Oratory developed a lyric recitative type of music.

(3) LITERATURE

Catholic works, destined to have great influence, were Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*, an epic of the Crusades on the model of the *Iliad*, Camoën's *Lusiads*, and the dramas of Lope de Vega. Though written in humanistic style, their spirit was Catholic insofar as they praised the chivalry of the crusaders of the Old World and the New, and exalted a Christian code of honor. The Jesuit colleges sponsored religious and moral dramas which had influence during the subsequent Golden Age of French literature with Corneille and Molière.

The French Jesuit, Blessed Claude La Colombière, indicates some of his canons of good style in a lecture at Lyons in 1672: "We have understood—and because our neighbors have not, they waste their talent and their efforts in the accumulation of voluminous works—we have understood what propriety, reason, and a sense of moderation demand of each of us. We know what distinguishes the sweet from the insipid, the vulgar from the simple and unadorned; what difference there is between the naïve and the affected, the noble and the pompous, the graceful and the beautiful, the brilliant and the conceited, the humorous and the clownish, in a word, that which separates the spirit of nicety from ingenious subtlety. Such henceforth is the excellence of the French tongue, that for sweetness, rhythm, brilliance, majesty, and richness it leaves nothing to be desired. The French name itself seems to have become everywhere abroad a synonym for politeness, purity, polish." [7]

Secular works were those of Erasmus, Rabelais, and Montaigne, but despite their authors' Catholicity, these were impregnated with renaissance scepticism. Far more Catholic in substance were the plays of William Shakespeare, who though scarcely a practicing Catholic, was surely one by baptism and secret affection, so that "he died a papist."

[7] Georges Guitton, *Perfect Friend*, trans. William J. Young (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1956), p. 64.

V

The Wars for Religion

38. THE PAPACY AND COUNTER REFORMATION

A. *Nature of the Counter Reformation*

(1) DEFINITION

"The term 'Counter Reformation' is to be understood literally: it embraces the movements of Catholicism directed against the Protestant Reformation. Contrary to a rather common notion these movements did not arise from human ambition but from the Church's innermost vocation and from her sense of duty. It was necessary (a) to withstand the attack, (b) to reject Protestant tendencies in the Church itself, (c) to regain lost territories. To accomplish this triple task all religious, theoretic-theological, political, and juridical (inquisition) means were employed. In the sphere of political interests the term 'Counter Reformation' took on a special, narrower, meaning."

(2) POLITICAL ASPECT

"In the sense of Church politics, Counter Reformation means the attempt to win back by political means the domain lost to the new religion." [1] Men's minds did not become instantaneously "modern" during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For many centuries the medieval attitude, especially among the laity, had confused Church and state into one Christian Commonwealth. Though religious unity had been broken by the revolts of the first half of the sixteenth century, few believed that Europe could remain permanently divided according to

[1] Joseph Lortz, *History of the Church*, trans. Edwin G. Kaiser, C.PP.S. (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1935), p. 444.

the maxim, *cujus regio ejus religio.* For neither Catholics nor Protestants could conceive of a nation divided by religious views any more than one differing in political allegiance. Catholics, divided and demoralized, had been forced to make a truce in central Europe. But now that the Catholic Reformation had revived their devotion to the Church, Catholic princes and statesmen reverted to the medieval mode of proving their devotion by going on crusade against heresy and infidelity. It would take many years of fighting without tangible success to disillusion them of advancing the Catholic cause by the sword.

(3) Papal Attitude

The reform popes were men of their time, and consequently would not, if they could, utterly discourage their sons from defending and advancing the Catholic cause by any legitimate political or military means. But they were not unaware that selfish motives intermingled with the religious zeal of Caesaro-papist Catholic monarchs, to say nothing of the Machiavellianism of some nominally Catholic intriguers. Hence, they did not return to that immersion in politics of the popes of the Renaissance, and they were prepared to console their adherents in case of failure with Christ's assurance that His kingdom was not of this world.

B. Papal History (1585–1655)

(1) Sixtus V (1585–90)

Felice Peretti (1521–90) was unanimously elected to the papal office on April 25, 1585. As a popular Franciscan preacher, he had won the friendship of Sts. Ignatius Loyola and Philip Neri. Though of humble birth, he was strong-willed and resolute.

Temporal administration demanded immediate attention. Pope Sixtus dealt sternly with the rebellion against his predecessor. By vigorous, frequent, and impartial use of the death penalty on nobility and peasantry, men and women, he restored order. The brigands were suppressed. Pasquinio, court wag, depicted St. Peter slinking out of Rome lest he be arrested for cutting off Malchus's ear. Next the entire administration of the city was reorganized and modernized. Piazzas were laid out and streets cut through. Six hundred men worked day and night on the cupola of St. Peter's. Aqueducts were constructed. The conquest of Turkey and Egypt, the building of a papal navy, the digging of a canal at Suez, promotion of pilgrimages from America—these were some of the projects that flitted through the pope's vivid imagination.

Curial reorganization also was undertaken. Besides the subdivision into fifteen congregations already described, the college of cardinals was fixed at the number of seventy: six bishops, fifty priests, and fourteen

deacons. Creation of lay cardinals was prohibited; henceforth cardinals were at least to be in minor orders.

Politics found Sixtus V lukewarm toward Philip II's designs on England and France, especially in regard to the Spanish Armada of 1588. During, rather than because of, Sixtus's pontificate the militant Counter Reformation was launched.

(2) PAPAL MORTALITY (1590–91)

Reaction against the vigor of the preceding pontificate seems to have induced the cardinals to elect aged or sickly pontiffs; at least, three short reigns ensued.

Urban VII, Giambattista Castagna, was chosen on September 15, 1590, and died on the twenty-seventh of the same month, having had time merely to issue a few sumptuary regulations.

Gregory XIV, Niccolò Sfondrati, elected December 5, 1590, reigned until October 15, 1591, but he was in poor health, and could achieve little beyond a firm stand against concessions to Henry of Navarre.

Innocent IX, Gian-Antonio Facchinetti, secretary of state during the preceding pontificate, was selected on October 29, 1591, to deal with the French Huguenot crisis, but by December 30 of the same year was dead.

(3) CLEMENT VIII (1592–1605)

Ippolito Aldobrandini (1536–1605) was elected pope, January 30, 1592. He was a holy and able cleric who relied greatly upon the advice of St. Philip Neri in his early years. He devoted himself to parochial supervision, promoted the Forty Hours' Devotion, published the final edition of the Vulgate, mediated between Thomists and Molinists, and denounced dueling. He added a Scottish seminary to the foreign training schools at Rome. In 1600 he presided over a jubilee in which three million pilgrims attested reviving Catholic fervor.

Reconciliation of Henry of Navarre to the Church was the chief diplomatic triumph of Clement, who steered between the pro-Spanish Cardinal Farnese and his own pro-French nephew, Cardinal Aldobrandini.

(4) LEO XI (1605)

Alessandro de' Medici (1535–1605) was elected finally as an affable compromise candidate on April 1, 1605, but died only twenty-seven days later.

The conclave had perhaps been more eventful than the pontificate. Sixty-two cardinals had begun deliberations on March 14. St. Robert Bellarmine received ten votes, but incurred the veto of the absolute monarchs for his democratic views. Cardinal Baronio had thirty-seven

votes on the second ballot, but was feared for his impartial historical spirit.

(5) PAUL V (1605–21)

Camillo Borghese (1552–1621) was elected on May 8, 1605, after both St. Robert and Cardinal Baronio had again discouraged their own choice. Borghese's comparative youth enabled him to endure a long and trying pontificate. He was a pious, learned, if somewhat punctilious ruler. Patron of learning and stern foe of disorder, he did not neglect the provision of the poor while pursuing bandits. St. Peter's Basilica was brought to completion during his pontificate, and the façade bears his name.

Diplomacy. Paul V made friendly overtures to James I of England, but the Gunpowder Plot soon destroyed what chances there were for concessions to Catholics. When the king exacted a new oath of supremacy, rejecting papal censures and theocratic powers, the Catholic leader, Archpriest Blackwell, consented to subscribe. The pope, however, condemned this oath and removed Blackwell, temporarily dividing English Catholics.

Friendly relations were maintained with the Habsburgs, though Paul V was but mildly sympathetic toward their cause during the opening years of the Thirty Years' War. The Catholic side, however, needed little support during the years before the pope's death, January 28, 1621.

Venetian Schism. It was rather with the Venetian Republic that Pope Paul had his chief trouble. The Republic had always resented papal theocracy and had refused to promulgate the bull *In Cena Domini*. Serious trouble began in 1603 when the senate forbade erection of ecclesiastical institutions without its permission. This was aggravated in 1605 by meddling with wills in favor of the Church and citing Bishop Sarrasin and Abbot Valdemarino before the civil tribunal. After his admonitions had failed, the pope excommunicated the senators and imposed interdict on the city, April 17, 1606. Doge Donato retorted with an order forbidding the clergy to disregard the interdict. The secular clerics for the most part acquiesced in the secular ruling, but the regulars were exiled for upholding the papal censure. A notable exception to the latter category was the Servite, Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623), who conducted antipapal propaganda for the Republic. Finally King Henry IV of France intervened to arrange a compromise: the senate released imprisoned clerics to the canonical tribunals, withdrew its manifestos, and Paul V removed his censures. Sarpi fled to London where his salacious *History of the Council of Trent* appeared in 1619. And the Jesuits remained banished by the Venetian Senate, a first instance of their persecution for loyalty to the Holy See.

(6) GREGORY XV (1621–23)

Alessandro Ludovisi (1554–1623) was chosen on February 9, 1621, after a third refusal by St. Robert Bellarmine. Though in ill health, Pope Gregory was ably assisted by his nephew, Ludovico Ludovisi, whom he named cardinal secretary. Pope and secretary worked well, if not always on a very lofty plane.

Ecclesiastical measures. Gregory XV issued two decrees of lasting importance. In 1621 he made new regulations for papal conclaves, insisting on a secret ballot and prescribing procedure in detail. In 1622 he established the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fidei* to supervise Catholic missionary activity.

Diplomacy. The pope tried to preserve peace between Habsburgs and Bourbons. While he made Paris a metropolitan see and named Richelieu cardinal, he also supported the Austrian cause during the Thirty Years' War and sanctioned the transfer of the Rhenish electorate to the Catholic Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. The pope died on July 8, 1623.

(7) URBAN VIII (1623–44)

Maffeo Barberini (1568–1644) was chosen pope, August 6, 1623. Personally moral and zealous, the pope was beset with nepotism, devoted to maladroit political intrigues, and an ardent builder at the expense of classical monuments of Rome: *Quod non fecerunt barbari, fecerunt Barberini.*

Galileo Case. One of Urban's ill-advised acts was to approve the censure of Galileo by the Holy Office. Galileo's defense of the Copernican theory against Ptolemy and Aristotle was believed by the curialists to subvert Scriptural inerrancy, and indeed Galileo sometimes spoke impudently and inaccurately. Yet the Holy Office need not have therefore branded his theory as "senseless and absurd in philosophy and formally heretical." This decision, first rendered in 1616, though conformable to contemporary opinion, both Catholic and Protestant, was rash, and St. Robert Bellarmine had advised patient waiting for the facts. But the decisions of the Holy Office were never deemed infallible, and Urban VIII, though keeping Galileo on parole for the rest of his life, treated him with great consideration. Not until 1822, however, was the decision cancelled.

Politics. As nuncio to Paris, Barberini had become a Bourbon partisan. Although he strove to maintain impartiality as pope, he yet seems to have been unconsciously biased in his diplomacy. As arbitrator in the Valtelline Case (1625) he awarded equal rights to Habsburg and Bourbon in regard to a vital communications link between Spanish and Austrian

territories. The pope was lukewarm to the Habsburg cause during the Thirty Years' War and quite attentive to the diplomacy of Cardinal Richelieu. He refused to sanction the imperial Edict of Restitution, probably wisely. He gave no aid to the Habsburgs against the Lutheran Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, claiming that the war was not one for religion; it is not true, however, that he positively assisted the Swedish king, as did Richelieu. But if he did not approve, he tolerated Richelieu's offensive against Catholic Austria, and Richelieu never took the papal peace efforts seriously. The one time that Urban VIII favored the Habsburgs, by nonrecognition of Portuguese independence, he provoked a Portuguese estrangement that lasted for years. He himself was badly defeated when he resorted to arms in a petty Italian quarrel about the fief of Castro, spending 12,000,000 scudi in an effort to collect a debt of 1,500,000.

(8) INNOCENT X (1644–55)

Giambattista Pamfili (1574–1655) was selected as a compromise between Bourbon and Habsburg pressures on September 15, 1655. Though personally worthy of the papal title that he assumed, Innocent X was too tolerant of nepotism, especially in the person of his domineering sister-in-law, Olympia Maldochina. But the Barberini were arrested or exiled for peculation during the preceding pontificate. The pope sponsored Bernini's additions to St. Peter's: the colonnade and the transfer of the obelisk.

The Peace of Westphalia ended the Thirty Years' War during Innocent's pontificate. Its spirit of compromise involved many losses to the Church in rights and property, against which the pope protested in vain. Perhaps had Urban VIII been less academically neutral, such concessions might have been avoided; now it was too late. Pope Innocent X by *Zelus Domus Meae* might declare the treaty provisions "null, vain, invalid, iniquitous, reproved," but the day when papal wishes were respected at peace conferences was over. A secularist era had dawned in which scant respect would be shown to the rights of the Church and of the clergy. Papal protests in time subsided to a tacit toleration of secular indifference in a world no longer culturally Christian, but it was a toleration under protest against physical might. Aged and feeble, the pope was neglected in death by his relatives. Olympia refused to take charge of his funeral, so that for three days after his death on January 7, 1655, the pope's corpse lay abandoned. It was perhaps symbolic of the vanished material glory of the papacy, but a corpse is neither a pope nor a man, and secular rulers would yet discover that the spiritual glory of the papacy was undimmed.

39. THE EMPIRE AND COUNTER REFORMATION

A. *Armed Truce* (1555-1618)

(1) AUGSBURG SETTLEMENT

The Peace of Augsburg (1555) had divided Germany about equally between Catholic and Lutheran princes, according to the axiom, *cujus regio ejus religio*. The pact was concluded on the assumption that the religion of the German princes would remain the same. But on the one hand, there were new apostasies to Lutheranism, and on the other, the Reformation stemming from Trent imparted to the Catholics a revived militancy. The Calvinists, whose greatest advances had been made since the Augsburg settlement, had no share in the legal toleration. The Lutherans finally protested at the *Ecclesiasticum Reservatum* clause of the Peace of Augsburg, which forbade apostate prince-bishops and -abbots from transferring their states to the Lutheran camp.

(2) PROTESTANT ENCROACHMENTS

Prelatial palatinates, then, proved a source of dispute. Those ecclesiastical territories surrounded by Lutheran states soon succumbed. Thus the Protestants acquired no less than fifteen small states. These Lutheran gains threatened the balance of power between the religious parties in Germany, and finally incited the Catholics to resist. Catholics, on the other hand, were consolidating their position in the south of Germany through the efforts of the bishop of Würzburg and the margrave of Baden-Baden to win back their subjects to the Church, and by the abjuration of heresy of the margrave of Baden-Hochberg. A Protestant claimant to Strasburg was bought off by Catholic subscription.

Active Catholic resistance began in 1581 when the Lutherans seized the see of Aachen. Though it required fifteen years of undeclared war, the Catholics recovered it. A greater crisis arose in 1583 when Gebhard von Waldburg, archbishop of Cologne, married his concubine and tried to retain his see despite his adhesion to Calvinism. When the chapter had declared Waldburg deposed and the pope had excommunicated him, the emperor and other Catholic princes assisted the people of Cologne in driving the apostate out. Ernst von Wittlesbach was installed in his stead, and thereafter until 1784 all the prelates of this key electorate were chosen from the Catholic Bavarian dynasty. Tension occurred elsewhere when Catholic princes tried to enforce religious conformity in their own dominions. Lutheran protests, however, were inconsistent, for they had annexed Catholic lands wherever they could.

(3) ANTECEDENTS OF WAR

Donauwörth Incident. These remote causes of conflict were accentuated by recurring clashes. The first of these took place at Donauwörth on the Bavarian border. On April 11, 1606, the Protestants attacked a Eucharistic procession and desecrated the church. The Emperor Rudolf II (1576–1612) placed the rioters under the ban, and Duke Maximilian of Bavaria (1597–1651) seized the town, which was permanently held for the Catholic cause.

Rival leagues. By 1608 the French monarchy had recovered from the Huguenot Wars and was prepared to intervene once more in German affairs. The ultimate objective of Henry IV's "Great Design" seems to have been the immemorial royal aim of weakening the Habsburgs. In 1608 the French king sponsored the Protestant League of Alhausen under the presidency of Elector Frederick IV of the Palatinate. Catholic princes promptly (1609) organized the rival League of Würzburg under the leadership of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. Armed conflict seemed likely between these two combinations in 1609 when Duke William of Cleves-Jülich died without direct heirs. Both Catholic and Protestant princes had claims to his Rhenish dominions and when the emperor named his brother as administrator, the Protestants threatened war. Henry IV was on the point of setting out to their assistance when he was assassinated by François Ravaillac, a religious fanatic. French administration fell into the hands of his widow, Marie de' Medici, pro-Habsburg, but incompetent. France was temporarily out of the international picture, and this and the death of its president the same year (1610) induced the Alhausen League to postpone hostilities. The Cleves-Jülich decision was also postponed; eventually the territories in dispute were divided between Catholics and Protestants.

Bohemian *casus belli*. Nonetheless the radical antipathies remained and the new Protestant leader, Elector Frederick V, relied on the assistance of his father-in-law, King James I of England. A favorable opportunity seemed to arise in Bohemia. Since Emperor Matthias (1612–19) was childless, it was necessary to provide for the Habsburg succession. His cousin, Duke Ferdinand of Styria, well known as an uncompromising Catholic, was accepted without difficulty as heir in Austria and Hungary. But Bohemia retained a large anti-Catholic and anti-German party from Hussite days. To Ferdinand's claim to inherit Bohemia by hereditary right, the Bohemian nobility opposed the ancient custom of election. On May 13, 1618, they replied to a Habsburg ultimatum by defenestrating the imperial envoys, and Count Thurn led the rebels in electing Frederick V of the Palatinate as King of Bohemia. He invoked the help of the Alhausen Union to defend his position and war loomed.

B. *The Thirty Years' War* (1618–48)

(1) BOHEMIAN PERIOD (1618–25)

Emperor Ferdinand II (1619–37), succeeding to Catholic leadership on Matthias's death, invoked the aid of the League of the Catholics and of the Spanish Habsburgs. Against such odds, Elector Frederick proved to be but a "Winter King." The Alhausen Union, solidly Lutheran, was awed and displayed no disposition to risk much for a Calvinist pretender, while James I of England confined himself chiefly to advice. The Catholic general, Johann Tserclaes, count Tilly, directed invasion of Bohemia from all sides. After a decisive Habsburg victory at White Mountain, November 8, 1620, Frederick fled and the rebellion collapsed.

Habsburg triumph. The emperor seized the offensive by decreeing dissolution of the Alhausen Union and forfeiture of the electoral Palatinate, while Philip IV of Spain resumed the attempt to subdue the revolted Dutch. By 1625 Tilly had expelled Frederick V from the Palatinate, and the Spanish general Spinola had captured Breda from the Dutch Protestants. The emperor then awarded the Rhenish Palatinate to Maximilian of Bavaria, thus gaining for the Catholic side a state and an electoral vote.

(2) DANISH PERIOD (1625–30)

Protestant desperation at this alarming turn of events induced Frederick's brother-in-law, Christian IV of Denmark, to accept an invitation of the Lutheran magnates to invade Germany. But the king was defeated at Dessau Bridge near Lutter (1626) by a new imperial general, Albrecht von Wallenstein. Harried northward by Wallenstein and Tilly, Christian IV was glad in 1629 to conclude peace. He yielded a few sees appropriated by his relatives since the Augsburg Peace and promised never again to intervene in German affairs—a pledge kept by his successors until 1848.

Edict of Restitution. Two months before this settlement, the emperor had issued an Edict of Restitution nullifying all Protestant seizures of Catholic territories since the Peace of Augsburg. Lutherans, however, were permitted the free exercise of their religion. Imperial commissioners began enforcement of this edict so vigorously that within three years five bishoprics, a hundred monasteries, thirty imperial towns, and numerous other territories had been recovered. This not only tipped the German balance in the Catholic favor, but considerably enhanced imperial Habsburg power, which might now conceivably be able to weld Germany into a centralized monarchy. This prospect frightened Cardinal Richelieu, French prime minister from 1624 to 1642. Though but lately (1628) victorious over French Protestants, he did not scruple to inter-

vene on the side of German Protestants in order to thwart the Bourbons' Habsburg rivals. At first avoiding any direct French intervention, Richelieu subsidized Austrian foes.

(3) SWEDISH PERIOD (1630–35)

Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden needed little urging. Already possessor of part of German Pomerania, he dreamed of making the Baltic a Swedish lake and his realm a great power. Accepting Richelieu's arms and money, he landed in Pomerania, July, 1630. While the Swedish king negotiated with the German Protestants, Tilly captured Magdeburg, May, 1631. His mercenaries, however, got out of hand and perpetrated a massacre which so infuriated and alarmed wavering Protestant magnates that they made common cause with Gustavus. Once in the field, the king proved more than a match for Tilly. He defeated him at Breitenfeld, September 17, 1631, and again at Rain near the Lech in April, 1632; in the latter contest the chivalrous Tilly was killed. Carrying the war into Catholic territory, the king defeated Wallenstein as well at Lutzen, November 16, 1632, but was himself slain in the battle. The new Protestant general, Bernard of Weimar, skirmished without decisive result for two years with Wallenstein. The latter, whose loyalty became suspect, was removed from command by assassination in 1634, but the Catholic cause was somewhat restored by a victory of General Gallas at Nördlingen in central Germany.

The Treaty of Prague, signed May 30, 1635, promised a reasonable settlement of German differences. The emperor offered an amnesty and freedom of religious cult to all Protestant princes who would lay down their arms. Captured territory was to be restored, and ecclesiastical palatinates returned to the *status quo* of 1627, a compromise between the Catholic nadir of 1618 and their zenith of 1629. Another important provision required dissolution of all private leagues and subjection of German military forces to the imperial command. This pact, actually signed by a majority of magnates, might have made Germany a united kingdom.

(4) FRENCH PERIOD (1635–48)

Richelieu, however, refused to permit such a solution and directly intervened in the war to encourage the Protestant princes to repudiate the Peace of Prague. This French intervention prolonged the conflict in Germany for another thirteen years. Spain, menaced by France, had to withdraw her forces for her own defense, and after a defeat at Rocroy (1643) was herself in desperate condition. In Germany, Bavaria bore the brunt of French attacks and was forced out of the war in 1647. But Austria held out, and presently Maximilian of Bavaria took a page from

Richelieu's diplomatic notebook to repudiate his separate peace. Richelieu's successor, Cardinal Mazarin, then agreed to terminate the indecisive German phase of the conflict by the Peace of Westphalia (1648), although the contest with Spain went on until the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659.

C. *The Westphalian Settlement* (1648)

(1) Religious Provisions

The Treaties of Westphalia, concluded on October 24, 1648, terminated thirty years of wasting conflict on substantially the same basis as the Peace of Augsburg nearly a century before. Once again it was *cujus regio ejus religio,* though this time legal toleration was extended to the Calvinists as well as the Lutherans. Ecclesiastical palatinates were apportioned on a norm of 1624; that is, before noteworthy Catholic annexations. Past and present confiscations were condoned, though the *ecclesiasticum reservatum* was to apply again to the future. But every provision was made to obviate future religious differences: all imperial courts, bureaus, and commissions were to have an equal number of Catholic and Protestant members. Pope Innocent's disapproval of the peace was chiefly excited by the formal concession to all German princes of "the right to reform religion," which was an implicit recognition of the Protestant principle of secular supremacy. Though the pope denounced "all articles of the Treaty prejudicial to the Catholic religion, divine worship, and the Apostolic See," Catholics perforce had to allow secularization of lands already in Protestant hands, amounting to sixteen sees and six abbeys.

(2) Secular Provisions

Politically, Germany ceased to be a nation save in name. Every prince was allowed to rule his territory and make war independently of the emperor-king. Though the title of Holy Roman Emperor survived until 1806, all imperial reality had vanished. Already possessing no more than honorary precedence over kings, the emperor now ceased to be effective king of Germany itself. If the Habsburgs continued powerful, it was in virtue of their dynastic possessions in Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary. The Rhenish Palatinate was restored with its electorate, though Bavaria was also given an electoral vote so that the Catholics retained a majority of five to three electoral votes. They also had a majority of representatives in the Reichstag, but this was of slight advantage in that antique body which became little more than a debating society. Broken into a thousand pieces at the mercy of foreign intervention, Germany for two centuries became the "Germanies"; only an inarticulate German pa-

triotism survived to the Romantic revival in reaction to Napoleon Bonaparte's invasion at the opening of the nineteenth century.

Social results. Unparalleled destruction had been wrought in Germany by the campaigns of thirty years. Population had declined; towns had been abandoned; education had disappeared, and the lower classes were brutalized and exposed to superstition. The German "Fatherland" was ruined, and despite economic recovery the German patriot began to nourish resentment against France—though cosmopolitan nobles still aped the French fashions. The perils of disunity may have made some accept unification at too great a price from Bismarck and Hitler, and may have provoked a sort of inferiority complex that sought compensation in the quest of might and conquest.

40. SPANISH CRUSADING

A. *Habsburg Spain* (*1516–1659*)

(1) CHARLES I (1516-56)

Spanish orthodoxy had been protected by the timely reforms of Cardinals Ximenes (1436–1517) and Dedel, later Adrian VI. A pseudo-mystic sect known as Alumbrados, however, appeared about 1512. These "Enlightened Ones," like the later Quietists, claimed that perfection consisted in annihilation of human liberty in an absolute passivity, and terminated in a state of impeccability. But the Inquisition suppressed them.

Comuneros' revolt. Charles of Habsburg, first king of a united Spanish monarchy, introduced Flemish counselors from his native Netherlands. Their rule was resented by the Spaniards who rebelled during Charles's journey to receive the German imperial crown. In July, 1520, a junta seized control to demand continuous royal residence in Spain, removal of all foreigners from office, reduction of taxes and curtailment of expenditure on alien projects, convocation of a cortes every three years, and abolition of the feudal privileges. But this last demand divided the rebels, and the nobles sided with the royal troops when their own prerogatives came to be threatened. The emperor refused to yield and the rebels were defeated at Villalar, April, 1521.

Benevolent despotism followed the emperor-king's return in 1522. Excluding the nobles from high office, he relied heavily on the gentry in filling civil and military posts. Though Spanish regionalism did not die, thereafter the Spanish Habsburg monarchy was comparatively absolute. Church and state became so fused in Spanish mentality that both monarchs and people regarded themselves divinely appointed crusaders against infidelity and heresy. Charles gave Spain and the New World humane and intelligent government, though his financial muddling

mortgaged the future revenues. The emperor raised Spain to the first rank in Europe and made her, quite unwillingly, the arsenal of Christendom. His New Laws of 1542 laid the basis of the Spanish colonial system in America. To Spain the Teutonic and much-traveled emperor finally returned to die, having abdicated the Spanish crown in favor of his son Philip two years before his death in 1558.

(2) PHILIP II (1556-98)

Philip (1527-98) received the Spanish crown in 1556, though the Austrian Habsburg possession went to his uncle Ferdinand. By birth and education Philip II was more popular with his Spanish subjects than his father, but he lacked his father's cosmopolitan viewpoint and his diplomatic skill. Philip became the personification of royal bureaucratic efficiency, laboriously supervising every detail of administration. Withal Philip was a just and stern ruler, a sincere Catholic, though quite prone to regard himself essential to the Church. Charles and Philip both meddled in ecclesiastical affairs with the best of intentions. They never, however, resisted unto anathema, and both died edifying deaths. Philip in particular worked with the Council of Trent and had its decrees promulgated, but he could never be induced to yield an iota of patronage nor confine the Spanish Inquisition within papal norms. It was with the greatest difficulty that the Holy See induced the crown to yield the archbishop of Toledo for judgment at Rome—where he renounced some unintentionally inapt expressions.

The diplomacy of "Philip the Prudent" was directed alike to Catholic and Habsburg interest. His suppression of the Moriscoes (1567-70) in Spain completed the *Reconquista*. He contributed to the defeat of the Turks at Lepanto (1571). His intervention in France, if not without blunders, probably prevented Huguenot capture of that kingdom. In Italy and America he warded off any encroachment of Protestantism, and he brought Portugal and its colonial domain under Spanish rule for half a century (1580-1640). England was Philip's great failure, and the Netherlands in large part escaped him. But all in all, Philip continued Spain's Golden Age of glory and power: his was the century of St. Ignatius, St. Theresa, St. Francis Borgia, the Salamanticenses, Suárez, Lope de Vega, Cervantes, El Greco.

(3) PHILIP III (1598-1621)

Philip III (1578-1621), sickly son of Philip II's old age, inherited the throne after the mysterious death of his erratic elder brother, Don Carlos (1545-68). Philip III was a good man and pious Catholic, but only a mediocre ruler. He committed administration to a prime minister, Francisco de Sandoval, duke of Lerma (1598-1618), who permitted intrigue

and corruption to flourish. Fortunately for Philip III, no major crisis arose to demand genius; the Dutch were glad to conclude a truce in 1609; Marie de' Medici's regency in France was favorable to Spanish interests; and James I of England was fascinated by the Spanish ambassador Gondomar into keeping the peace.

(4) PHILIP IV (1621–65)

Philip IV (1605–65) was a more active, but scarcely more able ruler than his father. Pleasure-loving and immoral, he expended his personal energy elsewhere than on affairs of state, leaving these to a prime minister, the count of Olivares (1621–43). The reign proved one long misfortune and the beginning of a decline which continued until the extinction of the Habsburg dynasty in Spain in 1700.

The Thirty Years' War, insofar as Spain was directly concerned, was designed to regain the revolted Dutch Netherlands. But after the initial success at Breda (1625), Spanish progress bogged down as the bulk of Spanish forces were shifted to Germany. The Dutch, who had used the truce to good advantage, proved strongest at sea. After 1635, moreover, French intervention forced the Spaniards to direct their main efforts against a new foe. Early victories were won against undisciplined French troops, but in 1640 the Portuguese declaration of independence and the Catalan uprising (1640–59) withdrew Spain's armies to the peninsula. The French won a triumph at Rocroy in 1643, and after a period of domestic strife—the Fronde—resumed the offensive with another victory at Dunkirk (1658). The Peace of the Pyrenees, signed November 7, 1659, was extorted from Philip IV to save his kingdom. He yielded Roussillon in the Pyrenees and Artois in Belgium, but worse than that had to acknowledge that Spanish leadership in Europe was at an end.

B. Portuguese Separatism (1521–1640)

(1) PORTUGUESE COLONIALISM (1521–78)

Portuguese colonial dominion had been extended widely in the East and West Indies during the reign of Manoel I (1495–1521), and at the height of the Renaissance, Portugal expended an energy and attained a grandeur quite disproportionate to its resources. King John III (1521–57), Manoel's son and successor, continued to promote Portuguese overseas ventures. Though not deserving all the charges of indolence leveled against him, the king saw his country's power decline despite external magnificence. The king gave some, but insufficient, backing to St. Francis Xavier and the missionaries who evangelized Portuguese outposts from India to Japan. Always the Jesuits had to complain of the bad example given prospective converts by Portuguese colonists, traders and administrators. At home, disputes about control of the Portuguese

Inquisition severed diplomatic relations with the Holy See from 1544 to 1548, when the tribunal resumed work under certain papal safeguards.

Extinction of the dynasty that had ruled Portugal since its birth in 1140 was now in prospect. John's grandson and successor, Sebastian (1557–78), despite papal disapproval, embarked on an injudicious attack on Morocco. Here he fell at the battle of Alcazar-El-Kabir, August, 1578. Since he was unmarried, the crown went to his elderly great-uncle, Cardinal-Prince Henry.

(2) Spanish Succession (1578–1640)

Spanish claims were advanced on behalf of Philip II as son and heir of Empress Isabella, a daughter of Manoel I. In a desperate effort to avert rule by Spain, the Cardinal-King Henry (1578–80), though sixty-seven years old, requested Gregory XIII to dispense him from sacerdotal celibacy. The Spaniards, on the other hand, interposed against such a dispensation. The pope temporized for a year, and then refused the concession as a matter of principle. The forlorn Portuguese dynastic hope perished with Henry in January, 1580.

Spanish domination began after the duke of Alba's prompt invasion in August, 1580. At Lisbon, Philip II's hereditary claims were recognized by prelates and nobles, though from 1583 he had to contend with a pretender, Antonio of Crato, illegitimate nephew of the cardinal-king. Support of Antonio by the French (1583) and the English (1589) failed to win him the Portuguese crown, but forced Philip II to employ unpopular martial rule. Portugal chafed under Spanish administration until an opportunity for revolt occurred in 1640. Taking advantage of Spain's distractions in the Thirty Years' War, the *Restaurodores* of Portuguese independence made good their rebellion.

C. The Spanish Netherlands

(1) Origins of the Dutch Revolt

The Netherlands had formed part of the dynastic inheritance of Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy that had passed to the Habsburgs by the marriage of his daughter Mary to Emperor Maximilian. Their grandson, Emperor Charles V, as a native of the Netherlands, loved its people and was respected in return. The provinces formed a wealthy and strategic part of his far-flung dominions, and he could usually rely upon their financial support in an emergency. The single instance of revolt, the Ghent uprising in 1540, had been quickly suppressed. Charles was tactful and tolerant on the whole, and employed capable deputies.

Protestant infiltration had begun during the emperor's reign so that he had resort to the Inquisition. Lutheranism spread from Saxony, and Anabaptist radicals fled to the Low Countries to escape the common op-

position of German Catholics and Lutherans. Calvinism, however, proved most attractive to the burghers of the Netherlands. Pierre Bruly, Calvin's friend, introduced the sect, but was executed with five others at Tournai in 1545. Other Calvinist preachers succeed these. Especially active until his execution in 1567 was Guy de Bray who appeared in 1556. After 1560 the Calvinists were active iconoclasts, and despite 159 executions at Tournai between 1567 and 1570, gained control of the nationalist movement. In the north they instituted a reign of terror against Catholics and in 1572 massacred nineteen priests and friars at Gorcum.

Philip II found his Spanish birth and manners, so favorable to him in Spain, a handicap in winning the affection of the Dutch. Patriotic feeling was aroused when his Spanish deputies deprived the natives of self-rule and curbed their commercial privileges. Philip's rigid and tactless use of the Inquisition aggravated the discontent, and radical sectaries retaliated with violence. Various nobles, while not in sympathy with such tactics, did petition for redress of Dutch grievances. Dismissed with the contemptuous appellation of *gueux*, "beggars," patriots seized on this name as a party label. Discontent proved too much for the regent, Margaret of Parma (1559–67), and she was replaced by the duke of Alba as military governor (1567–73). His stern reign of terror united all patriots against him, especially after he had executed two prominent Catholic nobles, Egmont and Hoorn (1567). Neither Alba nor his first successors, Requesens (1573–76) and Don Juan of Austria (1576–78), could prevail. In 1576 the Pacification of Ghent proclaimed the union of all provinces, irrespective of religious beliefs, in the cause of expelling the Spaniards.

(2) Politico-Religious Cleavage

Belgian Catholicity. The next governor-general, Alessandro Farnese, duke of Parma (1578–92), resorted to the time-honored maxim of "divide and conquer." Skillful as a diplomat and a general, after subduing the southern provinces he promised restoration of political autonomy. These lands were predominantly Catholic, Gallic in culture, and industrial; their interests differed from those of the northern provinces, more strongly Calvinist, Teutonic and commercial. By playing upon these divergences, Parma at length succeeded in detaching the southern provinces from the rebellion. The resulting Belgian Netherlands remained under Spanish rule until the eighteenth century, when they were transferred to the Austrian Habsburgs down to the French Revolution.

William of Orange (1533–84), an unscrupulous Dutch patriot, prevented the subjugation of Holland. A poor general, his fame lay chiefly in his diplomacy. He organized the "Land Beggars," a guerilla force

which harassed the Spanish legions, while the privateering "Sea Beggars" cut their line of communications by sea. Orange cemented the alliance of the northern provinces in the Union of Utrecht (1579) which, with occasional assistance from England and France, held out against Spain. Though William of Orange was assassinated in 1584, his family continued influential in Holland.

Dutch regime. The defeat of the Spanish Armada probably saved the Dutch as well as the English in 1588, though the war continued until a truce was declared in 1609. Spain's renewed efforts to conquer the Dutch during the Thirty Years' War were unsuccessful, and Dutch independence of both Spain and the Empire was formally recognized in 1648. The Dutch built up a colonial domain in the East Indies and made their Republic a leading financial power in Europe. "The Dutch Reformed Church proclaimed in its confession of faith that 'the office of the magistracy is to prevent and to eradicate all idolatry and false religion and to destroy the kingdom of antichrist.' But the states never acted according to that ecclesiastical doctrine." [2] Catholics, a strong minority in Holland, were denied civil rights and public worship, but enjoyed an uneasy toleration of the services held in private houses, as in later English penal days. Calvinist bigotry flared up from time to time to deport vicars apostolic and missionaries, but it was seldom of protracted duration. When the penal regime terminated in the nineteenth century, a third of the Dutch were still Catholic.

41. FRENCH HUGUENOT WARS

A. *Huguenot Civil Strife* (1559–98)

(1) The Contestants

Valois Politiques. Queen Catherine de' Medici, widow of Henry II, was the most influential person at court during the greater part of the reigns of her sons, Francis II (1559–60), Charles IX (1560–74) and Henry III (1574–89). A thorough disciple of her fellow Florentine, Machiavelli, the queen used every means to promote the interests of the Valois royal family. Though a Catholic herself, she displayed little more religious conviction than Elizabeth of England did in Anglicanism. Catherine did not rule out a possibility of religious change for herself or her sons; it never proved expedient. Her chancellor, Michel de L'Hôpital (1507–73), was a sort of Catholic Cecil, who favored a policy of toleration verging on indifferentism. The Montmorency of the younger generation headed the Politiques among the nobility.

Guise ultra-Catholics. Militant Catholics condemned the Court policy as a betrayal of the Faith and advocated stern repression of the Hugue-

[2] Adriaan Barnouw, *Making of Modern Holland* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1944), p. 147.

nots. They were led by the Guise, cadet branch of the House of Lorraine, originally a German dynasty. Though their founder, Claude, had become a naturalized Frenchman, some prejudice against the family's alien origin survived, particularly when they sought the assistance of Philip II of Spain. Claude's children had included Francis, duke of Guise, a renowned general; Charles, cardinal-archbishop of Rheims, Tridentine statesman; and Mary, widow of King James V of Scotland, and regent for their daughter, Mary, queen of Scots, and briefly of France as well. The third generation included other prominent nobles and prelates. The Guises, though they mixed politics with religion, never left any doubt of their pro-Catholic position.

Bourbon Huguenots. A third party had for its base of operations the tiny state of Navarre in the south of modern France. Ever since Margaret, sister of Francis I of France, had married Henry II of Navarre, this realm had served as a refuge for Huguenots. Their daughter Joan had married Antoine de Bourbon, first prince of the French blood royal. The Bourbons, descended from a son of St. Louis IX, were in virtue of the Salic Law *de jure* heirs of the French throne after Catherine de' Medici's feeble sons. Antoine and his brother, Louis of Conde, had become Huguenots, and as the Valois dynasty obviously approached extinction, Catholic legitimists were dismayed at the prospect that the rightful heir of France would be Antoine's son, Henry III of Navarre (1553–1610), also a Huguenot. Even were the Salic Law violated, he could claim the throne as husband of Catherine's daughter Margaret. Within France, the Huguenot party was headed by the Colignys: Gaspard (1519–72) was admiral of France; his brother Odet, an apostate cardinal, scandalized France by contracting marriage clad in his red robes; and another brother François and his son were prominent in the Huguenot interest. The admiral's daughter Louise was married to William of Orange, leader of the Dutch Calvinists. If the Guise sought foreign aid for the Catholic side, the Colignys did no less for the Huguenots.

(2) The Civil Wars (1559–98)

Guise ascendancy (1559–63). The accession of Francis II (1559–60) and Mary Stuart-Guise put the Guise faction in control temporarily. Replacing Coligny as governor of Picardy, they allied themselves with Philip II, and supported Mary of Guise in Scotland against the Lords of Congregation. Guise power provoked the Huguenots to a conspiracy which, however, was crushed in the first of reciprocal massacres, the "Tumult of Amboise" in 1560. Guise power was weakened by the king's death in December, 1560, and Catherine de' Medici became regent. She dared engage in the Conference of Poissy with Theodore Beza of

Geneva, and to issue an Edict of Toleration (1562) which accorded the Huguenots public cult outside walled towns. The duke of Guise thereupon seized the boy-king Charles IX (1560–74) and tried to rule in his name. This provoked the First Civil War (1562–63), favorable to the Guise until the duke was assassinated in February, 1563.

Valois equilibrium (1563–70) followed as the queen renewed her concessions to the Huguenots by the "Pacification of Amboise." The queen and L'Hôpital now tried to steer a middle course, alarming either side by halfhearted negotiations with Philip of Spain and Elizabeth of England. Bourbons and Guises intrigued at court, and in the field engaged in the indecisive Second (1567–68) and Third Civil Wars (1568–70). The "Pacification of St. Germain" in 1570 further extended Huguenot privileges.

Bourbon progress (1570–72). Papal excommunication of Queen Elizabeth of England and early Spanish success in the Netherlands seemed to portend a general Catholic offensive. Catherine then tried to offset rising Guise sentiment by conciliating the Bourbons. She gave her daughter Margaret in wedlock to Henry of Navarre, and summoned Admiral Coligny to court. At the same time she tried to marry her youngest son, François d'Alençon, to Elizabeth of England, while Coligny procured aid for the Dutch rebels and the German Protestants.

La Barthelemy. Coligny's ambitious projects, the queen presently perceived, were likely to bring down upon distracted France the mightiest military power of the day. In Machiavellian fashion she decided to rid herself of her too-powerful subject, Coligny. A hired assassin, Maureval, failed on August 22, 1572. It seems probable that the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, two days later, had no other premeditation than the queen's conviction that a bad job had better be completed before the alarmed Huguenots retaliated. Early on the morning of the feast, royal troops and Guise retainers fell upon the Huguenots in Paris, and similar massacres took place in the provinces during the following days. Perhaps two thousand to five thousand victims perished. The incident was reported to Gregory XIII as the "king's escape from a Huguenot plot"; this accounts for the papal *Te Deum.* It is not true that the Holy See was implicated; St. Pius V earlier in the year had condemned certain "intrigues" against Coligny that had come to his knowledge, and Gregory XIII on learning the full story branded Maureval as an "assassin."

Valois rule by attrition (1572–85) ensued while the Fourth to the Seventh Civil Wars were fought. These resulted in little else than confusion and exhaustion. Both in domestic and foreign politics the queen and her last surviving son, Henry III (1574–89), veered more and more in the Protestant direction, and only the childless Henry III lay between Henry of Navarre and the French crown.

War of the Three Henries. To avert this, Henry of Guise in 1585 declared for the Cardinal de Bourbon, Catholic uncle of Henry of Navarre, as heir to the throne. He procured the backing of Philip II by a promise to have Navarre ceded to Spain. Henry of Navarre resolved to fight for his kingdoms, provoking the Eighth Civil War (1585–89). During this three-cornered contest, Henry of Guise fought Henry of Navarre, while Henry of France attacked both. When Guise neared victory, Henry of France had him killed, December, 1588. "Now at last I am king," Henry III exclaimed, but whatever monarch France had died with Catherine de' Medici in January, 1589. Henry of France now went over to Henry of Navarre, but was stabbed to death in July, 1589, by Jacques Clément, fanatical partisan of the Guise.

War of the League. Henry of Navarre was now legitimate king of France as Henry IV, but the Catholic League refused to accept him and closed the gates of Paris against him. In the Ninth Civil War (1589–95) the Guise were supported by Philip II, but after the death of their candidate, the Cardinal "Charles X" (1590), prospect of a Spanish king lost the League much French support. Even so, Henry IV's triumph was far from assured in 1593 when he opened negotiations with the Estates General where moderate Catholics promised him recognition if he were to become a Catholic. Henry agreed to receive instruction and on June 23, 1593, abjured heresy and was absolved by Archbishop Beaune of Bourges. Henry's conversion may have been sincere. Born a Protestant, he may have begun inquiry with natural motives and gone on to accept Catholicity on supernatural grounds; certainly there was little of the Puritan about him. If his legendary saying, "Paris is worth a Mass" be true, Henry yet kept both Mass and Paris until his death. Crowned at Chartres in February, 1594, Henry IV entered Paris the next month as opposition melted away before his conversion. On September 18, 1595, Clement VIII, who at first deemed the archbishop's act premature, himself absolved and recognized the king. Even the Guise then submitted, January, 1596, and Philip II finally withdrew from the indecisive contest in May, 1598.

The Edict of Nantes, April 15, 1598, was Henry's solution for French religious divisions. This measure granted the Huguenots of France and Navarre political and religious autonomy within some hundred walled towns. For nearly a century, until its revocation by Louis XIV in 1685, this charter guaranteed Protestant freedom of worship in France. But France was not going Huguenot: in 1560 it is reliably estimated that fifteen per cent of France was Protestant, three out of twenty millions. By 1597, however, the proportion had fallen to ten per cent, though three bishops had defected and seven were suspect.

B. Gallican Triumph (1598–1629)

(1) MONARCHICAL RESTORATION (1598–1610)

Henry IV, king *de jure* since 1589, was not free from rivals until 1598. Thereafter this first of the Bourbons on the French throne proved an able and popular ruler. Though but a mediocre general, he had bluff, soldierly qualities, showed ready affability to his subjects, and had keen intelligence and wit. Hence the populace regarded him as "Good King Henry," although his intimates were well aware of his selfishness and avarice. In 1599 he secured an annulment of his marriage to the childless Margaret of Valois (1553–1615) when Pope Clement VIII accepted his plea of lack of initial consent. In 1600 the king married Marie de' Medici (1573–1640) who bore him his heir, Louis (1601–43).

Economic retrenchment was carried on by Henry's prime minister, the duc de Sully, a Huguenot financier who served him loyally from 1597 to the end of the reign. By economy, deflation, and careful collection of the taxes, Sully was able to effect an annual saving of a million livres by 1600. Sully, however, did not reform the haphazard system of administration and taxation thoroughly, but merely worked it as energetically as possible. His centralized bureaucracy enabled the monarchy to resume its long interrupted march toward Absolutism. A mercantilist policy cared for colonial interests; from this reign date French enterprises in Canada and India.

Religious situation. As a Huguenot, Sully was not disposed to interfere with the Edict of Nantes, and the Huguenot castles survived as a "state within a state." The dissidents even extended their influence, occasionally provoking riots by insults to Catholic practices. Though a minority, they were as forward as the German Protestants prior to the Thirty Years' War. The French crown showed itself self-confidently Gallican, and *parlement* still resisted the introduction of the Tridentine reform decrees, although the effects of the Civil Wars on ecclesiastical discipline had made these all the more necessary. Bodin's political treatise, *Six Livres de la Republique,* repudiated papal as well as imperial supervision of international law, and defended the absolute independence of the French monarchy from all alien controls. Pithou's *Libertés de L'Église Gallicane* defended a royal power to reform abuses in the Church, and hinted at the use of the conciliar theory in emergencies. At the close of the reign, as has been noted, Henry IV was meditating intervention on behalf of the German Protestants, when he belatedly met the fate of the other Henries: he was assassinated by François Ravaillac on May 14, 1610.

(2) Regency Relapse (1610–24)

Queen Marie de' Medici, as regent for the young King Louis XIII (1610–43), lacked either the vices or the ability of her cousin Catherine. Incompetent favorites mismanaged the government, the Huguenots became more aggressive, and the feudality reasserted itself. But the very weakness of the regime emboldened the French hierarchy to introduce the Tridentine decrees on their own authority in 1615. Simultaneously Berulle's Oratory began to exercise its reforming inspiration.

(3) Triumph of Absolutism (1624–29)

Cardinal Richelieu, member of the regency council since 1622, encouraged the young king to assume personal rule. Louis XIII did so in 1624 and made the cardinal his prime minister (1624–42). Consecrated bishop of Luçon in 1607, Richelieu had been an exemplary prelate so far as externals went. But he was almost a split personality, and it was not as bishop that he has made a name in history. Preoccupied with statesmanship, he aimed to make the king master of France, and France dominant in Europe. Through his own efforts and those of his disciple and successor, Cardinal Mazarin, these objectives were in large part realized by 1660.

Domestic victory. Richelieu set out to reduce the feudality to subjection. Huguenots, confident in the favor of the king's brother, Gaston of Orléans, did not wait but rose in revolt (1625) and solicited assistance from England. The cardinal did not fail to pursue them relentlessly and besieged their stronghold of La Rochelle for fifteen months while the duke of Buckingham vainly tried to bring relief. The fall of the citadel in May, 1628, broke the force of the rebellion. After mopping up, the cardinal-premier dictated the Peace of Alais in June, 1629. This abrogated the political autonomy conceded to the Huguenots by the Edict of Nantes, though it left its religious concessions intact. Deprived of their castellated home rule, the Huguenots ceased to be a major political party. Feudalism was further repressed by greater centralization and replacement of the noble governors in the provinces, with bourgeois intendants for fiscal supervision. Except for one final ineffective uprising, the Fronde of 1648–53 against Mazarin, the French nobility were brought into complete subjection to the crown.

Foreign triumph over the Austrian and Spanish Habsburgs, as already noted, exalted the French Bourbon monarchy to European primacy. This, too, was the result of Richelieu's diplomacy, as continued by Mazarin. Together they succeed in placing "His Most Christian Majesty" of France, Louis XIV (1643–1715), on the pinnacle of worldly power, whence he might plunge Europe into wasting conflicts and

insult the Holy See in a fashion but little different from that of Philip the Fair.

42. BRITISH RELIGIOUS STRIFE

A. Anglican Establishment (1558–1603)

(1) THE ELIZABETHAN REGIME (1558–1603)

Elizabeth Tudor (1533–1603), daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, succeeded Queen Mary in accord with the original dispositions of her father's testament. What religious sympathies she had were for Henrician "orthodoxy," but her interests were predominantly secular. The English Catholic hierarchy, made wiser by Edwardian heresy, would no longer support schism, while the queen herself would not recognize papal supremacy. Her only choice, then, lay in making what terms she could with the Protestants. The result was Anglicanism, hierarchical in discipline, but conservatively Protestant in doctrine. Though not without good impulses, Elizabeth was Machiavellian in the decisive moment after the tears had been shed. Her baffling diplomacy deceived two popes, not to speak of Philip II and a series of supposedly worldly-wise princes, suitors, and courtiers. But herself she could not deceive, and as far as man can surmise, she dropped her mask in despair during her last days.

William Cecil (1520–98), baron Burleigh and chief minister of the reign, was her ally. On basic issues he agreed with the queen; they were mutually indispensable: Cecil needed the queen's favor to remain in office, but she also required his information and skill. Adroit and cautious, he was brutal when it was safe to be, and he often stiffened the queen's resolution to deeds rightly unpalatable to humanity.

(2) ANGLICAN BEGINNINGS (1558–60)

Protestant omens. Although England remained officially Catholic until the re-enactment of the Acts of Supremacy and of Uniformity, May–June, 1559, Elizabeth was not long in hinting the trend of her religious policy. She struck the name of Pope Paul IV from the list of sovereigns to be notified of her accession, and allowed the airing of anti-Catholic views by unofficial channels. At Christmas she began to tamper with the Mass, though Bishop Oglethorpe was prevailed upon to crown her, January 15, 1559, "lest she be more easily moved to overthrow religion."

Royal supremacy, however, was clearly asserted when parliament met the same month. While the bishops opposed the suggested religious changes to a man, the laity offered little objection to a new Act of Supremacy which passed on April 25. As signed on May 8, this was nearly the same as the Henrician measure, save that the Queen was

styled "supreme governor" instead of "supreme head," apparently in order to leave an opening for compromising would-be Catholics. Some of the laity, indeed, held out for the Mass or the *First Book of Common Prayer,* but the queen ordered restoration of the *Second Book,* effective June 24, 1559. All the bishops, except Kitchin of Llandaff, refused to take the corresponding oaths to the new Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, and were deprived of their sees. They were replaced by a hierarchy installed according to the revived Edwardian *Ordinal.* From Barlow's invalid consecration of the new primate of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, on December 17, 1559, all Anglican prelates and clergy have derived their orders. The Catholic Bishop Bonner, indeed, challenged their validity; whereupon in 1564 the queen graciously issued a letter "supplying all defects." She herself, however, showed scant respect for her prelates and "hedge priests." All of the Catholic hierarchy died in prison except Kitchin, Heath of York, permitted to retire to his family estate, and Goldwell who escaped to the Continent where he died in 1585, last survivor of the Marian Catholic regime. Of some eight thousand beneficed clerics, six thousand took the required oaths, though some of these continued to say Mass in secret. About seven hundred resisted strongly; the others fled or resigned.

(3) Religious Truce (1560–66)

Catholic status. At Elizabeth's accession possibly two-thirds of Englishmen were opposed to Protestant doctrine, although many of these were amenable to Henrician schism. As late as June, 1565, Pope Pius IV spoke kindly of Elizabeth and expressed hope of reconciliation. For her part, the queen took advantage of this respite and took care not to push Catholics too fast or too far. Her government winked at secret evasion of the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy in some cases, and among the penalties for violation stopped at fines or imprisonment. Catholics in official position seized on the straw that Elizabeth was merely "supreme governor" in order to take the oaths with mental reservation of allegiance to the Pope as "supreme head." Many private citizens were not called upon to take the oaths. While occasionally conforming to the new ritual, they continued to hear Mass in secret—sometimes the same clergyman performed both rites in succession!

Anglican doctrine, as expressed in the *Thirty-Nine Articles* in January, 1563, was Protestant enough, though it was expressed in as ambiguous terms as possible. Thus, justification by faith alone, exclusive reliance upon the Bible, and rejection of papal and conciliar authority were upheld. All of the sacraments except baptism and the "Supper" were omitted, though the explicit repudiation of the Mass was not promulgated until 1570, when all hope of conciliating the Catholics had van-

ished. But the Edwardian *Prayer Book* and *Ordinal* precluded the offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass by the new generation of clergymen.

Puritanism. This definitive establishment of an Anglican *via media* between Catholicity and radical Protestantism alienated extreme Protestants who came to be termed "Puritans" because they wished to "purify" Anglicanism of papist vestiges. Of these, the Presbyterians inspired by John Knox and led by Thomas Cartwright (1535–1603) opposed Anglican episcopacy; while the Independents or Congregationalists, under the lead of Robert Browne (1550–1603), objected to any ecclesiastical government, ritual, or doctrinal formulation imposed from above.

(4) RELIGIOUS DECISION (1566–72)

St. Pius V (1566–72) soon put an end to any religious ambiguity in England. As cardinal-prefect of the Holy Office he had declared as early as 1562 that attendance at Anglican services was not to be tolerated; this, however, was a private rescript not certainly binding on all. Once pope, St. Pius promptly in the summer of 1566 condemned the *Book of Common Prayer,* and sent Father Vaux to circulate the decision, with broad faculties for reconciliation from schism and heresy. In 1564 Dr. Thomas Harding had made an effective *Rejoinder* to John Jewel's *Apologia* for Anglican establishment, and this was now distributed among the English Catholics. In 1567–68 the Catholic seminary on the Continent got under way under the direction of William Allen.

Political Rubicon. Not a few Catholics were roused to medieval militancy by these developments. In June, 1569, a plan was arranged to liberate Mary Stuart, restore her to the Scottish throne, and, if Elizabeth were not amenable, to place her in power in England as well. Late in the year a rising began in the north which solicited papal backing. Belatedly informed, Pope Pius V in February, 1570, issued the bull *Regnans in Excelsis* which employed against Elizabeth the old theocratic weapons of excommunication and deposition. Unfortunately this document was posted in London by the daring John Felton in May, 1570, after the northern rebellion had been suppressed. The papal action, therefore, proved to be the height of political inexpediency, although it irrevocably cleared the religious fog.

(5) PERSECUTION (1571–1603)

Penal laws. Not only did Queen Elizabeth take mortal vengeance on the leaders of the northern uprising, but in April, 1571, her packed parliament made it high treason to question her title to rule, to communicate with Rome, or to make use of Catholic religious articles. The

property of all refugees who failed to return within six months would be confiscated. The parliament of January, 1581, extended this indictment to any attempts to withdraw one from the practice of Anglicanism, the celebration or hearing of Mass, and fines were imposed for absence from Anglican services. Legislation during 1585 also made it high treason to minister as a priest or to harbor a priest in one's house. Finally in 1593 recusants were forbidden to travel five miles from their homes. These and other laws made the practice of the Catholic religion treasonable. Of the six hundred beatified victims of English persecution from 1535 to 1681, Queen Elizabeth accounted for 189, of whom 126 were priests. But countless others were executed for reasons pertinent to religion, if not officially judged sufficient for martyrdom by the Church. After 1583 Elizabeth was also severe toward the Puritans, though she is known to have invoked the death penalty in only two cases.

Priests from overseas. Marian priests still labored in England, and in 1573 Blessed Thomas Woodhouse, captive since 1561, was put to death. But replacements now began to arrive from Douai, the English College at Rome, and the Jesuit Order. Douay had 160 martyred alumni from its proto-martyr, Blessed Cuthbert Moyne, in 1577 until 1680. In 1580 Blessed Edmund Campion, future martyr, arrived to inaugurate the Jesuit mission. Despite the increasing vigilance of the port authorities and the mounting severity of the persecution, there were 360 priests in England when Elizabeth died. Unfortunately some disagreements between secular and regular missionaries impaired the effectiveness of their work, and in 1598 in lieu of a vicar apostolic, George Blackwell was named archpriest of the Anglo-Scottish mission. He turned out to be an unhappy choice.

Political complications. Robert Persons (1546–1610), a Jesuit who arrived in 1580 with Blessed Campion, proved to be more of a politician than a missionary. Presently he retired to Spain to plot the overthrow of the Elizabethan regime through Spanish intervention. A series of futile plots to rescue Mary Stuart, largely engineered by foreign meddlers, generally disgusted the Englishmen, including Catholics, and led the still captive queen to the block in 1587. Philip II's Spanish Armada of the following year was supposed to avenge her, but it was crippled by a storm and then destroyed by superior English seamanship, apparently with few regrets by English Catholics. Therefore, Elizabeth remained politically triumphant, although her last years showed her that a determined minority of Catholic and Puritan dissenters were undermining her cherished religious uniformity. Yet she would scarcely have dreamed that before another Elizabeth would ascend the English throne, Roman Catholics in England would outnumber the members of the official Anglican establishment. But at the close of her reign (1603),

practicing Catholics could have numbered no more than a third, if a sixth of the population.

B. Anglican Crisis (1603-60)

(1) JAMES I (1603-25)

James Stuart (1566-1625), king of Scotland since 1567, succeeded to the English crown as well at Elizabeth's death. Besides his claims as Mary Stuart's son, James had Elizabeth's deathbed acquiescence, at least as interpreted by Cecil's son Robert who continued as chief minister until his death in 1612. James's accession effected a personal union of the British Isles, but Scotland remained legally separate until 1707.

Religious policy. All groups turned hopefully to the new monarch, an explicit defender of the theory of "divine right" rule. In April, 1603, the Puritans presented a "Millenary Petition," supposedly signed by a thousand ministers, requesting that the Anglican establishment be remolded to their views. But James retorted: "If you aim at Scottish presbytery, it agreeth as well with me as God with the devil." Far from favoring the Puritans, the king proceeded to "harry them out of the land"—into New England. Instead the king upheld episcopalianism throughout Britain and encouraged William Laud (1573-1645) in his "High Church" stress on altars, vestments, and stained glass windows. Catholics, on the other hand, expected some leniency from Mary Stuart's son. But James had never known his mother and regarded Catholicity as equally menacing to his royal prerogative. In February, 1604, the king ordered all priests out of England and the following month had parliament re-enact the Elizabethan penal code. These harsh measures infuriated a group of Catholics who planned to blow up king and parliament alike on November 5, 1605.

Religious politics. The ensuing "Gunpowder Plot" was engineered by Robert Catesby, though Guy Fawkes, caught in the act, achieved immortality by being hanged in effigy every November 5 thereafter. Father Henry Garnet (1555-1606) was also executed, apparently because he would not break the seal of confession. A severe reaction of bigotry then swept over England and recusants were ordered to take a new oath against the papal deposing power. Archpriest Blackwell interpreted this as merely tendering civil allegiance and led some Catholics into taking the pledge in 1606. Pope Paul V, however, eventually condemned this action and deposed Blackwell in 1608. His successor, George Birkhead (1608-14), had much difficulty in reconciling the Catholic divisions and even erection of an episcopal vicariate apostolic in 1623 brought little peace. But while matrimonial negotiations were pending between the English and Spanish royal families, King

James released four thousand Catholic prisoners and enforced the penal laws less rigorously. Even though Prince Charles eventually married Henrietta Maria of France, this alliance with a Catholic power continued the expedient tolerance.

(2) CHARLES I (1625–49)

Charles (1600–49), only surviving son of King James I, inherited his throne and his feud with parliament over "divine-right" royal prerogative. Charles was shy and melancholy. Though sharing his father's monarchical principles, he lacked his intelligence, vanity and dogmatism. Honorable in personal relations, the king subscribed to the Machiavellian tenet that deceit was justifiable in defense of "reason of state," especially the royal prerogative. Though an exemplary private citizen, Charles turned out to be a most unsuccessful monarch. When parliament refused adequate funds to run the government unless the king would repudiate his "divine right" and "High Church" principles, Charles, after vainly trying to rule independently (1629–40), resorted to force. A *coup d'état* in parliament failing of its objective, he set up his standard, provoking war between the largely rural and Anglican "Cavaliers" and the dissident "Roundheads," whose strength lay in London. In this contest the king lost his head, though not his honor, and his dignified death deeply impressed Englishmen who were soon disillusioned of parliamentary Puritanism.

Religious history. King Charles was sincerely devoted to Anglicanism of a ritual variety of Laud, whom he made primate of Canterbury in 1633. Though neither king nor primate had any love for Catholicity, they were no persecutors. Charles incurred the odium of the Puritans by refusing to execute Catholics, and only twice did parliament wring from him death sentences. The king winked at his own laws to procure Catholic ministrations for his Catholic queen and her circle. A Catholic vicar-apostolic, Bishop Smith, resided in England from 1624 to 1631, but thereafter the English vicariate was practically in abeyance until 1685. Most Catholics embraced the royal cause as at least the lesser of two evils during the Civil War (1642–46), and for centuries the Stuart party was, without adequate justification, associated with favor to Catholic interests.

(3) THE COMMONWEALTH (1642–60)

Political survey. Though the Commonwealth was not officially proclaimed until after the king's execution in 1649, from 1642 parliament was supreme over the greater part of England and after 1645 was the *de facto* government. The inexperienced parliamentarians were not effective in the conduct of the war until Oliver Cromwell organized his

disciplined "New Model" army in 1644. This force quickly won the war but made itself and its general indispensable. In 1648 Cromwell purged parliament of conservative Presbyterians and cautious burghers. The remaining servile "Rump Parliament" took its directions from the army. After subduing Scotland and Ireland (1649–51), Cromwell returned to an open military dictatorship (1653–58), which professed to unite England, Ireland, and Scotland into a unitary republic under the written *Instrument of Government.* Oliver Cromwell could rule but not persuade, and his son Richard could do neither, resigning in May, 1659. When an anarchical contest among generals threatened, one of them, George Monck, sensed the popular nostalgia for the "good old days" of monarchy. After opening negotiations with the late king's son, Monck forcibly dissolved the "Long Parliament" (1640–60), and a reasonably free convention in April, 1660, voted that "government is, and ought to be by king, lords, and commons." At this cue Charles II landed at Dover, May 25, 1660.

Religious developments. Since most of the nobles, Anglican or Catholic, rallied to the king, the government devolved on the Puritan-dominated House of Commons. Presbyterians and Independents at first united to enforce the penal laws against Catholics: between 1642 and 1651 parliament executed twenty-one Catholics and confiscated much property. But the Presbyterians alienated other dissenters from Anglicanism by their plans for a Calvinist theocracy in league with the Scottish Covenanters. Cromwell, a fanatical but independent Protestant, thwarted an attempt to impose Presbyterianism upon England by law. His own military dictatorship tolerated all types of Protestants, and contemplated an established non-hierarchical church, with all sects subsidized equally by the state. Anglicans, though excluded from public office, were not persecuted. Jews were readmitted legally to England from which they had been banished in 1290. Only to Catholics did Cromwell deny leniency, although in their regard he preferred confiscation to execution. In England only one priest was executed during his administration, although Irish Catholics felt the full force of his religious and national prejudices. The Cromwellian Settlement, imposed in May, 1652, indeed settled Ireland in misery and poverty for centuries. All native land ownership was confiscated from Catholics and the latter were reduced to impoverished tenants for centuries. The external manifestations of Catholic worship were proscribed by ferocious penal laws, and the native language and customs were dealt with ruthlessly, but the Catholic and Irish spirit remained unconquered. Both in Ireland and in England by 1660 Catholic survivors had seen the worst of persecution, although another century of trial was ahead of them before the comparative toleration of the Relief Act of 1778.

43. SLAVIC CATHOLIC SURVIVAL

A. *Poland* *(1506–1668)*

(1) ADVENT OF PROTESTANTISM (1506–48)

Sigismund I (1506–48), youngest of the sons of Casimir the Great, wore the Polish crown during a critical half century. As grandson of Jagielo, he also ruled Lithuania, an immense land comprising the Ukraine and extending to Turkish-held Crimea. Sigismund proved capable of defending his realms against foreign foes, though the Russian capture of Smolensk in 1514 marked the beginning of a reconquest of White Russia, lost during the period of Russian disunity. Within his own kingdom, Sigismund faced a turbulent nobility, whose feudal control over the *bourgeoisie* and peasantry had been secured by statute (1496–1505). The hereditary Jagellon dynasty did enjoy a certain prestige, but even a monarch as competent as Sigismund I had to yield on many points to the nobles' remonstrances, as in 1537.

Protestant infiltration. The king, who remained a loyal Catholic, promptly seconded Pope Leo X's condemnation of Luther: *Exurge Domine* was upheld in Poland by the Edict of Thorn which proscribed Luther's writings. But Queen Bona Sforza (1493–1557), whom Sigismund married in 1518, was an undiscriminating patroness of novelty, and her Italian chaplain Lismanini seems to have dabbled in Calvinism. Polish students at Wittenberg and other German universities, moreover, brought back Lutheran ideas. At Posen, John Seclusian circulated Polish versions of Lutheran annotated Scriptures. Jacob Knade, an apostate monk in Dantzig, won partisans who protected his preaching of Lutheran teachings. Martin Glossa introduced Lutheran ideas into the national university of Cracow. The royal ban on Lutheranism was sustained by John Laski (1456–1531), archbishop of Gnesen since 1510, who held several synods against the heresy. Another prominent Catholic defender was Andrew Krzychi (d. 1537), humanist, royal chancellor, and eventually himself archbishop of Gnesen. But though the king forbade Polish students to frequent Wittenberg after 1534, Lutheran ideas continued to circulate in Poland, inasmuch as the force of the royal edicts and canonical censures was blunted by the jealous autonomy of the feudality. Many of this class, including the bishop of Posen, were willing to give a hearing to Lutheran and Hussite refugees. Before the king's death in 1548, Protestantism had done considerable boring within a free-thinking aristocracy. But the majority of the Polish people, whether in the towns or the country, often showed their resentment against this negligence by themselves taking forceful measures against disseminators of heresy.

(2) PROTESTANT PROGRESS (1548–87)

Sigismund II (1520–72) was a lukewarm and compromising Catholic. His first wife, Barbara Radziwill (d. 1551), was a Calvinist, though Queen Catherine (1533–72), daughter of Emperor Ferdinand I, later exercised a Catholic influence. At the Diet of Piotkrow in 1552 the nobility under the lead of the Calvinist Radziwills secured nullification of all previous legislation against the dissidents. Foreign Protestants now flooded the land, while Polish innovators grew bolder. Their leader was John a Lasco (1499–1560), apostate priest, who adopted a mélange of Lutheranism, Zwinglianism, and Calvinism during a tour of Europe. In 1556 he returned to Poland to champion a national Protestant establishment tolerant of sectarian opinions. With royal approval, a "National Synod" was held at Piotkrow in 1555 which recommended those Catholic-Protestant debates, elsewhere characteristic of states preparing for defection. The king proposed to Paul IV a vernacular liturgy, Communion under both species for the laity, a married clergy, and abolition of annates. Archbishop Jacob Uchanski of Gnesen (1563–81), aspiring to head a national church, granted preachers the utmost liberty, and in 1570 the dissidents issued from their Sandomir Conference a vague doctrinal formula on which they proposed to unite against Catholics.

Catholic resistance to threatened national apostasy was led by Stanislauw Hozjusz (Hosius) (1504–79), bishop of Ermland, and after 1561, cardinal. Between 1551 and 1558 he edited an excellent polemic, *Confession of the Catholic Faith,* which revived the slumbering of many Poles. In 1564 Hosius introduced the Jesuits to Poland in order to open schools, teach catechism, and debate with the dissidents. Such signs of Catholic vigor appeared that the opportunistic Archbishop Uchanski presently abandoned his plans for a schism.

Interregnum followed Sigismund II's death in July, 1572, which terminated the reign of the Jagellons. The throne was henceforth elective and more dependent on a jealous nobility. Spokesman for the latter until his death in 1605 was Jan Zamoyski. The interval was utilized by the nobility to impose the "Peace of the Dissidents" which from 1573 to 1588 guaranteed them equal religious and civil privileges with Catholics.

Henry of Valois, elected king of Poland in May, 1573, ratified these concessions and expressly recognized the monarchy as limited. When his brother, Charles IX of France, died in March, 1574, however, Henry literally escaped from the country in order to occupy the throne of his native land.

Stephen Bathori, prince of Transylvania and husband of Anne Jagellon, a sister of Sigismund II, was elected to the vacant Polish throne in 1575. Although a Catholic, King Stephen also observed the religious

truce. Besides patronizing the Jesuit schools, he did little to effect a change in the religious status.

(3) VASA COUNTER REFORMATION (1587–1668)

Sigismund III (1587–1632), crown prince of Sweden, was chosen king of Poland in 1587. He was militantly Catholic and co-operated with the Jesuits and the Habsburgs in promoting the Catholic Counter Reformation. Archbishop Uchanski had been succeeded by Stanislaus Karnkowski (1526–1603), who enthusiastically promoted Catholic reform. It was at his suggestion that King Sigismund, far from giving the dissidents encouragement, reaffirmed the official position of the Catholic Church in Poland in 1588. The king's exemplary conduct made Catholicity fashionable again in official circles. Himself trained by the Jesuits, he gave their Order his entire support. Father Jacob Wujek (d. 1597), besides distinguished service as preacher and professor, edited a good Polish translation of the Bible. An excellent catechism was prepared by Bishop Bialobrzeski. These and other leaders consolidated Catholic ranks, though they provoked the hostility of dissidents. In 1595, moreover, a considerable number of Ruthenian schismatics submitted to Rome in the Union of Brest-Litovsk.

Ladislas VII (1632–48), Sigismund's elder son, was elected to succeed him without opposition. Ladislas, quite as orthodox as his father, saw the need of Polish unity against avaricious neighbors. This he sought to achieve by conceding civil liberties to the dissidents, but his efforts met with little success and were misconstrued by uncompromising Jesuits. Nor could the king decide whether he should seek Habsburg aid against the Swedes, Russians, and Turks who threatened Poland, and Polish fear of German domination left her to face aggression alone.

John II Casimir (1648–68) succeeded his childless brother on the Polish throne to begin act three of his amazing career of Jesuit, cardinal, king, and abbot. He inherited the consequences of vacillation. In 1654 the Cossack chief, Bogdan Khmelnitsky, transferred his allegiance from Poland to Russia, and in 1655 the Swedes invaded Poland at the same time that the dissidents rebelled. Catholic resistance at Czestochowa Abbey turned the tide against the Swedes, and in 1656 the king in gratitude dedicated Poland to the Virgin Mary. But in 1660 Poland had to yield Sweden control of the Baltic, and in 1667 Smolensk and eastern Ukraine were ceded to Russia. Though the king had married his brother's widow, Queen Marie de Gonzaga, he had no children. In 1668 he abdicated to resume his clerical vocation as Abbot of St. Germain in France, leaving the Polish monarchy, or rather republic, once more a prey to faction.

B. Russia (1533–1689)

(1) Muscovite Advance (1533–1613)

Ivan the Terrible (1533–84) succeeded to the Muscovite principality which claimed to be the heir of Byzantium, and pushed its frontiers toward the Baltic, the Black Sea and the Urals. He developed trade with England and commenced expansion into Siberia. An attack on Livonia, however, was repulsed, and after his wife's death in 1560 he became mentally deranged. Yet in his arbitrary and inconsistent action a trend toward absolutism may be seen.

Aristocratic reaction followed under the weak reign of Ivan's son Theodore (1584–98), and on the latter's death one of the nobles, Boris Godunov, seized the throne (1598–1605). Pretenders to the throne appeared and Boris and his son were slain in 1605. The ensuing "Time of Troubles" was a period of anarchy during which it seemed for a time that Russia might be conquered by Poland. Sigismund III had his son Ladislas chosen king of Russia by a faction, and it is an interesting speculation how history might have been changed if a Catholic dynasty had been permanently seated on the Russian throne. The Polish attempt, however, was in total defiance of Russian national and religious prejudices, and a patriotic uprising repulsed it.

(2) Romanov Nationalism (1613–89)

Philaret Romanov, Muscovite patriarch from 1619 to 1633, was the agent of Russian revival. In 1613 he succeeded in convoking a national assembly which chose his son Michael as czar (1613–45). Philaret, however, remained the power behind the throne until death. He used the prestige of the Orthodox Church to restore order and impose despotism on impoverished and ignorant serfs. His grandson Alexis (1645–76) dis·continued calling the national assembly and acquired part of the Ukraine, while Theodore III (1676–82) obtained some territory at the expense of Turkey.

The Russian Church, which had been granted patriarchal dignity in 1585 by Jeremias II of Constantinople, became a powerful ally of the monarchy. When in political difficulties or in order to conciliate new Polish subjects, Russian rulers often opened negotiations with the Holy See, but Romeward moves were soon halted. Peter Mogilas (d. 1647), Orthodox metropolitan of Kiev, composed an *Orthodox Confession,* equally opposed to the Catholic and Protestant positions. This with his *Catechism* became the cornerstone of Russian orthodoxy in years to come. Henceforth it became a cardinal policy of Russian czardom to force all subjects to conform to the Russian Orthodox Church, and the

Ruthenian Uniates had much to suffer whenever they came under the control of the czars. But more serious was the rift within the Russian Church, for perhaps a third of the Russians were eventually involved in the Raskol Schism of 1667. Many of the peasants, dejected by poor land, antiquated methods of farming and feudal oppression, sympathized with this rebellion against the Orthodox Church which they had come to identify with the oppressive czarist rule. Russian advance into the Western orbit threatened, then, to involve Poland in many difficulties.

C. Hungary (1526–1699)

(1) Mohammedan and Protestant Threats

Retrospect. At the death of Louis II (1526), his kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia passed under Habsburg rule until 1918. But whereas Bohemia, a constituent state of the Holy Roman Empire, was firmly under Austrian control, Hungary remained a separate kingdom only personally united to the German monarchs.

Turkish domination. As husband of Louis II's sister Anne, Ferdinand of Habsburg, younger brother of Emperor Charles V, had claimed the Hungarian throne. Magyar nationalism so feared German domination that a large group of nobles, headed by John Zapolya, sought Turkish assistance. John Zapolya became Prince of Transylvania under Turkish suzerainty, and Ferdinand was able to gain possession of no more than a third of Hungary.

Protestant infiltration. Fifteenth-century Saxon immigrants provided a receptive field for Lutheran proselytizing. The Hungarian primate from 1497 to 1521, Cardinal Thomas Bokocy, was an ambitious and avaricious pluralist, and clerical discipline relaxed. Before 1525, when the Diet of Pesth decreed penalties against them, the Hungarian students from Wittenberg introduced Lutheranism. Led by Matthias Devay (d. 1546), many Magyars went over to the new sect, which was officially established in five cities. Lutheranism, however, had too many German connotations for most Magyars; after 1543 they began to follow Devay into Zwinglianism and then Peter Melius (1536–72) into Calvinism. Kaspar Koroli (1529–92) edited a Calvinist Magyar Bible and in 1563 the Protestant Synod of Tarezal declared Calvinism the national religion.

Catholic resistance to these Protestant inroads was at first ineffective. King Ferdinand and his Habsburg successors pushed protective measures for the Church through the Hungarian Diets and proscribed Protestant views, but these laws were enforced with difficulty even in that portion of Hungary subject to Habsburg rule, while dissidents could always find refuge in Transylvania. Nicholaus Olahi, archbishop of Gran (1553–68), introduced the Tridentine decrees and called in the Jesuits, but

Protestantism continued to make progress throughout the sixteenth century while the primatial see was paralyzed by long vacancies, one lasting twenty-three years.

(2) HUNGARIAN COUNTER REFORMATION

Catholic revival gained full momentum only under Peter Pazmany, primate of Gran from 1616 until his death in 1637. A convert from Calvinism, he entered the Jesuit order and was trained at Rome. On his return to Hungary in 1601, he distinguished himself as preacher, teacher, and apologist. As archbishop he received the wholehearted support of Emperor Ferdinand II (1618–37), the promoter of the Counter Reformation throughout the Habsburg dominions. Catholic fidelity was ensured by newly organized or revived schools, seminaries, and colleges. The archbishop made so many converts that it was eventually said of him that "he was born in Protestant Hungary, but died in Catholic Hungary." He was, of course, merely the most prominent of a host of zealous and untiring workers.

Reconquest from the Turks. The Calvinist princes of Transylvania under Turkish overlordship meanwhile tried to coerce their Catholic serfs. Militant Catholics demanded the restoration of churches seized by Protestants, and this led to intermittent warfare throughout the seventeenth century. In 1678, Eneric Tököly rose in a determined effort to defend the waning Protestant position. By 1684, with Turkish assistance, he gained control of a large part of Hungary. But the Turkish advance was halted before Vienna by the imperial general, Charles of Lorraine, supported by King John III Sobieski of Poland. Emperor Leopold I (1658–1705) then pressed the offensive against the Turks with such success that in 1699 the Treaty of Carlowitz restored all of Hungary and Transylvania to the Habsburg crown. This was of immense benefit to Catholics who were freed alike from Turkish oppression and Calvinist discrimination. The Catholic Church remained the official religion, although Protestants were conceded toleration.

Section III

RATIONALIST HUMANISM

1638-1789

VI

Theological Subjectivism

44. THE "ENLIGHTENMENT"

A. *Philosophic "Enlightenment"*

(1) NATURE OF THE MOVEMENT

"Enlightenment" or "Aufklaerung" was a term which became current for a new philosophy of life which gradually captivated European thought. Its ideal was Naturalism and its method was Rationalism, as opposed to the supernatural and Revelation. "The Enlightenment is the logical outcome of philosophical as well as Protestant religious individualism, and the absence of tradition. It has three roots: (1) Protestantism, or more specifically the disruption caused by Protestantism; (2) Humanism; (3) the autonomous development of individualistic philosophy, built upon mathematic-scientific discoveries." [1] Indeed, "the roots of the new 'Enlightenment' lay in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but its greatest spread and most obvious fruitage were so characteristic of the eighteenth century that it is this century which is known as the age of the 'Enlightenment.' " [2] Here, however, the term is employed with less stress upon chronology in order to describe the transition, admittedly gradual, from the primarily theological preoccupations of the age of religious revolts and wars (1517–1648), to the philosophic and rationalist fixation of the following period to the French Revolution. Leaving the new political philosophies to a topic more proximate to

[1] Joseph Lortz, *History of the Church*, trans. Edwin G. Kaiser, C.PP.S. (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1935), p. 444.

[2] Carlton Hayes, *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932–36), I, 511.

that cataclysm, attention can be directed for the moment to the more remote, though fundamental, transformations in speculative philosophy.

(2) CARTESIAN REVOLUTION

René Descartes (1596–1650) became the first important rebel against scholastic philosophy and is the remote but genuine founder of "Modern" schools. The Protestant Revolt had not been primarily a philosophic upheaval, and Luther in particular had belittled reason. Descartes was himself a product of Scholasticism to the extent that he studied at the Jesuit College of La Flèche. But while he never withdrew from the Catholic Church, and professed to except theology from the application of his speculations, his principles served in effect to revive the apparent conflict between Faith and reason which had been reconciled by St. Thomas Aquinas.

Cartesian scepticism, hypothetical though it was, served as the first introduction of an agnosticism that undermined both Faith and reason by questioning their ability to afford any conclusions of universal and lasting validity. It became the remote ancestor of modern pseudo-tolerance in regard to the very foundations of Revelation and meta-physics. For by exalting intuition of the cognitive subject over abstraction from experience with external material reality, Descartes at once fathered an idealistic trend culminating in Immanuel Kant, and provoked an empiricist reaction pushed to extremes by David Hume. Though he did not deny the reality of external substance, Descartes did take a first step in that direction by relegating certain secondary qualities to mere modes of subjective consciousness. On the other hand, by assuming the validity of human cognition and then demonstrating this same validity from the nature of God arrived at by innate ideas, Descartes forced himself into an untenable subjectivist position which glorified the individual at the expense of the universe, almost asserting his independence from its order. Thus he became an ancestor of the mind of "modern man," anthropocentric, lost in a world of doubt, confusion, and disunion. In aspiring to be an angel with infused ideas, Cartesian man had lost touch with external reality and became the victim of Rationalism. And "the essence of Rationalism consists in making human reason and its ideological content the measure of what is." [3]

(3) IDEALISTIC TREND

Cartesian inspiration. "Descartes' conception of man as an angel, or disembodied thinking substance, swept Europe, and was soon received as immediate evidence by the greatest thinkers of his time. Stripping

[3] Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942), p. 85.

themselves both of their bodies and of their souls, they became magnificent minds who, theoretically at least, did not feel indebted to their bodies for any one of their ideas. Leibniz in Germany, Malebranche in France, Spinoza in Holland were such minds, and all of them had nothing but innate ideas." [4]

Blaise Pascal (1623–62) adopted Cartesian scepticism to such extent as virtually to despair of reason, and fall back on faith alone, extending to reason perhaps no more than a "wager on God." Through Pascal, Descartes had some indirect influence on Jansenism.

Baruch Spinoza (1632–77), proceeding from the Cartesian preoccupation with demonstrating God's existence from one's own intuition of Him, was led to consider the mode of the origin of that idea within himself. He concluded by practically identifying the idea of God with God in a pantheistic system which came to be called "metaphysical parallelism."

Nicolas de Malebranche (1638–1715) also brought God into immediate and direct intellectual association with the thinking subject, although his Catholic faith prevented him from identifying God with man. Instead he suggested that matter, including man, afforded God occasions for giving man sensations and corresponding ideas: men became mere puppets in this "occasionalism."

Gottfried von Leibniz (1646–1716) used Descartes' idealistic claim for God's existence in the direction of innate ideas, and shut the door far more firmly against external experience than Descartes had done. Far from being an irreligious man, however, Leibniz wrote in the interest of a synthesis of Catholicity and Protestantism. For Leibniz, God had from the beginning deftly arranged a "pre-established harmony" of monads or essences.

Christian von Wolff (1679–1754), though he introduced some modifications into Leibniz's system, chiefly toward widening the cleavage between religion and philosophy, need be noted here chiefly as the link between Leibniz and Kant.

Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) concluded the idealistic trend by completely reorientating philosophy on an idealistic, subjective basis and utterly breaking with scholastic realism. Kant's views undermined the supernatural character of religion for many Protestants and eventually tempted some "Modernists" from the Catholic fold. Hitherto philosophers had been held somewhat in check by their personal religious beliefs; for Kant religion becomes morality, the final product was a nondogmatic "Christianity" which undermined the surviving fundamentals

[4] Étienne Gilson, *Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 163.

of Protestantism. Kant will be treated again in connection with Liberalism.

(4) EMPIRICIST REACTION

Cartesian stimulus. Descartes' antithesis between spirit and matter produced a reaction: while Idealists gave unreserved primacy to spirit and mind, Locke and the Empiricist School concentrated on matter. Thus arose a less noble, if often more common-sense, philosophic school, the forerunner of modern doctrinaire Materialism. Descartes, in departing from the scholastic realism had sired two warped versions of philosophic reality, engaged in continual academic conflict.

John Locke (1632–1704) repudiated Cartesian intuitionalism by a critique retaining much of Scholastic doctrine. Unfortunately, however, he retained the Cartesian dilemma, spirit or matter, and concluded for certainty as to the latter as the more obvious. "In other words, let us say we have no positive reasons to believe that matter is a thing that thinks, but when Descartes says that a thinking matter would be a contradiction, he goes far beyond the limits of what we know, and of what can be proved by the power of human understanding." [5]

Isaac Newton (1642–1727) by his brilliant scientific discoveries inaugurated the vogue of the physical sciences as intellectual mentors. Though not expressly a philosopher, he seemed to have vindicated a deistic naturalism with a brilliant but aloof Divine Mathematical Genius to initiate that perfect and exactly measureable machine that was the world. Newton's success, and that of Halley, Herschel, Torricelli, Fahrenheit, Boyle, Hutton, Leeuwenhoek, and others, seemed to confirm the validity of the empiricist method. Though physical science had not yet entirely supplanted metaphysics as queen of the natural sciences, these scientific advances foreshadowed the great cult of science of the nineteenth century. While most physical scientists of the period were at least Deists, some were beginning to air superficial views on religion and philosophy with pontifical solemnity.

David Hume (1711–76) brought the empiricist school back to the point from which it had started: scepticism. But whereas Descartes had professed a merely hypothetical doubt, Hume reached a real and sweeping scepticism, described as "pan-phenomenalism." Mind as well as matter was reduced to observable phenomena and the principle of causality undermined, if not repudiated. For many, Hume had given the final blow to metaphysics, and torn from its philosophic mooring, the intellectual world began to revolve in giddy circles. In particular, Hume roused Kant "from his dogmatic slumbers" to attempt a new philosophic

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 169.

synthesis which would prove to be a foundation as unstable as that of Descartes when he tried to evoke a new dogmatism without metaphysics.

B. Theological "Enlightenment"

(1) DETERIORATION OF PROTESTANTISM

Sectarian divisions. Luther and Calvin, while revolting against the dogmas of the Catholic Church, were themselves the most dogmatic of men. Their dogmatism, however, lacked the sanction of a recognized authority, of an organized educational system, and of a disciplined clergy. One revolt always opened the door to others: if Luther and Calvin and Tudor had felt themselves justified in rebelling against the Catholic Church because they disagreed with her, then their disciples were more than justified in questioning the teaching of the new doctors. Zwingli had dared to reject Luther's impanation; Arminius repudiated Calvin's predestinarianism; Tudor's son and daughter abandoned Henrician premises, while Puritans and Brownists challenged theirs. The ultimate result was a multitude of sects with conflicting beliefs and practices. The clash of this dissentient council of spiritual physicians was such that many pious folk deserted dogma for mere doing of good works: Pietism. Still others of the so-called intelligentsia abandoned faith for pure reason: Rationalism.

Rationalist innovations. Cocceius, who died in 1669, now constructed a "Biblical Theology" on a Cartesian basis. Presently disputes between Fundamentalists and Liberals broke out regarding the necessity of basic Lutheran tenets for living a good religious life. Christian Thomasius and Christian von Wolff openly attacked what the former had termed the "cramped beliefs of the (Augsburg) Confession," and launched into a naturalized religion supposedly erected on the philosophical tenets of Leibniz. Cartesian devotees cultivated their master's predilection for mathematics: mathematical certainty became the ideal of their faith, and finally in the eighteenth century Carpzov "demonstrated" the Trinity with mathematical finesse. The Bible was treated by others as a merely human literary classic, while the nature of its inspiration was mooted. The "Accommodation Theory" began to insinuate that Christ had adapted His teaching to Jewish mentality in such wise that it might be no longer satisfactory for "enlightened" moderns. Miracles were given natural explanations, the supernatural was carefully skirted, and the divinity of Christ questioned. Fedderson spoke of Christ as "that blessed, charitable, rightly-made, healthy man." Rosenmüller suggested that the doctrine of the Trinity had been introduced by some ignorant bishops. Lessing compared Judaism and Islam favorably with Christian revelation. All such innovators and scoffers found encouragement and pro-

tection from various powerful patrons, such as Frederick the Great, the benevolent despot of Prussia.

(2) Development of Religious Indifference

On the Continent, the Thirty Years' War (1618–48) had left Germany ruined and the rest of Europe exhausted. That conflict, despite numerous political ramifications, had ostensibly been a war for religion. Yet in this respect it had decided nothing, for the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 had substantially upheld the approximately equal division of Germany into Catholic and Protestant states established at Augsburg in 1555. It is not surprising, then, that many men reached the conclusion that religion was not worth fighting for. Spain, mortally wounded in her political primacy, began to doubt her self-appointed mission to bring Europe back to the Church, for the only states to profit by the recent strife had been compromising France and England. When the very basis of the supernatural was being sapped by the "Enlightenment," it seemed old-fashioned to insist on inquisitorial methods. Hence, though penal laws might remain on the statute books, they were less earnestly enforced, and the death penalty scarcely ever invoked.

In Great Britain, the Civil War and the monarchical restoration had had an effect similar to that of the Thirty Years' War on the Continent, and toleration had become politically expedient for the many strong Protestant sects, if not yet for Catholics. As Pope's *Essay on Man* would put it: "For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,/His can't be wrong whose life is in the right./In faith and hope the world will disagree,/ But all mankind's concern is charity." But politics rather than charity dictated the Toleration Act of 1689—though this did not embrace Catholics, none of their number suffered death thereafter. There arose a new concept of a secular, civic unity transcending religious beliefs which reached its most liberal expression in the new American Republic born at the close of the eighteenth century. But while some form of tolerance had become practically necessary in a Christendom hopelessly divided on religion, the theoretical source of such altruism was too often indifference to truth or error in religion.

(3) Influence of the "Enlightenment" on Catholics

Infiltration. If the teaching Church remained firm against the new Rationalism, not a few Catholics were disturbed by the heady atmosphere which they breathed. In France an arid and rigid Jansenism influenced by reaction the lives of many Catholics; in Germany, Febronianism and Josephinism cramped the Catholic spirit; surprisingly large numbers of the faithful and even of the clergy believed that a natural-

istic Freemasonry could be harmonized with Catholicity. Liturgical life reached its nadir, preaching on the eve of St. Vincent de Paul's "Little Method" tended to be stilted, if not fantastic. Many educated, if worldly, Catholics frowned on all religious emotion or repelled enthusiasm as an unqualified evil.

Antidotes. It was providential, therefore, that Catholics were re-directed to authentic divine charity in the midst of this ultraintellectual-ism. The Sacred Heart devotion in its modern form was first propagated by St. John Eudes, and especially by St. Margaret Mary Alacoque (1647–90), Visitandine nun of Paray–le–Monial, who received three apparitions of Christ between 1673 and 1675. She received guidance from Blessed Claude La Colombière, S.J., and the devotion received final sanction from Pope Clement XIII in 1765. It is significant that the Sacred Heart devotion was one of those singled out for attack by the Rationalist-Jansenist Synod of Pistoia in 1786. It might not be idle to remark, moreover, that the pietist revivalism in Protestant ranks had its orthodox parallel in the impassioned missionary preaching of St. Leonard of Port Maurice, Paul of the Cross, and Alfonso de Liguori.

45. THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV

A. Political Environment

(1) ABSOLUTISM

The Versailles model. In France, absolute "divine-right" monarchy had been established by the persistent efforts of those most secular of cardinals, Richelieu, prime minister from 1624 to 1642, and Mazarin, his successor until 1661. The beneficiary of these administrators was King Louis XIV, titular monarch from 1643, although he did not assume personal control until 1661. If he did not sum up his position with the famous *"L'État, c'est moi,"* at least Belestat in writing to the king assured him that in France: *"il faut qu'il n'y ait qu'un roi, qu'une loi, qu'une foi."* With Louis XIV Absolutism was enshrined in the glittering court of Versailles where it remained a brilliant façade long after its real power and greatness had departed. For to Versailles, as moths to a flame, streamed not only the nobility and the savants, but many prelates as well. It became the mecca of European society, and exile from Versailles was deemed by fawning courtiers as consignment to the ends of the earth. Down to the French Revolution, Versailles, though in a condition of moral decadence, remained an irresistible magnet for the only persons who counted: the privileged estates. Not until the bourgeois Revolution did the center of French government and culture move to Paris, to be broadened and popularized.

European imitation. Despite the solitary exception of Great Britain, the general political trend of European government was toward abso-

lutism on the Versailles pattern. The period from 1660 onward to the French Revolution became the age of the despot, benevolent or otherwise. Germany was no exception, for though it lacked real central government, local magnates were just as autocratic as the kings. Even the poles of German power, Vienna and Berlin, went to school to Versailles. Theocracy and empire were now things of the past, and Catholic sovereigns were as devoted to the principle of absolute rule in a "sovereign" state as were Protestants. Not content with their secular sphere, these "Most Catholic" rulers were continually invading ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The papacy, reduced from her commanding temporal position in the Middle Ages to the diplomatic necessity of treating with national monarchs as temporal equals, was now constrained to the condition of a suppliant, as when Alexander VII apologized to the "Grand Monarch," Louis XIV, and Pius VI journeyed to Vienna to placate Emperor Joseph II. "The Counter-Reformation had lost its vitality and the egoism of the emerging monarchical states had become the axis of political and cultural life. This meant secularization; instead of glorifying God, art and architecture were now bent to the glory of princes. . . . Palaces rather than churches now captured the imagination, and particularly one great palace, Versailles, became the focus of interest . . . for the great palace exemplified the new culture that was emerging in Europe." [6]

(2) NATIONALISTIC RIVALRIES

Nationalism had not substantially changed since the days of the Renaissance. It was still primarily dynastic nationalism, personified by the royal family, although intensified by further unification and centralization. This type ought to be carefully distinguished from that popular and democratic nationalism evoked by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. More than ever it was a narrow, selfish, patronizing nationalism, for the last real emperor, Charles V, had died in 1558, and the last pope to attempt to exercise theocratic powers, St. Pius V, had failed in 1570. Dynastic nationalism thought to invade the spiritual sphere with impunity, not merely to control discipline, but even to regulate doctrinal questions. Catholic monarchs flirted with the idea of national churches, and often their views, Gallican, Febronian, or Josephinist, were scarcely distinguishable from Anglicanism's Act of Royal Supremacy. Everywhere they cramped ecclesiastical initiative— in Europe and on the missions—so that the French Revolution was for the Church no unmixed evil.

Imperialism, also for the most part of the dynastic variety, carried nationalistic rivalry to the New World and the Indies, hampering mis-

---

[6] John Wolf, *Emergence of the Great Powers* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1951), pp. 244–51.

sionary efforts. Though the imperial title survived until 1806 as the exclusive prerogative of the "Holy Roman Empire," by now Spain, Portugal, France, Great Britain, and even Holland had created vaster colonial "empires." The seventeenth century would be the period of building the domains of France and Britain, while the succeeding century witnessed their duel to death for colonial supremacy. Britain won only to be rebuked and disillusioned—temporarily—in imperialism by the American Revolution. The Spanish and Portuguese dominions continued on a relatively stagnant course until, influenced by the North American example, Latin America repudiated European imperialism as well.

International law had to be developed on new foundations to fit these changed conditions. With neither the papacy nor the Holy Roman Empire any longer available as transcendent arbiters, a "law of nature" was proposed to regulate the relations of states theoretically "sovereign." For Catholics, a sound extension of St. Thomas's legal principles was made by the Scholastics, Vittoria and Suárez. Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), "father of international law," was indebted to their Scholastic notions, but he tended to ground natural law on will more than on reason. In any event, he and his successors, Hobbes, Locke, Pufendorf, Rousseau, would attempt to deduce a natural law for mankind, sometimes from an hypothetical "state of pure nature." But "National Individualism," not the "Christian Commonwealth," was the international watchword.

(3) POLITICAL SURVEY (1660–1715)

"The Balance of Power" was the only substitute which these nationalistic absolute monarchs could offer for the international ideals of the Middle Ages. This product of dynastic envy and of mutual fear meant simply that the new "sovereign" Great Powers, would not tolerate one of their number in a dominant position. Accordingly they sought through various and ever shifting alliances to hold a sort of equilibrium among leading states or groups of states. This "system" was never acknowledged by those against whom it was invoked, and its enforcement necessitated repeated and more extensive wars. The Great Powers, moreover, remained a fluid group whose precise composition was in dispute. At the beginning of the period, France, Spain and Austria were clearly in, with Great Britain, Sweden, Prussia and Russia seeking admittance. Often only a protracted conflict revealed whether a Great Power was really such, or only a counterfeit.

Anti-Habsburg combinations (1515–1659) had heralded this procedure during the Renaissance. The term, "balance of power," can be traced to the sixteenth-century writer Rucelai, who described the Italian

politics of the Renaissance in that fashion. But this expression, which Machiavelli would have endorsed, may also be applied to Wolsey's direction of English foreign policy during the same century. It pre-eminently fitted the French Valois combinations against the extraordinary dynastic power combination of Emperor Charles V. The emperor was checked in his ambition to restore reality to the Holy Roman Empire and to uphold the single faith of Christendom. But Charles V more than held his own during a lifetime duel with Kings Francis I and Henry II of France, from which contest Habsburg power emerged first if not dominant. Even though Charles V divided his dominions between his son, Philip II of Spain, and his brother, Ferdinand of Austria, the close family concert of these Habsburg rulers was the political provocation of the Thirty Years' War (1618–59) whereby Richelieu and Mazarin were successful in transferring European primacy from Spain to the France of Louis XIV.

Anti-Bourbon combinations were then formed to offset the preponderance of the French ruler. Louis XIV was at first moderately successful in pursuing France's imaginary "natural frontiers" against Spain, the empire and the Netherlands in the Wars of Devolution (1667–68; 1672–78). But when he proposed to penetrate into the German Palatinate and interfere in the succession to the British throne, his ambition was checked by the League of Augsburg in the English Succession War (1688–97). Louis's supreme effort to capture the entire Spanish inheritance of Charles II provoked the War of Spanish Succession (1701–13), which ended in territorial compromise and French exhaustion. Meanwhile Britain's naval strength was raising her to the status of a great power, resting upon American and Indian outposts, and the European conflicts began to be reflected in colonial frontier clashes: King William's War and Queen Anne's War. Simultaneously the Russia of Peter the Great took a notable step forward toward power, but the meteoric career of Charles XII of Sweden permanently eliminated the latter country from the ranks of Great Powers.

B. *Economic Environment*

(1) STATIC AGRARIANISM

Rural conditions. "Although the towns were growing rapidly, Europe remained through the seventeenth century overwhelmingly an agricultural economy. From eighty to ninety per cent of the population was rural and even that index is to be further weighted by the persistence to a degree now unfamiliar of agricultural activities in the towns, even in the great towns. The system of agriculture remained essentially that of the medieval communal operation, but manorial lordship had been

generally commuted to money-rents. In some very limited areas special crops such as wine and olives required more individualized operation, as did the truck gardening in the Netherlands. Capitalistic exploitation of the land in a very minor degree modified the open-field system in England. The drainage of the polders in the Netherlands and of the English fens involved large-scale financing and definitely capitalistic forms of ownership, control, and operation. These new forms, however, were marginal to the great body of European agriculture. Technique was correspondingly static. . . . English agriculture was on the whole more responsive to change than French agriculture, although the modernization of the whole system was to require a long-continued and energetic propaganda in the next century. . . ."[7]

(2) COMMERCIAL DYNAMICS

Commercial rivalries. The whole period in its economic sense is predominantly one of commercial rivalry which prompted colonial annexation. The chief contenders were Spain, France, England, and Holland. Spanish colonies, though for the most part retained by the mother country, were in some instances reduced to dependence on British sea power. France's ambitions in Canada and India were not pursued in preference to her European aims and consequently she lost out to Great Britain who made these areas a leading concern. Not until the nineteenth century did France attempt a new colonial domain in Africa and Asia. Holland proved too weak to sustain colonial competition over a protracted period, so that the victory went to Great Britain, "mistress of the seas." During this period, New Netherland on the Hudson, which had already swallowed a New Sweden in Jersey, was itself absorbed by the English and transformed into New York. "There is a 'law,' wrote Professor Seeley, 'which prevails throughout English history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the law, namely, of the interdependence of trade and war. . . . Trade leads naturally to war, and war fosters trade.' Obviously so simple an explanation for so complex a problem is incomplete, but it is undoubtedly true that the mercantilist regulations of trading nations, oriented as much toward the injury of competitors as toward the insurance of benefits for their own merchants, created tensions that led to conflict."[8]

Mercantilism. Colonies, however, were not in themselves an end so much as the means to the aggrandizement of the commercial prosperity of the mother country. "It is a law founded on the very nature of colonies

---

[7] Frederick Nussbaum, *Triumph of Science and Reason* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1953), p. 219.

[8] Wolf, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

that they ought to have no other culture or arts wherein to rival the arts and culture of the parent country." [9] Colonies were to be possessed, then, for the valuable raw materials which they could provide for the mother country, and for the exclusive market they could furnish for its manufactures. This system, known as mercantilism, was maintained by strict regulation of trade by the government in the interests of public economy.

In England, this economic regulation can be traced at least to the Statute of Apprentices (1563) and extended by the Statute of Monopolies (1624). But in England, at least, the government pursued policies which would please the commercial oligarchy and allow them to make profits. In other words, the government aided and even forced merchants to become prosperous, for it was felt that a wealthy commerce made for national stability and public welfare. According to mercantilist notions, it was essential to maintain a "favorable balance of trade," that is, exports should exceed imports. Hence, the mother country would first try to prevent her colonies from trading with anyone else, and then insist that all trade be on favorable terms to herself, whether beneficial to the colony or not. Second, she would try to augment her own markets and reduce her rivals' by trade with their colonies. Spain resolutely closed Latin America to foreign trade, while the British strove to break down these barriers by force or diplomacy. Great Britain, on the other hand, strove to prevent her own New England colonists from smuggling products from the French West Indies. They ought to buy what they needed from Great Britain, even when it proved more expensive. Unfortunately for Britain and mercantilism, America declared and won her independence.

In France, Colbert (1619–83), Louis XIV's minister of commerce, was an ardent believer in mercantilism, though he was more paternalistic in his efforts to stimulate and regulate industry and commerce. He tried to win foreign workmen, artificially encouraged industries, and rigorously excluded competition from abroad. But whatever gains France made by these means were in large part dissipated after Colbert's death through the exigencies of war.

Cameralism, from the German *kammer:* "treasury," was a type of mercantilist theory advocated by Van Osse, Seckendorf, Horing, Justi, and Sonnefels. This tended to be extremely bureaucratic in the service of a benevolent despot. Justi, for instance, declared that "all the duties of people and subjects may be reduced to the formula: to promote all the ways and means adopted by the ruler for their happiness, by their

[9] Walter Dorn, *Competition for Empire* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1940), p. 264.

obedience, fidelity, and diligence."[10] In Spain, the *regalistas* pursued somewhat similar objectives.

46. THE PAPACY AND GALLICANISM

A. *Italian Environment*

(1) SPANISH PREDOMINANCE (1648–1700)

The Peace of Westphalia (1648) did not directly affect Italy, which remained in Metternich's phrase, "a mere geographical expression." A number of petty states continued under the domination of the Spanish branch of the Habsburg dynasty. To the south, the Spanish monarch himself was king of the Two Sicilies, while Sardinia was an outright Spanish dependency. In central Italy, the Papal States preserved their traditional frontiers unchanged save for the addition since 1631 of the small Duchy of Urbino. To the north lay a number of small states, practically autonomous, though nominally still part of the Holy Roman Empire's Italian crown—a theory rather than a fact. Tuscany was still ruled by the Medici, Parma by the Farnese, Modena by the Este, and Mantua under the Gonzaga, who also possessed Montferrat. In the center of the Lombard plain lay the key duchy of the Milanese whose duke was the Spanish king. East of Milan, the Venetian Republic was declining with the shift of trade routes; west of Milan the rival Genoese Republic was intermittently under French domination. Finally the Savoyard dynasty destined to rule Italy in the nineteenth century was struggling to maintain freedom of action in Savoy-Piedmont, a buffer state between Spanish and French spheres of influence. Numerous as these petty states were, they yet represented a consolidation of still smaller medieval fiefs.

(2) AUSTRIAN PREDOMINANCE (1700–35)

The War of Spanish Succession (1701–13) considerably altered the Italian political picture. Though the Bourbon claimant, Philip of Anjou, was better situated to take immediate possession of Spain itself on the death of the last Spanish Habsburg (1700), his Austrian Habsburg rival, Archduke Charles, could strike at Italy directly. Austrian troops during the war marched through the peninsula, violating papal territory, and forced the papacy to accord at least *de facto* recognition to their claimant.

The Peace of Utrecht (1713) recognized Austrian conquests in Italy and thereby replaced Spanish with Austrian control. Naples and the Milanese passed to Charles, by now Emperor Charles VI (1711–40). Savoy was rewarded for her support of Austria with Sicily, which, how-

[10] Leo Gershoy, *From Despotism to Revolution* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1944), p. 53.

ever, she exchanged in 1720 for Sardinia. After 1720, then, the duke of Savoy also bore the title of king of Sardinia, the only native kingship in Italy. In the north, Habsburg-Austrian influence was also paramount. Extinction of the Gonzaga family in 1708 enabled the Habsburgs to annex Mantua to their newly gained Milanese, Montferrat going to Savoy. Though Tuscany, Parma, Modena, Venice, and Genoa preserved their territories intact, Austrian proximity enabled its rulers to exert a more cogent influence than the more remote Spanish monarchs had done. Traditional Italian anti-German prejudice, therefore, concentrated upon Austria and for a century and a half patriots longed to emancipate their land from her rule.

B. *Papal Endurance* (*1648–76*)

(1) ALEXANDER VII (1655–67)

Fabio Chigi (1599–1667), envoy of his predecessor Innocent X to the Westphalian peace conference, was elected to succeed him in the papacy after an eighty-day conclave, prolonged by the opposition of Cardinal Mazarin, with whose Francophile interests he had clashed during the peace negotiations. Cardinal Chigi's exemplary moral life and his previous opposition to nepotism had commended him to the electors, but promotion to the papacy which changed most men for the better, seemed to have an opposite effect upon him. In 1656 he acquiesced in the prevailing custom at the request of foreign ambassadors and brought his relatives to Rome. He then resigned the conduct of much of the papal business to his nephew, Fabio Chigi, able but pleasure-loving. Excessive pomp and splendor was thought to mark the pope's own public appearances. Alexander VII augmented the instruments of missionary endeavor: the jurisdiction of Propaganda was extended, the Parisian Mission Seminary founded, and vicars apostolic named for the Orient. Venice was at last persuaded to take back the Jesuits, who had been banished since the Sarpi Affair in 1607. The pope received ex-Queen Christina of Sweden into the Church in 1655, and gave her asylum in Rome where she died in 1689 after many good and meddlesome works. Ecclesiastical and secular buildings were repaired and beautified at considerable expense, and art and learning promoted.

Bourbon Gallicanism proved to be the greatest trial of the pontificate, although Jansenist intrigues—treated separately elsewhere—added to the pope's difficulties. As long as Cardinal Mazarin remained in charge of the French government, no official recognition was extended to the pope and the unofficial cardinal observers were generally *personae non gratae* to the Roman Pontiff. Louis XIV began more respectfully, for in 1662 he named an ambassador, but this proved to be the obvious duke of Crequi, whose manifest insolence appeared in a protest against the

French Jesuit Coret's defense of papal infallibility (1661). The ambassador also abused diplomatic immunity to give refuge to papal foes. The Corsicans in the papal guard so resented his cavalier attitude toward the papal authority that they precipitated a clash with the ambassadorial retinue. Shots were fired while the duke's carriage was entering the Farnese Palace, August 22, 1662. King and ambassador thereafter appeared resolved to turn this "Crequi Incident" into a humiliation for the pope. The brawl was termed by His Christian Majesty as "unprecedented even in the history of barbarians," and His Holiness was held to personal responsibility. A royal ultimatum demanded full satisfaction and French troops occupied Avignon to coerce its acceptance. At length Alexander VII was constrained to sign the humiliating Accord of Pisa (1664). Through his nephew, Cardinal Chigi, he presented his apologies to the Grand Monarch in France, and promised to eliminate all Corsicans perpetually from the papal service.

(2) CLEMENT IX (1667–69)

Giulio Rospigliosi (1600–69) was unanimously elected to succeed Alexander VII. He had assisted his predecessor as envoy and during the last two years of Alexander's pontificate had been his secretary of state. He proved a happy contrast to his predecessor. He was deeply religious and affable to all. Every week he heard the confessions of the poor in St. Peter's, and visited the hospitals. He gained universal good will in the Papal States by buying off a monopolist who had cornered the grain supply. He was a resolute foe of nepotism, and an economical financier who repaired the failing condition of the papal treasury, strained by Chigi extravagance. He tried in vain to organize a crusade against renewed Turkish offensives, and it was no fault of his that Crete fell to the Turks in 1669. He forbade missionaries to engage in commerce, a precept that Father La Valette would have done well to observe a century later. Clement IX beatified the first American, St. Rose of Lima, in April, 1668.

Peace-making was the characteristic of this short pontificate. Clement successfully mediated in the first War of Devolution to arrange the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1668). In the same year, by recognizing Portuguese independence from Spain, he terminated a virtual schism existing since 1640. After prolonged inquiries into French theological attitudes, he brought the first phase of the Jansenist controversy to an end in 1669 by the so-called "Clementine Peace."

(3) CLEMENT X (1670–76)

Emilio Altieri (1590–1676) was chosen as compromise candidate after five months of futile balloting under conflicting pressures of Bourbon

and Habsburg spokesmen. The new pontiff, an octogenarian, and a cardinal nominated by Clement IX on his deathbed, was designed as a temporary *locum tenens,* but his sturdy constitution enabled him to survive for six years. He had been a modest and inoffensive ecclesiastic, and his pontificate did not belie this augury, for he proved a prudent and kindly ruler of no great distinction. His age forced him to delegate much business, and in so doing he resorted to moderate nepotism. Having no male relatives of his own, he adopted the Paoluzzi, one of whom had married the Altieri heiress. To Cardinal Paoluzzi-Altieri were entrusted diplomatic functions, though the pope was diligent about spiritual affairs: canonizations were numerous.

Abortive negotiations, however, seemed to indicate a lack of vitality in the pontificate. In France, the "Regale Affair" began in 1673, but no test case was referred to the Holy See, nor did Clement X intervene; thus the generally passive attitude of the last two pontificates toward Bourbon Gallicanism continued. Other negotiations were opened with Alexis of Russia in the interests of reunion, but these proved without tangible fruit. Some aid was procured for the Poles against Turkish aggression, but the Turkish menace along the Danube worsened.

C. Papal Resistance (1676–1721)

(1) BLESSED INNOCENT XI (1676–89)

Benedetto Odescalchi (1611–89), whom many cardinals had wished to choose in 1670, was now unanimously selected despite a Bourbon veto. This modern Hildebrand proved to be the greatest pope of the century. His missionary zeal, charity for the poor, prudence and firmness in administration were recognized in his beatification by Pius XII. His pastoral vigilance was demonstrated in the decree on Frequent Communion (1679), his condemnation of Laxism (1679) and of Quietism (1687), and in his reform measures. Nepotism and extravagance were severely checked.

The Gallican Crisis, provoked by the Regale Affair, found a pope who dared defy the Grand Monarch. Like Hildebrand, Innocent XI was not personally victorious, but his successors reaped the fruit of his intrepidity. The pope stubbornly resisted Louis's claims to spiritual and temporal control of all French benefices; annulled the Four Gallican Articles impugning papal primacy; withheld canonical institution from insubordinate French bishops; and finally excommunicated the king and his minions. Louis XIV retaliated in 1687 by sending General Lavardin to take forceful possession of the French quarter at Rome, as well as of the papal domain at Avignon. Called upon to decide a contested election to the see of Cologne, the pope confirmed Joseph von Wittlesbach in preference to Louis's tool, Cardinal Fuerstenberg. When the pope died,

the king had expelled the papal nuncio and was appealing to a general council.

The last crusade against the Turks owed much of its success to the tireless efforts of Innocent XI. He encouraged King John Sobieski of Poland to submerge national antipathy in the common cause of Christendom, and prevailed on the Venetians to forego commercial advantages to continue their naval assistance. The result was the relief of Vienna (1683), the reconquest of Catholic Hungary, and the reversal of the whole Turkish offensive by the Peace of Carlowitz (1699).

(2) ALEXANDER VIII (1689–91)

Pietro Ottoboni (1610–91) was another octogenarian selected as a compromise candidate after a protracted conclave subject to dynastic pressures. Personally worthy, he was feeble and indulgent to others, reverting to nepotism and filling of sinecure offices in which the misconduct of relatives created no small scandal.

Diplomatic impasse. Pope Alexander VIII temporized and made a few concessions in the Regale Affair, but in the main continued to uphold his predecessor's position. Himself a Venetian, the pope had considerable success in encouraging Venetian support of the crusade.

(3) INNOCENT XII (1691–1700)

Antonio Pignatelli (1615–1700) was chosen as compromise candidate in a stormy conclave which Louis XIV strove to control. The new pope published *Decet Romanum Pontificem* shortly after his election. This prohibited a pope from naming a cardinal of his own family and proved to be the definitive corrective to papal nepotism. With Innocent XII the modern tradition of morally blameless popes happily begins.

Successful diplomacy terminated the Regale Affair, with concessions to sweeten the king's recognition of the basic principle of papal spiritual primacy. Count Martinitz, imperial ambassador, revived some of Crequi's claims to diplomatic immunity. Though this dispute was less severe, it may have influenced the pope to regard Bourbon claims to the Spanish inheritance more favorably than those of the Habsburgs.

(4) CLEMENT XI (1700–21)

Gian-Francesco Albani (1649–1721) was selected after Louis XIV had vetoed the candidature of Cardinal Mariscotti. The upright character and relative youth of the pope enabled him to endure a lengthy and trying pontificate, amid war and Jansenist quibbles.

The War of Spanish Succession and its aftermath overshadowed the pontificate. If Albani had previously been friendly to the Bourbons, as pope he strove for strict neutrality. Both Bourbons and Habsburgs

nevertheless accused him of partiality toward the other—probably a good testimony to his fairness. Austrian invasion of the Papal States in 1709 wrung from him recognition of Archduke Charles; whereupon Philip of Anjou broke off diplomatic relations. After the Peace of Utrecht, Clement came into conflict with the Austrian New Order in Italy; indeed, union of north and south under a single power was contrary to immemorial papal policy. Clement's chief difficulty was with Victor Amadeus of Savoy in Sicily from 1713 to 1720. This king pretended to revive the medieval "*Monarchia Sicula*," a claim to legatine jurisdiction. Papal interdict was met by the exile of three thousand clerics. Victor's transfer to Sardinia adjourned the conflict, but the papacy would yet endure much from the Savoyard dynasty.

47. GALLICAN FRANCE

A. *Origins of Gallicanism*

(1) REMOTE SOURCES

Legacy of Anagni. Ever since Philip the Fair's attack upon Pope Boniface VIII at Anagni, the French monarchy had displayed but scant respect for the Holy See. The Avignon captivity, the Great Western Schism, and the conciliar movement at Pisa, Constance, and Basle included manifestations of an inchoate Gallicanism. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438) had been renounced only to obtain through the Concordat of Bologna (1516) wide powers of royal nomination to French benefices, subjecting these in large measure to the court. Throughout the period of the Protestant Revolt the French monarchy had pursued a selfish policy to the disregard of the interests of Christendom, and Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin had scarcely altered this.

(2) PROXIMATE ORIGINS

Clerical Ultramontanism seemed to have triumphed with the participation of the French hierarchy in the Council of Trent during its last period, and Charles of Lorraine, cardinal of Rheims, had co-operated with reform efforts. But the Tridentine decrees had not been promulgated in France until 1615 when some French prelates were emboldened to do so on their own initiative during the feeble regency of Marie de' Medici.

Pierre Pithou, however, had published a treatise in 1594 entitled, *Des Libertés de l'Église Gallicane*. Without any speculative defense of the conciliar theory, he had nonetheless set forth a list of supposed legal precedents for royal supremacy over the French Church. He contended that custom gave the king the right to convoke plenary councils, that his permission was required for papal legates to enter France, that the monarch and his officials were exempt from papal excommunication and

deposition, and that in emergencies they might appeal to a general council "as from an abuse."

Edmond Richer (1559–1631), syndic of the University of Paris and editor of Gerson's works, went even farther in the direction of Gallicanism. After publicly teaching conciliarism at the University, he published *De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate* (1611), a work defending democratic views regarding the constitution of both Church and state. For Richer, the Church was a limited monarchy in which the legislative power was supreme, whether vested in ecumenical councils or local synods. The former was the "final and infallible court invested with the plenitude of power." He called Christ the "essential head of the Church"; the pope was merely the "ministerial head," subject to the dogmatic and disciplinary decrees of the general councils. The state, moreover, was the natural protector of the Church against abuses, although Richer claimed that supreme civil power lay with the legislature rather than the king.

(3) Evolution of Gallicanism

Queen Marie de' Medici, as regent for her son, Louis XIII, from 1610 to 1624, displayed little of the firmness of her royal predecessors. Cardinal Du Perron, archbishop of Sens, had the papal condemnation of Richer's work seconded at the Synod of Sens (1612), and similar action was taken by Bishop Henri de Gondi of Paris at the Synod of Aix. Richer, in conformity with his own teaching, appealed from these synodal condemnations to the *parlement* of Paris, which sustained him. Though the queen forced Richer's resignation from the faculty, he continued his public espousal of Gallicanism. In England, the apostate archbishop of Spalato, De Dominis, published in 1617 his *De Republica Ecclesiastica* with the approval of James I. In this treatise he defended the episcopalian theory of ecclesiastical government, although he later recanted this after leaving England.

Cardinal Richelieu, once in power after 1624, objected to Richer's theories more on account of their hint of political democracy than for any schismatic tendencies. Apparently the former was "rank heresy," while the latter only a freely debatable opinion. After the capture of the Huguenot stronghold of La Rochelle, the cardinal brought pressure to bear on Richer, and in 1629 Richelieu's deputy, Père Joseph, secured from Richer a complete signed recantation. The latter died in 1631.

Pierre Dupuy, however, met with Richelieu's approval when he published in 1638 his *Preuves des Libertés de L'Église Gallicane.* This defended royal supremacy over the French Church to the practical exclusion of papal jurisdiction. The work, however, was censured by many of the French bishops.

Pierre Marca was commissioned by Richelieu to interpret the cardinal-premier's views on papal-royal relations. Accordingly in 1641 Marca published *De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii,* in which papal jurisdiction was minimized and royal power exalted, even to intervention in abuses. Papal infallibility was conceded only *"cum aliquo consensu Ecclesiae."*

Cardinal Mazarin, Richelieu's successor from 1642 to 1661, was so menaced by domestic uprisings and preoccupied by foreign wars that he could not play his mentor's role in ecclesiastical affairs. Unlike his predecessor, moreover, he was not even in major orders. Thus, it became possible for the French hierarchy to condemn Gallican writings and have them proscribed by the Council of Conscience, where St. Vincent de Paul, with Queen Anne's backing, was sometimes able to restrain, if he could not entirely reverse, Mazarin's lax ecclesiastical policies.

B. Gallican Crisis

(1) ROYAL OFFENSIVE (1673–82)

The Mémoires of Louis XIV reveal his ecclesiastical policy. All of the faithful, "whether lay or tonsured," are the king's subjects, and the monarch enjoys eminent domain over ecclesiastical as well as secular property. The clergy are therefore subject to taxation, though the crown indulgently permits them to call it a "free donation." Indeed, "popes who have wished to contest that right of royalty have made it clearer and more incontestable by the distinct withdrawal of their ambitious pretentions, which they have been obliged to make."

The Regale Affair began in 1673. "The Regale was the assumed right of the crown to receive the revenues of vacant bishoprics and abbeys: *regale temporale;* and to nominate the candidates to all benefices, the collation of which belonged to the bishop: *regale spirituale.*" [11] Although the Regale had been introduced against the canons into some French provinces during the Dark Ages, the general council of Lyons in 1274 had explicitly forbade its extension. Yet in 1673 and 1675 the king summarily proclaimed this obsolete abuse for his entire kingdom. Although most of the French bishops acquiesced, two prelates of Jansenist sympathies, Pavillon of Alet and Caulet of Pamiers, resisted. Pope Innocent XI sustained them when the king tried to deprive them of their sees. Though both dissenters died soon afterwards, the issue was kept alive by the appeal of the Cistercian nuns of Charonne to Rome against royal appointment of an abbess of another order. When the pope annulled the royal nomination, the *parlement* of Paris in turn declared the papal decision legally null.

[11] Charles Poulet and Sidney Raemers, *Church History* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1935), II, 206.

The Gallican Articles (1682) represent an attempt to intimidate the pope. Innocent XI in 1679 had hinted that "we shall have recourse to remedies placed in our hands by God's power." The French hierarchy waxed indignant at even a threat to the Grand Monarch, and assured him that it was "bound to his cause by ties that nothing could sever." The king was emboldened to assemble thirty-four bishops and thirty-seven priests at Paris (1681–82). These ecclesiastics drew up the "Liberties of the Gallican Church," which endorsed the *regale temporale,* and the *spirituale* as well, subject to papal canonical institution. In July, 1682, Bishop Bossuet took the lead in formulating the "Four Gallican Articles": 1) The pope enjoyed no temporal authority over princes. 2) Papal power, according to the decrees of Constance, was limited by ecumenical councils. 3) Exercise of papal jurisdiction was also restricted by local conciliar decrees and the customs of the Gallican Church. 4) Papal definitions become infallible only after the universal Church has consented to accept them. Louis XIV endorsed these Gallican Articles, and ordered their acceptance by all candidates for theological degrees. Even though but 162 of some seven hundred doctors of the Sorbonne ratified these Articles, the king declared the minority view official. Bishops and theologians outside France, however, uttered their emphatic disapproval.

(2) Papal Defense (1682–95)

Innocent XI drew up a decree nullifying the Gallican Articles, but this was not promulgated until 1690, and by his successor, Pope Alexander VIII. Pope Innocent, however, denied his canonical confirmation to any royal nominee for an episcopal see who refused to repudiate the Gallican Articles. Since the king would not allow such repudiation and naturally nominated Gallicans, the number of canonically vacant sees multiplied: there were thirty-five such by 1688. The only recourse left Louis XIV was to begin a schism. This he hesitated to do against the advice of his wife, Madame de Maintenon. Schism, moreover, would awake the prelates to the real issue of papal primacy, and even Bossuet had asserted that "Peter remains in his successors the foundation stone of all the faithful." The king therefore tried to frighten the pope by seizing papal property at Avignon and Rome, by mustering an army against the Papal State, and by appealing to a general council. When the pope excommunicated General Lavardin and his accomplices, the *parlement* of Paris pronounced this censure of Louis's conduct "abominable." Innocent XI, however, remained unmoved.

Alexander VIII secured a partial understanding. Lavardin was recalled, the right of diplomatic immunity renounced by the French quarter in Rome, and Avignon was evacuated. After receiving the

requisite pledges, the pope confirmed a few episcopal appointments. But when he published his predecessor's nullification of the Four Gallican Articles in 1690, the king delayed full reconciliation.

Innocent XII was able to see the end of the affair begun under Innocent XI. Preoccupied by the War of English Succession, disturbed by the condemnation of the Catholic world, and the tacit hostility of the lesser French clergy and people, the king in 1693 relented. He assured the pope that in his future religious policy he would disregard the Gallican Articles. Papal confirmation was then extended to royal episcopal nominees willing to apologize for their part in the Gallican Assembly, and to endorse the papal decree of nullity pronounced on the Gallican Articles. The Holy See had defended its inalienable rights as a matter of principle to supreme spiritual jurisdiction, although the crown continued in virtual control of the temporalities of the French Church. Down to the French Revolution, king and *parlement* occasionally meddled in spiritual affairs, and Gallican doctrines did not die out. Jean De Launoy (1603–78) had upheld them, and as late as 1768, Jamin won popularity with his *Pensées Theologiques* in Gallican tenor. The French clergy remained more or less influenced by Gallican notions until the French Revolution, and vestiges survived right down to the Vatican Council of 1869.

(3) REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES (1685)

The Edict of Nantes had been Henry IV's indulgent grant (1598) of civil and religious liberties to the French Huguenots. Cardinal Richelieu had taken away the civil-military privileges of walled towns in 1629, but had not disturbed religious freedom. But on October 18, 1685, Louis XIV issued a sweeping edict that ordered demolition of Huguenot churches, closing of schools and exile of ministers. Henceforth, children were to be educated in Catholic schools alone. The measure was designed to complete the unification of the kingdom, and probably also to impress the Holy See at the height of the Gallican crisis, of the king's devotion to Catholic interests. Innocent XI, in an allocution during 1686, did commend the king's motives, but also backed up the French prelates who had protested against the cruel treatment of Protestants.

Results were not according to royal expectations. Some fifty thousand Huguenots fled the kingdom to influence foreign opinion against France. Yet Protestantism was not extinguished. Those who could not escape were presumed to have been converted, and were obliged to contract marriage before a priest under penalty of civil invalidity. Recusants were condemned to the galleys and soldiers quartered on suspected families. These harsh measures provoked the revolt of "Camisards," Huguenots of Cévennes, who took violent reprisals: during 1704 some

eighty priests and four thousand laymen were slain. The revolt was not entirely suppressed until 1710, and left an embittered Huguenot popu-lace. The king who would be pope had blundered badly: he had con-verted some eight hundred thousand subjects, not to the Church, but against the monarchy. Legal toleration was not granted until November, 1787, and came too late to prevent some Huguenot acts of revenge "against throne and altar" during the French Revolution.

48. JANSENIST ORIGINS

A. *Formulation: Jansenius*

(1) THE JANSENIST FOUNDER

Louvain environment. Michel De Bay (1513–89), a professor of Lou-vain University, has already been noted as the remote founder of Jansenism by his confusion of sin and concupiscence, and of the natural and the supernatural. De Bay, however, had died in the Catholic Church after a stormy career. Yet his habits of criticism survived at Louvain. Intellectual links between him and Jansen were the former's nephew, Jacob De Bay, and Jacob Jenson, both disciples of Michel De Bay, both professors of Louvain, and in due time teachers of Jansen and St.-Cyran. Thus Baianism, though condemned by the Holy Office in 1567, re-appeared in Jansenism.

Cornelis Jansen (1585–1638) was born at Accoi, near Leerdam, Holland. In 1602 he entered Louvain University and pursued his theo-logical studies under Jacob Jenson. Though he sought admission into the Jesuits, he was refused. This seems to have turned his attraction for the Society into aversion, for he participated in maneuvers which ex-pelled the Jesuits from Louvain. Jansen, a diligent but not particularly intelligent student, spent the years from 1611 to 1616 on the estate of his friend Jean Duvergier de Hauranne (1581–1643), later designated from his Abbey of St.-Cyran. The associates studied the Fathers, espe-cially St. Augustine, to whose works Jansen believed that he had dis-covered a clue unknown to the Scholastics. Jansen returned to Louvain where he received his doctorate in theology in 1619. He remained as tutor and professor, corresponding in code with St.-Cyran after the latter took up residence in Paris after 1621. Meanwhile Jansen was engaged in writing his masterpiece, the *Augustinus*, which he never got around to publishing during his lifetime. Jansen's pamphlet, *Mars Gallicus*, directed against Richelieu, may have contributed to winning him the favor of the Spanish government. He was named to the see of Ypres in 1636, and once consecrated, devoted himself zealously to his pastoral office. His solicitude exposed him to a plague at Ypres, where he died on May 6, 1638. He died protesting his allegiance to the Catholic Church, though he committed the manuscript of his *Augustinus* to his

executors, Canon Hendrik van Caelen and Dr. Libertus Froidmont. With the undiscriminating approval of Jacob Boonen, the incompetent archbishop of Malines, the executors discharged their commission in 1640. The edition bore Jansen's assertion: "If, however, the Holy See wishes any change, I am an obedient son, and I submit to that Church in which I have lived to my dying hour. This is my last wish." The founder of Jansenism, therefore, was not himself a Jansenist—in the sense of being a formal heretic.

(2) JANSENIST TEACHING

Jansenism ought to be distinguished into an heretical, theological system on grace and predestination, and a moral attitude or party remaining within the Church. While it is with the former sense that the following topics will be chiefly concerned, the influence of the latter was perhaps more widespread and lasting, as it was more earnest and well-meaning. It proposed to turn the clock back in the discipline of the sacraments: by severity in regard to the imposition of penances and imparting of absolution; and by the exceptional dispositions required for comparatively rare reception of Holy Communion.[12]

The **Augustinus**, published in 1640, was divided into three parts. The first was an historical exposition which endeavored to identify Molinism with Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, as part of Jansen's vendetta with the Jesuits. In this Jansen was in error, for though primitive Molinism had unwittingly relied on some Semi-Pelagian documents, it had been purged of any errors in faith.

Human nature was the subject of the second part. Here Jansen's basic error lay in virtual identification of the natural with the supernatural order. He regarded man in his original state as possessing the supernatural and preternatural gifts as of strict right, and consequently ordinated him to the beatific vision as to an essential exigency of human nature. Adam's fall, therefore, in Jansen's view, resulted in the loss of something due human nature, so that afterwards it remained entirely vitiated and corrupt. In this fallen state it found itself powerless to resist concupiscence which Jansen, like Luther and De Bay before him, practically identified with original sin. Human volition accordingly was at the mercy of a *"delectatio victrix,"* an overpowering attraction, whether from heaven or fallen nature. Though supposedly constrained interiorly by either grace or concupiscence, the human will was said to remain free to will good or evil insofar as it suffered no external constraint.

Supernatural aid was expounded by Jansen in the third part of his

---

[12] A. d'Ales, director, *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1925), II, 1154.

Augustinus. Here his fundamental mistake lay in identifying sufficient and efficacious grace in his concept of "victorious delectation." Jansen believed that St. Augustine's *"adjutorium sine quo non"* granted to Adam before the fall was a "purely sufficient grace" which Adam could use or not; whereas the Augustinian category, *"adjutorium quo,"* given to Adam's progeny was an irresistible divine force overpowering con- cupiscence by substituting a contrary delectation. As a matter of fact, for St. Augustine, the *"adjutorium sine quo non"* also offered Adam and the angels efficacious power to persevere, while the *"adjutorium quo"* was efficacious with the free consent of man. "The delectation of grace is a deliberate pleasure which the bishop of Hippo explicitly opposes to necessity (*voluptas, non necessitas*); but what we will and embrace with consenting pleasure, we cannot at the same time not will, and in this sense we will it necessarily. . . . This delight is called victorious, not because it fatally subjugates the will, but because it triumphs over con- cupiscence, fortifying free will to the point of rendering it invincible to natural desire." [13]

(3) INITIAL JANSENIST CONDEMNATION

Publication of the *Augustinus* opened the Jansenist controversy. While the work was still in manuscript, the Jesuits had denounced the design to the papal nuncio Stravius, who in turn reported the matter to the Holy See. Rome requested postponement of publication, but the message arrived too late, and Stravius sent a copy of the first edition to the Holy See for examination. The Jesuits meanwhile had begun to issue refuta- tions. But their criticism was vulnerable to censure since by reason of the acrimony of the Thomist-Molinist debates, further writings on grace had been prohibited without authorization from the Holy Office. Like- wise it could be alleged that the Jesuits were now actuated by revenge in posthumously indicting the works of a man who had helped procure their banishment from Louvain. At the same time Jansen's many friends rallied to his defense.

Roman censure followed. In August, 1641, the Holy Office vented its indignation on Jesuits and Jansenists alike by forbidding their unauthor- ized treatises on grace to be read. Louvain University was quibbling and evasive in accepting this censure. Pope Urban VIII now gave the matter his personal attention, and finally issued the bull, *In Eminenti,* dated March 6, 1642, but not appearing until June 19, 1643. This docu- ment renewed the ban on unauthorized publications on the subject of grace, and rejected Jansenist teaching as containing errors of Baianism, already condemned.

Jansenist evasion of even papal pronouncements, which was to be

[13] J. Forget, "Jansenius," *Catholic Encyclopedia,* VIII, 287.

the recurring theme of the movement, now appeared at the very outset. Louvain University demurred, professing doubts as to the bull's authenticity because of the discrepancy in date, and on October 24, 1643, the pope felt it necessary to make an explicit confirmation of its authenticity. But neither this nor subsequent statements by the Holy Office removed Jansenist qualms. Unfortunately, the previous condemnation of Baianism (*Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus,* October 1, 1567) had censured many propositions *in globo,* and a slight ambiguity in punctuation was seized upon to deflect the full force of condemnation (cf. Denzinger 1080). Though the bull, *In Eminenti,* was promulgated by the archbishop of Paris, the Sorbonne, and the French crown, it was ill received in the Jansenist place of origin, Flanders. Papal decrees were evaded by Archbishop Boonen of Malines, an elderly prelate controlled by his vicars, Caelen and Froidmont, who were none other than the executors of the *Augustinus.* Pressure from Rome was required to induce Louvain to accept the condemnation of Jansenism, May 5, 1645, but even then no practical measures were taken to enforce it. Not until 1651 did Archbishop Boonen publish the papal bull, and then with such derogatory remarks that he was cited to Rome. He excused himself on one ground or another until his death in 1655. He had given the Jansenist party time to grow. The most influential members of the faction, however, appeared in France.

B. Propagation of Jansenism

(1) St.-Cyran's Protagonism

Jean Duvergier, Abbé of St.-Cyran from 1620, had become the active protagonist of Jansen's teaching in France. He had joined the Academy of Cardinal de Berulle and was regarded as one of the advocates of clerical reform. In this environment he met St. Vincent de Paul, with whom he associated intimately prior to 1625 when the latter founded his Congregation of the Mission. About the same time St.-Cyran became affiliated with the famous convent of Port Royal, presently to be described. St.-Cyran apparently began to manifest marked Jansenist tendencies to St. Vincent about 1634–35, when they became estranged, though not hostile—St. Vincent attended St.-Cyran's funeral.

Jansenist Gnosticism is manifest in St.-Cyran's views as reported by St. Vincent when summoned in 1638 to give testimony before the ecclesiastical authorities. St. Vincent reported St.-Cyran as saying: "Calvin was right about that; . . . he defended his position badly, that's all: *bene sensit, male locutus est.* . . . God has revealed to me that the Church no longer exists; . . . that there has been no Church for more than five hundred or six hundred years. Before that, the Church was like a great river whose waters were clear, but now what seems

the Church to us is nothing but mud. . . . True, Jesus Christ built His Church on a rock, but there is a time of building up and a time of casting down. She was once His spouse, but now is an adulteress and a prostitute. Hence He has rejected her and it is His will to place another in her place who will be faithful. . . . Don't speak to me about the Council [of Trent]; it was the council of pope and Scholastics, and nothing but intrigues and cabals. . . . The holy Scriptures are more clear in my mind than they are in themselves." [14] Gnostic "inside theological information" had returned with a vengeance.

Prosecution. St.-Cyran and Richelieu had once been friendly, but the former's refusal to accept domination seems to have alienated the cardinal. In 1630 Queen Marie nominated St.-Cyran bishop of Bayonne, but Richelieu had this canceled two days later. In 1632 under the name of Peter Aureolus, St.-Cyran opposed a Jesuit tract. The unknown author was for a time popular with a portion of the French hierarchy, but not with Bishop Zamet of Langres, whom St.-Cyran had replaced as director of Port Royal. The bishop denounced St.-Cyran to Richelieu, who arrested the Abbé in May, 1638, on an unavowed suspicion of heresy. Though the cardinal took considerable testimony from St. Vincent, Condren, Zamet and others, he seems to have been content to keep St.-Cyran in easy captivity at Vincennes. There he remained, surrounded as usual with stacks of preparatory notes that he never edited, until the cardinal's death in December, 1642. The king then liberated St.-Cyran and he returned home to be hailed by his disciples as a martyr for the Jansenist cause. He died, however, less than a year after his release, October 11, 1643. Jansenism, far from expiring with him, proved to be merely at the beginning of its tortuous course.

(2) Port Royal

The Arnauld Clan. Jansenism had won the adherence of a celebrated bourgeois family. Antoine Arnauld (1612–94), ordained to the priesthood in 1641 on St.-Cyran's advice, became the sect's acknowledged leader after St.-Cyran's death. He was supported by two brothers, the influential lay courtier, Robert Arnauld D'Andilly (1589–1674), eldest of the family and father of Pomponne, a secretary of state; and Henri Arnauld (1597–1692), successively bishop of Toul and Angers. These brothers retained their influential posts until death, although Antoine deemed it prudent to retire to Holland in 1679 where he continued his literary activity until his death. Finally, six of their sisters entered the Port Royal convents. Of these, the most famous were Mère Angelique, née Jacqueline Arnauld (1591–1661), abbess of Port Royale, and Mère

---

[14] Coste, Pierre, *Life and Labours of St. Vincent de Paul* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935), III, 117.

Agnes, author of the *Rosary of the Blessed Sacrament,* which she termed pious "elevations" concerning sixteen divine attributes revealed in as many centuries of Christian history.

Port Royal, a Benedictine convent founded near Paris in 1204, had grown lax in discipline by 1602 when Jacqueline Arnauld was made abbess at the age of eleven. Under the influence of St. Francis de Sales, she began a reform of the convent in 1607. She extended her reform to Maubuisson in 1619, and founded a daughter house, Port Royal de Paris, in 1626. Unfortunately in 1622 she passed from St. Francis's guidance to that of Bishop Zamet, a zealous but eccentric man, and later under that of Abbé St.-Cyran, whom she had met as early as 1621. The latter organized a number of male hermits who took up abode at Port Royal des Champs. The exact nature of St.-Cyran's direction is unknown, but in his time and that of his disciple, Antoine Singlin, there was as yet no general abstention from Communion by the nuns. But they were to prove obstinate devotees of Jansenism, eliciting from Archbishop Perefixe of Paris the remark: "These sisters are as pure as angels, but as proud as devils." Throughout the controversy, Port Royal remained the stronghold of Jansenist learning and piety, resisting full submission despite episcopal censures. Pope Clement XI declared the convent suppressed in 1704, and during 1709 King Louis XIV expelled the surviving nuns, and the next year had the edifice destroyed and the cemetery violated.

The Port Royal circle, however, extended into aristocratic lay society. "Jansenism was above all the heresy of the salon and the study; the mass of the people was only the hapless victim of its exaggerations" (Ludwig von Pastor). Until 1679 the convent enjoyed the powerful protection of the duchess of Longueville, and for a time it had at its service the brilliant pen of Blaise Pascal. Jansenist influence was spread by books and pamphlets, and members of the aristocracy visited Port Royal to receive lectures on asceticism from the nuns.

49. JANSENIST TERGIVERSATION

A. *Jansenist Censure*

(1) ARNAULD'S LEADERSHIP

Antoine Arnauld (1612–94), speaker, polemicist, and organizer, was recognized as "The Great Arnauld" even by foes. He naturally inherited St.-Cyran's leadership of the Jansenist movement and preserved it until his death, with the assistance of his disciple and secretary, Pierre Nicole (1625–95). Arnauld accepted all of Jansen's teachings and defended them in an *Apology* in 1644. But he is best known for his own treatise, *De La Frequente Communion,* published in 1643. This shifted much attention in the Jansenist controversy from speculative questions about

grace, to practical problems of morality, especially concerning confession and Holy Communion.

La Frequente. The new issue had been occasioned by the conduct of the Marquise de Sablé. This social butterfly tried to combine piety with apparent worldliness: though at evidence at gala balls in the evening, she appeared in the morning at the communion rail. St.-Cyran had written a treatise for her admonition, and this was refuted by her Jesuit confessor, Father de Sesmaisons. When St.-Cyran died before he had opportunity to reply, Arnauld undertook his master's defense with his own treatise on Communion. In this he continued St.-Cyran's attacks on the Jesuits for their alleged laxity in regard to frequent confession and communion. Arnauld's aim in his *Frequente* would almost seem to be a revival of the ancient penitential discipline of the *exomologesis*. He insisted upon perfect contrition and complete satisfaction as essential prerequisites for absolution and Communion. The Eucharist, indeed, was to be a sort of reward reserved for the most perfect. None should receive unless he had spent several months at least in atonement for sin. Should he commit several acts of impatience, if he experienced no sensible devotion, a penitent ought to abstain from Holy Communion; in fact, abstention from the Holy Eucharist to Arnauld was "the most important part of penance." One might conclude from his theory that the longer one abstained from Holy Communion from a conviction of personal unworthiness, the more pleasing one was to God. Mère Angelique and her community vied with one another in abstention records: though the presumably holy abbess stayed away for only five months, some of her religious felt prompted to abstain for eighteen. Episcopal inquiries about the precept of Paschal Communion met with no obedience. Even papal rebukes encountered the rejoinder that Popes Liberius and Honorius had once fallen into heresy. Nor were these practices confined to Port Royal; presently they began to produce alarming results among the laity. Father Jacques Nouet, S.J., attacked Arnauld's treatise, and in 1644 Petau issued a learned but drab refutation on historical grounds that Arnauld rebutted with the acclaim of many. Arnauld's circle deplored much of the liturgy, veneration of the Blessed Virgin, and urged Bible reading as a sort of sacrament. Yet the *Frequente* had received the endorsement of fifteen French bishops, who were satisfied with Arnauld's assertion of loyalty to the Roman Church. When Queen Anne ordered Arnauld to render an account of his teaching at Rome, the *parlement* pleaded the "liberties of the Gallican Church."

(2) Explicit Condemnation of Jansenism

Censure of Frequente. Arnauld's book was not only being read with delight by intellectuals, but fashionable people were entrusting their

children to Port Royal. In 1644 Bishop Sanguin of Senlis had applied to Rome to halt the spread of Jansenism, but in 1645–46 pro-Jansenist bishops praised the *Frequente* in letters to Rome. Cardinal de Lugo warned Pope Innocent X against forcing these into open schism. Accordingly St. Vincent de Paul, since 1643 head of the queen's "Council of Conscience," resolved on an indirect attack. Realizing that the Holy See would act slowly in reaching a definitive decision on the complicated questions in dispute, he shrewdly seized on an incidental passage of the *Frequente* which termed St. Paul a "Roman cofounder," along with St. Peter. When this was brought to the attention of the Holy See, Rome, ever jealous of Petrine primacy, acted quickly. With explicit papal approval, the Holy Office in January, 1647, declared certain of Arnauld's statements heretical (Denzinger 1091). The queen and Cardinal Mazarin sustained the papal decree over Jansenist protests.

Indictment of five propositions. Though a joint episcopal-royal directive of 1643 had imposed the condemnation of Jansen contained in *In Eminenti*, the Jansenists, stimulated by Arnauld's *Apologies*, had refused to submit. In his "Observations on the bull, *In Eminenti*," Arnauld questioned the identification of Jansenism with Baianism, though he professed to be willing to accept a definitive papal judgment. This was the next objective of St. Vincent who in 1648 had assembled the leading theologians at St. Lazare to concert measures against the chief Jansenist tenets. A Jansenist demand from the Sorbonne of censure of Père Veron's attacks upon themselves gave the dean, Nicholas Cornet, a reason for an examination of Jansen's works. Forty-two Parisian doctors examined Jansenist writings and commissioned Cornet to draw up a list of passages for condemnation. Though he selected seven, the following "five propositions" from the *Augustinus* were finally censured by the Sorbonne in 1649 as heretical: "1) Some of God's commandments are impossible to just men who wish and strive to keep them, considering the powers they actually have; the grace by which these precepts may become possible is also wanting to them. 2) In the state of fallen nature no one ever resists interior grace. 3) In order to merit or demerit in the state of fallen nature, we must be free from all external constraint, but not from interior necessity. 4) The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of internal prevenient grace for all acts, even for the beginning of faith, but fell into heresy in pretending that this grace is such that man may either follow or resist it. 5) It is Semi-Pelagian to say that Christ died or shed His Blood for all men."

Papal condemnation of the five propositions was then sought by St. Vincent and his associates, while the Jansenists tried to avert this by delaying tactics of their Roman agent, Louis Gorin de St.-Amour. Though they forwarded eleven episcopal signatures on their behalf, the Jansenists

were overpowered by the 88 episcopal endorsements of the Sorbonne's censure obtained by 1651. In 1652 Dr. Hallier of the Sorbonne could assure Rome that but 20 of its 460 doctors were Jansenist. Innocent X in 1651 named a cardinalatial commission to study the propositions, and to avoid any charge of bias, included only one Jesuit, Pallavicinio, on the board. After an exhaustive inquiry, the pope on May 31, 1653, sanctioned the censure of heresy placed by the commission on the five propositions in the constitution, *Cum Occasione* (Denzinger 1092–96).

B. *Jansenist Evasion*

(1) THE "QUESTION OF FACT"

"L'Affaire Arnauld." One of the devotees of Port Royal, the duke of Liancourt, continued to confess at St. Sulpice, although Father Olier had definitely placed himself in opposition to the Jansenist ideas of penance in a sermon during 1649. During 1655 the duke learned that in the judgment of his Sulpician director, Father Picoté, reinforced by that of Father Olier, he would be denied Communion at St. Sulpice if he continued to frequent Port Royal. When this came to Arnauld's notice, he edited several "Open Letters" in which, besides denouncing the Sulpician stand, he enunciated the distinction of right and fact, possibly at the suggestion of Pierre Nicole. Arnauld maintained that the five propositions may have been rightly condemned by the Holy See in the sense suggested to Rome by unscrupulous enemies, e.g., Jesuits and Vincentians; yet, as a matter of fact, neither Jansen nor his followers understood the propositions in the same sense. Hence, though Rome had rightly condemned certain hypothetical errors, she had not touched the Jansenists who did not understand the indicted propositions in the same way. Arnauld's attack was censured at the Sorbonne, he was deprived of his doctorate, and denounced to Rome: December, 1655, to January, 1656.

Blaise Pascal (1623–62), "converted" in 1654, proved Port Royal's greatest recruit during these years. Pascal had been trained by Jansenists and never completely escaped their influence, though later acquaintance with the works of St. Thomas Aquinas somewhat modified his views. While he constantly denied any doctrinal affiliation with Jansenism, Pascal for a time played its game by seconding attacks upon the Jesuits. His friendship for Arnauld brought him to resent what he deemed the intrigues of petty casuists at the Sorbonne. In January, 1656, he wrote the first of his *Lettres Provinciales* which inflamed the controversy by focusing attention on personalities. Though grossly unfair to the Jesuits, these sallies constituted a masterpiece of satire which was relished by many persons otherwise unconnected with Jansenism. Molin-

ism was termed Pelagianism, and Probabilism held to scorn as mere "Jesuitical casuistry." At the same time (1656–57) Port Royal was claiming that miracles worked through the Holy Thorn—a fragment of the Crown of Thorns lent them—were confirming their teachings. After the Holy Office had placed the *Lettres Provinciales* on the Index, September 6, 1657, Pascal ceased to write them. But he failed to retract them and left a poison virulent for centuries. Several months before his death, however, Pascal disassociated himself from Port Royal and made entire submission to the Holy See.

Ad Sacram Beati Petri Sedem was the response of Alexander VII to the Jansenist question of fact on October 16, 1656. Therein he condemned the distinction between right and fact, and defined the dogmatic fact that the five propositions were actually found in the *Augustinus*, which Arnauld had denied, and that they had been condemned "in the sense intended by Jansen." The crown overrode *parlement's* objections to register this papal document in France, and urged the Assembly of the French Clergy to draw up a formula against Jansenism to be accepted by all candidates for benefices. During 1661 this was done with episcopal sanction, so that all clerics and theologians were henceforth required to accept the condemnation of the five propositions in the papal sense.

(2) "Mental Reservation"

"**Mental reservation**" was the Jansenists' next expedient. Many of their party now consented to subscribe to the formulary imposed by the assembly of the clergy so far as externals went, but at the same time they assured their associates that they had done so only with mental restriction. In fact, several Jansenist-minded vicars-general in Paris issued directives explicitly permitting such an indulgent interpretation. With this proviso, even the nuns of Port Royal were willing to accept the formulary in 1661. But the Jansenists were themselves divided about subscribing with reservation or continuing to refuse adherence. Arnauld and Nicole now raised further quibbles on the ground that the Holy See had been deceived by Jesuit machinations. Utter confusion seemed once again to have clouded the issue, which was undoubtedly what the Jansenist leaders desired.

Episcopal dissenters. Even more serious was the determined resistance offered to the formulary by four French bishops: Henri Arnauld of Angers, De Buzenval of Beauvais, De Caulet of Pamiers, and Pavillon of Alet. This group, headed by the ascetic but quite unintelligent Nicolas Pavillon, "maintained that the Church had the power to condemn a doctrine, but not to declare that this doctrine was contained in the writings of such or such an author. In other words, that the infallible

Church, infallible in matters of right, is not so in matters of fact." [15] Following a request for greater vigor in enforcing the formulary, emanating from Pope Alexander VII, the king renewed his requirements in April, 1664. But the Jansenists protested that this formula had not been approved by the Holy See, and indeed it had originally been drawn up in 1655 by Archbishop DeMarca of Toulouse, a Gallican, though a firm opponent of Jansenism.

Regiminis Apostolici, issued on February 15, 1665, was the pope's response. The vicars-general were now obliged to rescind their indulgence, and a new iron-clad formula was to be imposed on all, to be received without any mental reservation whatsoever. The new archbishop of Paris, Hardouin de Beaumont, secured submission from a few nuns of Port Royal without reservations; the others were banished from Paris to Port Royal des Champs and deprived of the sacraments. Though the king had had the new papal formulary registered in 1666, the four bishops still held out in "respectful silence." Apparently they judged that the Holy See had made a mistake, and that the decision was not to be deemed irrevocable. Until the end of the pontificate, Alexander VII hesitated about the action to be taken against these dissenters, and he rejected the royal proposal of a supreme tribunal of twelve French bishops. Nineteen other bishops had expressed sympathy with the stand of the accused, who themselves claimed that there was no such thing as a Jansenist heresy: this existed largely in Jesuit fancy. The Duchess de Longueville, head of the aristocratic protectors of Jansenism, also pleaded for the dissenters and much propaganda was spread on their behalf. The king began to weary of the Jansenist squabbles and the situation was growing critical.

C. The "Clementine Truce"

(1) TEMPORARY RECONCILIATION (1669)

Pope Clement IX (1667–69) had obtained experience with the Jansenist case as nuncio at Madrid. When Bishop Vialart of Châlons came forward as mediator between the four episcopal dissenters and Rome, Clement IX promised that the dissenters would not be prosecuted if they subscribed to previous papal pronouncements on Jansenism "without clauses, simply, sincerely, and clearly." Imposing on the ineptitude of the nuncio in France, Bargellini, Vialart sounded out the four prelates. They proved willing to sign a statement prepared by Antoine Arnauld professing devotion to the Holy See in phrases that could later be qualified in a Gallican sense. With some qualification, the bishops now had their clergy subscribe to the formula of Alexander VII. Even Antoine

---

[15] Fernand Mourret, S.S., *A History of the Catholic Church,* trans. Newton Thompson (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946), VI, 413.

Arnauld signed and was admitted to interviews with the nuncio and the king, although the Sorbonne refused to reinstate him. After repeated efforts to check upon the good faith of the dissenters, the pope decided to accept their protestations. Against the advice of Cardinal Albizzi, Clement IX wrote on January 19, 1669, to the four bishops, accepting their statements of sincerity in upholding the papal condemnations of Jansenism. This reconciliation was hailed in France on all sides as a peace, although in retrospect it can now be seen to have been merely a truce.

(2) SEEDS OF FUTURE CONFLICT

Jansenist sincerity must be regarded as highly questionable. Undoubtedly some of those reconciled had been merely confused by the ramifications of the strife and were truly sincere. But Arnauld and other Jansenist theologians gave evidence of intellectual dishonesty, for in private conversations they continued to express their old views, and a clique still met at the Longueville salon. The "Peace" prevailed outwardly during the pontificates of Popes Clement IX and Clement X, though Jansenist works continued to circulate despite papal and episcopal censures. Innocent XI wrote conciliatory letters to Arnauld and Port Royal, but by a decree of February 12, 1679, commended the practice of frequent, and even daily Communion to all whom their pastors or confessors judged to have the proper dispositions. Nuns sincerely disposed were not to be prohibited from daily Communion, nor were the laity to be discouraged by reason of their state from frequent or even daily reception. The pope also accepted the support of the former episcopal dissenters, Pavillon and Caulet, during his contest with royal Gallicanism. But while these bishops co-operated with the Holy See, Arnauld, with Nicole and Quesnel, upheld the Four Gallican Articles. Once their protectress, the Duchess de Longueville, had died in 1679, Arnauld, Nicole and Quesnel deemed it prudent to retire to Brussels where they adhered tenaciously to the fundamental Jansenist ideas.

50. QUIETIST REACTION

A. *Quietism*

(1) ORIGINS

Miguel de Molinos (1627–96) was a native of Aragon who may have been influenced by the Alumbrados, condemned by the Inquisition as late as 1623. These sectaries discouraged prayer and meditation on the sacred humanity of Christ. Molinos was educated in Spanish universities and ordained to the priesthood in 1652. He was the spiritual director for a community of nuns when he went to Rome in 1663 as postulator for the beatification of the Venerable Simon. At Rome he was attached to

the church of Spanish Discalced Augustinians and soon attained extraordinary fame as a spiritual director. He received the patronage of ex-Queen Christina of Sweden, the Oratorian leader Petrucci, later cardinal, and the papal secretaries, Favoriti and Casani; the latter seem to have diverted the attention of Innocent XI for a long time. Molinos's chief disciples were the brothers, Simone and Antonio Leoni.

The "Guida Spirituale," published by Molinos in 1675, was to be a synthesis of his teaching. It probably received the complacent routine approbation of one of his ecclesiastical admirers, for it attained favorable and wide circulation in Italy and elsewhere. The basis of his system is, however, indicated in the first of its propositions subsequently selected for papal condemnation: "Man must annihilate his powers, and this is the interior life." The treatise's chief notions of spirituality were:

1) **Passivity:** man must annihilate his natural powers to become entirely passive to supernatural inspiration. All intellectual and physical activity in spiritual matters must be excluded as displeasing to God, hostile to grace, and opposed to the soul's return to its origin, God's essence. Apropos of this are the words of Poulain: "There is a wide difference between the maxim: suppress all your acts; and this other which is orthodox: suppress all that is defective in your acts." [16]

2) **Contemplative indifference:** prayer must be entirely contemplative, to the exclusion of all discursive reasoning and affections. One must neither think of nor excite affection for Christ nor His life, nor distract oneself by performing acts of virtue. Rather one ought to listen to God in silence, perhaps unable even to recite the Lord's Prayer. This condition might last for years or for life; its prolongation ought not to be hindered by anxiety or effort about salvation. Hence, thoughts of heaven or hell, reward or punishment, should be excluded.

3) **Moral neutrality:** "God for some unknown reason prevails upon the soul to fall into the very sins it most detests in order to induce a state of complete self-renunciation" (Miguel de Molinos). For this reason, Molinos would advise that alien thoughts, even impure ones, may be accepted with calm resignation. These are in no sense sins but temptations and need not be confessed. Indeed, the inward way of Molinos supposedly transcended the sacrament of penance, for it was claimed that often souls became so perfect that they could no longer profit by penance.

(2) CONDEMNATION

Quietist popularity with the worldly set is not difficult to imagine. Molinos's penitents were captivated by a system which required no

[16] Augustine Poulain, *Graces of Interior Prayer* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), p. 487.

effort, and according to a blunt but logical interpretation might permit the utmost license. For his devotees, Molinos's prohibition to confess failings or temptations regarding purity might conceal from non-Quietist confessors the true state of the penitent's soul, and might even create the impression that the system was inculcating an angelic degree of spirituality.

Criticism, nevertheless, was not slow in appearing. As early as 1678 the Jesuit, Father Belluomo, had hinted at danger in the current spiritual teachings, although without naming Molinos. The celebrated Jesuit preacher, Paolo Segneri (1624–94), denounced Quietism in writing about 1680. He was seconded by both Jesuit and Dominican theologians, but so great was the popularity and so incredible the charges against an apparently saintly priest, that their efforts merely gave rise to a controversy. Prelates intervened to block inquiry and delay detection, and Segneri's book was itself placed on the Index. Pope Innocent seems to have been prejudiced in Molinos's favor by the papal secretaries, for he is reported to have remarked later: "Truly we were deceived." But Cardinal Junico Caracciolo, archbishop of Naples since 1667, presently adduced more concrete evidence. Several scandals, involving the corruption of the innocent, had taken place earlier in the seventeenth century to put the Neapolitan curia on its guard. Now in 1682 Cardinal Caracciolo reported to the Holy See that false mystics were appearing in his diocese who claimed "to omit exercises of piety prescribed or recommended by the Church; to regard vocal prayer and the sign of the cross as of no value; and to repel every idea or image which leads to meditation on the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, since such meditation separates one from God."

Papal condemnation. On receiving this information, the Holy See opened an investigation into current spiritual teachings. There seems to have been at first some difficulty in tracing the errors to Molinos, for he was once acquitted by the Inquisition. But in July, 1685, he was summarily arrested a second time by the Holy Office. He admitted many of the charges and was found guilty, along with the Leoni brothers. On September 3, 1687, Molinos and Simone Leoni were required to make public recantation in the Piazza sopra Minerva. Molinos was degraded from the priesthood and sentenced to perpetual penance in a monastery. Antonio Leoni refused at first to retract, but eventually did so. Petrucci was obliged to resign his see in 1696, but remained in good standing. With the retractation of Giuseppe Beccarelli at Venice in 1710, Quietism strictly so called seems to have disappeared in Italy. Meanwhile Pope Innocent XI had on November 20, 1688, issued a condemnation of sixty-eight Quietist propositions extracted from the *Guida Spirituale* or the some twenty-five thousand letters of Molinos. Petrucci's *Contemplazione*

Mistica was also censured, though the author was probably guilty more of rash and incautious expressions borrowed from Molinos, than of any deliberate and fundamental error of his own.

B. *Semiquietism*

(1) VOGUE OF MADAME GUYON

Jeanne Bouvier de la Motte (1648–1717) was born at Montargis and educated in the convent. Though attracted to the religious life by reading St. Theresa's works, she was given in marriage in 1664 to the rich bourgeois, Jacques de Guyon. When this match proved unhappy, she contrasted her state with the peace of the convent. Widowed in 1676, she sought a spiritual guide and professed to find one in François Lacombe (d. 1699), Barnabite director of the Convent of Gex. This pathological case encouraged her to leave her three small children for the convent. Madame Guyon then became greatly attached to Lacombe, whom she evidently wished to play John of the Cross to her Theresa of Avila. When Bishop D'Aranton of Geneva questioned their spiritual maxims, the pair felt called on to set out on a protracted tour of France and Italy to convert the world to "pure love." Among the many "converts" were Madame de Maintenon, the king's wife, and Abbé Fénelon, the royal tutor.

"Guyonism" was a doctrine of spiritual self-abnegation on the strength of pretended revelations. The soul ought to love God with perfect love, untarnished by any desire for heaven or fear of hell. Madame de Guyon implied that the sacraments became useless for the perfect. The trend of her teaching is evident from some of the titles of the Guyon-Lacombe works: *Spiritual Torrents, Explanation of the Apocalypse,* etc. Though her teaching was less gross than that of Molinos, and her own morals said to have been beyond reproach, Bossuet thought that the language that she sometimes used regarding purity in her mistaken devotion bore some resemblance to that of a libertine.

Arrest of the pair occurred at Paris in 1687 when Archbishop Du Harlay of Paris warned the king of the similarity between Semiquietism and the teaching of Molinos, then under fire at Rome. Lacombe remained incarcerated in various royal prisons until he died insane at Charenton. Madame de Guyon was soon released through Madame de Maintenon's influence, and assumed the office of spiritual guide at the fashionable girls' academy of St. Cyr. By 1694 her indiscreet, if not immoral, conduct reawakened suspicion, and the king had her arrested once more. Her admirer, Abbé Fénelon, urged an examination of her writings and participated in the conference held at Issy (1695–96) along with Bishop Bossuet, Bishop De Noailles of Châlons, and Father Tron-

son, superior of St. Sulpice. Their verdict was a compromise: although thirty-four of Madame de Guyon's propositions were branded worthy of censure, she was allowed to make a simple retraction of them. On August 23, 1696, she did so, promising to keep silence. She was released from the Bastille in 1703, retired to her son's home at Blois, and took no further part in public affairs. Fénelon always remained convinced of her good faith, and this and his dubious attachment to the Issy condemnation prolonged the semiquietist controversies.

(2) DUEL OF BOSSUET AND FÉNELON

Clash of personalities. Jacques Bossuet (1627–1704) was the darling of the court. Possessed of a brilliant intellect, vigorous rhetorical powers, precise theological training, he was an imperious and inflexible champion of Catholic truth as he saw it—though he usually saw it more in accord with the Grand Monarch than with Christ's Vicar. He had been resolute against Leibniz's would-be syncretism and all Jansenist wiles, but had played a sorry role in the Gallican Crisis. As the dauphin's tutor, he belonged to a different generation than Fénelon, tutor to the dauphin's son. Bishop of Meaux since 1681, Bossuet was a trusted royal advisor on ecclesiastical affairs. Distrusting Fénelon's adhesion to Issy, he submitted to him the manuscript of his forthcoming treatise, *Instructions sur les États d'Oraison*, which tore the new teachings to bits with cold theological logic.

François Fénelon (1651–1715) was rather a man of the heart than of logic. Pious, sensitive, even sentimental, his ardent temperament induced him to sympathize with the poor and oppressed. Now he felt that Madame de Guyon was being victimized. He not only failed to approve of Bossuet's work, but beat him to the press with a book of his own: *Maximes des Saints sur la Vie Interieure.* This professed to establish: (1) that all interior ways lead to pure love; (2) that the trials of this life are designed to purify this love; (3) that contemplation is the exercise of pure love; and (4) that the unitive and passive life is an habitual and pure state of love. While this presented a lofty ideal, it was misleading doctrine to preach to ordinary souls whom Fénelon had guided as archbishop of Cambrai since 1695. His book appeared in February, 1697, a month before Bossuet's own work.

Royal prosecution. The duc de Beauvilliers in Cambrai sent copies of the *Maxims* to Bossuet and the king. Bossuet subsequently reduced Fénelon's principles to the following consequences: (1) The soul in the habitual state of pure love loses all desire for salvation; (2) it becomes indifferent to perfection; (3) it loses appreciation of Christ; (4) it can sacrifice to God its eternal bliss. Bossuet then denounced Fénelon

to the king, and Louis XIV "exiled" Fénelon perpetually from Versailles —to residence in his own diocese. With royal backing, Bossuet also denounced Fénelon to the Holy See in July, 1697—though Fénelon to escape Bossuet's ruthless pursuit had already submitted his own treatise to Rome. Pending Roman decision, the principals engaged in literary controversy reflecting their divergent personalities. When Innocent XII demurred at condemning the good bishop of Cambrai by name, Bossuet advised the king to send Rome the following ultimatum, delivered by the bishop's nephew, Abbé Bossuet: "If His Holiness prolongs this affair by cautious delays, he [Louis advised by Bossuet] would know what to do"; and he hoped that His Holiness would not force him to such disagreeable extremities.

(3) Fénelon "in Exile"

Papal condemnation. On March 12, 1699, in the brief, *Cum Alias,* Innocent XII condemned twenty-three propositions drawn from the *Maximes* of Fénelon. Following Poulain's summary, we may say that Fénelon's false principles are two: exaggerated awaiting of the divine action; and exaggerated ideas of "pure love," disinterested even to the willing of salvation. Love should be exclusive rather than predominant.[17]

Humble submission. This condemnation was handed to Archbishop Fénelon as he entered the pulpit on the feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1699. After reading it, he announced its contents to his people, together with his profession of complete submission. He confirmed this oral recantation in a pastoral letter of April 9, in which he declared: "We adhere to this Brief, both in regard to the text of the book, and in regard to the twenty-three propositions, simply, absolutely, and without a shadow of restriction." The Holy See, which had labored for years to induce the Jansenists to acknowledge as much, never required anything further of Fénelon.

Télémaque. In his banishment from Versailles, Archbishop Fénelon composed his *Télémaque,* a description of an Utopian state in which the Bourbon monarchy was satirized under the guise of fictitious characters, subtly but not legally identifiable with the king and his minions. It is not surprising that Fénelon was later hailed by the Philosophes and French Revolutionaries as one of themselves. Though he may have shared some of their political objections to absolute monarchy, Fénelon's sincere Christianity is never in question. And the Grand Monarch and his successors would have done well to heed some of the archbishop's recommendations on behalf of the downtrodden peasants.

[17] Poulain, *op. cit.,* p. 498.

51. JANSENIST REVIVAL

A. *Clerical Jansenism*

(1) QUESNELISM

Abel de Ste.-Marthe (1620–71), superior of the French Oratory, is a link between the Jansenism of Arnauld and that of Quesnel. An antiquarian, Ste.-Marthe had become an ardent advocate of Arnauld's supposed revival of primitive discipline. Though exiled for his obstinacy by the archbishop of Paris, Ste.-Marthe left a pernicious influence upon some of his subjects.

Pasquier Quesnel (1634–1719) was one of these. Joining the Oratory in 1657, he devoted himself from 1662 to commentaries on the Gospels. The first fruits of his labors appeared in 1671 in the *Réflexions Morales sur le Nouveau Testament.* This work was deemed inoffensive enough to receive the imprimatur of Bishop Vialart of Châlons-sur-Marne. Quesnel subsequently came under the sway of Ste.-Marthe and of Arnauld himself. In 1693 he published a revised edition of the *Réflexions* which embodied Jansenist teachings. Though the work had been substantially altered, it continued to bear the usurped imprimatur of Bishop Vialart who had died in 1680. Through his writings Quesnel eventually came to be recognized as Arnauld's successor in leadership of the Jansenists. When some question was raised at the Sorbonne, Quesnel in 1695 secured from Bishop Vialart's successor, Louis de Noailles, a letter recommending the book to the laity. By this rash and perhaps routine approbation, de Noailles took the first step toward becoming the central figure of the new phase of Jansenism. As for Quesnel himself, he took care to reside at Brussels from 1685. Though Philip V of Spain had him imprisoned in 1703, Quesnel succeeded in escaping to Holland where he remained the Jansenist literary oracle until his death in December of 1719.

Quesnelism was not essentially different from either Baianism or Jansenism. This is evident from some of the propositions which were subsequently singled out for papal condemnation: "2) The grace of Jesus Christ, the efficacious principle of all good, is necessary for any good work whatsoever; without it not only is nothing done, but nothing can be done. . . . 10) Grace is the operation of the omnipotent hand of God, which nothing can hinder or retard. . . . 16) There is no attraction which does not yield to the attraction of grace, because nothing resists the Omnipotent. . . . 30) All those whom God wishes to save through Christ are infallibly saved. . . . 39) The will without prevenient grace has no light save to go wrong, no zeal but to hasten to destruction, no strength but to wound itself; it is capable of all evil, and incapable of any good" (Denzinger 1349 ff.).

(2) CONDEMNATION OF QUESNELISM

Louis de Noailles (1651–1729), who became the focal point of the Quesnelist controversy, was a man of moral life and considerable administrative ability, but he was weak and hesitant, sensitive about his reputation and prerogative. Shortly after his approval of Quesnel's *Réflexions* in 1695, he was named by the king to the archiepiscopal see of Paris. Jansenists now sought to secure the renewed approbation of the leading French prelate for a third edition of Quesnel's work which was to appear in 1699. Somewhat warier, the archbishop consulted Bossuet. But the latter's criticism of the *Réflexions* was so scathing that de Noailles considered it a pointed rebuke to his own previous approbation. He compromised by permitting the new edition to be published without his imprimatur. People now began to ask whether they ought to believe the bishop of Châlons or the archbishop of Paris in regard to the *Réflexions*. News of this theological wavering evidently did not reach Rome before 1700, when Innocent XII named de Noailles cardinal.

A case of conscience, presented for academic solution to the Sorbonne in 1701, reopened the Jansenist disputes. It was asked whether a penitent might receive absolution if he maintained "respectful silence" regarding the papal condemnation of the Five Propositions of Jansen. In July, 1701, forty doctors of the Sorbonne recommended leniency, but were at once denounced on all sides. When the solution was brought to the attention of Pope Clement XI (1700–1721), he not only rejected the decision of the benevolent forty, but entirely repudiated the attitude of "respectful silence" in *Vineam Domini,* July 16, 1705. Quesnel's work had been also under the scrutiny of the Roman curia for some time, and in 1708 the Pope also proscribed the *Réflexions* as "containing propositions already condemned and as manifestly savoring of the Jansenist heresy." Cardinal de Noailles, still hesitant about reversing his ambiguous stand, found placards announcing the papal verdict on the doors of his residence. Fancying this to be the work of the seminarian nephews of his rivals, the bishops of Luçon and of LaRochelle, the cardinal expelled the nephews and denounced their uncles as themselves Jansenists. As for his own position, de Noailles pleaded that Quesnelism had not yet been explicitly condemned.

Unigenitus Dei Filius, issued by Clement XI on September 8, 1713, settled all reasonable doubts as to papal disapproval. Therein 101 Quesnelian propositions were pronounced: "false, captious, evil-sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and her usages, extravagant for secular powers as well as for the Church, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspect and redolent

of heresy, favorable to heresy and to schism, erroneous, bordering on heresy and often condemned, heretical and reviving various heresies." The Holy See, weary of interminable Jansenist quibbling, had indeed given its "last word" on the subject, sufficient for all men of good will.

(3) THE APPELLANTS' SCHISM

The cardinal's dilemma. De Noailles had received more than his answer, but still was unwilling to admit that he had made a mistake. But the king, freed from his preoccupation with the War of Spanish Succession, was again intent on suppressing Jansenism. He insisted upon formal acceptance of *Unigenitus* by the French hierarchy. The cardinal feared to lose royal favor if he refused, or to lose face if he recanted. He compromised once more by issuing a pastoral in September, 1713, in which, while condemning the *Réflexions*, he endeavored to justify his previous approbation. Yet when in January, 1714, the Assembly of the French Clergy agreed to enforce the *Unigenitus*, the cardinal pleaded the need of yet further elucidation and directed the Sorbonne to defer its approbation. Now the university followed the king, who, disgusted with De Noailles, banished him from Versailles.

The cardinal's appeal. But the death of Louis XIV in 1715 brought the free-thinking duke of Orléans to the regency (1715–23). De Noailles stood high in his favor, and the pliant Sorbonne recanted its approbation of the *Unigenitus* in January, 1716. Many French bishops thereupon withdrew their subjects from attendance, and the pope suspended its faculty from conferring theological degrees. But on March 5, 1717, the cardinal and four other bishops appealed from "the aforesaid constitution (*Unigenitus*) to a future general council." Though these "Appellants" eventually included some twenty bishops and three thousand clerics, the majority of the hierarchy and the clergy, especially the religious, continued to sustain the papal condemnation. After exhausting other means Clement XI excommunicated the Appellants by *Pastoralis Officii* in 1718. During this schism the cardinal was lecturing the visiting Peter the Great of Russia on the malice of Greek Orthodox schism, and encouraging Dr. Petitpied's liturgical aberrations which professed to revive the primitive practices.

The cardinal's submission. But the regent was coming to rely for political advice on Abbé Guillaume Du Bois (1656–1723), who in 1720 became the third of the French cardinal-premiers. Politician and secularist, Du Bois was nonetheless an ardent anti-Jansenist. Under his pressure, the Appellants began to waver and send out feelers for an understanding. But the Holy See refused to accept anything short of full submission. Though the cardinal's diary reveals that he gradually became convinced of the necessity for this, he delayed his journey to Canossa

until a premonition of death suggested that the time for hesitation was nearing its end. On July 19, 1728, he wrote his submission to Pope Benedict XIII; on October 11, he publicly retracted his errors and accepted the *Unigenitus;* on May 3, 1729, he was dead. Only four of the episcopal Appellants survived him, and in the same year the Sorbonne expelled the Quesnelians and reaccepted the *Unigenitus.* Though a number of the Appellants lived on till death in sullen semi-retirement, for practical purposes Jansenism among the clergy neared its end, for religious and secular superiors now began to take rigorous measures to stamp it out in seminaries and communities.

B. Parliamentary Jansenism

(1) JANSENIST CONVULSIONARIES

St. Medard Cemetery became the scene of Jansenism's last hysterical stand. Here had been interred in 1727 the Jansenist deacon, François de Paris, whose sanctity was vouched for by the fact that he had abstained from Communion for two years. Soon afterwards Jansenists began to claim miracles at his tomb, and many devotees, especially women, went into ecstasies and violent convulsions during which they denounced the Holy See and all foes of Jansenism. By 1731 the manifestations had become notorious. Archbishop de Ventimille of Paris (1729–46) examined several cases and pronounced them inauthentic; subsequently various individuals who had been involved admitted fraud, though some diabolical intervention need not be excluded. When the royal authorities closed the cemetery in 1732 to prevent indecent antics, *parlement,* partly from sheer antagonism to the crown, tried to take up a defense of the Jansenist cause. In the long run, the pseudo-miracles quite discredited the Jansenists with the laity.

(2) CONFESSIONAL CERTIFICATES

Enforcement of "Unigenitus" by the hierarchy led various bishops to withdraw the faculties from suspected clerics, and there were confessors who denied the sacraments to suspicious penitents. From 1731 *parlement* repeatedly accepted appeals from Jansenists against Catholic clerics accused of not rendering them their "legal" rights to ecclesiastical services. One of the most famous cases occurred when Archbishop de Beaumont of Paris (1746–81) denied absolution to all penitents who refused to accept the papal document, and decreed that they were not to be admitted to Viaticum unless they produced a "certificate of confession" from a priest in good standing. A test case came up in 1752 when the Oratorian Le Mère was reported to have been refused Viaticum by Père Bouettin. Upon appeal, the *parlement* of Paris ordered the archbishop to rescind his directive. When he refused to do so, *parlement* confiscated

his property and even had him banished for a time from Paris until the "absolute monarch," King Louis XV, finally was able to overrule *parlement* and restore the archbishop (1757).

Papal decision had meanwhile been requested regarding lawfulness of the episcopal regulations of the treatment of penitents. In 1756 Pope Benedict XIV gave prudent instructions. While upholding the bishops' denial of the sacraments to all public and notorious rebels against *Unigenitus,* he ordered that the "certificates of confession" be dispensed with as a means to this enforcement. After some further controversy, Louis XV forced *parlement* to register the papal document and thus in 1757 the Jansenist controversy ended in France. But Jansenism left these subterranean rumblings: laxity in the reception of the sacraments, hostility to the Jesuits, and lurking antagonism toward "throne and altar."

C. Schismatic Jansenism

(1) Utrecht Schism

Jansenist refugees from royal prosecution in France had repeatedly received asylum in Protestant Holland. Here they were successful in attracting the indulgent sympathy of the Catholic vicars-apostolic, Neercassel (1663–86) and Peter Codde (1686–1702). The latter was finally deposed by Clement XI in 1702, but continued to claim jurisdiction until his death in 1710 at Rome. This pretense was encouraged by his Jansenist vicars-general in the Netherlands, who refused to recognize Codde's Catholic successors, and obtained ordination for their clergy from the French Appellants.

Formal schism began in 1723 when seven Jansenist clerics constituted themselves into the "Chapter of Utrecht" and elected their vicar-capitular, Cornelius Steenhoven, as "Archbishop of Utrecht." They prevailed upon a suspended French bishop, Varlet, formerly of New Orleans and missioned to Persia, to consecrate Steenhoven. Both bishops were then excommunicated by Rome.

(2) Jansenist Survival

Though Steenhoven died in 1725 shortly after the formal rupture with the Holy See, the Utrecht schism continued under his successor, Barcham Vuytiers, with the protection of the Dutch government. In time two suffragan sees were erected by the Jansenists at Haarlem and Deventer. Their bishops continued to profess allegiance to the Holy See and notified Rome of their election—to be promptly excommunicated and suspended. After 1757, however, Jansenism declined in the Netherlands as well as in France, and by 1789 there were but thirty priests and ten thousand lay members of the Utrecht schism. The movement had never been strong outside these areas, though Jansenist errors played a part

in the schismatic Synod of Pistoia in Tuscany (1786) under Grand Duke
Leopold and Scipio Ricci. This, as will be noted later, proved a fiasco so
far as the bulk of the clergy and people were concerned. The Utrecht
schism did receive a new lease on life after 1870 with the defection of
Dr. Doellinger's German "Old Catholics" from the decisions of the
Vatican Council. The "Old Catholics" accepted orders from Utrecht
and the combined movement reached a zenith of some one hundred
thousand adherents during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.
Since that time, however, it has declined in comparative importance,
although the Jansenist prelate of Utrecht is accorded a sort of honorary
primacy since 1889 over the various autonomous "Old Catholic" bodies
in different national jurisdictions.

52. CATHOLIC MORAL SYNTHESIS

A. *Formulation of Probabilism*

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF MORAL THEOLOGY

St. Thomas Aquinas and the medieval Scholastics had worked theol-
ogy into a synthesis harmonizing faith and reason. This included both
dogmatic and speculative moral theology so that until modern times
what is now called moral theology was treated within this framework.
But aside from its speculative aspect, pastoral and practical moral
theology had as yet received no explicit formulation of principles, al-
though both the Fathers and the Scholastics had discussed individual
cases.

St. Alphonsus Liguori took the lead during the eighteenth century in
this formulation, so that he has been accorded a primacy in moral
theology analogous to that tendered St. Thomas in speculative theology.
In some way this synthesis of Catholic Moral represented harmony be-
tween objective norms of law and subjective principles of conscience.
For just as in the thirteenth century an erroneous philosophy threatened
to undermine dogma, so during the seventeenth and eighteenth cen-
turies Cartesian subjectivism menaced any moral theology founded on
objective standards. Controversies arose between traditional theologians
and others influenced more or less unconsciously by the "Enlighten-
ment."

(2) PRESENTATION OF PROBABILISM

Probabilism, though it had served as an implicit principle for the
solution of moral cases by the Fathers and Scholastics, had not been ex-
plicitly formulated prior to the sixteenth century.

Bartolomé Medina (1527–81), Dominican professor at Salamanca,
performed this service about 1572 in a commentary on St. Thomas's
Summa Theologica. He wrote: "It seems to me that if an opinion is

probable, it may be followed, even though the opposite opinion is more probable" (I–II, xix, 6). He then went on to define a probable opinion as one "which is held by wise men and is supported by first-class arguments." Medina's opinion provoked little opposition at the time, for it did not contradict Catholic practice.

Francisco Suárez (1548–1617), the great Molinist luminary, confirmed this position with his argument against the obligation of a doubtful law: "When there is a really probable argument against the existence of some obligation, the law which enjoins the said obligation is not sufficiently promulgated. Now it is a universally accepted principle that a law obliges only after it has been sufficiently promulgated."

B. Condemnation of Extremes

(1) Laxism

Origin. The temptation existed for theologians to adopt Medina's principle without the safeguard of his definition of a prudently probable opinion. The result was Laxism, which by its false claim to the name of Probabilism brought that system into disrepute for a time. Laxism, if carried to its final consequences, would have exchanged objective morality for sectarian and rationalist subjectivism. The true Laxists were Bresser, Tamburini, Amico, and Viva. Certain theologians have been called Laxists, but though they did occasionally defend rash and tenuously probable opinions which merited theological censure, they were not Laxists by principle. Such were Juan Sánchez, Leander, Bauny, Escobar, Moya, Diana, and Caramuel.

Condemnation. It was Moya's fanatical defense of the Jesuits, censured by the Sorbonne in February, 1665, which may have provoked the condemnation of forty-five Laxist propositions by Pope Alexander VII in approving decrees of the Holy Office of September 24, 1665, and March 18, 1666. It is Viva who is chiefly meant in the rejection by Innocent XI of Laxism as a principle: "1) It is not illicit in conferring the sacraments to follow a probable opinion of the validity of the sacrament to the disregard of a safer one, unless law, custom, or the grave danger of inflicting injury forbids this. . . . 2) In general, we always act prudently when we do anything relying on intrinsic or extrinsic probability, no matter how light it may be, provided that it does not go beyond the limits of probability." These were included with the sixty-five laxist propositions condemned on March 2, 1679. They were not true probabilist opinions, but laxist distortions.

(2) Tutiorism

Origin. Meanwhile Jansenists were going to the opposite extreme. The *Augustinus* had declared that "probability is the fruit of a Pelagian

philosophy, and can only undermine the foundations of Christian morality, just as the many subtleties of the Scholastics drove out the grace of Jesus Christ." Jansenist self-questioning went on to demand absolute certainty for the performance of moral acts; a view in conformity with the Jansenist admission that God could lay impossible precepts upon an entirely vitiated human nature. Port Royal put such theories into practice, while one Sinnichius of Louvain (d. 1666) formulated them into the system of Absolute Tutiorism, with the assistance of Pierre Nicole.

Condemnation. This system also fell under papal censure, for in 1690 Alexander VIII in condemning thirty-one Jansenist propositions, also repudiated the basis of Absolute Tutiorism: "It is not licit to follow an opinion which is the most probable among probable opinions." Tutiorists thereafter accepted a most probable opinion as the limit of their indulgence. This Mitigated Tutiorism, though not explicitly condemned, logically falls under the preceding censure. It continued to flourish at Louvain among the theologians, Van Opstraet, Daelman, Dens, and others to the end of the eighteenth century.

C. Determination of the Via Media

(1) VOGUE OF PROBABILIORISM

Origin. Though the extremes of moral systems had been rejected by papal authority, there remained ample ground for dispute. Must the opinion favoring liberty against law be more probable, equally probable, or simply probable? So bold had been some of the Laxists, and so wide the permeation of an unconscious Jansenist rigorism, that many theologians believed that it was necessary to put a halt to anything savoring of benevolence. Consequently Probabiliorism was born, or if one prefers, was revived from a possible basis in the works of Albertus Magnus. Its immediate origin may be traced to an instruction of Alexander VII in 1656 to the general chapter of the Dominicans, urging them to combat Laxism by some safe moral guide. The Dominicans went even beyond the papal suggestion. Almost to a man, they began to advocate Probabiliorism, despite a few defections to Probabilism.

Development. The Jesuits, on the other hand, had adopted in dogmatic theology the philosophical basis of simultaneous concurrence which gave more play to the human will. Their position had been formulated at the time of the Lutheran denial of free will and of Calvinist absolute predestination and reprobation, so that Molinism tended to lean over backwards in trying to attribute the maximum of activity to the human free will. As long as these two heresies remained threatening, and after the rise of Jansenist rigorism, the Jesuits' Molinist system seemed better adapted to apologetical purposes than Dominican Thomist

premotion. But in remaining strongly attached to Probabilism, the Jesuits seemed to verge on that Laxism rampant amid the breakdown of morality following the sectarian revolts and the demoralizing Religious Wars. Jansenists, as has been seen, were not slow to bring the charge of Laxism against their Jesuit opponents. Thus the Probabilists found themselves in a position for the time being unpopular, while the Probabiliorists were generally regarded as affording more assurance of security. But it must be repeated that these are but generalizations, for members of each Order were found in both systems. Indeed, toward the end of the seventeenth century the Jesuit general, Father González, strove to introduce Probabiliorism among his subjects, and repeatedly besought several popes to issue an explicit condemnation of Probabilism. The Roman Pontiffs, however, maintained the same calm neutrality between the two moral systems and their sponsors as they had already shown during the heated Thomist-Molinist controversy about the dogma of grace. The Holy See was content to permit liberty of discussion within limits which did not contradict the deposit of faith.

(2) Probabilist Revival

St. Alphonsus Liguori (1696–1787). It seems providential, then, that the greatest of moral theologians came from neither of the contending religious orders. The founder of the Redemptorists had wide experience of life. He had been trained in civil law, had been a missionary preacher, and had founded a religious congregation. From 1762 to 1775 he was bishop of St. Agatha in Italy. He had been victimized by political intrigues and tried by physical ailments and cruel calumnies. But he had displayed throughout a life of ninety years an heroic virtue vindicated by his canonization within fifty years of his death.

Moral principles. Despite his numerous apostolic duties, the saint's vow never to waste time prompted him to find opportunity for study and writing. He had been educated in the prevailing probabiliorist principles, but his pastoral experience had revealed to him many difficulties in their application. When he was past fifty years of age, he set out to discover a more workable principle. From 1748 to 1779 he published eight editions of his now classic *Theologia Moralis*. These represent his conscientious endeavor to attain accuracy, and manifest many shades of his altering opinions. Hence, Probabiliorists, Probabilists, and Aequi-Probabilists can all claim him for their own at various stages of his works. But it is fairly well agreed that during his prime he was definitely a Probabilist. For with his defense of *"lex dubia non obligat,"* he definitely left the probabiliorist camp. In 1749 he declared that: "Even in the presence of a more probable opinion, it is permissible to follow a probable opinion, if this rests on a serious reason or authority." But

with St. Alphonsus the idea that law remained in possession until dethroned came to have great weight. Thus, in 1755 he added a qualification to his foregoing principle, "provided that the difference of probability is not enormous between the two opinions." There is here a tendency toward a balance or compensation between law and liberty which became accentuated in 1767 when he allowed dissent from the law only when the conflicting opinions were "almost equally probable." This was virtually the basis of the Aequi-Probabilism to which he adhered in later life. But even his view, "when a less sage opinion is equally or almost equally probable, one may licitly follow it," was sufficient to tip the scales against Probabiliorism. Finally, in his practical solutions of cases, the practical differences between Probabilism and Aequi-Probabilism became less rigid. Whether St. Alphonsus was a Probabilist or an Aequi-Probabilist, he certainly deserted Probabiliorism.

(3) Victory of Benign Principles

Reversal of trend. The response of the Sacred Penitentiary (1831) commending St. Alphonsus's principles as generically safe, and his proclamation as doctor of the Church (1871) gave his moral theology pre-eminent place. Hence, the popularity of Probabiliorism began to wane, though this legitimate opinion has never lacked defenders. It is not too much to suppose, moreover, that the Latitudinarianism introduced by the philosophers and the French Revolution made anything savoring of Rigorism apologetically inexpedient, while Probabilism or Aequi-Probabilism commended themselves as affording the utmost in legitimate concession to the spirit of *"Liberté, Égalité, et Fraternité."* As Christian moralists united against materialism and atheism, rigid partisanship broke down and basic agreement was reached, spiced by a healthy difference of view on minor points.

53. SECTARIAN PIETISM

A. *Sectarian Doctrinal Chaos*

(1) Protestant Disunity

Legacy of revolution. By 1700 the several Protestant sects had found their "better informed popes": some in the will of the absolute monarchs as in Continental Erastianism; some in the majority vote of an aristocratic-bourgeois oligarchy, as in British Nonconformity. Originally both the oracles of "divine right" and *vox populi* were supposedly from God. Then came authority unashamedly of man, when the eighteenth century proclaimed the new autonomy of subjective reason whose natural powers might question supernatural revelation. Fundamental attachment to the letter of the Bible only provoked latitudinarian attempts at compromise and gave rise to endless and hopeless doctrinal

differences. Against these disputes and against the cold intellectualism of speculative reason, arose the pietist movement within Protestantism. In desperate reaction against a truncated or distorted dogma, Pietists asserted the warm promptings of the heart, and the religious guidance, if such it might be called, of fervent emotion. Unlike contemporary Catholic revivalists, Sts. Paul of the Cross and Leonard of Port Maurice, Protestant enthusiasts found little intellectual restraint. Some struck the chilling doctrine of predestinarianism and evaporated; others came into contact with faith without works and withered away. Some, like Boehme and Law, took refuge in an uncensored Quietism. But the good sense of Wesley blended some of the sounder elements of Fundamentalism and Pietism into an evangelical "Methodism" which achieved considerable success in Anglo-Saxon lands.

Search for unity. In this chaotic condition, it is not surprising that some of the Protestant rebels against a rebellion should attempt to promote reunion with the Catholic Church. One congenial base of operations was Brunswick-Hanover, which had kept up a tradition of free religious discussion. Here Jesuits effected many individual conversions, including Duke John Frederick of the ruling dynasty. Gerard van der Meulen, Protestant abbot of Lockum, opened discussions with the Catholic Bishop Cristoforo di Spinola. Later the scope of the inquiry was broadened by the appearance of Leibniz on the Protestant side, and of Bossuet on the Catholic. But a series of polemical letters failed to reach a satisfactory common ground. A decisive obstacle, however, may have been political. Duke Ernest August and his heirs aspired to ascend the British throne, which parliament had denied to any Catholic claimant. As this glittering prospect came nearer, the Hanoverian court and its theologians seemed to lose interest in reunion with the Catholic Church.

(2) Lutheran Divisions

Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560) even during Luther's lifetime had perceived the fatal consequences of Luther's teaching of faith alone without good works. Melanchthon became head of a faction which after Luther's death boldly affirmed the Catholic teaching on good works. Nikolaus Amsdorf (1483–1565) upheld the original Lutheran view and a bitter controversy ensued concerning the part played by the human will in the work of salvation. Melanchthon, moreover, had from the first been dubious about Luther's impanation, and gradually adopted Calvin's sacramental symbolism, thus forming a Crypto-Calvinist faction within the Lutheran ranks. Andreas Osiander also attacked Luther's theory of imputed justice and strove to supplant it with an intrinsic and effective justice.

Breakdown of accord. In 1577 Melanchthon's disciples were persuaded to sign a Lutheran "Formula of Concord." It took them several years to discover that this cautiously worded document virtually rejected their position; whereupon dissension broke out anew. When the majority of Lutheran princes adopted the Formula, the dissenters were reduced to Saxony. Here, too, the Fundamentalists tried to introduce rigid Lutheranism in 1591. Despite a temporary external triumph, Fundamentalists saw Georg Calixt (d. 1656) revive Melanchthon's ideas during the seventeenth century, and all attempts to preserve rigid doctrinal unity broke down.

(3) CALVINIST DIVISION

Jacob Härmensen (1560–1609), a Dutch Calvinist of Leyden, usually known by his Latinized name of Arminius, attacked the basic Calvinist tenet, absolute predestinarianism. Hitherto the rigid Calvinist clerical discipline had saved the sect from the dissensions disrupting the Lutherans, while the need of Dutch Protestant unity against Spain during the wars for independence had thrust theological disputes into the background. But early in the seventeenth century in the course of a dispute with Gomar, Arminius asserted that the Calvinist doctrine of absolute predestination was incompatible with divine justice and wisdom, and proposed to substitute a sort of Molinistic prevision of man's merits. After the truce of 1609 with Spain, strife between the Arminians and Rigid Calvinists became intense. Stadholder Maurice of Orange sided with the Gomarists and took violent measures against the Arminians, and the Ecumenical Calvinist Synod of Dordrectht in 1619 anathematized them. Large numbers of the dissidents went to England where the religious climate was more congenial. Those who remained in Holland secured greater toleration after Maurice's death in 1625. Though Calvinists on the Continent generally sustained the synodal ban, the influence of Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), Arminian-Humanist authority on international law, revealed widespread dissent within Calvinist ranks.

B. Pietist Reaction

(1) PRIMITIVE PIETISM

Philipp Jakob Spener (1635–1705), a zealous Alsatian, became imbued with the mysticism of Johann Arndt (1555–1621), whose work *Wahren Christenthum*, became a Protestant *Imitation of Christ*, from which with other Catholic sources it was largely drawn. Reverencing Luther as a "Father of the Church," but refraining from violent anti-Catholic polemics, Arndt had stressed prayer, practical love of the neighbor, and external worship. Spener, as chief Lutheran minister of Frankfort-am-Main, carried out Arndt's ideas. When these were repro-

bated by the Fundamentalists, he fled to Dresden where his denuncia-
tion of the vices of Elector John George III of Saxony led to his dis-
missal. Later as provost of Berlin, Spener became disgusted with the
sterility and dreariness of Lutheranism, and discouraged at the ineffec-
tiveness of his preaching in effecting moral reform. After renewed study
of the medieval mystic, Johann Tauler, he reached the conclusion that
"religion is wholly an affair of the heart, and that the preacher, in order
to exercise his ministry properly, must bring home to the minds and
hearts of his hearers the convictions and feelings with which he himself
is carried away."

Pietist organization. Personal experience of religion was, then, Spener's
cure, and in pursuance of this idea he began from 1675 to organize
"collegia pietatis" to strengthen faith by means of homilies on the Scrip-
tures. These "pietist" gatherings soon began to evince an ostentatious
and singular piety which gained them their name. Despite noteworthy
extravagances, they often manifested a better moral character than the
Fundamentalists. Among them was displayed the phenomena of modern
evangelical revivals, complete, it is true, with predictions of the end of
the world. Pietists were soon excluded from Wittenberg and other Prot-
estant universities. Thereafter their ministers were drawn from and
catered to the lower classes and tended to a more informal organization.
But the original Pietists after Spener's death separated into three schools:
Collenbrusch subordinated dogma to piety; Kohlbrügge stifled piety
with Lutheran dogma; and Eller turned visionary.

(2) COMMUNAL PIETISM

Ludwig, Graf von Zinzendorf (1700–60) became convinced that the
pietist movement could not flourish in the face of governmental op-
position. He resolved to settle a model community on his own estates
at Hutberg, renamed Herrnhut: "Watch Hill of the Lord." His disciples,
officially the "United Brethren," were popularly known as "Herrn-
huters." Their piety concentrated on the "bloody death of Christ on the
Cross"; the topic of sermons, prayers, and hymns was expressed in emo-
tional, fanciful, and often extravagant language. They were ruled by
the usual Protestant overseers, elders, and deacons, and were disciplined
or even expelled if incorrigible. Their primitive spirit was later weak-
ened by economic enterprise, though they were more successful than
most "model communities."

(3) THE QUAKERS

George Fox (1624–91) initiated a pietist camp of the more radical
type. This Leicestershire cobbler professed to believe that religious
consciousness was something so forceful that it would make one physi-

cally tremble or "quake." Any man seized with a fit of "quaking" at a religious meeting was therefore presumed to be inspired by the Holy Spirit. The Quakers neglected baptism for their "inner light," and regarded ecclesiastical discipline and even Scripture as of no account in comparison with this spontaneous outpouring of the heart. Their consciences were very tender: taking of oaths, payment of taxes, games of chance, music, theater-going, novels, dancing, titles of honor, and law suits were all sinful. The Quakers were at first exhibitionists: once Fox was moved to walk barefoot through town shouting: "Woe to the bloody city of Lichfield." Regarding the Commonwealth of the 1650's as Utopia, some Quakers brought the sect into ridicule.

Conservatism tended to gain possession of the movement after the restoration of the monarchy in 1660. Pacifism and an eccentric but relatively inoffensive piety, survived. Emigration to Pennsylvania secured a new Utopia for many. In England Quakers were long looked upon with almost the same abhorrence as "papists," with whom, as companions in distress, they were usually friendly. Eventually, "what survived . . . was a religious coterie rather than a sect; a band of well-to-do reformers, distinguished by their wide influence and active benevolence, but numbering only a handful of adherents among the multitudes." [18] One of their greatest successes was their leadership of the anti-slave trade agitation throughout the British dominions.

(4) SWEDENBORGIANS

Emanuel Swedenborg (1688–1772) professed to have revelations about a "New Jerusalem" to be inaugurated in 1770. He rejected original sin, angels, devils, and considered satisfaction through Christ useless. For a time deluded dilettantes in Scandinavia and elsewhere accepted his apocalyptic visions, but it can be doubted whether his type of Pietism had any good effects. Though he practically supplanted Christianity by a new religion, Swedenborg was not formally condemned by the established Swedish Lutheranism. The Swedenborgian "New Church" was akin to a gnostic inner circle within Protestantism. Branches of the sect spread to England and the United States.

(5) THE METHODISTS

John Wesley (1703–91), aided by his brother Charles (1707–88), founded the most enduring and influential of the pietist sects. He was the son of pious and moderately well-to-do Anglican parents who provided him with a good education at Oxford. Here remnants of Scholastic philosophy enabled him to steer clear of many of the vagaries of other Pietists. He also employed the Catholic practices of examination of

[18] Ronald Knox, *Enthusiasm* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 168.

conscience, spiritual reading, and mortification. In 1728 he received Anglican orders and devoted himself especially to relieving the needs of the neglected poorer classes. This quest for a time took him to the debtor colonists of Georgia and to Zinzendorf's Herrnhuters. Besides accepting some pietists ideas, he adopted the Philippist and Arminian teachings on good works and grace, which were more in accord with Catholic than with Protestant fundamentalist tenets.

Evangelization in England became Wesley's chief enterprise. He resolved to preach his personal doctrinal synthesis in sermons which would methodically combine sound logic and enthusiasm: "Methodism." He concentrated upon the poor in the fields, villages, and rising mining communities. In his effort to reach them, he adopted open air "hedge" preaching, and is reported to have delivered 40,000 sermons during his 225,000 miles of journeying throughout the British Isles. While the Methodists had no wish to separate from the Anglican Establishment, their practices had excited the disapproval of some of the Anglican prelates. Wesley took what proved a decisive step in 1784 when he assumed to himself episcopal functions to "ordain" his disciples. Though he claimed to have lived until death in the Anglican Church, his Methodists had already become a group apart, and a formal separation came in 1795. The Anglican hierarchy remained divided, some prelates accepting him, others repudiating him. Methodists continued to increase in numbers, both in Great Britain and the United States, and came to exercise a strong and widespread influence on Anglo-Saxon religious and cultural life. In time, Methodism produced a profound self-questioning within the Anglican Establishment, and this contributed to the rise of the Oxford Movement which led many to Rome.

VII

The Cult of Rationalism

54. THE OLD REGIME IN EUROPE

A. *The Weight of Tradition*

(1) SOCIAL IDEAL

An "Old Regime," originally sprung from feudalism, and still cling-
ing to many of its customs, was nearing its end during the eighteenth
century. Its ideals were paternalistic, conservative, presupposing fixed
social status. Democracy had scarcely any meaning for it, but in its
ideals it by no means overlooked the common man. "The Old Regime
did not believe in political or in social equality. It did not think in
terms of individualism. The tie binding the individual to the community
was not an impersonal citizenship in an impersonal state, but a status
of a social hierarchy with innumerable gradations from the peasant or
artisan at the bottom to the king at the top. . . . It is in the 'numberless
chartered freedoms' that the ideals of the Old Regime centered. In
theory everyone had a place in the commonwealth with a charter to some
portion, however small, of indefeasible freedom. . . . Even in appar-
ently despotic and authoritarian governments the Old Regime was char-
acterized by a personal quasi-feudal leadership. . . ." [1] But unfortu-
nately for this regime, practice had never lived up to theory, and after
centuries of passive acceptance, it would be challenged in all its tradi-
tions, good and bad.

(2) ECONOMIC BASIS

Land had been the capital of the original feudal regime, and despite
the rise of the city and its industry and commerce, it still furnished

[1] Penfield Roberts, *Quest for Security* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1947), p. 127.
[336

wealth and livelihood to lord and peasant who comprised the greater portion of the population. "The conservative cult of stability after 1715 had its roots in the unchanging European countryside. The major changes in Europe had been caused by the growth of towns and cities, by the extension of trade and commerce, and by the expansion of Europe overseas. . . . In 1715 and 1740 the countryside was still for the most part living and working in the established way, a way in some respects of immemorial antiquity, older than the Roman Empire." [2] But, as will be noted later in this same topic, an agrarian revolution was commencing in England which, once extended to the Continent, would seriously disrupt the old ways. Europe was also on the eve of an industrial transformation which at long last would begin to shift the balance of numbers and influence from the rural to the urban areas, quite confusing the old social relationships. But the old order had to go for survival, since European population, relatively stable at fifty to sixty millions during the Middle Ages, had been increasing in "modern" times: according to one estimate, a population of some 73,000,000 in 1600 would increase to 187,000,000 by 1800.[3] The old methods could never have supported such a growth; it was providential that new were found.

(3) POLITICAL SURVEY

"The balance of power" continued its calculating gait until Bonaparte tipped it over—though not for long. Emeric de Vattel, Swiss jurist, would explain that "the balance of power" is an "arrangement of affairs so that no state shall be in a position to have absolute mastery and dominate over the others." And the old scoffer, Frederick II of Prussia, remarked cynically that "politics is the science of acting always by convenient ways in conformity with one's own interests." [4] Fortunately total mobilization of manpower was not yet possible, and these wars continued to be waged for limited objectives by a relatively small portion of the population, hired or impressed into military service. It would be the French Revolution which would introduce "equality" in the miseries of war as well as in the "rights of man and the citizen."

Anglo-French duel for empire is the political constant in the otherwise somewhat erratic combinations of European powers during the eighteenth century. While the meteoric career of Charles XII of Sweden failed to raise his country permanently into the ranks of the Great

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[3] A. M. Carr-Saunders, "Growth of Population in Europe," Edward Eyre, editor, *European Civilization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937), V.

[4] Leo Gershoy, *From Despotism to Revolution* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1944), p. 162.

Powers, Frederick the Great of Prussia definitely did make Prussia a military force to be respected. Bourbon France, apparently but not really still in the ascendant, pursued her old rivalry with the Habsburgs by allying with Prussia in the Wars of Polish Succession (1733–38) and Austrian Succession (1740–48). Then by a sudden change of policy labeled the "Diplomatic Revolution," she accepted Kaunitz's bid for an alliance with Austria against Prussia in the Seven Years' War (1756–63). These conflicts resulted in the permanent transfer of Silesia from Austria to Prussia and prepared the way for the latter's headship of Germany a century later. But the overseas counterpart of the Seven Years' War, known in America as the French and Indian War, proved to be Great Britain's decisive victory over France in both America and India. France and Spain gained some revenge by joining the American rebels against Britain in the American Revolutionary War (1776–83) which, though it regained little land for France, helped deny Britain the fruits of her victory.

Anti-Revolutionary coalitions. The early stages of the French Revolution, so menacing to the Old Regime, were not sufficiently estimated by the other continental powers, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, then preoccupied in taking their second and third bites of Poland, whereby that land of Texan proportions was wiped off the political map of Europe. But presently these same powers were desperately trying to contain the dynamic force of the French Revolutionary *élan*, and the military genius of its heir and propagator, Napoleon Bonaparte. Great Britain was tireless in organizing combinations against France in a contest that went on with but brief interruptions from 1792 until 1815. The new French bid for European hegemony was at length defeated—but the nineteenth and twentieth centuries would yet see Prussia's repeated grasps at the same will-o'-the-wisp.

B. Forces for Change

(1) SOCIAL FORCES

"**The fascinating idea was that of Nature**—a fundamental naturalism which assumed now sentimental, now philosophical, now artistic aspects, which crept into all the recesses of the thought of the time, like the revelation of a happy world to which the contemporary system, based on dogmatic and authoritarian religion and on absolute government, was in contradiction. This conception of nature, of man in the abstract as naturally endowed with all good qualities, arose out of that of reason as the sure light of truth and that of the law of nature as the basis of human sociability." [5] These words of Don Luigi Sturzo recall

[5] Don Luigi Sturzo, *Church and State*, trans. Barbara Carter (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939), p. 341.

the basic ideas of the philosophers; here some of the by-products can be examined.

"Humanitarianism gradually pervaded life, even as it flooded literature and the arts, and lay reformers worked assiduously to realize their ideal of happiness on earth. But their efforts to attain secular salvation, to spread the greatest possible benefits among the greatest possible number, were held in check, they averred, by the institutionalized strength of the revealed religions and most of all by the prestige and the power of the 'advanced sentinels of the court of Rome,' as they called the Jesuits." [6] As much as they could without disturbing their peace of mind or dirtying their sleeves, liberal nobles and merchants strove to out-distance the Church by a secular welfare work. Nor did their challeng-ing zeal fail in some instances to put to shame devoted, but routine religious servants of the underprivileged. Philosophers and sentimental novelists had the public ear, and their "sensibility" did call attention to some abuses. In England great advances were made in the care of new-born children. Public health programs made determined onslaught against urban dirt and disease. New legislation for the care of paupers and vagrants was enacted. But welcome as this advance was, it could not supply the place of supernatural charity as a motive for day to day care for the poor. "In Catholic countries on the Continent the Church still took care of the poor . . . and the management, nursing, and other care was done by religious orders like the Sisters of Charity founded by St. Vincent de Paul in 1633. The work of these orders, despite its faults, was certainly more successful in alleviating the sufferings of the poor than the English poor law of the eighteenth century. . . ." [7]

"Enlightenment" did not lose its charm during the new vogue of sen-timentality. Ambitious plans for eradicating illiteracy were made on the assumption that reason, once stimulated, would save everyone. La Chalotais in 1763 presented his *Essai d'Éducation Nationale* which demanded: "I claim for the nation an education dependent upon the state alone, because education belongs essentially to the state." The liberal revolutions would take up this program of secular education, and its advocates, if not immediately successful in the primary grades, would work pertinaciously for its realization. Finally, baroque and its later rococo modification now began to yield in the arts and crafts to neoclassicism harking back to Winckelmann's ideal of "the noble sim-plicity and serene greatness of the ancients." The Renaissance was still a word to conjure with.

[6] Gershoy, *op. cit.*, p. 264.
[7] Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

(2) ECONOMIC FORCES: AGRARIAN REVOLUTION

English enclosure movement. A great change took place in the English countryside during the eighteenth century and reached its height during the reign of George III (1760–1820). This was the result of the enclosure movement. "Behind the enclosure movement lay a complex set of causes both economic and political. On the one hand, the agricultural disadvantages of the open-field system were obvious. The work in labor and cartage through individual cultivators occupying scattered strips of land widely separated from each other was very great, the existence of the scattered strips were the source of constant quarrels in regard to the exact position of the boundaries which could be easily shifted, the strips were too narrow to admit of cross ploughing or cross harrowing. Drainage was practically impossible because if one man drained his land another might block his outfalls. Moreover, all occupiers were bound by rigid customary rules, and no winter crops could be grown so long as the arable fields were subject to common rights of pasture from August to February. . . . The enclosure prepared the way —indeed to a large extent made possible—the great advances in agricultural technique which followed them. But the motives which brought enclosures about were not elevated ones." [8]

A squire might hire lawyers to draw up arguments for enclosing, i.e., fencing off, a certain portion of the common. A notice would then be put up announcing "a certain act of parliament" in this connection. The peasantry, even if they understood the notice, seldom had the experience nor the means to offer effective resistance. The act in question took its routine course through a parliament of nobles and squires. From about seventy such acts during Anne's reign (1702–14), the number rose to over a thousand in that of George III: 3,883 acts were passed between 1761 and 1801. By the middle of the nineteenth century the process was practically complete. In its later stages the procedure had been facilitated by a general act of parliament authorizing any squire to put up a notice and to enclose provided no successful contradiction appeared. When the squire's lawyers could unearth or manufacture documents, peasants usually lacked any written witness to their immemorial rights of tenantry. Hence the freeholder or yeomen nearly disappeared by 1800. Some became tenants, but more were reduced to pauperism by the combined effect of the agrarian and industrial revolutions. Many drifted to the cities where the prevalence of cheap female and child labor prevented them from entering industry. Often they were reduced to idleness, beggary, or vice.

[8] R. R. Enfield, "European Agriculture Since 1750," Edward Eyre, editor, *European Civilization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937), V, 191–93.

On the Continent, though the processes were not identical, similar transformations occurred in Germany, Spain, Italy, Russia, Poland, and the Balkans. France, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries alone preserved a substantial group of small landowners, and in the case of France, the Revolution of 1789 gave them a vested interest in their small holdings which was to be of enduring political consequence.

Stock breeding improvements. The squires had also long resented pasturing their own herds, the breed of which they were endeavoring to improve, with the scrawny animals of poorer farmers. Enclosure, therefore, was also represented as a necessity to ensure the improvement of the breed of cattle, and this in turn was declared to be imperative to provide for a population increase in England from some three millions in 1700 to seven millions in 1800. Profits, however, were not equally distributed, but went largely to the great owners, for scientific progress required capital. But between 1735 and 1780 the average weight of cattle was doubled.

Scientific farming. Deep plowing was introduced in the middle of the eighteenth century, thus utilizing land never before used. The harrow was brought into play to break up clods; and drilling replaced a broadcast method of seeding. Chemical fertilizers began to be employed, and the rotation of cereals and roots also contributed to improving the yield. New crops were developed to provide forage for animals, so that these need no longer be slaughtered wholesale for the winter—this medieval practice had removed the better animals each year and continually stunted the breed. Model farms were set up for study and experimentation, and country fairs began to offer prizes, not for freaks as previously, but for the largest and best animals. Arthur Young (1741–1820) collected agricultural lore and published it. The pioneer of eighteenth-century scientific farming, Jethro Tull (1674–1740), was sustained by Viscount "Turnip" Townshend (1674–1730). Robert Bakewell (1725–95) specialized in scientific breeding, which was enthusiastically taken up and carried on by Coke of Holkham (1752–1842).

On the Continent, agricultural progress was generally slower than in England, though scientific rotation of crops seems to have originated in Holland, whence it was borrowed by the English and the Germans. Prussia was eager to adopt English methods, but comparatively little progress was made in France during the eighteenth century. Yet agriculture remained a major occupation in France, and during the nineteenth century great efforts were made to improve.

55. RATIONALIST DOCTRINAIRES

A. *Deist Theologians*

(1) ORIGINS OF DEISM

Deism had its doctrinal origin in the rationalist "Enlightenment." This movement, beginning in a modest way with Descartes, tended increasingly to represent philosophy as hostile and superior to theology. Deism had its historic beginning during the Religious Wars wherein the champions of contradictory concepts of supernatural religion gave a bad example of Christian principles. It matured in the intellectual atmosphere of the disputes of Protestant doctors and the quibbling of Jansenist luminaries. Under these circumstances many of the intelligentsia felt it best to seek common ground by restricting themselves to an academic view of the Deity as known by reason alone, and by reducing divine influence upon human life to a minimum.

English Deism. It is not surprising that the new deistic Naturalism should first appear and flourish in England. There the Protestant Revolt had been intimately connected with economic causes, and had produced an unscrupulous aristocracy enriched by ecclesiastical confiscations. Their "reformation" seemed blessed by England's unparalleled commercial and colonial prosperity during the period following her defection from Catholic unity. Though the Anglican Establishment sometimes weakly echoed the old Catholic moral restraints, it lacked effective sanctions. The plutocracy welcomed a religion that would remove God as far as possible from human everyday life. Now that the theocracy had been eliminated from influence on public affairs, classes attuned to economic progress allied themselves against its last vestiges in Anglican hierarchy and Stuart monarchy. The "Glorious Revolution" of 1689 had superseded these by a parliamentary oligarchy of squires and commercial barons, who accorded one another political and religious toleration.

Continental Deism. In France, Gallicanism aspired to make the French Church almost as independent of Rome as Anglicanism. Royal Absolutism, however, wished to manage, not destroy, the Church. Against this by no means desirable "union of throne and altar," liberal nobles and bourgeois merchants intrigued, though their efforts did not wholly triumph until a century after the English revolt. But the free-thinking Regent Orléans (1715–23) allowed royal restraints to lapse for a short period, and the bars could never be securely fastened again. Elsewhere Deism made its way into the Prussia of the cynical Frederick the Great and the Austria of the muddled Joseph II, while lesser estates were affected in greater or less degree by the prevailing mode.

(2) BRITISH DEISTIC INNOVATORS

Edward Herbert, baron of Cherbury (1583–1648), in his treatise, *De Veritate,* introduced the deistic thesis of a universal natural religion in place of a dogmatic supernatural Revelation "invented by priests and rulers." Acceptance of God and virtue, he argued, were independent of any definite religious code: "Believe in God and do your duty" was an adequate rule of life.

Ashley Cooper, earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1713), grandson of the founder of the Whig party, belittled biblical miracles and prophecies, and confused with aesthetic harmony a virtuous happiness. Natural religion for him was an aid, while supernatural religion merely rendered men selfish by beckoning them to heavenly rewards.

John Toland (1670–1722) questioned the authenticity of Scripture and the historicity of miracles in his *Christianity not Mysterious: A Treatise Showing that there is Nothing in the Gospel Contrary to Reason or above It.*

Anthony Collins (1676–1729) deserves passing notice for coining the term "freethinker," in his *Discourse on Free Thinking.*

Henry St. John, viscount Bolingbroke (1678–1751), British statesman, carried Shaftesbury's Moral Estheticism into public life, and carried on the school, to be followed by Hutcheson, Butler, and Adam Smith.

David Hume (1711–76) with cold scepticism demolished the Idealism of the Anglican prelate, George Berkeley (1685–1753) whose *esse est percipi* was particularly vulnerable in the cause of religion. Hume likewise dampened pietist ardor and suggested an agnostic attitude toward God. To Hume must be attributed much of the modern prejudged opposition to any discussion of the supernatural, for he posed the specious objection: "It is contrary to universal experience for miracles to be true, but it is not against experience for testimony to be false."

(3) CONTINENTAL AGNOSTICS

Peter Bayle (1647–1706), a Dutchman disgusted with supernatural religion after several changes of belief, compiled his *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique,* which served the French Rationalists and Agnostics as an arsenal.

The "Regency Wits," men like Vairesse, Tyssot de Patet, Fontenelle, and Boulainvilliers, used Fénelon's device of observations on remote or fictitious lands to disguise attacks on the French Church and state.

Voltaire. François Arouet (1694–1778), known as Voltaire, was a brilliant but superficial critic who retailed Bayle's strictures in caustic

and witty sallies. During an English exile (1726–29) he had come upon Bayle's work and his biographer Condorcet claimed that he had taken an oath to devote his whole life to destroying Christianity: *ecrasez l'infâme*. After progressing through several changes of religion, he became an agnostic scoffer who was nonetheless the idol of French society for his pleasing style in plays, essays, and poems.

The Encyclopédie was planned by Voltaire's disciples, Denis Diderot (1713–84) and Jean d'Alembert (1717–83). It was published, with or without royal permission, between 1751 and 1765, and assiduously disseminated by lawyers, traveling actors, urban demagogues, masonic clubs, and even dissatisfied curés. As a contribution of culture and progress, the *Encyclopédie* won international renown and was imitated in other countries. Its articles, after an initial flair for objective fairness, usually left a naturalistic, agnostic, or even atheistic impression—the last was sometimes injected by Paul Holbach (1723–89), though it was not typical. In vain did the ecclesiastical authorities proscribe the *Encyclopédie;* it lured many Catholics into Indifference and anticlericalism.

B. *Political Philosophers*

(1) Defense of Absolutism

Jean Bodin (1530–96) in *Six Livres de la Republique,* written in support of Henry of Navarre, contended that the state originally arose by forcible seizure of power by vigorous men. Progress in civilization has legitimated this rule and harmonized it with law. Now firmly constituted, the state possesses sovereignty: sole ultimate control over all persons within its territory. Papal theocracy and imperial suzerainty are repudiated as antiquated.

Richard Hooker (1553–1600) in his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity,* defended the Anglican Establishment against the Puritans. To this end he adapted the Aristotelian-Thomistic theory of law as an ordination of reason. Hooker was highly prized by Locke and through the latter's citations diluted Scholastic political teaching reached the American Founding Fathers.

William Barclay (1546–1608) was a Scottish Catholic who yet begrudged papal theocratic power over princes. In his defense of Stuart "divine right" monarchy, Barclay was refuted by St. Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) who defended indirect papal jurisdiction in temporalities and foreshadowed democratic theory in politics. Paradoxically, Barclay was exiled for refusing to abjure his Catholicity, and Bellarmine was long suspect in reactionary clerical circles.

Sir Robert Filmer (d. 1653) composed *Patriarcha* in the height of the English Civil War to rebut St. Robert's arguments, although his work was not actually published until 1680. Filmer resorted to philosophic and

pseudo-historical arguments to maintain that "divine right" monarchy was an organic development of a primitive *paterfamilias* down to His Britannic Majesty.

Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) set out in the *Leviathan* to refute Filmer's basis for monarchy. But though Hobbes also intended to uphold Absolutism by different arguments, these in the hands of later politicians boomeranged into an indictment of it. Writing in 1651 with the horrors of the Civil War in mind, Hobbes conceived of humanity as a monster, a "Leviathan" of horrid little men rising up to sweep away monarchs and priests—not that Hobbes cared much about the latter. And so it had ever been, for in the "state of nature" man had been a brute with hand ever lifted against his fellows. To avert self-destruction mankind had been obliged to enter into a "social contract" between government and governed: to save themselves from themselves men had surrendered all rights to the state. Though this might be democratic, aristocratic or monarchical, Hobbes felt that for practical reasons it should best be embodied in an absolute monarch. But the oligarchs of the Glorious Revolution of 1689 had little difficulty in readapting his theory to fit themselves.

(2) Outline of Limited Monarchy

John Locke (1632–1704) published *Two Treatises of Government* in 1690, the year after the triumph of aristocracy over monarchy. The first of these treatises refuted Filmer's thesis of the patriarchal origin of the state; the second presented his own views, drawn in part from Hooker and from Hobbes. Thus, though Locke accepted the Hobbesian "state of nature," he defined it as a "state of peace, good-will, mutual assistance, and preservation." He admitted with Hobbes natural rights, but followed Hooker in insisting that rights were correlative with duties imposed by the natural law, established by God, and known to men by reason. Locke also implicitly agreed with Filmer's opponent, St. Robert, that all civil authority is derived from God through the will of the people. Although this could serve as justification for a democracy, Locke himself professed contentment with the British limited monarchy. To act as a check on tyranny, Locke advocated distinction of judicial, executive, and legislative powers, but he also spoke of a "federative" power over foreign affairs. But he did not insist on a balance among these powers: it was sufficient that the king—later his ministers—have the executive and a veto, provided that the legislature was controlled by popular representatives. Opposing paternalism, Locke favored restriction of the state to negative duties of preserving order. While the English accepted both Locke's theory and his interpretation of it, the Americans drew from it their own conclusions, ultimately democratic.

Charles de Secondat, baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755) advocated introduction of Locke's theories into France, but with differences. Montesquieu's *L'Esprit des Lois* (1748) disregarded natural rights as so much academic theory; what he was interested in was the pragmatic and historical interpretation of law. He cared less for a moral basis for either individual or social rights than for concrete guarantees: "Constant experience shows us that every man invested with power is apt to abuse it. . . . To prevent this it is necessary . . . that power should be a check to power." Misinterpreting the practical working of the British Constitution, Montesquieu advocated not merely a distinction, but a separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, to provide the guarantee of liberty. The Americans tended to follow Montesquieu in this "check and balance" version of Locke. Montesquieu, though finding no fault with hereditary aristocracy, insisted that the popular branch of the legislature be elected by universal suffrage, and the latter idea was put into effect in America before England. Like Locke, however, Montesquieu distrusted direct democracy and insisted upon representative forms. He also advocated an absolute executive veto, fair taxation, complete religious liberty, without, however, separation of Church and state. Montesquieu's abstract style gave him less influence over his countrymen who demanded prompt and drastic measures, but after the French Revolution, Benjamin Constant and others resorted to his theories.

(3) Call for Revolutionary Democracy

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78) was a romantic, neurotic, immoral worshipper of nature. "What is peculiar to Jean Jacques, his special privilege, is his resignation to himself. . . . He acquiesces in being yes and no at the same time; and that he can do just as far as he acquiesces in falling from the state of reason and letting the disconnected pieces of his soul vegetate as they are. Such is the sincerity of Jean Jacques and his friends. It consists in never meddling with what you find in yourself at each moment of your life for fear of perverting your being. . . . He delights at the same time in the good he loves but does not, and the evil he does and hates not." [9]

Rousseau's political maxims included: (1) Nature—an Eden without original sin; whence (2) absolute liberty, and (3) absolute equality are deduced. (4) This Utopia, once lost through oppressors, is to be regained by (5) the social contract, producing (6) the general will of the common self born of sacrifice of individual selves on the altar of the state. (7) Law is the expression of this general will, ascertained by (8)

[9] Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942), p. 98.

universal suffrage of the people, enlightened perhaps by (9) a philosophic legislative superman.

Rousseau's "Contrat Social" (1762) closely influenced the French *Declaration of the Rights of Man* in 1789, and more than anyone else he is the author of *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*—his Jacobin disciples would read his works in chorus. Rousseau retained Hobbes's social contract, but to the latter's pessimism opposed an optimistic deification of natural man. The contract in Hobbes was but a device of the powerful to enslave the poor; Rousseau reinterpreted it as an agreement made by men as individuals with themselves as a collective body: "Man was born free, but is now everywhere in chains." In the new regime all will give up everything; therefore all will be equal and free; indeed, if need be, men must be forced to be free. Government will then be the expression of the "general will": infallible, omnipotent, indivisible, and eternal. This is to be determined by direct suffrage of the sovereign people, for the common man, with universal behaviorist education, will be wise and just. Governors are merely the "depositaries of executive power: they are not masters of the people, but its officers." It might happen, however, that the people might constitute some philosopher sole depositary to interpret the general will—a reminiscence of Platonism and a seed of Totalitarianism. Rousseau's vague and inconsistent theories, taken in his primary and obvious sense, are the French Revolution in germ. Yet that Revolution would reveal that they could bear the interpretation of a dictatorship, either of Robespierre or of Bonaparte. Finally, if one attends to sly hints at the irresponsibility of all government, the need of perpetual revolution, the sharing of wives and property, Rousseau could be deemed a father of Anarchism or Socialism. In any event many a disturbing idea came out of his Pandora's box.

56. RATIONALIST CHAMPIONS: THE FREEMASONS

A. *Origins of Freemasonry*

(1) ALLEGED DERIVATION

Medieval masons, like other tradesmen, had their guilds which maintained certain secrets in order to preserve their monopoly of skill and business. The only externs permitted to share these secrets were the ecclesiastics who served as chaplains. Yet before the Protestant Revolt, there is no evidence that these "masonic secrets" contained anything derogatory to the Catholic faith. They were chiefly of an economic or rotarian nature, and the societies themselves enjoyed ecclesiastical approbation. It is possible, of course, that in later years such medieval institutions could serve as a cloak for subversive activities.

The Knights Templar, it will be remembered, were suppressed in 1314 by Pope Clement V and King Philip IV of France. Serious accusations,

indeed, had been made against their faith and morals, but these have never been satisfactorily proven, nor were they admitted as reasons in the papal bull of suppression. Freemasonry, which has taken its name from the medieval guilds, also claimed the Knights Templars as ancestors. Jacques de Molay, the Knights' grand master executed by the royal inquisition, is claimed as a martyr of Freemasonry, and neophytes of the Scottish rite were required to swear to avenge his death on the successors of pope and king: "War against throne and altar." These claims, however, have no historical foundation, and although secret societies undoubtedly existed during the Middle Ages, any continuity between them and modern Freemasonry is quite gratuitously asserted.

(2) EARLY EVIDENCE

During the Protestant Revolt, the first indications of Masonry strictly so called appear. There is evidence for the existence of some sort of masonic lodge at Amsterdam according to the so-called Charter of Cologne (1535). This document bears the signatures of Philipp Melanchthon, Lutheran leader, Hermann von Wied, later apostate archbishop of Cologne, and Admiral de Coligny, French Huguenot chief. The charter states that "for the present" the association will be "Christian and nonsectarian," devoted to the preservation of secret teachings and promotion of sectarian tolerance. The Rosicrucians appear about the same time in authentic history, as a pseudo-mystic cult combining deistic, gnostic, and rationalist features. A political masonry undoubtedly existed among the Jacobite partisans of the Stuarts, and claims have been made that Oliver Cromwell, Francis Bacon, and even Lord Burleigh belonged to political coteries of this nature.

(3) ACCEPTED FREEMASONRY

Accepted Freemasonry, or Masonry in its strict modern sense, is ordinarily considered to have originated in 1717. In that year Des Aguilliers, Anderson, and Payne left an existing masonic society and founded a new organization which abandoned all subterfuge of a medieval guild, and substituted for sectarian Christianity an unmistakable Deism. This association, devoted to the ideals of deist spiritual communion and humanist philanthropy, adopted its first constitution in England by 1723. The movement, or imitations, spread to France between 1725 and 1732; appeared in Germany by 1733, in Portugal and Holland in 1735, in Switzerland in 1740, in Denmark in 1745, in Italy in 1763, and in Sweden in 1773. Doubtless secret lodges existed elsewhere, including the English Colonies.

The rites. Though there are various rites of accepted Freemasonry, prior to 1877 all were joined in a federation. Of these "rites," the chief

ones are the "Free and Accepted Masons of England," the familiar "York Rite" with branches in Anglo-Saxon countries; the "Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite"; the "Grand National Lodge" of Germany, the "Grand Orient" of France with satellites in other Latin lands, and for a time the "Carbonarii" of Italy. If not expressly masonic affiliates, the subsequent "Know Nothings" in the United States, and the "Orangemen" and "Fenians" in Ireland had some masonic elements.

The degrees. All masonic lodges have in common the three fundamental degrees of "apprentice," "companion," and "master": this is "Blue Masonry." All higher degrees of more recent addition vary in name and number with the rites, and propose a more intimate and profound knowledge of masonic secrets and greater participation in its activities: "Red Masonry." These degrees and the various grades into which they are sometimes subdivided are supposedly stages through which the initiate passes in order to become more intelligently, solemnly, and irrevocably bound to the masonic organization. Yet often the real direction lies outside the formal degrees, and much symbolism has become a hollow routine.

The lodges. The basic local unit of Freemasonry is the lodge which is supposed to be a symbol of the natural universe. These lodges are organized under supreme central councils of the respective rites which are charged with the direction of common affairs and efforts. At the head of the grand councils is a grand master, or president. In the Grand Orient, the supreme council of thirty-three delegates was apportioned for specialized work into bureaus or parliamentary committees. Though all Freemasons are theoretically equal, they are bound to render blind obedience to their immediate superiors. While these superiors in their ascending degrees are often assured of having attained the "inner circle," there is a constant tendency for groups to form "inner circles" within "inner circles."

B. Doctrine of Freemasonry

(1) As Defended by Masons

"The Supreme Self-Existent All-Wise . . . Creator was the same by whatever He was called to the intellectual and enlightened men of all nations. . . . Catholicity was a vital truth in its earliest ages, but it became obsolete, and Protestantism arose, flourished, and deteriorated. . . . Each was truth for the time. . . . The Mason does not war with his own instincts. . . . He does not put aside the nature which God has given him, to struggle after another which He has not bestowed. . . . Masonry does not exhort us to detach our hearts from this earthly life as empty, fleeting, and unworthy, and fix them upon heaven. . . . Man is sent into this world, not to be constantly hankering after, dreaming of,

preparing for another; but to do his duty and fulfill his destiny here on earth. . . . Our religion is the natural, primitive, unique, universal, and unchangeable religion—it is Freemasonry." [10]

(2) As Analyzed by Catholics

"Freemasonry denies the supernatural, the revealed word of God, the fall of the human race in Adam and Eve, and as a consequence, the whole mystery of Redemption, the Incarnation, and Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the Catholic Church. . . . All the masonic teachings are based on the natural order, and the supernatural is carefully excluded. Hence, the use of natural means to obtain the end of man. Naturalism is their teaching called, because nature is good, so they say, and whatever is natural is just and right, and there is no such thing as sin in the sense of the Church. Masonry, according to its votaries, is a universal system and teaches the relative and social duties of men on the broad and extensive basis of philanthropy." [11]

(3) As Manifested in Its Rites

"**Blue Masonry.**" A candidate for the degree of apprentice is conducted into a darkened "chamber of reflection" by his sponsor and is catechized. Then with chest, left arm, and right knee bared, he is led by a halter before the officials, is administered an oath of secrecy, and passes the proofs of earth, fire, and air. When blindfolds have been removed, he discovers his new confreres surrounding him with drawn swords. He is then given insignia: a pelt representing a laborious life; a trowel, to hide his brothers' faults; a stone representing himself as about to be shaped to virtue; a compass to find his way; a square representing the masonic spirit; a level denoting equality, and a plumb-line meaning singleness of interest. In this and succeeding degrees he is given a lot of pseudo-mystic lore supposedly revealing to him natural truths unknown to others, but much of this is ignored by the rotarian or gregarious Mason.

"**Red Masonry.**" Although the foregoing is often regarded by some initiates themselves as outworn mummery, in some higher degrees anti-Christian sentiment has been incorporated. Thus the "Elect" vows war on religion by all means; the "Scot" is to be initiated in ceremonies ridiculing the Catholic priesthood; the "Red Cross" begins with a parody of Calvary; the "Chevalier of the East" mocks Catholic teachings. Finally, the "Chevalier Kadosch" has been initiated before a three-headed serpent supposed to represent papacy, royalty, and army (the last is a shifting factor), is ordered to utter a cry of vengeance against the

---

[10] M. Bazot, Grand Orient secretary, and Albert Pike, Scottish Rite potentate.

[11] Peter Rosen, *The Catholic Church and Secret Societies* (Milwaukee: Houtkamp & Cannon, 1902), p. 24.

cross, and to break a crucifix. If not typical, these rites indicate in the Grand Orient, where they were once practiced, a core of fanatical hatred for Christianity and the Catholic Church.

C. Evolution of Masonry

(1) EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

Papal condemnation. The Holy Office had the masonic lodge in Rome closed in 1737, and the following year, April 28, 1738, Pope Clement XII issued the first papal condemnation. His bull, *In Eminenti*, proscribed the various societies of "Freemasons" and ordered the ecclesiastical authorities to proceed against members as those suspect of heresy. Although the papal condemnation was upheld by the liberal Pope Benedict XIV in 1750, down to the French Revolution a considerable number of clerics took it so lightly that they continued as members of the lodges. They were, however, either hypocrites or dupes, and during the Revolution the former became apostates and the latter were enlightened. "Clerical Masonry," therefore, was but a temporary phenomenon of the "Enlightenment," reaching its height during the ministry of Choiseul in France (1758–70) and the Bourbon conspiracy against the Society of Jesus.

Deist-Rationalist phase. Masons of the eighteenth century were predominantly Deists and readily allied themselves with the Rationalists. Toward the end of the century, however, some atheistic and communist elements appeared, for example in Weishaupt's "Illuminati." In Protestant countries, Masonry attracted "benevolent despots" such as Frederick the Great for a time, and members of the nobility, so that its influence was directed less against the government than against Catholicity and the residue of the supernatural in Protestantism. In Catholic lands, Masons professed to war on "throne and altar," duping several Catholic rulers, such as Joseph II of Austria. In France, Masonry under its reputed grand master, the duke of Orléans—"Citoyen Égalité" of the French Revolution—worked for the overthrow of the monarchy during the first stages of the Revolution, or its transformation into constitutional presidency. But the Masons themselves were sharply divided on national, social, political, and economic questions, as was revealed during the course of the French Revolution. Freemasonry was a product of its times rather than their cause. True, Masons claim to have been the chief agents in the suppression of the Jesuits, in the "Plan of Chalotais" for modern secular education, in the precipitation of the Revolution, in effecting the king's condemnation, in winning the battle of Valmy, etc.—all supposedly by "fifth column" work. Bonaparte, whose antecedents were masonic, supposedly broke with the masonic international clique and was abandoned by them. While there is some truth to these claims, it

seems more likely that Masons were but one of the champions of Rationalism, and owed their popularity less to creating the "Enlightenment" and the French Revolution, than to going along with contemporary ideas and projects of the middle classes. Certainly they were not the all-pervading and omnipotent conspiracy of sensational literature.

(2) SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS

After the Restoration, the attack on "throne and altar" was resumed by Freemasonry in alliance with Liberalism; "A free Church in a free state" was its ostensible slogan. The French Grand Orient apparently hoped to render parliamentary government pliable to its real objectives of destroying the Church's hold on the family and education. Anticlerical laws followed the establishment of most liberal regimes, and Masons had a share in the unification of Italy under Cavour and of Germany under Bismarck. Certainly they participated in the defeat of French monarchy, and the overthrow of Carlists in Spain and Miguelists in Portugal. In the latter country the Daughters of Charity arriving in 1857 were forced out in 1862 by an open display of masonic power in parliament. In Latin America, especially Mexico, there were reflections of the contests in Latin Europe, and Brazil was unusually monopolized by masonic organization. Pius IX accused King Victor Emmanuel of being a tool of the Masons, and Freemasons vented their rage against the Church in a fantastic "Anti-Council" at Naples in 1869. Dombrowski, director of the Polish revolt of 1829, and Kossuth, Hungarian rebel of 1848, were masonic leaders. In South America, the Mason Santander hampered Bolívar; while in Mexico, Masonry, though divided into factions, overthrew Iturbide and sustained anticlerical governments.

A masonic schism between Continental and Anglo-Saxon branches took place in 1877 when the Grand Orient suppressed references to God's existence and adopted vague references to "human solidarity." English and American lodges, which had to a degree affiliated themselves with a latitudinarian Protestantism and had adapted the Bible to their ritual, then severed their relations with the Latin groups. While doubtless members of the "atheistic inner circle" are to be found in both camps, especially in the Scottish Rite, yet Anglo-Saxon Masons adopted less violent methods and professed degrees of toleration even for Catholic worship. The reason for their milder activity, however, lies largely in the fact that most of their objectives have already been achieved in non-Catholic countries. Everywhere, Masonry has remained naturalistic and secular; everywhere it has merited the condemnation of the Church on its principles, if not upon all its members. The advent of Communism tended to produce a new cleavage in masonic Liberalism: while radicals found in it the realization of all their objectives, especially in opposition

to religion, some bourgeois Liberals were frightened by its economic features. These have sometimes been bewildered in finding themselves closer to Catholics than to Communists on political and social questions.

57. THE PAPACY AND RATIONALISM

A. *The Italian Environment* (*1720–1815*)

(1) HABSBURG-BOURBON RIVALRY (1720–95)

Habsburg control. The Peace of Utrecht (1713) had made the power of the Austrian Habsburgs predominant in Italy. After the exchange of Sardinia for Sicily, Austria controlled both the southern and northern boundaries of the Papal States. In 1737, on the extinction of the Medici dynasty, Tuscany was given to ex-Duke Francis of Lorraine who, by marrying Maria Theresa, heiress of Austria, founded the modern House of Lorraine-Habsburg. Thereafter Tuscany was a Habsburg *secundo-geniture,* reserved for the junior branch of the family. The approaching extinction of the male line of the Este in Modena also portended acquisition of its inheritance by a Habsburg son-in-law. The surviving independent states of Venice and Savoy were clearly effaced by Austrian might.

Bourbon infiltration, however, went on from 1735. The War of Polish Succession had the strange result of transferring the Two Sicilies from the Habsburgs to the Spanish Bourbons. Thereafter the south of Italy, though never personally united with the Spanish crown, was ruled by younger Spanish Bourbon princes. Marriage of Elizabeth Farnese to Philip V of Spain established another Bourbon cadet line at Parma. Genoa, although still independent, came increasingly under French Bourbon influence, and was forced to cede Corsica to France in 1768. Prior to the French Revolution, then, Italy remained under foreign domination.

(2) REVOLUTIONARY INFLUENCES (1795–1814)

Bonaparte's Italian campaigns, which began in 1795, temporarily disturbed this situation. His dictated Peace of Leoben (1797), while permitting Austria to annex Venice, forced her to permit French organization of the former Austrian sphere of influence in northern Italy. Milan, Mantua, Modena, and papal Romagna became the Cisalpine Republic, and Genoa the Ligurian Republic. Soon all of Italy was apportioned into French satellites, for the Roman Republic was set up in the Papal States and the Parthenopean in Naples during 1798 and 1799. When Bonaparte declared himself emperor, these republics obligingly became vassal monarchies. Genoa, Tuscany, and Rome were annexed outright to France; the rest of northern Italy became the "Kingdom of Italy" (1805–14) with Bonaparte himself as king, and his step-son,

Eugene Beauharnais, as viceroy. Naples was successively given to Napoleon's brother Joseph, and to his brother-in-law, Joachim Murat. Only Sicily, protected by British sea power, escaped. These arrangements did not outlast Bonaparte's fall, but the formation of an Italian kingdom had stimulated national patriotism so that Italian unification remained an ardent hope long after the Congress of Vienna (1815) had restored the foreign Habsburg and Bourbon rulers.

B. A Conciliatory Papacy (1721–58)

(1) INNOCENT XIII (1721–24)

Michelangelo dei Conti (1655–1724) was elected after a stormy conclave of seven weeks. Of somewhat sickly constitution, the new pope was mild and tranquil, disposed to peaceful conciliation. His pastoral vigilance, however, prevented him from yielding to the Jansenist Appellants in France, and from overlooking disciplinary abuses in Spain.

Diplomatic conciliation was displayed in the pope's investiture of Emperor Charles VI with the Two Sicilies, thus concluding the dispute about the *Monarchica Sicula*. When the emperor (1723) in his turn invested Don Carlos of Bourbon with Parma, the pope protested that this territory was also under papal feudal suzerainty, but did not press his claim to extremities. He resumed diplomatic relations with Philip V of Spain, and pleased the French regent by granting the red hat to his favorite Dubois.

(2) BENEDICT XIII (1724–30)

Pietro Francesco Orsini (1649–1730), a Dominican, was chosen after a conclave of two months, thereby receiving an unexpected answer to his novena to implore the end of the delay. He was one of the *Zelanti*, a group of cardinals who resented political pressure and mundane considerations in papal administration. Modest, holy, and energetic, he had the simplicity of a dove, if sometimes lacking in the prudence of the serpent. For the pontificate suffered from the abuse of the pope's confidence by Cardinal Coscia, later imprisoned for financial maladministration. The pope was severe in ecclesiastical discipline, diligent in the visitation of his diocese and the consecration of churches and altars.

Ecclesiastical diplomacy, however, found him aloof so that conciliation continued in the main. Though Benedict XIII did deny some importunate demands of the king of Portugal, he granted the emperor and the king of Sardinia broad concessions of patronage, and placed no obstacles in the way of reconciling the Appellants in France.

(3) CLEMENT XII (1730–40)

Lorenzo Corsini (1652–1740), a holy but aged cardinal, was selected as compromise candidate. During the second year of his pontificate he

became blind and in his last years was confined to bed. Yet he displayed
real diligence in temporal administration, sending up Coscia for a ten-
year term. Departing from Benedict's anti-bingoism, he revived the
public lottery, and devoted its proceeds to extensive building and re-
pairs.

Concessions to Portugal—granting of the red hat denied Bicchi by his
predecessor—and renunciation of annexation of San Marino charac-
terized his diplomacy.

(4) BENEDICT XIV (1740-58)

Prospero Lambertini (1675-1758), certainly one of the most brilliant
men elected to the papacy, in a sense talked himself into it. Doctor
utriusque juris at nineteen, he had had a meteoric curial career, es-
pecially distinguishing himself as "devil's advocate" in beatification
procedure. His universal interest embraced not only theology and canon
law, but historical criticism, experimental physical science, and litera-
ture. No recluse, he was well known in all learned circles of the day. As
Montfaucon said: "He has two souls: one for science, the other for
society." His personality was extrovert: he was vivacious and loquacious,
irresistibly drawn to puns, witticisms, and jokes that sometimes shocked
polite society, though they won the appreciation of the common people.
It was perhaps in a jesting mood that he addressed the conclave on
August 17 after six months of hot and futile ballots: "If you want a saint,
elect Gotti; a statesman, Aldobrandini; a regular fellow, me." He was
promptly chosen and began a liberal pontificate as a *politique*.

Diplomatic accommodation. In Church-state relations, Benedict was
disposed to let theocratic claims lapse. He arranged concordats with
Portugal, Spain, Sardinia, and the Two Sicilies, in which he granted ex-
tensive rights of patronage and revenue to the monarchs, abridged
clerical immunity, and promoted friendly relations. The Prussian royal
title was recognized despite curial opposition. The pope evinced a policy
of emphasizing the distinction between his spiritual and temporal pre-
rogatives, and of sacrificing the latter whenever the former could be
safeguarded or enhanced. He mediated between Naples and the Knights
of Malta, though even he had to resist Venetian jurisdictionalism. He
tried to attract deist and rationalist scholars, including Voltaire, though
he gained no noteworthy success. European monarchs, not excluding
the Sultan, praised his broad-mindedness. But he could be pushed too
far: when a French ambassador made excessive importunities, the
vigorous Pontiff pushed him on to the papal throne, saying: "You be
pope." That his conciliatory policy never sacrificed principle may be
seen in his renewal of the condemnation of Freemasonry.

Ecclesiastical reform was effected by Benedict XIV, though he once
complained: "The pope orders, the cardinals do not obey, and the people

do as they choose." In 1748 *Magnae Nobis Admirationis* clarified regulations for mixed marriages and the Catholic training of all children. In 1757 *Ex Omnibus Christianae Orbis* ended the Jansenist controversy by insisting on acceptance of papal definitions, while forbidding the exclusion from communion of any but public sinners. He revised the *Roman Martyrology* and the *Episcopal Ceremonial,* and codified canonization procedure. He was unable to complete a revision of the breviary designed to suppress unhistorical lessons, but did eliminate a number of feasts. Reunion of several Oriental churches was effected, though he felt obliged to repudiate the Malabar and Chinese "rites" thus far tolerated in the Far East. On May 3, 1758, he closed a scintillating reign.

C. The Papacy under Stress (1758–99)

(1) CLEMENT XIII (1758-69)

Carlo Rezzonico (1693–1769) was elected by the Zelanti in the hope that his Jesuit training would induce him to defend the threatened Society. The new pope was an exemplary cleric, regarded as a saint even by the Jansenist Clement. He displayed a resolute firmness which, however, won him nothing but the opprobrium of the absolute monarchs and their abettors, the Rationalists and Masons.

The Jesuit controversy disturbed his entire pontificate. But in spite of continual pressure from monarchs and scholars, Clement XIII proved adamant in opposing the chorus which demanded the suppression of the Society of Jesus. He could not silence the clamor, however, and it is believed that presentation on the same day of identical notes by French, Spanish, and Neapolitan envoys demanding suppression hastened the pope's death.

Rationalism found the pope a vigilant opponent. Abandoning his predecessor's attempt at *rapprochement,* Clement placed the *Encyclopédie* on the Index along with a great number of rationalist treatises. He tried to warm the jejune intellectualism of the age by promoting devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. But it only became clearer that Rationalism could neither be conciliated nor coerced, and that the absolute monarchs would learn no lesson other than the French Revolution.

(2) CLEMENT XIV (1769-74)

Lorenzo Ganganelli (1705–74), a Franciscan, was elected pope after a three months' conclave again protracted by the Jesuit issue. Unusual Bourbon pressure was brought to bear: all but five of nearly fifty cardinals were vetoed, and D'Aubeterre, the French ambassador, insisted that any possible candidate subscribe in advance to the suppression of the Jesuits. It seems likely that Cardinal Ganganelli signified his belief

in the right, if not the intention, of a pope to suppress a religious order, but there is scarcely proof of a pledge to suppress the Jesuits. The Zelanti, on the other hand, sought to elect a pope favorable to the Society. Their failure spelled its doom, for the new pope, if not personally opposed to the Jesuits, was not likely to regard their interests as linked with those of the Church.

The utmost in concession became Clement's policy. He discontinued reading of the bull of St. Pius V, *In Cena Domini,* with its penalties for Catholic rulers who refused to prosecute heresy. He placated monarchs with personal favors, possibly in an effort to distract their attention from their demand for suppression of the Jesuits. As will be seen more at length in the following topic, Clement XIV failed; at least he became convinced that schism was threatened. In 1773 *Dominus ac Redemptor* suppressed the Society for the sake of peace. The Bourbons then restored papal territories that had been seized, but the pope's jubilation over this event received little echo in the consistory. The harried pontiff died on September 22, 1774.

(3) Pius VI (1775–99)

Gianangelo Braschi (1717–99) was chosen in another long conclave, again disturbed by Bourbon dread of a pro-Jesuit pope. Pro-Jesuit the new pope was, but he confined himself to befriending individuals, and officially ignored the Society's continued corporate existence in certain regions, such as Poland. Pius was affable, magnanimous, cultured, handsome, but destined for a long and trying pontificate.

Regalism in all its varied forms of Gallicanism, Febronianism, and Josephenism gave the pope much to suffer. Joseph II of Austria enacted sweeping measures that threatened to disrupt the ecclesiastical discipline of the Habsburg dominions. Pius VI did his utmost to conciliate the emperor, well-meaning, but ill advised by Chancellor Kaunitz. In the spring of 1782 the pope even made a personal visit to Vienna. This produced few tangible results, but may have averted schism. For though Kaunitz interposed between pope and emperor at Vienna, a return visit of Joseph II to Rome in 1783 effected some slight improvement. Josephenism was seconded by the archiepiscopal electors of Germany and by the emperor's brother, Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, who abetted the Synod of Pistoia (1786). In condemning this meeting, all of the regalist errors were censured in detail by Pius VI in *Auctorem Fidei* (1794). Spain, Sardinia, Venice, and the Two Sicilies opposed Gallican theories, but only in the last named state did relations with the Holy See become critical. When King Ferdinand demanded the *exequatur* for all papal documents entering his dominions, Pius VI refused canonical confirmation to the ruler's episcopal nominations. Over sixty sees were

canonically vacant before a *modus vivendi* was reached late in the pontificate. It may have given Pius VI some consolation, then, to erect the see of Baltimore (1789) in a new Republic free from such royal pests.

The French Revolution, treated in detail elsewhere, afforded the pope his last and greatest trial. Throughout he directed the interests of the Church with great patience, prudence, and firmness. Kept informed by his envoy, Monsignor Salamon, Pius VI planned an understanding with the new regime, but did not live to see it put into operation. Between 1796 and 1798 the Papal States were shorn of territory and independence by General Bonaparte, and on February 15, 1798, General Berthier proclaimed the "Roman Republic." The now octogenarian pope was carried off to captivity at Siena, Florence, Parma, Piacenza, Turin, Besançon, Grenoble, and Valence. In the latter French town his "Stations of the Cross" ended with a holy death on August 29, 1799. Though some of the revolutionists believed that they had seen the last of the popes, a greater number of Europeans, by now shocked at the excesses of a decade of violent change, pondered the words of Pius VI: "The Catholic faith is eternal. This faith which existed before you will live after you, and its reign will last until the end of time." Almost on the very day of the pope's death in exile, Bonaparte was sailing back from Egypt to overthrow the French Republic.

58. PAPAL CHAMPIONS: JESUIT SUPPRESSION

A. *Causes of Jesuit Suppression*

The real worth of the Society of Jesus as a militant arm of the Catholic Church and of the papacy excited the animosity of anti-Catholic groups, especially the Rationalists and Freemasons. Many persons were prone to regard the Society as synonymous with the Catholic Church; its suppression, they felt, would be but the prelude to the destruction of Christianity. On the other hand, the close *esprit de corps* of some members of the Society induced other Catholics, both clerical and lay, to conceive prejudices against it.

Papal primacy, zealously upheld by the Jesuits and the object of the professed fourth vow, clashed with the prevailing royal Absolutism, state sovereignty, nationalism, regal "jurisdictionalism": Gallicanism, Febronianism, Josephinism. On the other hand, some Jesuits clung so tenaciously to their exemption from the local ordinaries and pleaded so consistently privileges of special immediate subjection to the Holy See that they antagonized many bishops. This was especially true in missionary lands, where Jesuit "presbyterianism" provoked the hierarchy, bishops or vicars-apostolic.

Opposition to Jansenism earned the Society many influential enemies

in aristocratic circles. Jansenists or rigoristic Catholics branded the Jesuits' still unpopular Probabilism as Laxism.

Real or fancied political power made the Jesuits objects of dread to despotic governments, and the tyrannicide advocated by some malcontents, e.g., Mariana, was falsely ascribed to the whole Society, as in the case of the English Gunpowder Plot.

The Monita Secrata, supposed Machiavellian rules for Jesuit intrigue, were widely circulated and believed. This work was first published in 1612 at Notabirga (No-town), Poland. It was subsequently learned from the author's recantation, that it had been composed by the ex-Jesuit, Jerome Zahrowski, who had cleverly arranged false directives in the order and style of the authentic *Monita Generalia* of the Society. Chapter headings of the *Monita Secreta* reveal some of the nature of the calumny: "How the Society should act to get a new foundation. . . . How to win and keep the friendship of princes and important personages. . . . How to act with people who wield political influence, or those who, even if not rich, may be serviceable. . . . How to win over wealthy widows. . . . How to induce them to dispose of their property. . . . How to induce them to enter religious communities, etc." Despite the recantation, the forgery succeeded in fixing the word "jesuitical" in opprobrium.

The "Lettres Provinciales" of Blaise Pascal, already mentioned, repeated these accusations and made a greater impression by reason of the author's fame and skill. Pascal, it seems, merely elaborated on information supplied him by Arnauld and Quinet. Pascal ceased his attacks in 1657 without retracting them; the preacher Bourdaloue undertook to refute the allegations.

B. *Governmental Persecution*

(1) PORTUGUESE

Pombal, omnipotent prime minister of Portugal from 1750 to 1777, was a Freemason who confiscated church property to enrich himself, and controlled the Inquisition through his brother, Paul Carvalho, the grand inquisitor. In 1751 some of Spanish Paraguay came under Portuguese sway by treaty. The transfer dispossessed thirty thousand Indians who objected forcibly. Their revolt, in reality provoked by the rapacity of gold seekers, was blamed on the Jesuits who had been the Christianizing and civilizing agents of these "reductions" or missionary communities. When one Pereira informed Pombal that the Jesuits had been aiming at erection of an independent commercial empire for themselves, the premier demanded their punishment from the Holy See.

Portuguese suppression. On Pombal's denunciation, Benedict XIV directed the patriarch of Lisbon, Cardinal Saldanha, to investigate. Un-

known to the pope, the latter was but another of Pombal's tools. Within two weeks and without any apparent investigation, Saldanha confirmed the charges and suspended Jesuit faculties. In the same year (1758) suspects taken in after an assassination plot against the king were forced by torture to accuse the Jesuits. Though one of the accusers, the duke of Aveiro, later withdrew his testimony, Pombal had what he desired. He demanded of Clement XIII authority to punish clerics guilty of regicide. In conceding this petition, the pope yet warned that "the innocent ought not to be made to suffer." But Pombal was easily convinced that every Jesuit without exception within the Portuguese dominions had been guilty of treason. All were either imprisoned or exiled. Some 1,100 Jesuits were landed in the Papal States without notification, while 221 Jesuits still survived in Portuguese prisons in 1777 when Queen Maria I dismissed Pombal and released them.

(2) FRENCH

Choiseul, a creature of La Pompadour and influential minister of Louis XV from 1758 to 1770, opposed the Society in France. The Jesuits were delivered into his hands by a series of misfortunes. One of the Society, La Valette, superior of the Martinque mission, engaged in unauthorized commerce. When his ships were seized by the British during the unexpected outbreak of hostilities in the French and Indian War, funds advanced by French firms were lost. When the latter appealed to the Society for compensation, they were reminded that La Valette had acted without permission and therefore the Order was not liable. Imprudently the Jesuits appealed to *parlement* to free them from any obligations. But in 1762 this court, largely composed of Rationalists or Jansenist sympathizers, gleefully ordered the Society to make payment in full and sequestered Jesuit funds in France until it should be made.

French suppression. But the financial loss was minor compared to the damage done to Jesuit reputation, already wounded by calumnies. Choiseul and La Pompadour, whose conduct had been censured by the Jesuits, utilized these incidents to demand suppression of the Society from the king. Father de la Croix, Parisian provincial, sought to avert this by issuing an abject declaration of submission to all Gallican ideas, and endorsed the Four Articles of 1682. Although all French Jesuits by no means followed his lead, his action weakened the Society's position among its friends. The king tried to avert suppression by proposing an autonomous French vicariate to the general, Ricci; to this the latter is said to have retorted: "*Sint ut sunt, aut non sint.*" Thereupon the well-meaning but morally craven monarch yielded to the lobby and sup-

pressed the Society in France. Some six thousand French Jesuits were dispersed and their goods confiscated.

(3) SPANISH

Aranda, rationalist premier of Charles III, planned suppression of the Society in Spain as early as 1759, but delayed until the death of the influential queen mother, Elizabeth Farnese, in 1766. Soon after a riot of Madrilenos at an edict of Don Squillace, a Genoese member of the ministry, afforded an opportunity. This foreigner incensed the citizens by forbidding them to wear their customary cloaks and sombreros. Jesuits were seen in the streets talking to the rioters—actually to calm the mob. But for this and "other reasons hidden in my royal heart," the king expelled six thousand Jesuits from Spain on April 2, 1767. The unwanted exiles were deported to the Papal States and to Corsica with scant provision for their needs.

(4) NEAPOLITAN

Tanucci, Neapolitan premier, held the broad-minded and detached view that Jesuits might be innocuous as individuals—he had one as his confessor—but were victims of corporate delusion and malice. He promptly followed Spain's lead to arrest or deport the Jesuits from the Two Sicilies during 1767–68. He also induced the Knights of Malta to do the same.

The Bourbon courts, to which must be added Parma, thereafter bombarded the Holy See with demands for the suppression of the Society in the universal Church.

(5) GERMAN ATTITUDE

Maria Theresa of Austria restrained her son, Emperor Joseph II, from taking similar action. The empress did not particularly care for the Jesuits whose influence in education she had restricted, but she did not believe herself justified in taking any steps against them—or for them.

Frederick II of Prussia paradoxically defended the Jesuits, along with his accomplice in Polish partition, Catherine II of Russia. These rulers seem to have felt that the competent Jesuit school system in Poland was essential to the cultural well-being of their new provinces and that retention of the Jesuits would placate the Poles. The course of Jesuit fortunes enabled the Old Scoffer to say with telling irony: "While my brothers the Catholic kings, 'very Christian,' 'very faithful,' and 'apostolic,' have driven them out; I, very heretical, am picking up as many of them as I can."

C. Papal Suppression

Pope Clement XIII (1758–69), as already noted, firmly resisted all demands for the suppression of the Jesuits.

Pope Clement XIV (1769–74) tried to conciliate the Bourbons who persisted in their demands, holding Avignon and Benevento as hostages. At his first audience, the pope dismissed the Jesuit General Ricci without a word and he often ignored Jesuits on the streets—possibly to appease their foes. In 1769 he suggested that the clergy of the Bourbon lands should express their opinion, and intimated that his life was in danger from allies of the Jesuits. Under renewed royal pressure, he secretly assured Charles III of Spain on November 30, 1769, that he would "fulfill his obligations" to the king and soon dissolve the Society by a *moto proprio.*

Delay nonetheless ensued as Clement, a weak and devious character, sought one ruse after another. Anti-Jesuit cardinals were authorized to make a visitation of Jesuit houses in Rome in May, 1770, and their report was relied upon to remove the seminary from Jesuit direction. Faculties were withdrawn from the Jesuit exiles from Bourbon lands who had taken refuge in the Papal States. Through his envoy, the anti-papal layman Monino, Charles III demanded action. Clement then pleaded illness, but Monino was insistent. In December, 1772, the pope commissioned Zelada and Monino to prepare a draft of a bull of suppression. This sketch, substantially the same as the final version, was circulated among the Bourbon courts during 1773 for their approbation. Meanwhile the cardinal of Bologna was authorized to suppress Jesuit schools and dismiss their novices.

Dominus ac Redemptor was at length signed by Clement XIV on July 21, 1773, and published on the following August 16. After giving a history of papal suppression of orders, and reciting unfavorable reports about the Society, the pope asserted that "at the very birth of this Society there germinated manifold seeds of dissension and jealousy, and that not merely within itself but also against other orders and against the secular priesthood. . . ." Consequently, "since it can no longer bring forth the abundant fruits or be of the usefulness for which it was founded, we dissolve, suppress, extinguish, and abolish the said Society."

Execution of this decree began with the arrest of General Ricci and the Jesuit Roman administration on August 17. Accused of hoarding vast sums of money, Ricci rejected the charge as absurd, and no evidence was ever found against him or his aides. Yet Bourbon pressure kept him in prison until his death in 1775. Avignon and Benevento were now

restored to the pope, but when the latter jubilantly reported this to a consistory, the cardinals received it in "chilly silence."

Restoration came when Pope Pius VII, advised by Cardinal Pacca, recognized that "the Catholic world unanimously demands the reestablishment of the Society of Jesus." With the bull, *Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum*, published August 7, 1814, Pius VII restored the Society.

D. New Religious Communities

(1) CHRISTIAN BROTHERS

St. John de La Salle (1651–1719), a French priest and canon, had been impressed by the need for Christian education of the young. As early as 1679 he conducted a free school at Rheims, and later he resigned his benefice to devote his whole time to this work. At first he intended to form a community of priests to assist him in his labors, but gradually adapted the rules for lay brothers exclusively. Regulations formulated in 1695 and revised in 1717 attracted 274 zealous disciples by the time of his death. Pope Benedict XIII erected the society into a religious order in 1725. Though the community was dissolved during the French Revolution because of the Brothers' loyalty to the Holy See, it was reorganized in 1803 and spread rapidly throughout the world. In modern times of stress on secular education, the Christian Brothers have become ever more useful to the Church.

(2) THE PASSIONISTS

St. Paul of the Cross (1694–1775), an Italian ex-soldier, proved that even the most rigorous asceticism could be combined with the active life in modern times. In 1737 he formed the first community of Passionists: the Congregation of Discalced Clerks of the Holy Cross and the Passion, which gave Father Paul Danei his title of Paul of the Cross. The rule was approved by Benedict XIV in 1741. The members take simple perpetual vows, but like the Carthusians are to spend five hours a day chanting the office and in meditation. They were to observe three days of abstinence each week and practice rigid austerity in dress and lodging. Yet they were to be active in preaching. St. Paul had England's conversion as a special objective, and it cannot be without significance that John Henry Newman was received into the Church by a Passionist.

(3) THE REDEMPTORISTS

St. Alphonsus Liguori (1696–1787) was advised during a retreat at a Vincentian house that his vocation lay elsewhere. The community which he eventually founded had their support and similar aims in working

for the salvation of the poor country people. His Congregation of the Holy Redeemer took the usual religious vows, though it was for a time disrupted by regalist cross fire which saddened the last days of its aged founder. These shadows were dispelled not long afterwards, and the community was favored with the services of St. Clement Hofbauer (1751-1820), resolute opponent of Josephinism in Germany, under whom the congregation became truly international.

(4) OTHER COMMUNITIES

Other communities founded during this period aspired to the Christian ideals of perfection. St. Louis de Montfort (1673-1716), herald of the modern accent on Mariology, founded his Company of Mary. Father Batholomew Holzhauser (1613-58) organized an association of priests, known now by the name of Apostolic Union after its revival by Canon Le Beurier (1862) and its endorsement by Pope St. Pius X. During the same time the Basilians were united and reorganized among the Catholic Ruthenians.

59. THE OLD REGIME IN FRANCE

A. *Social Survey*

(1) THE FIRST ESTATE: THE CLERGY

Prelates. By the Concordat of Bologna (1516), the king had received from the Holy See the privilege of nominating to all sees, abbacies, canonries, and inferior benefices. "By means of this patronage, the monarch was usually able to control the higher clergy, who were chosen almost invariably from the ranks of the nobility and formed a special caste even in their own order. In spite of the notorious example of men like Archbishop Dubois, they were as a class not unworthy of their sacred office, though it must be admitted that in the century preceding the Revolution they could boast of few colleagues of eminent sanctity and learning." [12] In 1789 there were 134 sees, of which all but five were occupied by noblemen. The abbots were for the most part laymen holding *in commendam*. The income of the bishoprics varied between $500,000 and $2,000, with perhaps $12,000 as an average. These prelates had the administration of at least one-fifth of the land of France, though most of this wealth was used for the traditional charitable works of the Catholic Church. There were a number of courtier prelates, like Cardinal de Rohan, who longed to bask in the radiance of Versailles, and whose scandalous escapades set tongues wagging unjustifiably in generalizations about the entire episcopate. The tithe—which actually

[12] J. MacCaffery, *History of the Church* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1910), I, 4.

amounted to about a thirteenth—was resented by the common people, and as many as four hundred thousand law suits are reported against it during one year.

The parochial clergy numbered between sixty thousand and seventy thousand, and was largely recruited from the third estate, or the common people. With fewer exceptions they were clergymen of irreproachable moral qualities. Most of them were respected by the peasants to whom they were bound by common social class and their zeal. The parishes were of unequal size and revenue, but while a few might receive as much as $4,000 a year in a town, most country curés had to struggle along with an income of merely $125 a year. Some members of this "spiritual proletariat" bitterly resented this inequality with the prelates, and consequently were readily induced to co-operate with the *bourgeoisie* against the privileged classes during the early stages of the French Revolution. This antipathy, active or passive, contributed largely to preventing a united clerical stand in regard to the evils against which the Revolution was directed. Some of the curés were readers and disseminators of the current political philosophy, and not a few were deceived by the Encyclopedists whose works they procured clandestinely.

Religious were little in favor with Gallican prelates and statesmen: between 1705 and 1784 the Commission of Regulars, deputed by the Assembly of the French Clergy, suppressed 426 religious houses, and in 1773 virtually ended their exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, despite protests from the Holy See and the international generalates. The French conduct toward the Society of Jesus was merely an extreme example of the disregard for the regular clergy.

(2) THE SECOND ESTATE: THE NOBILITY

The king was absolute in theory, but frequently a slave of a court and ministerial system which he found difficult to change, or of mistresses whom he had no inclination to give up. Since 1614 the monarchy had ceased to consult the Estates General, the French legislature. Legislation and taxation emanated from royal councils, themselves influenced by powerful pressure groups among the nobility. Though Richelieu and Mazarin had developed new and more efficient instruments of government, none of the medieval offices had been abolished. They remained as costly sinecures with overlapping jurisdiction. The *parlements,* the courts of France, could sometimes oppose the royal will by refusing to register a royal decree. Ultimately a determined monarch could override this opposition by a *lit de justice,* a personal confrontation, but this and more severe punitive measures often antagonized public opinion which cherished the *parlements* as champions of liberty, caste-ridden and petty as they often showed themselves.

In the provinces, gerrymandering was used to weaken the power of the local nobility. Thus, the noble governors had been largely superseded in practice by the fiscal powers of the bourgeois intendants. Chaotic inequalities survived in the provinces with their varying types of law, custom, and administrative machinery. The local districts also differed in dialect, attachment to the crown, and mode of taxation. Though taxation could have been comparatively light in the aggregate, it was unequally assessed and annoyingly collected. Despite it, however, trade was increasing and some peasants were even able to buy land, one-third of which had come into their possession. But if occasionally well-to-do, the country people saw fit to disguise appearances to avoid ruinous taxes. France remained in a state of "prodigal anarchy."

The nobles clung to outmoded privileges. While exempt from royal taxation—though not from some "donatives"—they themselves continued to exact feudal dues: monopolies on commodities, fees for the use of manorial ovens, mills, etc., although they no longer performed the feudal protective services which had originally given them a sort of title to these perquisites. Perhaps seventy-five per cent of the nobles were absentee landlords, either away at court or serving in the armed forces where they alone merited officers' commissions. There were some two hundred thousand noblemen, divided, however, by rivalry between the ancient feudal nobility "of the sword," and the newer ministerial nobility "of the robe." Intermarriage with the *bourgeoisie* took place with increasing frequency, but came too late to fuse the upper classes prior to the French Revolution. Unlike the alliance of squirearchy and upper middle class in England, France still held rival castes.

(3) THIRD ESTATE: COMMONERS

The bourgeoisie formed the dynamic element. Those in Paris were numerous and wealthy, and the group as a whole included the lawyers, bureaucrats, merchants, and a few manufacturers. They were likely to be educated in the rationalist and secularist tradition. But though they possessed wealth and intelligence, they were denied political and social equality with the nobility. In an attempt to re-enact the English Revolt of 1689 they began the more conservative phase of the Revolution in France.

The artisans, numerically less important, were nevertheless strong in the strategic city of Paris. There they forced the Revolution beyond the plans of the capitalists and lawyers who, once their own objectives had been achieved, would have displayed little disposition to extend their gains to the rest of the third estate.

The peasants were in agreement with the *bourgeoisie* only in opposition to the privileges of the *Ancien Régime* with its *taille reelle* (land-

tax), *taille personelle* (head-tax), *vingtieme* (income tax), *gabelle* (salt monopoly), *octroi* (internal tariff), *corvée* (forced labor)—to say nothing more of the tithe. Aside from the removal of their tax burdens and other feudal restrictions, however, the peasants had little grievance against Church and monarchy. They were in the strict sense reformers; that is, they desired the improvement, not the overthrow, of existing institutions.

B. The Aging of the Regime (1715–74)

(1) KING LOUIS XV (1715–74)

The Regent Orléans (1715–23), as next prince of the blood royal, took over the rule of France for the five-year-old Louis XV when the Grand Monarch, Louis XIV, terminated his seventy-two year reign in 1715. Philip, duke of Orléans (1674–1723), was a dabbler in philosophy and science and an immoral debauchee. With him the full panoply of the "Enlightenment" was allowed free admittance into France. Its teachings, subversive of ecclesiastical and secular authority alike, were given free rein. Though repressive measures could later be employed by Orléans' successors, this opening wedge could never be forced completely out. At first under cover, and after 1748 semipublicly, the new theories went the rounds of salons and clubs. Morals among the court nobility were too often patterned after those of the regent. The regent's Latitudinarianism permitted the revival of Jansenism; his sponsorship of Law's Mississippi speculation scheme left bankruptcy and panic in its wake.

Cardinal André Fleury (1653–1743) became the real head of the government at the regent's death, although the duke of Bourbon was nominally premier until 1726. The aged cardinal, once the king's tutor, enjoyed his confidence and did not betray it. This cautious statesman perceived that France's situation required peace abroad and rigid economy at home. He lacked, however, the energy or the power to pursue his objectives with sufficient tenacity to produce a radical cure. France eventually became involved in the War of Polish Succession which put Bourbons on the throne of the Two Sicilies, but increased her financial burdens. At home, the cardinal on the whole reduced expenditures and promoted trade and industry. Probably he postponed the French Revolution, but he did not permanently reverse the trend to the abyss.

"**Personal rule**" by King Louis XV supposedly followed the cardinal's death in 1743. The monarch, indeed, declared himself his own prime minister as Louis XIV had done before him. But Louis XV was no "Grand Monarch" and his interest in government was but spasmodic. Even then it was usually prompted by a series of mistresses of whom Pompadour and Du Barry were the most notorious. If Louis was sound in faith and well disposed toward the Church, his gross and flagrant

immorality created an obvious target for the critics' shafts. The king's benevolence to the clergy, however, was thoroughly Gallican: in 1768 a royal order raised clerical salaries from 150 to 250 livres minimum. Nor could the king prevail over the wishes of his minister Choiseul regarding the Jesuits.

Both of Fleury's policies were entirely abandoned. France now plunged recklessly into the War of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War with the result that both Canada and India were lost, while debt piled up at home. The financial deficit increased with the extravagance of a frivolous court at Versailles. The *Ancien Régime* was by now maintained with increasing difficulty. Murmurs became audible and an attempted assassination of "Louis the Well-Beloved" in 1757 led to reprisals. The *parlement* of Paris, indoctrinated with religious and political Rationalism, attempted a course of legal opposition to the throne, that bore some analogy to that of the English "Long Parliament" toward King Charles I. Louis XV finally countered this by abolishing all of the twelve *parlements* of France in 1771—a measure which did not last. He was not unaware that his regime could not long survive, but continued to remark cynically: "After us, the deluge." The Last Sacraments may have saved his own soul, but he left France little other salvation than revolution.

(2) KING LOUIS XVI (1774-93)

Louis XVI, twenty-year-old grandson of Louis XV, was the largely innocent heir of the sins of the Bourbon *Ancien Régime*. Pious, upright, and well-meaning, he would have made an exemplary private citizen— and locksmith. Not deficient in intelligence, he was weak of will. This was ill supplied by the stubborn caprice of the unpopular Austrian queen, Marie Antoinette. Unwilling to use force to shed his people's blood, never tenacious enough to take the lead in any consistent reform policy, the king's vacillating gestures nullified each other. Yielding to the march of events, he was swept along with the current.

Turgot (1774-76), the king's first minister, belonged to the economic individualists known as Physiocrats. Turgot abolished the internal tolls on grain and the *corvée*, and repressed monopolies. The exiled *parlements* were recalled. But when tax reform and rigid economy were proposed, the court clique forced Turgot out.

Necker (1776-81; 1788-89), a Swiss banker, believed that business efficiency was all that France needed. Skillful manipulation did postpone a reckoning a few more years, but effected no real cure. What economies he could effect were dissipated by French espousal of the American Revolutionary cause. Necker's efforts to cut pensions and dismiss bureaucrats forced him out as well. Before departing he published an un-

authorized financial statement that alerted the intelligent to some of France's peril. After his successors, Calonne and De Brienne, had merely temporized, Necker was recalled in 1788 to meet a desperate insolvency which could no longer be relieved by loans—governmental credit was nearly gone. Necker advised convocation of the Estates General, and its meeting was announced as a New Year's gift to the nation for the memorable year of 1789. A Bourbon king had at last been forced to admit publicly that he alone was not the state.

60. SECULARIST GERMANY

A. Twilight of the Holy Roman Empire (1648–1806)

(1) POLITICAL SURVEY

The Treaty of Westphalia marked the virtual end of central government in Germany. If the Peace of Augsburg (1555) terminated the international influence of the Holy Roman Empire, that of Westphalia put an end to the German Kingdom. Until 1871 one must speak of the "Germanies" rather than of Germany. Though Austrian archdukes continued to be elected emperors and kings, their importance was derived from their hereditary lands and not from these ornamental titles. All of the German states, theoretically just provinces of the kingdom, were by now independent in the regulation of both foreign and domestic affairs. This led to the anomalous situation of political "split personalities." Thus, the archduke of Austria was king of Hungary outside the imperial frontiers; the elector of Brandenburg was to become king of Prussia in the same sense; the elector of Saxony was often king of Poland; the elector of Hanover was king of Great Britain; the duke of Holstein was the king of Denmark; counts palatine and counts of Hesse successively were kings of Sweden; the prince of the Netherlands was the king of Spain; the count of Alsace was the king of France; and the duke of Savoy became king of Sardinia. Obviously these sovereigns were not meek subjects in their capacity as German vassals: they tended to rule all their lands with a single policy. This resulted in Germany being dragged into nearly every war. Finally, all pretense of unity collapsed before the Bonapartist conquests and pretensions, so that at last Francis II resigned the empty but venerable title of Holy Roman Emperor in 1806. Under these circumstances, no unified history of the German Church is possible. Since each of the three hundred or so German states cannot be treated, until 1870 it will be convenient to confine our efforts to the leading Catholic state, Austria, and its chief Protestant rival, Prussia.

(2) ECCLESIASTICAL GENERALIZATIONS

Reform in Germany was promoted by Bishops Johann von Bicken of Mainz and Julius von Mespelbruun of Würzburg, and Abbot Gaspard

Hoffmann of Melk, whose monastic reform federation continued after his death in 1623. Father Bartholomew Holzhauser (1613–58) of Austria formed an association of secular clerics to train the clergy and to promote parochial community life, and this movement spread into Hungary, Poland, and Spain. Confirmed as a diocesan association in 1680 by Pope Innocent XI, it was revived during the nineteenth century by Canon Le Beurier and vigorously promoted by St. Giuseppe Sarto (Pius X). "The parts of the Germany that remained Catholic recovered with surprising rapidity from the harm of the Thirty Years' War. A new life spirit appeared, a healthy joy of being alive, expressed in the countless ecclesiastical and profane buildings and sculptures in the baroque style which still imprint their stamp on the scenery. There was no flaming spirituality, no ardent mysticism. Catholics of the German Baroque Age did not wrestle with problems. . . . Theirs was a thoroughly localized religion, deeply rooted, pervading all of life. It produced no great saints, but neither was it a breeding ground of Jansenism and Illuminism." [13] Other reform figures were the missionary, Philip Jenigen, S.J., Ulric Megerle (d. 1709), blunt and popular preacher, and the poet, Friedrich von Spee (d. 1635).

B. Austria

(1) Eastern Direction (1648–1740)

The Habsburgs after the Treaty of Westphalia contented themselves with their ceremonial precedence among European rulers and the influence that came from ruling the largest German state. The German empire and kingdom became relics, and in 1663 the Diet at Regensburg became "perpetual," that is, continued without new blood down to the formal dissolution of the empire in 1806.

Emperor Leopold I (1658–1705), like his father and grandfather, was zealously Catholic, though entertaining some Caesaro-papistical illusions. Like other jurisdictionalist monarchs, he considered prelates his subjects in all respects, and minor disputes occurred periodically between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities.

The Balkan crusade against the Turks revealed the emperor in his best role, for his resistance to a renewed onslaught by the Porte saved the Church and Central Europe and permanently reversed the Mohammedan tide. The long war (1682–99) resulted in the complete liberation of Catholic Hungary, and beckoned the Habsburgs to seek domination of the Balkans. At first the Turks menaced Vienna itself (1683), but were repulsed by the rallying power of Pope Innocent XI and the military assistance of King John Sobieski of Poland. National rivalry was set aside

---

[13] Ludwig Hertling and Anselm Briggs, *History of the Church* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1957), p. 435.

until the city was relieved, though thereafter it paralyzed the effect of Polish aid. But the emperor was able to force the Turks to yield with Venetian naval assistance. By the Treaty of Carlowitz (1699) the two-thirds of Hungary lost in 1526 at the battle of Mohacs were recovered.

The War of Spanish Succession proved an unsuccessful diversion of Habsburg attention toward the West. It failed in its design of placing Leopold's second son Charles on the Spanish throne. The war continued throughout the reign of Leopold's elder son, Joseph I (1705-11), but concluded shortly after his demise, for the great powers would not consent to a revival of the dynastic empire of Charles V in the person of the archduke, now Emperor Charles VI.

Emperor Charles VI (1711-40) was well served against Turkey by his greatest general, Eugene of Savoy (1663-1736), who recaptured Belgrade and parts of Servia from the Turks in 1718. After his death, however, these gains were in large part lost, and the Austrian southern frontier was stabilized until the occupation of Bosnia in 1878. Charles also participated in the Polish Succession War, seated his candidate on the Polish throne, but had to renounce the Two Sicilies to the Spanish Bourbons. Since Charles, like his brother Joseph, lacked male heirs, he spent his last years in securing signatures to a "Pragmatic Sanction" which guaranteed the succession of his daughter Maria Theresa to all of his dominions. His Prussian neighbor remarked cynically that a strong army would have been a better guarantee—and he knew whereof he spoke, for Austrian Silesia was soon stolen by the first Prussian *blitz* launched after tearing up treaties like "scraps of paper."

(2) Febronian Trend (1740-80)

Maria Theresa (1740-80) succeeded to the throne in Austria and Hungary, but as a woman was ineligible for the imperial throne. Frederick II of Prussia seized Austrian Silesia and held it through the Austrian Succession (1740-48) and Seven Years' Wars (1756-63), while backing the Bavarian elector as Emperor Charles VII (1742-45). Maria Theresa, however, preserved the rest of her extensive lands, and after the defeat and death of Charles VII, got her husband, Duke Francis of Lorraine, chosen as his successor (1745-65). Personally devout, the empress was led by advisors such as Kaunitz to meddle in ecclesiastical affairs. She abolished the Inquisition and nullified ecclesiastical decrees enacted without her *placet*. A number of monasteries were secularized and the clergy subjected to taxation. Far more serious was her blindness in allowing education in Vienna University to be tainted by rationalist and Febronian influences.

Febronianism had originated with the Jansenist professor of Louvain, Van Espen, who denied to the pope any primacy of jurisdiction. His

doctrine was given its widest publicity after it had been incorporated in a work, *De Praesenti Statu Ecclesiae,* by Johann von Hontheim, auxiliary bishop of Trier, who wrote under the pen name of Febronius. This treatise proposed three means of achieving ecclesiastical reform. The first was to restrict papal jurisdiction to a "primacy of direction." The second advocated a general council to enlighten and direct the papacy. Lastly, bishops were to invoke the aid of monarchs in reforming abuses. Clement XIII condemned Febronianism on March 14, 1764, and urged the German hierarchy to ban the book. In spite of a didactic refutation prepared by the Venetian Jesuit, Zaccharia—the *Anti-Febronio*—new editions of Hontheim's work continued to appear. Episcopal censures were rendered inefficacious by the refusal of the elector-archbishop of Trier, to rebuke his auxiliary. This prelate, Clemens von Wettin, a son of the king of Poland, instead joined the electors of Mainz and Cologne in presenting their *gravamina* to the Roman Curia in 1769. These representations revealed Febronian influence, and only in 1778 after repeated papal urging did the elector secure a half-hearted retractation from Hontheim, who died in communion with the Church in 1790.

(3) Josephinism (1780-1806)

Emperor Joseph (1765–90), Maria Theresa's eldest son, though Holy Roman Emperor since his father's death in 1765, did not attain real power until her death in 1780. This well-meaning but ill-advised ruler embarked on a series of "reforms" which threw all the Habsburg dominions into confusion. And this "Brother Sacristan" blended rationalist and Febronian errors into a new mixture known as Josephinism.

Political Josephinism, which here must receive short attention, was an arbitrary project of welding the heterogeneous Habsburg territories into one absolute, centralized monarchy, with a single law, customs, and language. Revolts in Belgium and Hungary thwarted the scheme, and it was abandoned by Joseph's successor.

Ecclesiastical Josephinism might be summarized in a letter of the imperial chancellor Kaunitz to the papal nuncio, Monsignor Garampi: "Supremacy of the state over the Church extends to all ecclesiastical laws and practices devised and established solely by man, and whatever else the Church owes to the consent and sanction of the secular power. Consequently the state must always have the power to limit, alter, or annul its former concessions. . . ." Concrete instances were these: 1) The royal *placet* was required for epicopal communication with Rome. 2) Appeals to the Roman curia for faculties and marriage dispensations were branded "violations of the rights of bishops." 3) Liturgy was mi-

nutely regulated, and in 1786 a German ritual demanded. 4) Episcopal oaths of allegiance were to precede oaths to the Holy See. 5) Education was largely taken from hierarchical supervision, even in regard to seminaries. 6) Contemplative orders were to be suppressed and their property nationalized. 7) Imperial censorship was decreed for all books, including religious treatises.

Pope Pius VI met these repeated affronts with patient prudence. Realizing that the cardinal-archbishop of Vienna, Migazzi, was being disregarded, the pope paid an unprecedented visit to Vienna. The people received the pontiff enthusiastically, but the chancellor practically prevented any private interview with the emperor. But Joseph II was more amenable on a return visit to Rome (1783) without Kaunitz.

The Punctuation of Ems (1786) was a manifestation of the Josephinist theory by the imperial electors of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne. Along with the archbishop of Salzburg, they asserted: (1) that they would no longer apply to the Holy See without the royal *placet;* (2) that all religious should be subject to their jurisdiction; (3) that there ought to be no international superiors-general; (4) that there was no need for quinquennial faculties; (5) that they would choose which papal decrees they would accept; (6) that pallium and annate taxes would no longer be paid the curia; and (7) that papal primacy was based on the "False Decretals." This declaration proved to be bluster, for when the nuncio Pacca warned the authors that acts placed in accord with the Ems Punctuation would be held null by the Holy See, they yielded (1787–89). In 1789 began that Revolution which would deprive them of all their temporal possessions, their springboard for Josephinist gestures.

The Synod of Pistoia (1786) was another Josephinist manifesto, aggravated by Baianist, Jansenist, and Febronian errors. It was held under the protection of the emperor's brother, Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, and the presidency of Bishop Scipio Ricci of Pistoia. Some two hundred clerics attended. Besides asserting the aforementioned Josephinist ideas, the synod denied papal power over indulgences and reserved sins, asserted that matrimony was a mere civil contract, advocated episcopal and parochial autonomy, declared the religious state incompatible with the care of souls, and impugned the cult of the Sacred Heart. Pius VI forced Ricci to resign in 1790, and by the bull *Auctorem Fidei* (1794), furnished a detailed condemnation of the errors.

Imperial twilight. Joseph's successor, Leopold II (1790–92), extricated the Habsburg dominions from the effects of political Josephinism, but the dregs of ecclesiastical Josephinism were to trouble the Austrian Church far into the nineteenth century. Leopold II and his son, Francis II (1792–1806), were largely preoccupied with the French Revolution,

which slew their relative Marie Antoinette, sapped monarchical founda-
tions, and nourished a General Bonaparte whose brilliant conquests
brought the Holy Roman Empire to its official end in August, 1806.

C. Prussia

(1) PRUSSIAN RISE

The "Great Elector," Frederick William (1640–88), set himself to
unify his scattered territories. He secured Hohenzollern claims to Cleves
in the Catholic Rhineland at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, and
forced the declining Polish monarchy to concede him a clear title to
Prussia and the Corridor. The separate administration of his diverse
lands was consolidated in a bureaucracy directed from Berlin, a city
which began to prosper after harboring Huguenot refugees from the
Edict of Nantes. To avoid religious dissension in his own lands, the
elector permitted virtual freedom of conscience, though not of external
cult. A mission directed by *Propaganda Fidei* from 1625 was thus able
to continue.

Frederick I (1688–1713) secured recognition of his title of "King in
Prussia" from Emperor Leopold by promising to permit the Catholics of
Brandenburg to hear Mass in the Catholic embassy chapels at Berlin.

Frederick William I (1713–40) imported Belgian factory workers and
hired foreign mercenaries, many of whom were Catholics. After 1719
he bargained for their services by permitting a few Catholic priests to
act openly as their chaplains, though marriages performed by the latter
were still regarded as null in the Prussian law.

(2) PRUSSIAN GREATNESS

Frederick II the Great (1740–86) entered his reign as a Deist with
the religious policy: "Everyone can attain heaven in his own fashion."
Complete religious toleration was the logical conclusion of this principle,
and Frederick normally did not hesitate to draw it, even in favor of
Catholics. Asked to suppress Catholic schools which were beginning to
open, he replied: "All religions must be tolerated, and the authorities
must only see to it that none encroaches upon the other." He insisted
throughout his reign that all religions be placed on an equal footing in
relation to the state and supported by their members alone. Though
personally he contemned supernatural religion, Frederick was convinced
that persecution was bad politics; he even harbored Jesuits after their
suppression. While he permitted freedom of religion, he also allowed
contempt for it. Good citizens, he felt, moreover, must not be lost in
monasteries, hence only a limited number might be permitted to become
clerics or religious. Communications with foreign powers, e.g., the pa-
pacy, ought to be restricted, and ecclesiastical property ought not to be

allowed to accumulate in mortmain. Yet Frederick's interference was less annoying and reprehensible than that of his nominally Catholic brother monarchs.

Frederick William II (1786–97) continued his uncle's policy of toleration, and in 1794 even gave further legal guarantees for ecclesiastical property. With Frederick William III (1797–1840) a new era of Church-state relations in Prussia was to begin, once the whirlwind of the French Revolution had flooded Prussia and receded.

61. WEAKENING OF THE CATHOLIC EAST

A. Polish Collapse (1669–1815)

Introduction. By the Statute of Piotkrow and the Constitution of Radom at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Poland had become an aristocratic state misruled by an assembly of magnates whose possession of the *liberum veto* enabled any member to obstruct progressive legislation. The monarchy correspondingly declined in power, although the Catholic Jagellon and Vasa dynasties until 1668 somewhat held in check these germs of anarchy. Thereafter, however, Poland rapidly descended to destruction at the hands of strong and aggressive neighbors, Prussia and Russia. Continuance of an oppressive serfdom, moreover, prevented any widespread popular regeneration.

(1) ELECTIVE MONARCHY (1669–96)

Michael Wisniowiecki (1669–73). King John II Casimir, last of the Vasas, wearied of internal revolts and unsuccessful foreign wars. In September, 1668, he abdicated and retired to the Abbey of Nevers in France. With him hereditary monarchy ceased. In 1669 the magnates chose Michael Wisniowiecki as king of Poland, chiefly because his father, Prince Jeremy, had distinguished himself in opposing Cossack insurrections. The young and quite inexperienced ruler proved unable to cope simultaneously with domestic and foreign intrigues. He died shortly after General John Sobieski had checked a Turkish invasion at Chocim.

John Sobieski (1674–96). The successful general was elected king by acclamation. He espoused a French alliance which brought little concrete assistance to Poland, and made peace with Sweden. At the Diet of 1678–79, he submerged nationalistic interests to respond to the appeal of Innocent XI to participate in a Catholic league against the Turks, then threatening Vienna. Sobieski's policy in this matter was truly in Poland's own best interest, and the relief of Vienna (1683) justified his intervention. But in trying to follow up his victory in the Balkans, the king failed to receive the support that he needed from Poland and experienced friction with the Austrian command. It is possible, moreover, that Sobieski was not sufficiently alert to the equally dangerous Russian

menace. After his military prestige had been destroyed by several reverses in Rumania, his efforts to introduce internal reforms also failed to elicit popular support. The *liberum veto* and factional dissension even within his own family prevented him from founding a dynasty. John Sobieski, then, was a hero king, but he was a meteor rather than a pole star.

(2) Saxon Period (1697–1763)

Augustus the Strong (1697–1733). The contest for the Polish throne recommenced at Sobieski's death. The nobility turned from a native candidate to a foreigner in the hope of gaining his country as an ally. One faction elected a Bourbon, François de Conti; the other chose Friederich August von Wettin, elector of Saxony. The latter embraced Catholicity and secured the throne with the backing of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. No sooner had the Treaty of Carlowitz (1699) ended the Turkish War, however, than August dragged his exhausted realm into a coalition for the dismemberment of Sweden. But King Charles XII of Sweden surprised everyone by carrying the conflict to his foes' territories. In Poland itself, Charles set up a pretender, Stanislaus Leszczyński (1704–9), and only after a devastating war did August regain his crown with the dangerous assistance of Peter the Great of Russia. Thereafter in dread of this powerful ally, the Polish monarch drew closer to Austria, while Russia and Prussia engaged in secret negotiations for the appropriation of Polish territory.

In **domestic affairs**, the German autocrat clashed with the Polish aristocrats. Polish nobles and Saxon guards were ranging for combat when Peter the Great pretended to arbitrate. In the Confederation of Tarnogrod (1717), he proposed limitation of the Polish army to twenty-four thousand men in order to reduce the possibilities of civil conflict. This suggestion was ratified by the notorious "Dumb Diet," and the Polish military organization received a wound from which it never fully recovered.

In **religious questions**, another cause for disunity lay in the presence of large numbers of Lutherans and Orthodox within the Polish frontiers. In times past these had received many civil and religious privileges, which were resented by the Catholic majority. While the Dissidents—Lutherans and Orientals—sought to extend these concessions, rash and fanatical Catholics endeavored to abridge them, thereby giving Prussia and Russia pretext to intervene on behalf of their coreligionists. In 1717 the Dissidents were excluded from public office, and in 1724 the Toruń incident attracted the attention of Europe. When a mob had destroyed the Jesuit college at Toruń, some ten Protestants were summarily executed despite the intercession of the papal nuncio. Russia and Prussia

at once directed violent propaganda against Poland, and forced the Diet to restore the Dissidents' privileges in 1736.

King August II (1733–63), son of the preceding monarch, won the Polish crown after another disputed election which gave rise to the War of Polish Succession. This time the Polish nobility generally favored their former antiking, Stanislaus Leszczyński, whose daughter had recently married Louis XV of France. But the Russian, Austrian, and Prussian governments insisted on August II, and succeeded in installing him by 1735. The new king normally resided in Saxony and left Polish affairs to the mercy of his favorites, Brühl and Mniszech. Religious and civil strife continued scarcely unabated. The Diet, in express violation of the bull *Magnae Nobis Admirationis* of Benedict XIV, permitted mixed marriages in which sons would be raised indiscriminately in the father's religion and daughters in the mother's. But the bishops in a circular letter from Posen declared the Diet's regulations void.

(3) Partition of Poland

King Stanislaus II (1764–95). At the death of August II, Catherine the Great of Russia secured the election of one of her paramours, Stanislaus Poniatowski. The new monarch, although not without talent and sympathy for his countrymen, usually proved a pawn of Russian foreign policy.

A national revival took place during the latter half of the century in the fine arts and literature, and this stimulated patriotic sentiment. Bishop Naruszewicz (1733–96) was a beloved poet, and Father Stanislaus Konarski (1700–73) outstanding as educator and reformer. Two parties of nobles were demanding reform: the Potocki who hoped for French support, and the Czartoryski seeking Russian intervention. The latter group prevailed in the 1764 Diet which restricted the *liberum veto* and endorsed a modest administrative reform. The clergy were able to secure a law inflicting the death penalty on a noble who would kill a peasant: this was the first breach in the outmoded feudal system. The king, a nephew of Prince Czartoryski, promoted the reform with more vigor than Catherine II desired. When the Diet of 1766 re-enacted former laws against Dissidents and demanded a reform in the army, both Russia and Prussia threatened war. From 1767 onwards, the Diet at Warsaw was muzzled by Repnin, the Russian ambassador, who also organized a group of collaborationists, the Confederation of Radom.

First Partition (1772). With their government under alien control, Polish patriots formed the Confederation of Bar in 1768. Relying on French and Turkish assistance, they commenced a revolt. But no foreign aid was forthcoming, and the poorly armed patriots were crushed by Russian armies. To preserve the "balance of power," Frederick II of

Prussia and Maria Theresa of Austria demanded slices of Poland when Russia annexed Polish territory adjacent to her own.

Second Partition (1792). The patriots now redoubled their efforts. While Russia and Austria were engaged in a war with the Turks, the Four Year Diet (1788–92) pursued its own course. By May, 1791, it had adopted a new constitution providing for an hereditary monarchy under the Saxon dynasty, limited by a bicameral legislative in which the *liberum veto* no longer applied. But in 1792 Russia concluded peace with Turkey and turned on Poland. Prussia, unwilling to be left out, did likewise, and the two powers effected a second partition, to the exclusion of Austria, just weakened by the death of Leopold II.

Third Partition (1795). Thaddeus Kosciusko next proceeded to lead a gallant but hopeless national uprising (1794–95). This general, trained in the American Revolution, drove out the resident Russian troops, but was defeated when Russia and Prussia counterattacked. Converging on Warsaw, the invaders extinguished the revolt. Austria was this time admitted to a share in the third and final partition. Stanislaus was given a pension and Polish independence came to an end until 1918, though Bonaparte for a time sustained a puppet "Grand Duchy of Warsaw" (1806–13) under August (III) of Saxony, king-designate of the 1791 Constitution. This ephemeral and truncated state fell with Bonaparte and Poland was repartitioned by the Congress of Vienna.

B. Russian Rise (1689–1796)

(1) SECULAR HISTORY (1613–1796)

The Romanovs had emerged from the "Time of Troubles" (1605–13) on the Russian throne. Philaret Romanov, Muscovite patriarch, had proved a patriot during the Polish invasion and a national assembly in 1613 chose his son Michael as czar. Philaret, however, remained the real head of the secular government until his death in 1633. He used the prestige of the Greek Orthodox establishment to restore order and to reimpose despotism on impoverished and ignorant serfs. His grandson Alexis (1645–76) discontinued the national assembly.

Peter the Great (1682–1725) was the first of the Romanovs to make much impression on the outside world. Effective despot from 1689, this brutal, if brilliant, despot and crowned boor became intent on westernizing Russia according to impressions gained on several "semi-incognito" visits to Western Europe. Arbitrarily he ordered adoption of French manners and dress, which at least the Russian nobility thenceforward affected. He likewise imposed a complete autocracy more severe than the French model that lasted in substance until the March Revolution of 1917. He secured the Baltic provinces of Esthonia and Latvia from the declining grasp of Sweden, thereby affording Russia a Baltic port

and a wedge into European politics. His designs on Poland have already been noted.

Peter's immediate successors—his wife, grandson, niece, and daughter —were lesser personalities. From 1725 to 1762 court intrigue paralyzed the government and there was little territorial expansion. In 1762 the throne passed to Peter's grandson, Peter III, but before the year was out he had been deposed and murdered by his wife, Catherine of Anhalt, who then usurped the crown.

Catherine the Great, born an insignificant German princess, had been a political protégé of Frederick II of Prussia and long continued to act in concert with his policies. Her reign was a resumption of the work of Peter the Great so that it is frequently said that Peter made Russia a European power, and Catherine raised it to a great power. Unscrupulous and grossly immoral, Catherine yet possessed considerable shrewd insight and daring statesmanship. She extended Russian dominions not only by appropriating the lioness's share of Poland-Lithuania, but by pushing the Turks out of the Crimea and the Caucasus. Russian successes against the Turks inspired the czaress with the hope that by the capture of Constantinople Russia might reach the Mediterranean as well. Until the first World War, Russian policy was directed to this objective, and it is by no means certain that it has been renounced.

(2) Ecclesiastical History

It had been hoped that the Ruthenian Union of Brest (1595) might serve as a bridge to the reunion of the Russian Orthodox Church with Rome. Jesuits who had participated in the Polish revival tried to penetrate into Russia as well. Support given by some Catholic politicians to the foreign invasions of Russia during the "Time of Troubles" prejudiced the Romanov national reaction against the Catholic Church, and Uniates were persecuted by Czars Michael (1613–45) and Alexis (1645–76). Peter Mogila, Orthodox patriarch of Kiev-Radomysl from 1632, raised the decadent and somnolent schismatic theology by his *Cathecism*, largely sound in faith. But when the Muscovite patriarch Nikon tried to correct the liturgy in accord with the standards of Byzantine ceremonial, the Schism of Raskol (1667) took place. A considerable number of quite ignorant but fanatical "old-ritualists" formed a dissenting minority, and by 1917 one third of Russian subjects were nonconformists: Russian radical sects, Protestants, and Catholics, Latin or Ruthenian.

Secularism came in with Peter the Great. Austrian influence was at first strong at court, and Jesuits served on the embassy staff until 1719 when they were expelled, leaving two thousand converts. *Propaganda Fidei* eventually replaced them with Franciscans. Peter was capricious toward Catholics: in 1705 he slew five Basilian monks with his own hand

at Polotsk in an outburst of passion. On the death of the Russian patriarch of Moscow in 1702, Peter placed the schismatic established church under the lay president of the Holy Synod, practically a minister of religion wholly dependent on the czar. Since the complete control of discipline had passed into royal hands, Peter could thump his chest and shout: "Behold your patriarch." Henceforth the Russian state church became an ossified government bureau, all too identified with the ruling autocracy and consequently losing much of its hold upon the oppressed serfs. In 1700 some 557 Orthodox monasteries were secularized under a "department of monasteries," and the monks pensioned and subsidized by grain and wood. Anna Ivanovna (1730–40) consented to prefectures-apostolic for foreign Catholics, but Elizabeth (1741–62) was strongly anti-Catholic and executed or imprisoned those who communicated with priests. On the other hand, Catherine II extended her protection to the Polish Jesuits, and they remained acceptable in Russian dominions until 1820 when the election of an international superior-general gave the crown a pretext to banish them. Catherine's quasi-toleration, however, was limited to the Catholics of the Latin Rite. She persistently strove to force some eight million Ruthenian Catholics into the schismatic establishment. Down to 1917 it remained basic royal policy to uphold the principle that all native Russians ought to be Orthodox Dissidents, although Latin Catholics might enjoy a measure of toleration as to a thoroughly and permanently alien element.

62. IBERIAN DECLINE

A. Spain: 1665–1808

(1) HABSBURG SUNSET (1659–1700)

Retrospect. With the death of King Philip IV (1621–65), who had staked all Spanish resources in the tradition of Philip II on Catholic and Habsburg ascendancy during the Thirty Years' War, Spain's predominance in the world was obviously over. Bourbon France succeeded to the leadership of Europe, and Spain herself soon came under her influence. After the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659), Spain declined rapidly and visibly abroad until at the opening of the twentieth century the first "empire on which the sun never set" had been almost entirely lost. In Europe, Spain soon retired beyond the Pyrenees and sank gradually to the status of a second-rate power. The spiritual and temporal prosperity of the Spanish Church waned with Spain's political importance, chiefly because of the close connection that had always been maintained between Church and state in the Iberian peninsula. Though the Church's hold on the common people was as yet unshaken, the upper classes were not free from the Rationalist currents of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Spain had its benevolent despot, King

Charles III (1759–88), but on the whole there was no decisive and lasting Spanish Renaissance until General Franco's revolt in 1936. Portugal, which had been subjected to the Spanish crown from 1580 to 1640, had regained her independence during the Thirty Years' War, and consequently must again be treated separately in the present topic.

King Charles II (1665–1700), son and successor of Philip IV, was feeble in mind and body. This epileptic, nicknamed Carlos el Hechizado, "the Bewitched," had inherited a country ruined by the exactions in men and money squandered on the Thirty Years' War, which, so far as Spain was concerned, had actually lasted from 1618 to 1659. Charles's confessor and political advisor, the German Jesuit, Father Nithard, undertook the always unpopular policy of deflation and retrenchment. Opposition to his foreign birth nullified his proposed financial reforms. Since Charles II had no children, his illegitimate brother, Don Juan (II), for a time entertained hopes of power. Temporarily he rallied patriotic support, and as soon as the queen mother's regency was terminated in 1676, Don Juan staged a *coup d'état*. He dismissed the queen and Father Nithard, and himself assumed direction of the government. But his death in 1679 removed the last possible native Spanish successor to the sickly monarch.

(2) THE SPANISH SUCCESSION

Partition schemes. A foreign heir therefore became inevitable for the still vast Spanish dominions. Fearing the combination of either Spain or Austria under a Habsburg, or of Spain and France under a Bourbon prince, the Great Powers at first sought a promising compromise candidate. After many proposals, they decided upon Joseph Ferdinand, grandson in the female line of Emperor Leopold I. Since Joseph was due to inherit merely Bavaria, a third- or fourth-rate power, it was felt that his succession to the Spanish throne would not seriously disturb the balance of power. Hence, in 1698 the Great Powers partitioned the Spanish inheritance among Joseph and others, though Charles II, insisting that his dominions should not be divided, made the seven-year-old prince heir to all his lands. But this not unreasonable solution of the dynastic problem was destroyed by the boy's death the following year. Other partitions were next proposed by the powers, while Louis XIV of France sought to obtain the entire inheritance for his younger grandson, Philip of Anjou, a grand-nephew of Charles II. Emperor Leopold, however, claimed that the Spanish dominions ought properly to revert to Charles's Habsburg cousins in Austria, though he tried to relieve the Powers' apprehensions by promising to assign it to his younger son, Archduke Charles, presumably out of the line of succession to the Austrian throne. The Spanish nobility were divided and a diplomatic battle

was waged between Cardinal Portocarrero and Ambassador Harcourt on behalf of France, and the imperial ambassador Harrach and the English envoy Stanhope in the interest of Austria. Finally, a month before his death on November 1, 1700, Charles II was induced to sign a dubiously valid will leaving his whole inheritance to Philip of Anjou.

War of Spanish Succession. After some hesitation, Louis XIV accepted the perilous bequest on behalf of his grandson, embracing him with the significant remark, "The Pyrenees no longer exist." Philip of Anjou proceeded to Madrid where he was proclaimed King Philip V. Perhaps a majority of Castilians received him, although the Catalans, ever jealous of their autonomy, declared for Archduke Charles. The issue depended on whether the British navy in Austrian service could keep open communications with Aragon, and whether the archduke could expel Philip from his possession of the Spanish capital. The British fulfilled their part by seizing Gibraltar and Minorca—which they long retained—but an Allied landing in Aragon failed. The Catalans continued resistance on their own in Charles's behalf. But in 1711 the death of the archduke's elder brother, Emperor Joseph I, without direct heirs, brought him the imperial crown. Since the Great Powers would never allow the recreation of the empire of Charles V, they forced Charles VI to a compromise Peace of Utrecht (1713). By this Philip of Anjou was confirmed in his possession of Spain and its American colonies, though the Italian and Belgian dependencies of the Spanish crown were ceded to Emperor Charles VI. The Catalans, abandoned to Philip's vengeance, were overwhelmed by 1714. The British retained Gibraltar and extorted the Asiento treaty which gave them commercial concessions in Latin America.

(3) THE BOURBONS (1700–1808)

Philip V (1700–46), first of the Bourbon monarchs of Spain, was led into an antipapal policy by his prime minister, Cardinal Alberoni. Disputing royal rights of patronage, the crown sequestered papal funds. Philip closed the papal nunciature at Madrid in 1709 on the ground that Clement XI had favored Archduke Charles. The pope refused canonical institution to royal nominees to sees, and Philip utilized a papal subsidy to attack Italy.

Elizabeth Farnese, Philip's second wife whom he married in 1714, somewhat improved relations with the papacy, and Alberoni was forced out of power in 1719. She, however, dragged Spain into wars in order to secure Italian thrones for her own children. The Polish Succession War gained the Two Sicilies for Charles, and the Austrian Succession contest seated Philip Junior on the throne of Parma. In 1737 a concordat with the Holy See repudiated the *placet,* while restricting clerical privileges.

Ferdinand VI (1746–59) succeeded Philip V on his death in 1746. This monarch terminated the War of Austrian Succession and refused to be entangled in the Seven Years' War. Chapman estimates that his economic reforms prepared the way for his successor's prosperous reign. Ferdinand opposed the Freemasons, and in 1753 ended disputes with the Holy See over patronage. The king died childless, and was followed by his half-brother, Charles of Naples, son of Elizabeth Farnese.

Charles III (1759–88), hitherto king of the Two Sicilies, left that realm to his son, and moved to Spain. His ecclesiastical policy was regalistic; he proscribed the Jesuits and curtailed clerical rights. In alliance with his Bourbon cousins of France, Charles III belatedly joined in both the Seven Years' War and that of the American Revolution. In the first contest, Spain's colonial possessions lost heavily, but she was compensated for the cession of Florida by receiving Louisiana from France. During the second war, Spain regained both Florida and Minorca. At home Charles showed himself a competent enlightened despot in material things. But material prosperity was purchased at the expense of encouragement of rationalist influences.

Charles IV (1788–1808). If Charles III was a pale reflection of Louis XIV of France, Charles IV combined the faults of the reigns of Louis XV and Louis XVI. Neither shrewd nor virtuous, the king fell under the domination of his wife, Maria Luisa, and her paramour Godoy, whom the king named prime minister (1792–1808). While the state was honeycombed with corruption and incompetence, the Church was severely attacked. Education was increasingly secularized in the higher branches, and rationalist instruction provided in institutes founded by confiscating ecclesiastical property. Godoy tried to outwit Napoleon Bonaparte by diplomatic duplicity, without preparing an adequate defense against the French armies. Bonaparte, however, lured king, queen, and premier to the French town of Bayonne where he forced them to abdicate in his favor—brother Joseph Bonaparte was then named vassal king of Spain.

B. Portugal (1640–1807)

(1) RECOVERY OF INDEPENDENCE

John IV (1640–56). After Portugal had been virtually a Spanish province for sixty years, John, duke of Braganza, and Portuguese patriots known as the *Restaurodores* seized the opportunity of Spain's involvement in the Thirty Years' War to proclaim anew Portugal's independence. With English and French assistance, John was able to assume the crown, though his government was not recognized by Spain. Influenced by Spain's protests, the papacy likewise refused diplomatic recognition to John IV. This precipitated a virtual schism which lasted until 1668. During this period the popes refused to confirm nominations to episcopal

sees by the Portuguese crown and by 1668 but one canonical prelate remained. John IV was successful in recovering Brazil from the Dutch who had seized it from the Spaniards. Despite the nominal Catholicity of Portugal, religious life there in modern times lagged behind that of Spain in its intensity and loyalty, and a certain aloofness from the Holy See was displayed by the clergy.

Alfonso VI (1656–83), elder son of John IV, was a vicious and irresponsible tyrant who continued to alienate Portugal from the Holy See. Through the marriage of his sister Catherine to Charles II of England, that traditional alliance was strengthened—at the price of Bombay, ceded to the English. After the king's incapacity had become intolerable, his younger brother Peter exiled him and assumed the regency. Queen Maria di Savoia, wife of the deposed ruler, obtained a decree of nullity from the Lisbon chapter on the plea of non-consummation, and was dispensed by her uncle, Cardinal Vendôme, to marry Peter. Pope Clement IX, when the case was subsequently referred to him for judgment, asserted that the cardinal had exceeded his jurisdiction, but ratified the new marriage on his own authority.

Peter II (1667–1706) as regent and, after 1683, king of Portugal, ruled quite ably and secured recognition of Portuguese independence from Spain in 1668. This removed any obstacle to papal-royal accord in Portugal, and Clement IX hastened to recognize Peter II and fill the vacant episcopal sees. The Methuen Treaty of 1703 with England assured Portugal close commercial co-operation, and gave Portugal a share in British prosperity. Colonial profits from the Indies enabled Peter and his successors to dispense with the cortes or legislature, which did not meet from 1691 to 1820.

(2) DECLINE OF THE MONARCHY

John V (1706–50), Peter's son, was an extravagant and immoral ruler whose parade of religious fervor prejudiced the cause of religion and encouraged the advance of Rationalism. Arrogantly the king insisted that the Holy See give the cardinal's hat to the incompetent nuncio, Valente Bichi, whom Benedict XIII had seen fit to recall. When this request was refused, the king broke off diplomatic relations with Rome in 1725. Eventually Clement XII chose Bichi's elevation to the cardinalate as the lesser evil. A concordat concerning colonial patronage was reached in 1748.

Joseph (1750–77) was made famous only through his prime minister, Don Carvalho, marquis of Pombal, who opened the attack on the Jesuits. Pombal's policies toward the Church paralleled those of Aranda in the Spain of Charles III. He made of Coimbra University a rationalist center which long influenced both lay and clerical alumni. A slavish imitator of

foreign mercantilism, Pombal was far from being a great financier, and left the civil and military service with huge unpaid bills. Yet he ruled arbitrarily until 1774 when the king's insanity enabled the queen-regent, in response to popular resentment against Pombal, to restrict his influence.

Maria I (1777–1816), Joseph's daughter, who married her uncle, Peter III (1777–86), dismissed Pombal and his anticlerical measures, while retaining some of his administrative reforms. But soon after her husband's death, the queen became mentally deranged and their son John was named regent in 1792. He strove to eradicate the ideas of the French Revolution, then invading the country, by repression. Bonaparte, however, resented Portugal's trade with Britain and in 1807 French and Spanish troops invaded Portugal to partition it. The royal family fled to Brazil where it remained until 1820, while the country became a battleground between French and British.

63. BRITISH CATHOLIC VICISSITUDES

A. The Restored Stuart Monarchy (1660–89)

(1) CHARLES II (1660–85)

Charles Stuart was slight of build, black-haired, with a patrician nose and gently cynical humor. Behind a mask of feigned indolence, he concealed great political acumen. Well aware of what had befallen his father, Charles was in any event resolved "not to go on his travels again." He was immoral, but not the political slave of his mistresses. In times of adversity he turned to his long-suffering Catholic wife, Catherine of Braganza, whose dowry had been Bombay. Despite a velleity for Catholicity, the king never imperiled his political fortune by a courageous avowal until on his deathbed.

The **"Cavalier Parliament"** (1661–79), riding on the wave of Restoration popularity, re-established Anglicanism and discriminated against all dissenters, although without imposing a death penalty. Legislation regarding religion passed under the prime minister, the earl of Clarendon, is known as the "Clarendon Code." This included: (1) the Corporation Act (1661) excluding dissenters from local office by requiring town officials to receive Anglican communion thrice annually; (2) the Uniformity Act (1662) obliging all clergymen, college fellows, and schoolmasters to use the *Book of Common Prayer*—now containing a commemoration of Charles I, "king and martyr"; (3) the Conventicle Act (1664) which banned nonconformist religious meetings in which four externs besides the family were present; and (4) the Five Mile Act (1665) banishing nonconformists five miles from a corporate town. Though not all of these provisions were consistently enforced, they served to expel from the Anglican establishment all nonconformists who

had hitherto claimed to work for a change in doctrine or discipline within its body. Some two thousand clergymen thereby lost Anglican benefices, which were then often filled by mere time-servers. The Catholics shared the plight of other dissenters, although they were scarcely worse off than before.

The "Cabal" (1667–73). After the dismissal of Clarendon in 1667, royal policies were conducted through a group of ministers nicknamed the "Cabal" from their initials: Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale, of whom the first two were Catholics. This privileged pair, who alone enjoyed the king's confidence, in 1670 negotiated the secret Treaty of Dover with Louis XIV of France. By its terms Charles II, in exchange for an annual subsidy from Louis of £300,000, promised to ally England with France against the Dutch, embrace Catholicity, and secure toleration for Catholics in England. In 1672 Charles tried to carry out one of his pledges by issuing a "Declaration of Indulgence" which dispensed all dissenters, including Catholics, from effects of the penal laws. But when the king yielded to popular dissatisfaction with the Dutch War to conclude a separate peace with Holland, Louis XIV, piqued, informed Ashley of the secret pact of Dover. Ashley, Protestant and Freemason, broke up by the "Cabal" by his resignation.

Whig opposition to royal absolutism was henceforth led in parliament by this Ashley, later earl of Shaftesbury. He may be regarded as founder of the Whig party which felt it necessary to curb monarchical power. Through his influence, parliament in 1673 defeated ratification of the royal Declaration of Indulgence, and instead passed the Test Act which disqualified for public office all who refused to receive Anglican communion and to denounce Catholic transubstantiation—this law barred Catholics until 1829. The king next gave his favor to Thomas Osborne, earl of Danby, founder of the Tory loyalists, who was prime minister from 1673 to 1678. Patching up his differences with Louis XIV, Charles secured new subsidies which enabled him to rule independently of parliamentary grants for the rest of his life.

The "Popish Plot" (1678–81). In 1678 the Whigs exploited the testimony of a supposed ex-Jesuit, Titus Oates, who claimed to reveal a "papist plot" to murder the king and place the Catholic duke of York on the throne with the aid of French troops. Though convicted of falsehood by the king's own cross-examination, Oates's tale was generally believed and aroused great popular excitement. Armed bands were formed to celebrate Queen Elizabeth's birthday as a demonstration against the "papists." The furore was heightened when Colman, Duke James's secretary, imperiled the Catholics by indiscreet letters to Louis XIV. When Sir Edmund Godfrey, the sheriff before whom Oates had given his "evidence" was found dead, many came forward to declare that

they had seen a Jesuit run his body through with a sword. The king weakly yielded to the popular frenzy to sacrifice the lives of some twenty or thirty priests and laymen during 1679. In 1680, William Howard, viscount Stafford, was executed, and in 1681 Blessed Oliver Plunkett, archbishop of Armagh, followed him to the block—though the latter was the last man executed on a religious charge in England. Oates was eventually convicted of perjury and imprisoned, but released by William III. After attempting another denunciation in 1691, he died in 1705.

Royal reaction. Meanwhile Ashley—Dryden's "Achitophel"—aspired to become prime minister and to exclude the Catholic duke of York from succeeding to the throne. But as often as his "Exclusion Bill" was passed by parliament (1679, 1680), the king dissolved that assembly. When the parliament of 1681 laid down the ultimatum, "no taxes without exclusion," the king, by now subsidized anew from France, dissolved parliament and did not call another during his reign. Whig clubs were closed and Ashley considered it prudent to flee to Holland. During his last years, Charles II remained loyal to his brother's interests, and debarred as illegitimate his son by Lucy Waters, the duke of Monmouth. Charles ended his life as political master, politely begging pardon for being "such an unconscionable time in dying."

(2) JAMES II (1685–88)

James, duke of York, secured the English throne despite the rising of the duke of Monmouth. James II was a conscientious, obstinate, solemn, and harsh-tempered ruler. He professed his Catholic religion, to which he had announced his conversion, ostentatiously, and dispensed Catholics from all legal disabilities, including the Test Act. The Jesuit Father Petre was included in his council, and a Benedictine presented for a degree at Cambridge. The Catholic vicariate-apostolic was restored in 1685 and subdivided into four districts, each with an episcopal vicar, in 1688.

"The Glorious Revolution." Although Pope Innocent XI warned the king to proceed cautiously in his patronage of Catholics, King James held defiantly to his bold course. A crisis was provoked when the king ordered the Anglican prelates to read a new Declaration of Indulgence, already rejected by parliament, from their pulpits. Primate Sancroft and six other prelates refused, and when the king brought them to trial a jury acquitted them with the hearty approval of London. Yet James's foes might have left him to end his days on the throne, had it not been for the unexpected birth of a male heir. In 1688 James's second and Catholic wife, Mary of Modena, gave birth to a son, James, later the "Old Pretender," "James III." This boy took precedence of James's daughters by his first and Protestant wife, Anne Hyde, Clarendon's daughter. Instead of an elderly Catholic king, an indefinite Catholic

dynasty seemed in prospect for strongly Protestant England. Accordingly "seven eminent persons" among the nobility entered into communication with James's elder daughter Mary and her husband, William III of Holland. After hesitating during the summer of 1688, William of Orange landed at Torbay on November 5, 1688. When most of the nobility, including his own daughter Anne, flocked to William's standard, James II, unwilling to provoke civil strife, hurled the Great Seal into the Thames and sailed for France. Thus, in Belloc's words, "the last king left England."

B. Parliamentary Oligarchy

(1) THE WHIG SETTLEMENT

Constitutional guarantees. The victorious Whigs decreed that: "King James, having endeavored to subvert the constitution of this kingdom by breaking his original contract between king and people, and by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons having violated the fundamental laws . . . has abdicated the government." Next parliament adjudged the vacant crown to Mary II (1689–94) and William III (1689–1702) jointly. This was the seal on the "Glorious Revolution," which permanently destroyed absolute monarchy in England, and inaugurated a century and a half of parliamentary oligarchy. For down to the Reform Bill of 1832, the landed nobles and squires, usually Anglicans and Tories, allied themselves on basic governmental principles with the commercial and industrial classes, often Whigs and Protestant dissenters. Although they might differ on secondary points and the degree of influence which they left to the crown, these alternating factions were agreed that Stuart "divine right" claims were irrevocably refuted. Parliamentary supremacy was assured by the Bill of Rights (1689) which forbade the king to dispense from the laws, levy any money save through parliament, muster troops, or tamper with justice. Soon William III discovered that his ministers worked better when they were of the same party allegiance as the majority faction in parliament. Although the process was gradual and halting, executive power within a century passed from the monarch to a ministry responsible to a majority of the legislature.

Religious toleration was granted in accord with deist ideas. The Act of Toleration of 1689 conceded liberty of conscience to all dissenters save Catholics, Unitarians, Jews, and infidels. The Uniformity, Conventicle, and Five Mile Acts were repealed, though the Corporation and Test Acts still excluded Catholics—and some conscientious non-conformists— from public office. All dissenters, however, had to continue to contribute to the support of the Anglican Establishment, even though they

might personally attend some licensed chapel of their own denomination.

The penal code, however, was still in force for Catholics, and was even augmented. Catholics were forbidden to inherit land, own arms, or a horse, or send their children to be educated abroad. Priests might be imprisoned for life if discovered saying Mass, although this was not always rigidly enforced. Since the Tridentine prohibition against clandestine marriage had never been promulgated in England, Catholics were not yet hampered in regard to the civil effects of marriage. They were subjected, however, to a legal, social, and economic persecution which varied with the severity of the judge and the animosity of their neighbors on the jury. Finally, the Act of Succession of 1701 formally excluded Catholics or anyone married to Catholics from the English throne.

(2) ORANGE-STUART ERA (1689-1714)

William III defended his throne during the War of English Succession (1689-97). James's Irish adherents were crushed at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690, and Scottish resistance was intimidated by the Massacre of Glencoe (1692). Great Britain was thenceforth a political reality. Because of his skill in foreign affairs, the king exercised considerable influence on the government, although even he found it prudent to choose his ministers from men favored by parliament.

Queen Anne (1702-14). Since William and Mary II were childless, the second Protestant daughter of James II succeeded to the throne. She was largely dominated by the Churchills: the duke of Marlborough was a brilliant commander during the Spanish Succession War, and his wife Sarah acted as the queen's confidante. Anne was somewhat more dependent on her ministers than William III, and was the last English monarch to date to exercise the royal veto—henceforth, though legally permissible, such action is apparently not "cricket." In 1707 England and Scotland were legally united into the kingdom of Great Britain with a common parliament.

Jacobite restoration remained the dream of many partisans of the deposed King James II (d. 1702), or of his Catholic descendants. Though Queen Anne and her husband, Prince George of Denmark, had twenty-three children, none had survived. According to the Act of Succession, therefore, the British crown must pass to Sophia, electress of Hanover, and her descendants, "being Protestants." Actually Sophia predeceased Anne, but her son George, great-grandson of James I of England, eventually succeeded to the throne. Nonetheless, Jacobites tried to avert the Hanoverian succession by negotiations with the Pretender. This en-

couraged the Stuarts to stage a rising in Scotland where "James III" landed in 1715. But the duke of Argyle dispersed the ill-organized and undecided Jacobites with comparative ease and James hurried back to the Continent. Since Catholics were identified with the Jacobite cause by the Hanoverian government, this rising of the "Old Pretender" resulted in more severe enforcement of the penal laws. Then anxiety waned only to be reawakened by a second Jacobite uprising of the "Young Pretender." "Bonnie Prince Charlie," son of "James III," landed in Scotland and actually penetrated into the north of England before he was routed by the royal forces. This repulse permanently ended Stuart hopes of restoration, and the exiled male line of the Stuarts ended in 1807 with "Henry IX," Cardinal Henry Stuart, who bequeathed the royal insignia to the *de facto* King George III. Catholics, freed from the Stuart albatross, might now hope for some toleration.

(3) HANOVERIAN PERIOD TO 1778

Parliament became even more influential when the crown passed to German monarchs. Though by no means fools, George I (1714–27) and George II (1727–60) were more interested in being absolute monarchs in Hanover than in trying to master the English language and customs. They allowed Robert Walpole, a typical Whig, to take over the royal presidency of the ministry, and to become the first of the parliamentary prime ministers (1721–42)—the title was not officially mentioned until the twentieth century. The effort of the English born George III (1760–1820) to recover royal prerogatives led to the American Revolution. Its outcome was not conducive to royal prestige, and soon after the first of recurring fits of insanity incapacitated the monarch.

Catholics had been burdened with a double tax in 1722, but thereafter the penal code received no additions, and its enforcement relaxed after the final Jacobite failure in 1746. As late as 1767, however, Father Maloney was sentenced to death, although the penalty was not actually imposed. The dejected "faithful remnant" of sixty thousand Catholics began to open schools and reorganize. In this work the three hundred priests were led in particular by Richard Challoner (1691–1781), vicar-apostolic of the London district from 1740. His revision of the Douay translation of the Bible, his *Meditations,* his *Lives* of English saints and martyrs—all supplied his flock with the minimum essentials of a Catholic literature in the vernacular. He set up chapels and schools, although these could not yet be legally acknowledged as such. He held retreats in taverns, with beer steins as camouflage. Priest-hunters often gave him trouble, but he survived to see the passage of the first Catholic Relief Bill in 1778. In 1754 Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Bill outlawed clandestine marriages. From this date to 1835 Catholics had to be married be-

fore an Anglican minister to obtain legal recognition of their married status, and according to this criterion the marriage of the Catholic Mrs. FitzHerbert to the prince of Wales, later George IV, was valid both in the eyes of the Catholic Church and the Anglican establishment. It was not, however, recognized by king and parliament. A new period of the history of the Church in England begins with the Catholic Relief Act of 1778.

Part II

THE CHURCH IN AN

AGNOSTIC WORLD

*

Section I

LIBERAL AGNOSTICISM

1789-1870

VIII

Liberal Revolutions

64. NATURE OF LIBERALISM

A. Liberalism in General

(1) DEFINITIONS

Liberalism, according to common usage since the French Revolution, has in general connoted freedom of the individual human spirit from social tyranny. The term itself seems to have first been used in 1811 to designate advocates of the new Spanish Constitution, an imitation of the revolutionary French document of 1791. It remains, indeed, an elusive and shifting designation, for though at first it suggested chiefly revolutionary liberation from something, once established, more recent "Welfare Liberalism" argues about freedom for something. Certain generic characteristics, however, can be predicated of this movement in its historical setting. Following Dr. Neill,[1] these may be enumerated for "Integral Liberalism," or Liberalism in general: (1) strongly bourgeois membership; (2) capitalistic economic theory; (3) nonconformist attitude toward religion; (4) a reverence for property; (5) preference for empirical, scientific knowledge; (6) optimism; (7) rationalism; and (8) a faith in the possibility of unlimited progress.

Idealistic or Ecumenical Liberalism, however, stands for a vague generosity of spirit or liberality of mind. "Liberalism, we are told, is not a creed, a doctrine, a system; it is a way of life, a spirit a habit of mind, a Weltanschauung, a kind of religion, a belief in the natural dignity of man, in his high destiny, in his ability to perfect himself through natural

---

[1] Thomas Neill, *Rise and Decline of Liberalism* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1953), pp. 12, 16–21.

reason and self-determination, in the ultimate triumph of truth, justice, and freedom.' It is the consciousness which the free man has of his rights and of his duties as well. It stands for loftiness of views, for generosity of sentiment; it is based on the ideal that humanity . . . can be enlightened by discussion and improved by the very experience of its errors.' " [2]

(2) Evaluation

Briefly, it may be said that Liberalism's justification or condemnation lies in whether it repudiates the abuse of authority, or the very principle of authority itself; whether it distinguishes between infallible divine authority enjoining immutable divine law in the human conscience, or fallible human government legislating on matters of changing opinion. Liberalism can stand for the glorious tradition of Western Civilization resisting despotism in the spirit of Herodotus: "Though the Greeks are freemen, they are not free in every respect. Law is the master they own, and this master they fear more than thy subjects fear you." Widely as they may have differed on other points, on such grounds even Herbert Hoover and Franklin Delano Roosevelt might find themselves in agreement. Yet since the French Revolution, Integral Liberalism—Liberalism unqualified as to species or degree—has indeed taken on a pejorative sense in Church history, even if not always deserving of Sarda y Salvani's uncompromising phrase: *"Liberalismo es pecado."* For many liberals have not understood the classic tradition of "Christian Humanism" and have been betrayed into sweeping denunciations of all authority, a course which repudiates true Liberalism as well. Luther and Calvin can be cited both for as well as against religious despotism; Rousseau was parent alike of Democracy and Fascism; Kant can lead to Nietzsche; some of Adam Smith's disciples made of his tenets a code of economic oppression; and that great alleged champion of the common man, Marxism-Leninism, admits that it involves the "dictatorship of the proletariat." Because of these manifold senses and nuances of Liberalism, accuracy demands a more thorough inquiry into specific types of Liberalism in the intellectual, political and economic orders.

B. *Theological Liberalism*

(1) Liberalism and Dogma: Indifferentism

Nature. It is of course theological Liberalism which chiefly falls under the condemnation of the Church. In modern times Liberal challenges to dogma appeared under the guise of Indifferentism, Rationalism and Modernism. Such theological Liberalism, according to Cardinal New-

[2] Raymond Corrigan, S.J., *The Church and the Nineteenth Century* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1938), pp. 27–28.

man, involves "false liberty of thought, or the exercise of thought upon matters in which, from the constitution of the human mind, thought cannot be brought to any successful issue, and therefore is out of place. Among such matters are first principles of whatever kind; and of these the most sacred and momentous are especially to be reckoned the truths of Revelation. Liberalism, then, is the mistake of subjecting to human judgment those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and independent of it, and of claiming to determine on intrinsic grounds the truth and value of propositions which rest for their reception on the external authority of the Divine Word." [3]

Historically, during the period now under survey, Pope Pius VI condemned the aberrations of the Synod of Pistoia by *Auctorem Fidei* (1794); Leo XII warned against various rationalist "Bible Societies" in *Ubi Primum* (1824); Gregory XVI rejected both the Indifferentism of Lammenais (1832) and the Rationalism of Hermes (1835), while Pius IX summed up for reprobation all the latitudinarian errors in his *Syllabus Errorum* (1864). Finally, after reaffirming Catholic teaching on Faith and reason, the Vatican Council during 1870 flung the definition of papal infallibility in the face of both dogmatic Liberals and Catholic opportunists.

(2) LIBERALISM AND DISCIPLINE: ANTICLERICALISM

Nature. Somewhat less definitely anti-Catholic was the Liberal challenge to discipline as expressed in anticlericalism. Ostensibly it was not a question here of outright denial of a divinely constituted hierarchy, so much as a charge that individual clerics were abusing their sacred office on behalf of politics, or opposing social progress through reactionary attachment to the Old Regime. Doubtless an academic distinction can be drawn between opposition to clerics as individuals and that to the clergy as the Church's official ministers. In practice, however, it is ever difficult to pursue such distinctions without error. As a matter of fact, however, much professed "anticlericalism" was a Liberal disguise for anti-Catholicism: Courdaroux admitted to the masonic lodge at Lille in 1879 that, however useful a distinction might be for propaganda purposes, "let us admit here among ourselves that Catholicism and clericalism are but one."

Influence. Still it must be admitted that some clerics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries did meddle in politics. In Latin lands especially, the clergy tended to remain uncompromising monarchists, basking in and later harking back to the privileged status of the Old Regime. But in so doing the majority were seeking to uphold ecclesiastical rights

[3] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1897), note A, p. 288.

over morality, education, matrimony, etc., which the Liberal war on "throne and altar" endangered. Insofar as the Liberal program usually embraced divorce, civil marriage, secular schools, and unlimited tolerance of blasphemy, immorality, and falsity, this majority can scarcely be blamed for their attitude. Some of these clerics, it is true, were more attached to the material perquisites of their profession, and this minority by their excesses exposed the whole body to attack. It was possible, then, for some anticlericals in their indignation against real abuses or selfishness to be more or less in good faith during the early stages of an anticlerical campaign.

C. *Philosophical Liberalism* ⁷/₁₅

(1) SUBJECTIVIST TREND

Cartesianism, which inaugurated "modern" philosophy, had been initially an attempt to safeguard rational certitude against the Scepticism of Cusa and Montaigne. Yet, as has been already noted, this Cartesian quest for philosophic security had terminated in the new and more destructive Scepticism of David Hume by the close of the eighteenth century. Liberal philosophy then resumed its search for absolute certitude with Immanuel Kant (1724–1804). Despairing of any certitude derived from metaphysical reality, Kant proceeded to erect an ivory tower of Idealism, protected by subjective postulates designed to safeguard morality: a "categoric imperative" assured men of the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and freedom of the will. Unfortunately this meant—and this tendency is clearer in Kant's disciples—that these are postulates of "practical reason," eventually of the will, or belief, or sentiment, and cannot be demonstrated to have objective validity. This Idealistic Agnosticism of the Kantian type, moreover, according to its conceptualist view of the universal, reduced it to a subjective category, destroyed the basis of systematic knowledge, threatened, if logically applied, to render science individual and subjective. Hence modern man was given no philosophical explanation of his natural certitude regarding the objectivity of principles.

Over against Kant's Idealistic Subjectivism appeared an empirical "Sociology" of Auguste Comte (1798–1857), who issued a clarion call for unification of all science in and for humanitarianism. Rejecting alike Revelation and metaphysics, his science of man would be pure biology. In 1851 he set forth a plan for a "Statolatry": twenty thousand sociologist-priests under a high priest at Paris would administer the nine positivist sacraments—the last to be conferred seven years after the subject's death! The pure doctrine of Comte was scarcely implemented, but it cannot be denied that through disciples and imitators much of it was rephrased and widely accepted.

Reconciliation of the Kantian school of Individualism with the positivist cult of Sociologism became the great dilemma for philosophic Liberalism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Despairing of any immediate fusion of enlightened Egoism with social Utilitarianism, Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) espoused evolutionary ethical standards and relegated absolute morality to some indefinite future. Before the formulation of this ideal code, however, Liberals were dismayed to observe widespread renunciation of individual freedom under totalitarian dictatorships.

(2) EVALUATION

"The only thing that can be said to the credit of the so-called Liberal philosophers is that ever since 1850 most of them have realized that the recent extension of positive science to social facts was bound to bring about this new fatalism. . . . Unfortunately, themselves the sons of Kant and Hume, they had lost faith in the rational validity of all metaphysical knowledge. Thus, left without any set of philosophical convictions concerning man, his nature, and his destiny, they had nothing wherewith to oppose the progressive encroachments of science on the field of human facts. This is the reason why, for want of a rational metaphysics by which the use of science could be regulated, the Liberal philosophers had no other choice than to attack science itself and weaken its absolute rationality. The source of modern Agnosticism is the fear of scientific determinism in the hearts of men who, by breaking metaphysical Rationalism, had broken the very backbone of human liberty. . . ." [4]

D. *Political Liberalism*

(1) THEORY

"In its essence true Liberalism is associated neither with 'progressivism' nor with 'conservatism.' When the existing regime is dominated by autocracy or despotism, the followers of liberalism are ardent reformers and demand rapid and widespread political changes. When, on the other hand, a country has a free and democratic government and this government seems threatened by a drift towards autocracy and despotism, the true liberal is a conservative, resisting all efforts to overthrow the existing regime. . . . To the present writer it seems clear that Liberalism as a political creed is a compound of two separate elements. One of these elements is Democracy, the other is Individualism. Not infrequently these two elements are confused because of their long association inside the Liberal tradition, but it is well to keep the two doctrines

[4] Étienne Gilson, *Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 291.

clearly separate and distinct. Democracy, of course, means the belief that ultimate political control should rest with the citizens of the country concerned and more particularly with the numerical majority of such citizens, rather than be entrusted permanently to a single person or to any minority group. . . . To be sharply distinguished from Democracy is the doctrine of Individualism, which implies the right of each person to control his actions as long as he does not seriously interfere with the liberty or the actions of others." [5]

(2) Practice

Political Liberalism is predominantly of Anglo-Saxon origin. Without doubt Anglo-Saxon constitutional theory owed much to Greek and Christian antecedents, but the European Continent shared these influences as well. It was in England that Scholastic democracy, however altered, had a chance to maintain a fairly continuous tradition which resisted and survived the continental vogue of Absolutism. The contest with Stuart's "divine right" illusions evoked defenders of parliamentary constitutionalism, and their utterances were crystallized in the political bible of John Locke. French political writers were not ashamed to acknowledge their indebtedness to Locke, and the Founding Fathers of the American Republic made him their text—though probably deriving more from their practical colonial experience. Self-government, moreover, had always survived to a degree in the English countryside, to be reborn on the American frontier. The economic revolutions that destroyed the nobles' monopoly of politics prepared the way for a broadening of the suffrage in England, though classes admitted to political influence often showed little zeal in extending its benefits to those below them on the political ladder—if they did not actually kick over the ladder. Meanwhile on the Continent, the French "Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen" had destroyed forever the bases of the Old Regime—the concessions and the failures of the restored monarchs demonstrate this. For good or ill, the will of the people would henceforth have to be consulted, even if its wishes were not always followed, or even "interpreted" or perverted by demagogues and dictators. Democracy, finally, became such a magic word that even totalitarian dictatorships had to claim to be "democratic"; however, a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," if it has not perished from the earth, has by no means won its struggle for existence.

[5] William McGovern, *From Luther to Hitler* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1941), p. 10.

E. Economic Liberalism

(1) Transition from Mercantilism

Corresponding to the political age of absolutism had been an equally prevalent adherence to the economic theory of Mercantilism, the minute governmental regulation of economic life. But François Quesnay (1694–1744) and his school of "Physiocrats" came to oppose this notion with the argument that governmental authority was merely a necessary evil and therefore ought to be curbed as much as possible. Instead, government should give individual liberty and initiative free rein. The Physiocrats employed the term *laissez faire,* and one of their number, Turgot, was minister of King Louis XVI from 1774 to 1776. In the latter year, moreover, appeared Adam Smith's book, *Wealth of Nations,* which gave greater currency to similar doctrines in Great Britain. "All systems, either of preference or restraint, being thus completely taken away," he concluded, "the simple and obvious system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord." In its economic aspect, the American Revolution of the same year was a breach in Mercantilism. As soon as the French Revolution got under way, the most radical economic Liberalism was for a time proclaimed. Thus during 1791 the *Loi Chapelier* abolished trade guilds and all professional societies. At first these changes to individual liberty were chiefly of benefit to the new industrial capitalists who easily outdistanced poorer individuals in very non-collective bargaining, while the state remained muzzled.

(2) Characteristics of Economic Liberalism

Theory. "As developed by the classical economists and crystallized in the writings of Senior, economic Liberalism was a mighty prop to the new industrialists. It maintained that the 'greatest good of the greatest number' would be promoted by encouraging business enterprise and individual industrial profit, and that such encouragement could best be given through a policy of *laissez faire* freedom of trade, freedom of contract, freedom of competition, free operation of the 'laws' of supply and demand, without interference by government or social groups." [6]

Laissez-faire maxims may be appraised from the following samples: "The natural price of labor is that price which is necessary to enable the laborers to subsist and perpetuate their race without either increase or diminution. . . . There is no means of improving the lot of the worker except by limiting the number of his children. . . . All legislative interference must be pernicious" (Ricardo). "The poverty of the incapable, the distresses that come upon the imprudent, the starvation of the idle,

[6] Carlton Hayes, *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936), II, 169.

are the decrees of a large, far-seeing benevolence" (Spencer). "The true gospel concerning wealth . . . is that the law of competition is basic to economic society, divine and irrevocable . . . because it ensures the survival of the fittest in every department" (Carnegie). "Godliness is in league with riches. . . . Material prosperity is helping make the national character sweeter, more joyous, more unselfish, more Christlike" (Protestant prelate of Massachusetts, Dr. Lawrence). [7]

Summary. "If we were to characterize modern Western society in a single word, one such word would unquestionably be Contractualism . . . of economic relationship . . . of government of the people . . . of religion. . . . Marriage was also made more contractual in its continuity and dissolution; . . . the family tended to become an increasingly contractual institution. . . ." [8]

65. ECONOMIC REVOLUTIONS

A. *Industrial Revolution*

(1) COMING OF THE REVOLUTION

Survey of industrial evolution. The first stage was that of the primitive family which co-operated without specialization in supplying all of its needs. This lasted into the early Middle Ages, although there are rare survivals today. The second stage is that of handicraft, when the cultivation of food crops has reached a development sufficient to permit a group of craftsmen to specialize in the making of articles for sale. This stage, flowering during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, requires and stimulates urban growth and improved communications. The craftsman, however, had a limited market and usually sold directly to the customer without a middleman. Skill was more important than capital, and associations known as guilds protected good workmanship and fair dealing. It has been seen that these guild regulations were in an ossified or decadent condition by the sixteenth century. A third stage appeared during the later Middle Ages and has been termed the domestic system. Now capitalists and middlemen increase in importance for supplying raw materials to individual workmen at home, collecting the finished articles, and marketing them. The workers remained their own masters as to time, tools, and working conditions, but they became much more dependent on outside merchants. This system lasted into the eighteenth century and has not yet ceased in all places. A fourth stage was that of the factory where the worker was required to labor on the employer's terms: in a place and with tools provided by the latter, and under conditions and

[7] Emmet Hughes, *The Church and Liberal Society* (Princeton University Press, 1944), pp. 157–58, 200.

[8] Pitrim Sorokin, *Crisis of Our Age* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1942), pp. 170 ff.

for wages largely controlled by the capitalist. Although factories existed as early as the days of the Roman Empire, full utilization of such a procedure awaited the introduction of power-driven machinery.

"The term, 'Industrial Revolution,' was first made popular by Arnold Toynbee who chose it as the title of a course of lectures published after his death in 1884. . . . The industrial transformation of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was marked by two outstanding features, each of which deserves to be qualified as revolutionary: (a) an enormous acceleration in the rate of economic change; (b) an intensification of the social suffering which has hitherto been the invariable concomitant of ruthlessly pursued economic progress. . . . In its essence, the Industrial Revolution means the substitution of industry for agriculture as the principal occupation of the leading European peoples. . . . The immediate causes of this great transformation were mainly two: (a) the opening up of new markets by the expansion of overseas trade; (b) the development of mass machine methods of production. . . . The marks of an industrialized state are: (a) a high degree of urbanization; (b) a large industrial population; (c) an excess of imports over exports in regard to food and raw materials; (d) conversely, an excess of exports over imports in regard to manufactures." [9]

(2) PROGRESS OF THE REVOLUTION

Production changes. The Industrial Revolution originated in the textile industry from improvements in the spinning process. Thereafter spinners and weavers vied with one another in inventions to utilize the increased productivity of one or the other. As looms became larger, it became practical to apply water and steam power. The resulting bulky and expensive equipment began the trend from domestic devices to centralized factories. But machinery for the improved looms required a better and more efficient production of iron and steel. Iron had, indeed, been developed by use of charcoal. When coke was at first tried it was found to cake the furnace, and only when a hot draft produced better and speedier pig iron, was it possible to have the desired machinery. This advance was hindered until standard sizes in nuts, bolts, and other replacements could be agreed upon. Finally, steam power, long employed on pumps in mines, was applied to produce rotary motion and adapted to spinning, and in due time to other formerly manual processes. Of course the manual artisans did not at once disappear, but by the turn of the nineteenth century were falling behind in competition throughout Great Britain. For a time in England "Lud's boys" tried to smash machinery, but after the Napoleonic Wars the domestic artisan

[9] Arthur Birnie, "Growth of Industry," Edward Eyre, editor, *European Civilization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937), V, 291; cf. 253.

was obliged to abandon the unequal contest and become a factory hand on the industrial capitalist's terms.

Transportation changes. Overproduction presently resulted because distribution, both domestic and foreign, remained defective. The pottery industry promoted construction of canals to transport its fragile product safely, but these were overdeveloped, and faulty speculation ensued. Roads, hitherto filled with holes and consisting in little more than ruts which the standard wheel bases must needs follow, likewise required radical improvement. MacAdam invented a road composed of layers of graduated stones which allowed drainage through the stones, and which were also sloped into ditches on the sides. Another Scot, Telfond, designed improvements for bridges. Finally in 1825 Stephenson revolutionized travel by successfully applying steam power to traction and opening his railroad. Railways were rapidly constructed in England and on the Continent. The American, Robert Fulton, invented the first practicable steamboat, but utilization of steam power on ships proceeded more slowly. Yet with all its unpredictable consequences the movement toward "One World" had begun.

Agrarian changes. "The nineteenth century was to revolutionize farm practice in advanced countries almost out of recognition; the chemist, the biologist, and the agricultural engineer were to introduce technical changes which although common practice by the end of the century were undreamt of at the beginning. . . . New mechanical appliances spread, though at different rates, amongst European countries. . . . An acre of wheat yielding approximately fifteen bushels, when it was harvested with the scythe or sickle and threshed with the flail, took altogether from thirty-five to fifty hours of labor. An attachment known as the 'cradle' reduced the time required by about ten hours. With the reaper-binder and stationary thresher the same work could be accomplished in three to four hours, while for the combined harvester-thresher only three-quarters of an hour of labor is required. Under traditional European methods of single furrow ploughing with a pair of horses or team of oxen driven by one man, the area ploughed per day varies from three to less than one acre. With a fifty horse-power tractor one man can plough as much as twenty acres per day. A tractor-drawn seed-drill can sow from seventy to eighty acres compared with ten to fifteen acres with a horse-drawn drill." [10]

B. Financial Revolution

(1) INDUSTRIAL CAPITALISM

Capitalism, of course, had long been in existence in banking and commerce, but its widespread application to revolutionary industrial con-

[10] R. R. Enfield, "European Agriculture Since 1750," *ibid.,* pp. 203, 214.

ditions produced remarkable developments in their turn. Briefly, the equipment required for the new industrialism soon exhausted the resources of even the larger individual fortunes, and necessitated a pooling of fortunes in the joint-stock company or corporation. In England the building of railways and subsequently exploitation of the resources of economically retarded countries abroad, evoked the British investment market under the lead of the Rothschilds and Barings. In 1844 the Bank Charter Act gave the Bank of England an eventual monopoly on note issues, and in 1855 the British Companies Act securely established industrial capitalism by granting limited liability to all joint-stock concerns in industry.

The corporation—or *société anonyme* as the French aptly termed it—unfortunately tended to diffuse responsibility among too numerous and too scattered a body of stockholders to allow for personal interest or even democratic control. Large numbers of investors were not interested in the industry, its methods, policies, or morals, but solely in their dividends and profits. British investments led the way, both at home and abroad, but other industrialized countries quickly organized in similar fashion. Economic imperialism became an important factor in international politics now on a global scale, and economic imperialism could easily evolve into war.

(2) FREE TRADE

British endorsement. Adam Smith had begun the attack on the mercantilist theory of protection of home industries, but his views, however acceptable to the merchants, at first clashed with those of the landowners. The latter insisted on subsidies known as the Spenhamland System in England, and laid on imported grains high tariffs known as the Corn Laws. Industrialists and merchants argued, however, that Great Britain's superior resources and start in industry and trade could enable her to win such profits in the international market that these would more than offset the need to import foodstuffs. With the abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846 Great Britain began to opt for "free trade," a policy which she quite consistently followed into the twentieth century. England ceased to be predominantly agricultural and entrusted her economic destiny almost entirely to coal and iron, factory and power plant, railway and steamship.

Other countries, if they viewed British prosperity with an envious eye, were long so far behind in the industrial transformation that they continued to resort with fair consistency to protective tariffs. In Germany, Friedrich List explicitly challenged the prevalent theory of free trade, and manufacturers in the United States joined farmers in demanding protective duties on many items.

C. Social Consequences

(1) Abuse of the Underprivileged

Urban distress. The Agrarian Revolution had already displaced a considerable number of English laborers from rural areas, and had driven them to the cities. The Industrial Revolution accentuated this trend. Again social evils arose while profits went to the few. There resulted overcrowding of cities, slums, disease, drunkenness, vice, lack of education, low wages, long hours of labor, unsanitary and unpleasant working conditions, exploitation of female and child labor at inappropriate tasks. For a time the workman was completely at the employer's mercy, for until 1833 in England the Government abided quite strictly by the new *laissez faire* economic theory—and Great Britain was the first country that made any departure from this prevailing dogma. Hence the artisan, in company with the ex-farmer, lost all economic independence. He became a laborer, dependent on the wage paid him by the employer—if the latter chose to employ him. The very numbers of those in this condition deprived individual employees of bargaining power. Individualists for centuries, rural and domestic workers did not know how to organize; scattered attempts in this direction were severely repressed by governments dominated by the industrial or agrarian capitalists. Thus for years laborers worked as long as there was light—sixteen hours were not unknown. Crowded into boom towns with medieval facilities, any time off tended to be spent exclusively in eating and sleeping—and drinking to escape troubles that stretched without seeming end.

Case histories reported by parliamentary investigations during the first half of the nineteenth century give some picture of the resulting misery. We learn that Matthew Crabtree worked in the factory since he was eight years old, ordinarily from 6 A.M. to 8 P.M., and from 5 to 9 when trade was brisk. He had to walk two miles to the factory and was beaten if late. Although the overseer was not unusually vicious, someone was being beaten in the factory hourly. No wonder that Matthew returned to supper and at once went to bed. Elizabeth Bentley was beaten if she was late or flagged at her work; indeed, all the boys and girls there were flogged. She could not eat in the factory because there was too much dust, and the foreman would give her food to the pigs. Let Sarah Gooder, aged eight, speak for herself: "I'm a trapper in the Gawber pit. It does not tire me, but I have to trap without a light and I'm scared. I go at four and sometimes half past three in the morning, and come out at five and half-past. I never go to sleep. Sometimes I sing when I've light, but not in the dark; I dare not sing then. I don't like being in the pit. I'm very sleepy when I go sometimes in the morning. I go to Sunday school and read *Reading Made Easy*. . . . They teach me to

pray: 'God bless my father and mother, and sister and brother, and everybody else, and God bless me and make me a good servant. Amen.' I have heard tell of Jesus many a time. I don't know why He came on earth, I'm sure, and I don't know why He died, but He had stones for His head to rest on." [11] From an instance such as this it is easy to surmise the origin of the Marxist slur: "Religion is the opiate of the people" —however grossly inaccurate it is as a generalization even of nineteenth-century morals.

(2) GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

In England, governmental bodies were controlled until 1832 by the alliance of Tory squires and Whig merchants and industrialists. Their rivalry and spite—aside from humanitarian sentiments—sometimes resulted in departures from the classic *laissez faire* role for government. Intervention began half-heartedly in 1802, but it was not until after the 1833 Factory Act that there was effective enforcement of a ban on child labor under nine and limitation of minors to a twelve hour day. Even so, protection of the underprivileged did not really get under way until after 1850.

France made laws limiting the working day to a twelve hour maximum as early as 1841, but since no inspectors were provided to enforce the law until 1874, little or no protection was given the laborers.

Prussia had a child labor law in 1839, though it also was scarcely enforced adequately until 1853. Bismarck was the first European statesman to give labor a general code, and this was during the 1880's.

Eventually, as is well-known, even the most *laissez faire* of theorists departed from Manchester School Individualism to invoke governmental protection for the working classes. But this did not happen before Marx and Engels had issued a fateful summons to desperate men: "Workers of the world unite; you have nothing to lose but your chains" (*Communist Manifesto*, 1848).

66. BRITISH CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

A. *Political Background* (*1783–1832*)

(1) LIBERAL AGITATION

The American Revolution left Great Britain temporarily disillusioned about the advantages of empire. The mercantilist tenet of the Whig commercial oligarchy was discredited, and the Tories entered into a parliamentary supremacy which lasted almost unbroken from 1783 to 1830. Their premier, William Pitt II, was, indeed, an able war minister, but after his death in 1806 Tory rule degenerated into mere standpatism. The rise of new industrial magnates, still unenfranchised,

[11] Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

created a new cause for the Whigs to champion, and the grossly unequal system of parliamentary representation came in for repeated denunciations. War conditions enabled the Government to repress would-be reformers with a heavy hand, but removal of the Napoleonic menace in 1815 unleashed the full force of political and social discontent. Early labor agitation evoked (1819) the "Manchester Massacre" and "Six Repressive Acts" which invaded traditional English rights of freedom from search, of assembly, of speech and the press.

After the suicide of the ultra-conservative Castlereagh in 1822, however, moderate Tories came to the fore. Canning as foreign minister abandoned the Metternich system to abet foreign Liberalism, while Huskinson as president of the Board of Trade modified mercantilist restrictions. But these efforts to appease the demand for parliamentary reform by concessions on other points merely postponed the issue. The Whigs won the 1830 elections and after two years of tense struggle pushed through the Reform Act of 1832 which redistributed parliamentary seats so as to give some representation to the industrial boom towns. Only wealthy industrialists profited by this modification, however, for the proportion of voters still remained about one in twenty-two. The reform, then, was far from producing Democracy, although it was Liberalism, and at long last it dethroned the oligarchy which had dominated England since the "Glorious Revolution" of 1689.

(2) Political Factors for Tolerance

The failure in 1745 of the last attempt at a Stuart restoration had removed Hanoverian dread of Jacobites—which Catholics were all supposed to be. Acquisition of numerous Catholic subjects for the British crown in Canada had dictated a certain toleration (1763; 1774) in order to conserve their loyalty, especially during and after the American Revolution. British statesmen understood the danger that Ireland might imitate the Americans, and realized that concessions to Catholicity might allay part of the Celtic grievance. The Napoleonic Wars, moreover, had found Great Britain allied with the Papal States, and during the whole period of the French Revolution many French priests fled to England as refugees. These cultured gentlemen conducted themselves decorously—some were even hired as tutors—and thus seemed to have more in common with British "respectability" than with their fanatical persecutors, the *sans-culottes*. All in all, despite their traditional prejudices, Englishmen moved haltingly toward emancipation for Catholics because such a course was in accord with political expediency and a spirit of compromise. These political factors were paralleled by a new interest in religion in British lands. On the one hand the progress of Deism among the commercial and industrial classes made them less

interested in the suppression of any one type of supernatural religion. On the other hand, the excesses of the French Revolution in the direction of atheism shocked the Anglicans and the earnest newly-formed Methodists. A menace of anarchy and godlessness had arisen, and conservative Protestants became less averse to extending the "Christian Front" to include Catholics—whom none could accuse of latitudinarianism.

B. Preliminary Concessions (1778–1813)

(1) PARTIAL ENGLISH RELIEF

Relief Act of 1778. By 1778 the English Catholics constituted a minority of some sixty thousand, served by 350 priests. Although strict enforcement of the Penal Code against Catholics had waned, as late as 1771 Father Maloney had had a death sentence commuted to deportation. During the manifold difficulties of the American Revolution a group of English Catholics, headed by the duke of Norfolk, were emboldened to send an address of loyalty to the king. This was particularly welcome after the disaster at Saratoga (1777), and Edmund Burke, whose wife was a Catholic, had no great difficulty in steering a modest Relief Bill through parliament. In May, 1778, this passed both houses of parliament and received the signature of King George III. This measure did away with the £100 reward for informers against Catholic priests and schoolmasters, and abolished the penalty of life imprisonment for these two categories in the event of their conviction. Although Catholics were not yet permitted to hear Mass publicly, they were given to understand by the government that they would not be disturbed during peaceable worship in private chapels and homes. Catholics were now allowed to hold, purchase, and inherit real estate without fear that an apostate among the heirs might claim the whole inheritance. Yet they remained excluded from all official, legal and military positions, and were obliged to a double tax on land.

Flare-up of bigotry. Bitter popular opposition to the Relief Act in London was in marked contrast to the official attitude. The somewhat unbalanced Lord George Gordon stirred up a mob to burn and pillage Catholic properties while other agitators tried to intimidate parliament with monster petitions. The city magistrates refused to take action, and disorder was finally halted by the king's personal intervention. After the regular soldiers had fired upon the mob, more than a hundred casualties were reported before quiet was restored. Eventually Catholics were indemnified financially by the government and the City of London. But in Scotland popular opposition became so violent that the 1778 Relief Act could not be put into force until 1793, and bigotry lingered longer there.

Relief Act of 1791. The wealthier Catholics were now intent on re-

moval of civil and social disabilities. But their disposition to gain conces-
sions at the cost of a compromising oath of allegiance threatened a rift
between "cisalpine" and "ultramontane" Catholics: those suspicious
of or zealous for papal direction. During 1782 the lay leaders formed a
"Catholic Committee" which in 1788 requested further relief. They
assured Prime Minister Pitt that they considered papal infallibility and
theocratic powers of no effect in Great Britain. In place of the existing
Test and Supremacy Oaths, they proposed a new formula in which the
aforesaid papal prerogatives were branded as "impious, heretical and
damnable." The Catholic clergy, led by Bishop Walmesley, for the most
part condemned the proposed oath, and eventually suggested as the
lesser of two evils the Irish Oath of 1774 which confined itself to a
simple rejection of papal secular jurisdiction and deposing powers in
regard to the British crown. Although not entirely unobjectionable, this
formula was not, like the committee's proposal, *proxima haeresi*. The
Anglican prelate, Dr. Horsley, advised Pitt to reject the lay formula for
the clerical one, and the Prime Minister, who sought to pacify and not
provoke Catholics, followed this course. On July 24, 1791, a new Catholic
Relief Act provided that those who pronounced the new oath were
henceforth immune from prosecution for their religion or priesthood.
Catholic chapels were now recognized as legal places of worship, pro-
vided that their location was signified to the government, and they did
not manifest the external appearance of a church—which, it seems,
essentially consisted in steeple and bell. Catholic children might now
be tutored in their religion, although Catholic schools were not formally
authorized. The legal profession was opened to Catholics, but the civil
and military services remained closed. Catholic marriages and funerals
were still to be held in Anglican churches.

(2) ANGLO-IRISH DISSENSION

Irish disabilities. Irish Catholics, while they might enjoy the comfort
of numbers, were oppressed by a Penal Code directed against their race
from which English Catholics were free. The vast majority of Irish
Catholics had been reduced by Elizabeth I and Cromwell to the con-
dition of agrarian slaves of Protestant landlords. Cromwell's treatment
had deprived them of effective means of resistance, but the British
Government was nonetheless uneasy during the American and French
Revolutions. Irish addresses of loyalty to the crown, however, had by
1771 elicited no greater concession than permission to take leases on
bog land for reclamation. But in 1778 after Burgoyne's surrender at
Saratoga, the British crown hastily granted Irish Catholics the privilege
of 999 year leases on land, and extended to them the religious provisions
of the English Relief Act of 1778. In 1782, moreover, the British par-

liament's veto on Irish legislation was removed. But such independence as the Irish parliament enjoyed during the following two decades was largely in the Protestant interest. Hence a new "Catholic Association" was formed under the lead of Lord Kenmare and John Keogh. Agitation did extort some new concesssions, but these benefited chiefly the few wealthy Catholics, who thereupon became apathetic. Keogh and the commoners then drifted into the United Irish Movement which was tinged with French Jacobinism. Their uprising during 1798 was suppressed by British troops. Under threat of reprisals, influential Catholics headed by Archbishop Troy of Dublin were induced to consent to the joining of Ireland in a "United Kingdom of Great Britain" on the understanding that Catholic emancipation would be their recompense. The Union did go into effect in 1801, but King George III refused to honor Pitt's intimation of emancipation.

Relief Bill of 1813. English and Irish Catholics were now united under a single political regime and the right of suffrage became a common goal. Unfortunately its acquisition was delayed by disagreement as to means. The English Catholic Committee persisted in seeking political enfranchisement from parliament by offering ultra-liberal concessions regarding subjection to the Holy See. In 1813 Charles Butler, secretary of the English Committee, and Henry Grattan, a conciliatory Irish Protestant leader, sponsored a Relief Bill which proposed to allow the British government a veto on papal nomination of bishops throughout the United Kingdom, and some regulation of hierarchical communication with the Holy See. The Irish hierarchy resolutely opposed emancipation on such conditions, and were vehemently supported by the English vicar-apostolic, John Milner. Schism was never nearer than when the Catholic Committee censured and expelled Milner who, however combative and tactless, was a Catholic bishop. The English Committee did receive a vague endorsement of their plan from Monsignor Quarantotti, *locum tenens* of the Congregation of Propaganda, during the detention of Pius VII and his advisors in France. On his return from captivity, however, the pope repudiated the concession. Both the Irish hierarchy and the Cisalpines tried to influence the Holy See in their favor in none too deferential terms, and the controversy lasted for years. In 1821 William Plunkett did pass a Relief Bill incorporating the proposed veto through Commons, but fortunately it was thrown out by the House of Lords. The prolonged agitation had revealed sad disagreement between English and Irish Catholics, or rather, between "Old Catholics," wealthy aristocrats whose grievances were largely political and social, and the rank and file who suffered economic discrimination as well. The "Cisalpine" attitude, which stopped just short of schism, was yet to give the

Catholic Church in England some anxious moments, but like French Gallicanism it died with the Vatican definition of papal primacy.

C. Winning of Emancipation (1823-29)

(1) The Irish Campaign

Daniel O'Connell (1775-1847) presently emerged as the Irish Catholic leader in succession to Keogh. During 1813 he had won notoriety by dramatizing Irish woes in the defense of the pro-Catholic editor Magee —though the case was lost, British ascendancy had been excoriated. By 1823 O'Connell founded a "Catholic Association" into which he endeavored to gather all the discordant parties in order to press for Catholic emancipation. His task proved difficult, but by 1825 contributions were being collected for the association in nearly every parish. In alarm the British government outlawed "societies working for the redress of evils" from collecting money, practically suppressing the association. But the irrepressible O'Connell quickly returned with the "New Catholic Association" and he continued to find ways to evade legal prosecution while keeping the original organization substantially intact. Meanwhile the impression of Irish lawlessness was offset in British governmental circles by the intelligent and moderate testimony of Bishop Doyle of Kildare before a parliamentary investigating body during 1825.

Final struggle. The association continued to gain strength and in 1826 O'Connell steeled the Irish tenants to oust the incumbent Beresford from a safe parliamentary borough and to threaten many others. During 1828 he himself defeated FitzGerald in Clare, announcing: "The oath at present required by law is: 'That the Sacrifice of the Mass and invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary and other saints, as now practiced in the Church of Rome, are impious and idolatrous.' Of course, I will never stain my soul by such an oath. I leave that to my honorable opponent, Mr. Vesey FitzGerald. He has often taken that horrible oath." Thus, though clearly the choice of his constituents for a seat in the British parliament, O'Connell demonstrated that he was barred from taking office on religious grounds. This point he dramatized on the floor of Commons to Englishmen priding themselves on "fair play." The point was made.

British surrender. O'Connell's electoral victories made British politicians aware that some concession would be required. In a last ditch stand against all forms of Liberalism, the Tories put the premiership in the hands of the duke of Wellington. But Wellington, experienced in civil strife from the Spanish peninsula, advised against forcible repression of the Irish movement—the peacefulness and sobriety of which

O'Connell had taken pains to emphasize. The Clare election convinced Wellington that he was fairly beaten, and with a soldier's scorn of political maneuvers prepared to surrender. In this he was supported by Robert Peel, at least on grounds of expediency. At first King George IV, deserter of a lawful Catholic wife, refused to sanction this proposal. Thereupon Wellington and Peel resigned. When the king learned that his only alternative was to summon a yet more detested foe, a Whig ministry, he recalled the Tories. After much haggling over terms and pleading of his "conscience," the king finally gave his reluctant signature on April 13, 1829, to an act granting emancipation to British Catholics.

(2) NATURE OF EMANCIPATION

Content of the Act. An oath of allegiance, acceptable to all Catholics, was now subsituted for the Test and Corporation Acts. Thereby all offices under the crown and all legislative positions were opened to Catholics with the following exceptions. The Act of Succession still required the king to be a Protestant and—until 1910—obliged him to make a "Protestant Declaration" repudiating Transubstantiation, etc. Catholics were also denied the posts of Lord Chancellor, Lord Keeper of the Seal, and Viceroy of Ireland—which last has ceased to exist. To placate bigotry several nuisance riders obliged religious to notify the civil authorities of their whereabouts, forbade religious processions outside churches, and still denied Catholic churches steeples and bells.

Operation of the Act. When some Catholics wished to reject the concession for these latter reasons, O'Connell shrewdly pointed out that the British government was merely trying to save face and had no serious intention of enforcement. This proved largely true in the sequel, and the obnoxious appendices had generally fallen into disuse by the time that they were formally repealed in 1927. O'Connell was re-elected and took his seat in parliament, though preceded there by Howard, earl of Surrey, first acknowledged Catholic in Commons since the Elizabethan era. Requirements regarding Catholic marriage in Anglican churches were modified in 1835, and Catholics, though under governmental surveillance until 1898, could thereafter be legally married before a priest. Paradoxically, emancipation temporarily disenfranchised 190,000 of the 40 shilling freeholders by whose support O'Connell had won—a bargain of which he heard much subsequently. On the whole, however, if popular bigotry was far from stilled, Catholics were now legally emancipated throughout Great Britain, and by implication, Sts. John Fisher, Thomas More, and their martyred associates were again "His Majesty's loyal opposition."

67. AMERICAN SECULAR REVOLUTION   Ṣḳịṗ

A. Revolution

(1) REMOTE CAUSES

A basic political cause of the American Revolution was Britain's desire to rule the colonies primarily, if not exclusively, for the benefit of the mother country. This attitude of British aristocrats was an outcome of the "sacred egoism" of sovereign states following the breakdown of medieval Christendom. Great Britain had profited most by the disruption of the Theocracy, and her successful career, as judged by materialistic norms, was hailed as vindication of the Machiavellian new order. In 1763 she had emerged as victor and seemingly master in both America and India. Yet within a generation her selfish policy had received a stinging rebuke, and it might be regarded as fitting that this was delivered by those who secured some of their philosophic ammunition, although unconsciously and indirectly, from scholastic sources.

Scholastic antecedents. "We have to come back to Locke's *Two Treatises on Government* as the bible of the Revolution. Locke wrote to refute Filmer, whose *Patriarchia*, though written thirty years before, was not published until 1680. Those who read Locke, when serious students, had also to read Filmer. We know that Jefferson read him, because his copy of *Patriarchia* is preserved in the Congressional Library. That he read Locke is patent in the very phrasing of the Declaration of Independence. Now Locke's thought was formed by Hooker, and Hooker's thought was formed by St. Thomas Aquinas. As for Filmer, he was an honest enough controversialist to present the gist of his opponent's arguments faithfully. That opponent was Cardinal Bellarmine. And while Filmer signally failed to establish his own position, those who read him got, at second-hand, a sufficiently adequate acquaintance with Bellarmine. In the same way, as Dr. James J. Walsh conclusively shows in his book, *The Education of the Founding Fathers*, that the system of the public defense of a list of theses by the graduating students in American colleges of the period was purely scholastic in form, and generally in content, and that a good half of the members of the Continental Congress were college men whose minds had been moulded by this system. . . ." [12]

An initial aspect was economic, for British merchants were pursuing the theory of Mercantilism which regarded colonies as chattels to enrich the mother country: they were to trade exclusively with Great Britain. Thus the lion's share of profits would go to the British commercial oligarchy, whatever might be the hardships imposed upon the American

[12] Theodore Maynard, *Story of American Catholicism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942), p. 119.

Colonies. Though the administration of these Colonies did cost the British government £350,000 annually by 1764, British merchants were realizing simultaneously a yearly profit from these same Colonies of £2,000,000. The only loss was through American smuggling to the French and Spanish West Indies—where alone the colonists could make a profit. This drain upon British revenues certain statesmen were now resolved to plug.

(2) PROXIMATE CAUSES

Taxation of the Colonies to ease the British Exchequer was the aim of Grenville, expert financier but no politician. His Revenue Act of 1764 after (1) asserting a parliamentary right to tax Americans; (2) levied duties on sugar and other luxuries; and (3) tightened up on enforcement of customs upon erstwhile smugglers. But in 1765 Grenville's Stamp Act crystallized American opposition, and a "Virginia Resolution"—widely circulated if never formally adopted—asserted that colonists were not obliged to obey any tax not imposed by their own assembly. A colonial boycott proved so effective that the British merchants themselves advocated repeal as a strategic retreat. But in 1767 Townshend raised the same basic issue with new import duties, and colonial assemblies in New York and Massachusetts were dissolved in an evident effort to discipline the colonies.

"**Legal rights**" accordingly became the subject of the hour. The best legal authorities in England and America had declared that equality before the law was the common birthright of all Englishmen, even when transplanted to America. "No taxation without representation," Hutchinson contended, in rebutting the English rejoinder that the average Englishman was not represented in the British parliament, did not mean that every individual had to be represented, but every "interest." While urban and rural England were collectively represented in parliament, Americans lacked any spokesman. This complaint might have been met by Pitt's anticipation of a "British Commonwealth" or by an imperial parliament, and had such ideas been proposed in time they could well have been acceptable to most Americans. For the colonists did not deny a certain "equality in subordination" to the mother country, and they revered the majesty of the crown until the king's obstinacy alienated them. What Americans objected to were: (1) abuse of authority by writs of assistance, breaking up of assemblies, suspension of colonial legislation, excessive trade restrictions; (2) discriminatory legislation extending admiralty and martial law beyond limits set by English constitutional norms; and (3) the claim of the British parliament to universal, absolute jurisdiction in "all cases whatsoever."

"**Natural rights**" were also invoked to interpret the British Constitu-

tion, or if need be, to assert it as a "higher law." Samuel Adams maintained that the "British Constitution . . . is founded on the law of God and nature," and not in "positive law, which would indeed give parliament an ultimate and therefore a despotic authority." Since "it is an essential natural right that a man shall quietly enjoy and have sole disposal of his property," the Americans share this right equally with Englishmen. Bostonians, complaining against soldiers and customs officials, proclaimed that they possessed "natural rights" to "life, liberty, and property."

The Boston Tea Party, December 16, 1773, provided the spark for this inflammable atmosphere. Taking the concession of a tea monopoly to the East India Company as an added insult, Bostonians tossed a large consignment into the harbor, reminding all concerned that "we are not Sepoys or Marattas, but British subjects born to liberty." When the British government closed the port of Boston, the American colonies, hitherto all too individualistic, rallied to the support of Massachusetts. On September 5, 1774, representatives from twelve of the American colonies entered Carpenter's Hall, Philadelphia, to form the First Continental Congress. Out of the retaliatory measures against Great Britain which were voted by this body, the American Revolution followed within a year.

(3) Effects

Independence. The Continental Congress was to some extent precipitated into taking extreme measures by Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* which appeared in January, 1776. This fervid denunciation of "crowned ruffians" urged Americans to strike out for themselves, for "freedom hath been hunted round the globe. . . . Receive the fugitive and prepare in time an asylum for mankind." Paine's religious views were scarcely orthodox and his political ideal eventually verged on anarchism, but his was the book of the year 1776. Congress could have alleged more conservative authority, for St. Thomas had said: "If it pertains to the right of the multitude to provide a king for itself, it will not be unjust to depose such a king . . . if the royal power is tyrannously abused . . . because this royal power was not delegated to him to abuse his office." With perhaps pardonable exaggeration, the Americans recited such abuses. They then asserted that "to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The British Constitution—Magna Charta, Petition and Declaration of Right—parliamentary practice, and the colonial charters had all implicitly recognized popular sovereignty. It was not, then, "for light and transient reasons" that they decided "to dissolve the political bonds which connected them with another," in

order "to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." To safeguard "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," they were resolved to pledge one another "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor."

Catholic participation. General Washington discouraged bigotry by his order (1775) forbidding "observance of that ridiculous and childish custom of burning the effigy of the pope," especially at a time when Americans sought Canadian support, "for to be insulting their religion is so monstrous as not to be suffered or excused." If the Canadians did not join the American cause, at least the only commissioned Catholic chaplain was the Canadian, Abbé Lotbinière, named by Arnold and confirmed by Congress, August 10, 1776. And Americans were eventually helped by the Catholic nations of France and Spain so that chaplains in the French armed forces had occasion to minister to American Catholics. Individual foreign Catholics, such as Lafayette, Pulaski, and Kosciusko, gave valuable aid, and John Barry, first commander of the American Navy, performed some of the greatest services. Stephen Moylan was Washington's aide and secretary. Among civilian patriots, the Carroll family was prominent, along with Thomas FitzSimons, George Meade, and the Moylans of Pennsylvania. Catholic Tories, however, did exist, Shea's rash denial notwithstanding. But as might be expected from Britain's record of persecution, the Catholic percentage among Tories was relatively low.[13] President Washington's tribute to Catholic loyalty ought to be well known. Replying to congratulations from a Catholic group, he affirmed: "I presume your fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

(4) Consequences

In the political sphere, the success of the American Revolution marked a turning point in history. It gave scope for the formation of a state not bound by the monarchical tradition predominant since the crossing of the Rubicon. The new Republic would have a unique opportunity to profit by the successes and mistakes of England's political evolution. The theory, if not yet the practice, of the new nation was Democracy. Should it prove successful, the way would lie open for imitation by peoples of the Old World, and absolute monarchy, creature of humanism and Protestantism, would be doomed. With the blessing of Providence, the democratic dream was in large part realized and the United States became a beacon to the world. Most of the Liberal reform move-

[13] Charles Metzger, S.J., "Catholic Tories," *Catholic Historical Review,* 1949–50.

ments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries invoked the American Declaration of Independence and its principles were finally accepted by half of the world.

In regard to religion, the Catholic Church could have no regret to see Absolutism supplanted by Democracy, for she had long languished under oppressive regimes that relegated her to the background, tied her hands for good, and expected her to be obsequiously grateful for the patronage accorded her. Under the new American system the Church could not be legally dominated. Neither, however, could she dominate. Her clergy would have to abandon their privileged position in the Old World; henceforth they would have to persuade instead of commanding with the sanction of civil law at their back. The Church had once subsisted under a regime which granted her no priorities, the Roman empire, and had converted it. She could repeat this achievement if primitive zeal returned as well. But in a democratic regime, Christian brotherhood would have to be stressed without detriment to clerical authority; energy and initiative would have to prevail over clerical decorum to the extent that the priest would be obliged to go to the people, and not expect them to come to him.

B. Organization

(1) The Federal Constitution

The Constitutional Convention (1787) sought a remedy for the disunity prevailing among the newly independent states under the original Articles of Confederation. A veritable "brain trust" met: thirty-one of its fifty-five members were college trained and most had experience in the Continental Congress. Washington presided over deliberations led by Madison and Wilson, and restrained by Franklin; the Catholics, FitzSimons and Daniel Carroll, were members of the convention.

Constitutional theory was in accord with scholastic principles that secular authority emanated from God through the people, for: "We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America." The Constitution was really the first explicitly written instrument of government, although it reflected the memory of centuries of English constitutional evolution and more proximate experience of American autonomy under the colonial charters. Its theory emanated from Locke's distinction of governmental powers, as distorted by Montesquieu into a check and balance of governmental branches to avoid tyranny. But the Founding Fathers probably derived more from practical experience than from abstract political science. The

constitutional machinery that emerged was federal rather than national, and left most domestic affairs to the state governments. Broad principles were enunciated; details were left to time and experience, though succeeding generations were tempted to read into the mind of the authors their own political and economic views.

Religious guarantees were eventually written into the Constitution. Charles Pinckney of South Carolina proposed to the Convention a draft statement which contained the phrase, "The legislature of the United States shall pass no law on the subject of religion." This was not adopted, not so much because it was opposed, but because it was felt to be unnecessary. But the debates concerning the adoption of the Constitution revealed the uneasiness of a large portion of the American people about the lack of a "Bill of Rights" explicitly affirmed in the document. To allay such fears, the first Congress of the new Federal Government adopted in December, 1791, such a charter of liberties: the first ten amendments. The first of these amendments contains this reference to religious liberty: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." The last clause of the sixth article of the original Constitution, moreover, had asserted that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Interpretation of Church-state relations, of course, has varied. The majority of the Founding Fathers were not irreligious, even if they did not see fit to establish any official church. The first Federal Congress on September 24, 1789, requested the president to recommend a "Thanksgiving Day"; on January 7, 1790, it provided for congressional chaplains; on March 3, 1791, for army chaplains. In 1789 President Washington did not scruple to recommend to Congress appropriation of funds for missionaries among the Indians. During June, 1797, under the Adams administration John B. Sartori was named first American consul to the Papal States, and the series of American consuls at Rome continued to the fall of the temporal power in 1870. Though not warranted in theory or practice, non-Catholics have been prone to regard President Jefferson's remarks to the Danbury Baptists in 1802 as an official interpretation of the American attitude on religion: "Religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God. . . . I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should 'make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' thus building a wall of separation between Church and state." Yet the following year Jefferson sent to Congress for ratification a treaty assuring the Kaskaskia Indians

of an annual subsidy of $100 for their chaplain, and $300 for erection of a church. Consulted in 1806 by Bishop Carroll about the expediency of recommending a Frenchman for the vacant see of New Orleans in newly acquired Louisiana, Jefferson and Madison replied courteously but warily that the Federal Government deemed the matter entirely outside its competence.

(2) STATE CONTESTS FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Generic status. Despite the Federal Constitution, the laws of many states continued for some time to discriminate against Catholics. This was particularly true of New England where Catholics were debarred from office during most of the period under review. After the rise of political parties, the Federalists became identified in New England with retention of Congregational establishment, supported as it was by the commercial aristocracy. Accordingly after 1794 the Democratic-Republicans took up the cause of dissenters and strove to repeal oppressive legislation. This aim attracted to their ranks many Irish immigrants who at this early date came to play an important minor role in the party of "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion." But though uniformly successful in Federal politics after 1800, the Democrats remained a minority party in New England state politics for some fifteen years longer. By 1815, however, the Federalists had degenerated into a sectionalist party stubbornly defending Congregationalist supremacy and class distinctions. Bigotry and fanaticism spelled the ruin of this group, for Federalist espousal of secession for New England during the War of 1812 brought about a rapid loss of support in the East, while western expansion of the United States reduced the relative importance of New England.

Massachusetts in its first state constitution (1780) obliged its citizens to support the established Congregational Church, and excluded from public office all refusing to renounce by oath "those principles of spiritual jurisdiction which Roman Catholics in some countries have held." A brief Democratic tenure of office (1807) saw introduction of a new Public Worship Bill, but it was defeated and the Federalists returned to power. Congregationalism, however, was challenged by the development of Unitarianism, and in 1818 Chief Justice Parker sustained the dissenting minister, Alvan Lamson. Yet in the 1820 constitutional convention Congregationalists joined the Unitarians to continue discrimination against others. Democratic victory in 1823 led to amendments, for a time blocked by a die-hard senate. But by 1833 the offending clauses had been removed.

Connecticut granted religious liberty during the period between 1777 and 1791, though under vexatious conditions. Certificates of exemption from support of the established church were issued, and the struggle

for equal rights followed the pattern in Massachusetts, but was resolved in favor of the dissenters as early as 1818.

New Hampshire persevered longest in discriminating against Catholics. Not only was there an established religion, but a test oath against the papacy was deliberately included. Congregational establishment was terminated in 1819, but public officials and teachers still had to be Protestants. In 1852 Catholic emancipation was rejected by votes of fifteen thousand to twenty-five thousand, and not until 1877 was the religious test for office abolished. Yet even then the words "Protestant" and "Evangelical" were still retained in the Constitution of a supposedly nonsectarian state.

New York suffered until 1821 under the Jay "Alien Clause" requiring immigrants seeking naturalization to renounce allegiance to foreign authority "in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil." Native Catholics, however, were elected to the legislature in 1806, and during 1812 Judge De Witt Clinton upheld Father Kohlman's plea for the privileged character of "secrets of sacramental confession" in a case of alleged theft.

Southern states. Religious liberty in the southern states had to await formulation of the new constitutions. In 1776, indeed, North Carolina granted that "no person who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion . . . will be capable of holding office." Yet several Catholics attained posts by various evasions. One asserted that he did deny any "truth" of the Protestant religion; in another instance, a request for an official list of these truths provoked internecine strife among Protestants. At any rate, Thomas Burke became congressman and governor, and Aldanus Burke and William Gaston were justices of the State Supreme Court before the phrase was officially altered from "Protestant" to "Christian." South Carolina also tried to maintain a "Christian Protestant" established religion in 1778, while conceding equal and religious rights to Protestants of every denomination. These provisions, however, were abandoned in 1790 and religious freedom and civil equality defined in terms which could include Catholics. Georgia in 1777 conceded "freedom of conscience" while still insisting that all legislators be Protestants. Taxes for the support of religion were imposed until 1789 when at length all "male, tax-paying freemen" were enfranchised. As previously noted, Virginia and Maryland had granted religious liberty at the end of the colonial period. In 1786 Virginia dissenters secured the disestablishment of Anglicanism, although Catholic corporate property rights were imperfectly recognized at law until 1830.

It required approximately a half century, then, before the principles of the Federal Constitution regarding religion were put into effect by the vast majority of the States.

68. AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL ORIGINS

A. *Hierarchical Organization* (1773–1815)

(1) PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT (1773–89)

Transitional status. At the outbreak of the Revolution, American Catholics were still subject to Bishop Challoner, vicar-apostolic of the London District. Prior to the opening of hostilities, Bishop Challoner had named Father John Lewis (1721–88), former superior of the Jesuit missionaries in the English colonies, his vicar-general. Father Lewis continued to act as local superior after Bishop Challoner's death in 1781, although the latter's successor, Bishop James Talbot, refused to exercise jurisdiction within the new Republic. To clarify this nebulous canonical status, the American clergy decided at a conference during 1783 to appeal to the Holy See. They reported that although Catholicity was by then tolerated in all of the United States, it had been intimated to them that continued subjection to an English hierarchy would not be pleasing to the American Continental Congress. Fearing that appointment of a Catholic bishop would arouse Protestant alarm—since no Anglican prelate had thus far been named for the English colonies—the American clergy suggested to Propaganda that the American mission be ruled directly by the Holy See through a superior with faculties to confirm. Meanwhile, in response to inquiries by Cardinal Antonelli, prefect of Propaganda, Monsignor Pamphili, the nuncio in France, reported a suggestion emanating from Benjamin Franklin that a French bishop be substituted for the English prelate, and that the American clergy might be recruited from a seminary at Bordeaux.

Prefecture-apostolic. More recent research seems to have established that Rome gave no serious consideration to the "French Plan," and Franklin, on recalling his old diplomatic colleague, John Carroll, expressed confidence in his prudence. The Holy See, after excusing Father Lewis from further responsibility by reason of his "advanced age," on June 9, 1784, named Father John Carroll provisional superior of the American mission, with faculties to confirm. At the same time the new prelate was informed that this arrangement was merely temporary, and was asked to forward a report to guide the Holy See in preparing a definitive organization. Father Carroll did not delay in sending this report (1785), in which he estimated the number of Catholics at about twenty-five thousand; that the few priests—twenty-five or twenty-six—led a life of great labor in visiting scattered congregations; and that the Church possessed no corporate property, all establishments being held under individual title. Father Carroll believed that the native Catholics, if somewhat influenced by their non-Catholic environment, were gen-

erally faithful to the sacraments, at least to their Easter Duties, but he deplored the laxity of newer immigrants. Catechetical instruction, especially for Negro slaves, left very much to be desired.[14]

Father Carroll also set out to visit his prefecture and to exercise his functions, although an oversight in his delegation, corrected in 1786, at first prevented him from conceding faculties to clerics volunteering for the American mission. He needed patience to guide his flock through disputes about jurisdiction with the see of Quebec, the heresy of the apostate priest Wharton, and the criticisms of vagrant and insubordinate clerics. Thus in 1788 he and his ex-Jesuit confreres were accused by a disgruntled Irish priest, Patrick Smyth, of plotting to dominate the Church in America in his *Present State of Catholic Missions Conducted by Ex-Jesuits*. But presently the even-tempered Carroll under the pen name of "Pacific" was appealing to his fellow citizens for religious liberty (1789).

(2) Episcopal Establishment (1789–91)

Preparations. Clerical discipline proved to be one of Father Carroll's greatest trials as prefect apostolic. National misunderstandings, the first rumblings of Trusteeism, the irresponsible conduct of vagrant clerics from Europe—these and other difficulties convinced most of the older clergy that episcopal authority had become imperative in the United States. Elderly ex-Jesuits withdrew their former opposition in the fear that sees might be established anyway and filled with outsiders. The Continental Congress, moreover, had given them to understand that a residential see with ordinary jurisdiction directly subject to Rome would not be taken amiss. Hence in 1786 a chapter of the American clergy recommended to the Holy See the establishment of a bishopric. When Propaganda had signified its willingness to do so, the American clergy on March 12, 1788, requested the privilege of electing their first bishop. The Holy See having agreed *pro hac vice*, elections conducted during April, 1789, resulted in twenty-four of twenty-six votes being cast for Father Carroll.

Nomination. Pope Pius VI gave his approbation on September 14, 1789, and the following November 6 issued the brief, *Ex Hac Apostolicae*, naming John Carroll bishop of Baltimore, with jurisdiction over all the territory of the United States—in 1791 Propaganda confirmed that Bishop Carroll's jurisdiction was conterminous with American civil jurisdiction. Before sailing to England for his consecration, the bishop-elect joined Senator Charles Carroll in an "Address of Roman Catholics," congratulating George Washington on his election as president of the

---

[14] Cf. John Tracy Ellis, *Documents of American Church History* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1955), p. 151.

United States, and received a gracious reply. By happy coincidence the first bishop and the first president were chosen in the same year.

Consecration. John Carroll sailed for Europe in the same ship bearing Dr. Madison, recently selected as the first Protestant Episcopalian prelate for Virginia. Carroll was consecrated bishop on August 15, 1790, in the chapel of the Weld family's Lulworth Castle. The consecrator was his friend, Bishop Charles Walmesley, O.S.B., senior English vicar-apostolic; from this source the majority of American bishops derive their participation in the apostolic succession. Before returning to America, Bishop Carroll arranged with Father Emery, superior of Saint-Sulpice, for the staffing of a seminary at Baltimore; the future St. Mary's was opened by French Sulpicians during 1791. Refusing pressing invitations to visit Ireland, Bishop Carroll hastened back to his diocese. He arrived to begin his quarter century of episcopate on the eve of the feast of the Immaculate Conception. The next Sunday, December 12, the bishop took possession of his temporary pro-cathedral of St. Peter's, celebrated pontifical Mass, preached eloquently, and dedicated his national diocese to the Mother of God, commending his subjects to be devoted to her.

(3) National Synodal Legislation (1791)

The Synod of Baltimore, held by Bishop Carroll and twenty-two priests during November, 1791, enacted the first canonical legislation in the United States, and its decrees were binding on the whole country until supplemented by the first provincial council of 1829. The chief prescriptions were the following:

Baptism. Canonical legislation regarding conditional re-baptism of converts was clarified and prescribed, with the requirement of investigation in each case. Baptismal registers were ordered kept.

Confirmation. This sacrament, except in danger of death, was not to be conferred on persons who had not reached the use of reason and had not been properly instructed.

Penance. Priests exercising faculties without episcopal approbation were suspended, and the faithful were to be instructed that confession to unauthorized priests was invalid. Annual confession and Communion were to be enforced, and those who contumaciously refused obedience were to be deprived of Christian burial.

Holy Eucharist. So far as possible, Sunday Mass was to be made accessible to all, with due regard to the needs of merchants and of laborers. The cassock was to be worn at the celebration of Mass, and the surplice during public functions of the ministry. At Sunday Mass, reading of the Gospel in the vernacular, a short sermon, the litany of the Blessed Virgin, and a prayer for civil authorities were prescribed. Wherever possible, a *missa cantata* with the Asperges should be cele-

brated, followed in the afternoon by Vespers and Benediction. Children ought to be prepared without undue delay for reception of Holy Communion.

Extreme unction was to be conferred on all in danger of death, even upon children who had reached the use of reason.

Matrimony. The bans of marriage should be duly proclaimed three times. Instructions in the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church and testimonials from former pastors were to be required. Mixed marriages ought to be discouraged, but if they could not be prevented, the promise of educating children in the Catholic faith was to be exacted from the non-Catholic party. Mixed marriages were not to be entitled to the Nuptial Mass.

Finances. Parochial funds ought to be divided into three portions: one for the support of the clergy, another for maintenance of the church, and a third for assisting the poor. Avarice and simony in regard to stipends were reprimanded. The faithful ought to be admonished to support the church and an instruction regarding the amount of stipends read to them. Cleanliness must be observed in regard to the church and altar, and trustees and ushers named to ensure good order at services.

Supplementary regulations. Lenten discipline, as revealed in the bishop's pastoral for 1792, was severe: only liquids were allowed in the morning; milk and eggs, as well as meat, were banned from the collation, and meat was permitted only on most Sundays and Saturdays, but merely once. During 1810, the newly consecrated American hierarchy held an informal meeting. After reviewing and retaining the synodal legislation, they supplemented it by a few additional regulations. Theaters and dancing were to be discouraged; Catholics who joined the Freemasons were denied the sacraments; the Latin ritual was to be observed, save for duly authorized translations, and the stipend for Masses fixed at fifty cents.

(4) Hierarchical Development (1793–1815)

Episcopal coadjutors. Lest some accident deprive the nascent Church in the United States of a bishop for a long period, Bishop Carroll petitioned the Holy See to divide his diocese or grant him a coadjutor. The Holy See preferred the latter alternative (1793), and the Bavarian, Lawrence Graessl, was elected and confirmed by Rome, but died before his consecration. The second nominee, Leonard Neale, though confirmed in 1795, was not consecrated until 1800 by reason of delay in the arrival of documents. Bishop Neale, president of Georgetown College, had little share in diocesan administration until he succeeded Bishop

Carroll at Baltimore (1815–17). But by 1806 the diocese was well organized and the cornerstone for America's first cathedral, that of the Assumption, was laid—it was not completed until 1821. The Louisiana Purchase (1803) extended Bishop Carroll's responsibilities, for he was made administrator of the vacant see of New Orleans which had been erected under Spanish rule in 1793. In 1812 Bishop Carroll had William DuBourg named administrator, and the latter became bishop of New Orleans in 1815.

Metropolitan organization. Immigration continued to increase the number of Catholics, whose widely scattered residences placed many out of reach of the aging Bishop Carroll. After repeated pleas, he obtained from the Holy See a division of his immense diocese. In 1808 Pope Pius VII elevated Baltimore to metropolitan rank and gave it as suffragans the new sees of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Bardstown—subsequently Louisville. Bishop Concannon, nominated at Rome for New York, died en route with the documents, so that the consecration of the other bishops was delayed until 1810. Then Archbishop Carroll imposed hands in turn on Cheverus for Boston, Egan for Philadelphia, and Flaget for Bardstown. This completed the hierarchical organization of the United States during John Carroll's lifetime, and the country remained a single ecclesiastical province for forty years. The venerable pioneer bishop ended a long life of missionary labor at Baltimore on December 3, 1815. The marks of esteem tendered him by Protestants as well as Catholics during his last days indicate that he had largely fulfilled the hopes that he expressed in 1785: "To dissipate prejudice, time will be our best aid, as also will Divine Providence and the experience of our fellow citizens in our devotion to our country and its independence." He had seen the Church in the United States grow from about 25 priests and 25,000 Catholics in 1774, to at least 125 priests and 125,000 of the faithful by the time of his death—for the Catholic population is estimated at 195,000 by 1820.

B. *Catholic Foundations* (*1773–1815*)

(1) DIOCESAN BEGINNINGS

Baltimore. Until the division of the diocese in 1808, Bishop Carroll preserved the existing subdivisions of the American mission. He himself cared for the Middle District in Maryland, and had fairly regular vicars-general for the Northern, Southern, and Western Districts. By 1815 Baltimore city had four churches and the seminary. But the Southern District was sparsely provided with missionary priests. Virginia received its first resident priest in 1791; he was Jean Dubois, future bishop of New York. The French Revolution was an ill wind that blew much good

to the New World in the person of *émigrés* who worked in the Carolinas and Georgia. Unfortunately, insubordination and Trusteeism were also rife.

Boston had its first resident priest in 1788, but the pastors proved ill-suited until the arrival in 1792 of the exemplary Abbé François Matignon, whose brilliant assistant, Jean Cheverus, became the first bishop in 1808. Bigotry was not yet dead in Boston, for in 1800 Father Cheverus was tried for officiating at a Catholic marriage. Though threatened with the pillory, he was at length acquitted of wrongdoing. As bishop, this ascetic, sociable, learned missionary won all hearts. He was one of Boston's leading citizens when ill-health forced him to return to France —where he was later named a cardinal.

New York. As late as 1777, Père de la Motte had been arrested for saying Mass in New York, but in 1781 Father Farmer could open a chapel over a carpenter shop. Catholics also worshipped in the Spanish Embassy chapel until St. Peter's Church was erected in 1786 with donations from the Spanish crown. Trusteeism blighted the early history, and the first bishop never arrived in his see. Until the arrival of the second bishop in 1815, the diocese was administered by Father Anthony Kohlmann.

Philadelphia. By 1790 there were five parishes served by ex-Jesuits in Pennsylvania. The German Catholics were prone to welcome unauthorized priests of their language from Europe, and Trusteeism became serious. It was undoubtedly to placate malcontents that Bishop Carroll recommended the exemplary German priest Graessl as coadjutor, but after his premature death clerical disputes plagued the brief episcopate of the first bishop, Michael Egan (1808–14).

Bardstown was the scene of activity of Father Badin, self-styled "proto-priest of the United States." This eccentric but basically zealous priest labored in the early West from 1794 to 1819. For bishop, Bardstown was happy to have the Sulpician, Benoit Flaget (1763–1850), who with his faithful lieutenant and coadjutor, John David (1761–1841), gave the Northwest over thirty years of prudent direction.

(2) Origins of Trusteeism (1784–1815)

The democratic atmosphere of the United States might be termed the radical cause of Trusteeism, a near schismatic tendency that threatened ecclesiastical discipline in the United States during the first half century of its national existence. This development was less surprising since Catholics, a small minority in a predominantly Protestant environment, of necessity received only the minimum essentials of religious instruction, and but infrequently had an opportunity to receive the sacraments. In daily life they were continually exposed to the attractive

theory of Democracy in civil government, which their Protestant compatriots were not slow in extending to religious government as well. Many American Catholics, despite a basic reverence for the Holy See, came to assume more or less in good faith that New World Democracy might modify traditional Catholic Authoritarianism.

Incorporation of church property provided the immediate occasion for the difficulty. Discriminatory laws during colonial days had forced Catholics to use devious methods to safeguard what little ecclesiastical property they had. The Jesuit missionaries in Maryland had usually taken title to church real estate as individuals, handing it on by will to their designated successors. This precarious system was at the mercy of accidents of sudden death, unsympathetic probate courts, and avaricious clerics. The Jesuits, barred from private property by their vow of poverty, conserved the church property intact, and even after secularization had preserved an *esprit de corps*. This could not be expected of seculars, some of whom had constituted disciplinary problems in their European dioceses, and were now open to temptations to avarice and ambition. A solution for the problem seemed to be suggested by an act of the New York legislature of April 6, 1784. This allowed lay trustees of any church or congregation to "have, hold, use, exercise and enjoy, all and singular the churches, meeting-houses, parsonages . . . to the sole and proper use and benefit of them the said trustees and their successors forever in as full, firm, and ample a manner in the law, as if the said trustees had been legally incorporated."

Early problems. Though this and similar subsequent enactments of other states contemplated a Protestant type of ecclesiastical government, they were so worded as to permit Catholics to take advantage of them. The congregation of St. Peter's Church in New York City began by choosing five lay trustees under the foregoing statute. Bishop Carroll, familiar with European and lay patronage, was induced to tolerate this procedure in view of the precarious condition of church property, though the sixth decree of his Synod contemplated appointment of the trustees by the pastor, and restricted their functions to taking up the collection. Bitter experience would reveal that some trustees, with more attention to civil than canon law, deemed themselves masters not only of the property but even of the clergy of the Church. Weak or venal clerics were found, moreover, to conspire with such trustees in defying episcopal authority itself. Instances of this serious evil appeared even during Bishop Carroll's lifetime, although his prestige, popularity, and amiable tact mitigated problems and postponed major crises until later, when the problem would be aggravated by nationalist friction within Catholic ranks. Thus St. Peter's of New York saw disputes between Fathers Whalen and Nugent until Father William O'Brien was finally recog-

nized at law as legitimate pastor. Holy Trinity Church in Philadelphia went as far as schism between 1797 and 1802 in defense of the clerical vagrants, Goetz and Elling. From 1793 Dr. Gallagher, orator and inebriate, was in and out of favor with hierarchy and trustees in the Carolinas, and eventually precipitated a schism in Charleston. At New Orleans, the rector of the cathedral, Antonio de Sedella, entrenched himself with his masonic-minded flock, and defied both Spanish and American episcopal authorities from 1785 to his death in 1829. By 1815, then, Trusteeism had by no means reached its peak.

(3) EDUCATIONAL EXPANSION

Colonial mission schools are known in Florida from 1594, in New Mexico from 1630, in Texas in 1689, in Louisiana in 1722, in Missouri in 1774, in Indiana in 1786, and in California in 1793, but all ceased with the respective missions to which they had been attached. But the Ursuline Academy, founded in New Orleans in 1727, survived into the administration of the United States. English Jesuits had schools in Maryland and Pennsylvania; and one at Philadelphia, St. Mary's, is regarded as the oldest parochial school in the United States.

Clerical formation, stressed in the papal bull of erection for Baltimore, was carried out through St. Mary's Seminary. On his return to America, Bishop Carroll purchased One Mile Tavern as the nucleus of the new major seminary. Father Charles Nagot (1754–1816) became the first rector in 1791 and continued in his post until 1810. He brought over from France four professors and five seminarians for whose support the Sulpicians furnished 100,000 francs. The first ordinand (1793) was Stephen Badin, long a missionary in Kentucky, and the second (1795) was Lord Gallitizin who labored in Pennsylvania until his death in 1840. After his ordination the seminary lacked students for two years; only in 1800 did it ordain its third priest, the first native alumnus, Father William Mathews, pastor of St. Patrick's in Washington from 1805 to 1855. In 1803, however, Father Emery ordered the Sulpicians' return, claiming that the seminary was neither a financial nor spiritual success. Bishop Carroll appealed to the Holy See, and Pope Pius, at Paris in 1804 for Napoleon's coronation, prevailed on Father Emery: "My son, let it stand; it will bear fruit in its own time." St. Mary's vindicated the papal prophecy, for between 1791 and 1815 thirty priests were ordained for the needy American mission. After a number of unsuccessful attempts to use secular colleges as preparatory seminaries, the Sulpicians opened a minor seminary at Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, in 1808; when this was taken over by the Diocese of Baltimore in 1826, they began another at Catonsville.

Lay instruction under the national period began with Carroll's founda-

tion of Georgetown College (1789). Sulpicians assisted in the teaching at Georgetown until 1806, when the College was committed to the revived Society of Jesus; it was chartered as a university in 1815. Besides the Sulpician colleges already mentioned, the Dominicans founded St. Thomas Academy in Kentucky in 1807. Most remarkable among these early educators was Father Richard, who in 1798 took over an existing French Canadian school at Detroit, opened a high school in 1802, edited the first Catholic newspaper, the *Michigan Essay,* in 1809, became vice-president of Michigan University in 1817, and was elected to the Federal Congress in 1823. Besides St. Mary's parochial school in Philadelphia (1781), Holy Trinity School was erected in the same city in 1789. St. Peter's parochial "free school" in New York City dates from 1800, but there is no record of a parish school in New England during Bishop Carroll's lifetime. A school opened by the Poor Clares at Baltimore in 1792 was continued after their departure in 1805 by a community of Visitandines founded by Bishop Neale. Mother Seton is entitled to a place of honor beside Bishop Carroll as a pioneer educator, for her school dates from 1808, and educational institutions were associated with most of the early religious houses now to be noted.

(4) EARLY RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

Mother Seton. Elizabeth Bayley (1774–1821), reared as an Episcopalian, was married to Mr. William Seton (1768–1803) of New York in 1794. His death in Italy brought her into contact with Catholicity as practiced by their friends, the Filiccis. On her return to the United States, Mrs. Seton braved her minister's displeasure to join the Catholic Church in 1805. Ostracized by most of her relatives, the widow turned to teaching in order to support her children. In time her life approximated to that of a religious and attracted disciples. Though she wished to affiliate her nascent community with St. Vincent de Paul's Daughters of Charity, the Napoleonic Wars prevented this. Yet she modeled the rule of her Sisters of Charity after theirs, subject to certain modifications suggested by Bishop Carroll, who approved the institute in 1812. In the latter year her Academy begun at Baltimore in 1808 moved to Emmitsburg, which became the headquarters of her community. A portion of her foundation subsequently affiliated with the Daughters of Charity, while other groups survive as the Sisters of Charity.

Nuns. Though the first nuns in the United States, the Carmelite contemplatives (1791), could not be persuaded to open a school, educational institutions of one kind or another were associated with the convents of the Poor Clares (1792), the Visitandines (1799), Mother Seton's Sisters of Charity (1812), and the Lorettines, founded in 1812 by Father Charles Nerinckx in Kentucky.

Communities of men. The Jesuit pioneers in the English Colonies were reinforced soon after American independence by the Austin Friars from Dublin (1796), the Franciscans under Father Egan, subsequently bishop of Philadelphia (1799), and the Dominicans, introduced by the native Marylander, Edward Fenwick, later bishop of Cincinnati (1804). The Trappists (1804–12), however, discovered that they could not endure pioneer clerical life without mitigating their severe austerities; they returned to Europe to await a more providential time. Enlisted for the American missions by Bishop Du Bourg at Rome, Fathers De Andreis, Rosati, and other Italian Vincentians departed for their destination late in 1815, but did not reach the United States during Bishop Carroll's lifetime.

69. FRENCH CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION

A. The Estates General (*January–June, 1789*)

(1) PREPARATIONS

Mode of selection. On January 24, 1789, the crown issued regulations for convoking the three Estates as "counsellors and friends." They were assured that they would speak for the nation, control taxation, and meet at regular intervals in the future—for their last regular assembly had been in 1614. Individual liberty would be safeguarded, *lettres de cachet* and press censorship would end, and a constitution—very vague in the royal mind—would ensure equal taxation for all. Each Estate was directed to choose its representatives in the traditional manner, though as a palliative the Third Estate was allowed double representation. The First Estate chose 308 delegates by the votes of all ordained members, a system which gave little preference to the prelates and provoked some friction. The Second Estate, more homogeneous, had less difficulty in choosing 285 nobles. Progressives seem to have gained a majority of the 621 members chosen by the Third Estate where the number of Rationalists and Freemasons was probably out of proportion.

Secular objectives are revealed in the *cahiers* or memorials drawn up by various district constituencies for directing their delegates in voicing grievances. Their tenor was frequently suggested by bourgeois lawyers, and the duke of Orléans is believed to have exercised a special influence throughout the Loire Valley. A consensus of these complaints reveals desires for a "constitution," a "King of the French," i.e., a limited rather than absolute monarch, equal taxation, guarantees of personal liberty, abolition of abuses in administration, and the termination of the feudal privileges.

Clerical aspirations exhibit the point of view of the rank and file of the secular clergy. Frequently mentioned proposals were: (1) change

of the method of choosing bishops: some would have the crown advised by a new council of conscience; others wished election by the clergy; (2) pastoral representation in councils and synods, with stress on pastoral experience as a qualification for prelatial posts; (3) suppression of monastic religious houses or redirection of their personnel to the active ministry—though there was little objection to convents of nuns. What is remarkable is that these and all other desired "reforms" were sought from the crown; not one *cahier* proposed recourse to the Holy See to remedy abuses.

(2) DELIBERATIONS

Organizational contest. The Estates General formally opened their sessions at Versailles on May 5 when they listened to a rambling speech from the throne, and long reports by Barenton and Necker that were poorly understood. But on May 6 the king directed the Estates to organize separately in order to cast their votes by houses, as of yore. Since this procedure would enable the two privileged Estates to outvote the commoners, the Third Estate invited the others to join them in forming a "National Assembly" where voting would be by head. This method, in view of the Third Estate's double representation, could ensure the latter a slight majority. A deadlock ensued until June 17 when Abbé Sieyès led the Third Estate in arrogating to itself the role of "National Assembly." Many clerics and a few nobles expressed sympathy with this plan, although the majority votes of the privileged Estates opposed it.

Victory of the Third Estate. On June 22 a long-delayed royal session was held. The court had twice evicted the commoners from their meeting places, and they had retorted by an oath not to disband until they had given the nation a constitution. The king now bluntly ordered them to conform to the traditional organizational procedure. After the king's departure, however, the Third Estate, reputedly on Mirabeau's motion, refused to disperse, asserting that it represented the nation and that only bayonets could dismiss them. The court wavered between coercion and appeasement: while the comte d'Artois recommended the use of troops, others doubted their loyalty. Meanwhile the duc D'Orléans and forty-seven of the nobles rallied to the Third Estate, with which the majority of the clergy were now in sympathy. On June 27 the king yielded to the demand that all three Estates meet together and vote by head. Irresolute, averse to bloodshed, fearful of responsibility, Louis XVI would henceforth capitulate in every decisive political—though not religious—contest. The "sovereign people" had embarked on their momentous revolution for the principles of *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*—which last may be equated with nationalism.

B. Constituent Assembly (*June, 1789 to September, 1791*)⁹⁄₂₂

(1) BACKGROUND OF DELIBERATIONS

Political parties. The National Assembly became a disorderly body permitting endless discussion. Its leaders were mostly lawyers or civil servants. Though there were no organized political parties in the Anglo-Saxon sense, members might be classified according to their views. As "birds of a feather flocked together," this physical circumstance has given some ideological significance to the position of their seats. *The Right* showed itself politically inept, reactionary, without a positive program. The *Moderate Right*, indeed, was composed of theorists favoring constitutional monarchy on a British model, but it lacked popular and nationalist support. The *Plain* in the center of the assembly comprised some six hundred leaderless deputies with few decided views, and these easily modified by oratory or mob pressure. The *Moderate Left* was well led and provided the leadership for the first phase of the Revolution. *The Radicals*, seated in the "mountain" of the galleries, favored a republic, but had as yet little influence in the assembly itself while located at Versailles. Clubs, such as the Jacobins, outside the assembly, were quite as important as the deputies on the floor in preparing and pressing through measures.

Fall of the Bastile. The Parisian mob often showed its power. Reports, partly true, reached the populace that the court was planning a reaction. On July 11 the beloved Necker was dismissed, and it was rumored—falsely, as it proved—that Orléans was in exile. By July 12 the demagogue Des Moulins was stirring up discontent in Paris and for several days the mob was out of control. Private grudges were settled, shops pillaged, and then on July 14 the mob's attention was directed to the Bastile, symbol of autocracy, although at the moment housing but seven non-political criminals. The commandant Launay yielded after some skirmishing and bloodshed, while rumor and propaganda magnified the incident into a heroic popular storming of a royal stronghold.

"The Great Fear." The Bastile uprising prevented any possible royal *coup*. Louis XVI recalled Necker, donned a revolutionary cap, and absolved the rioters. The comte d'Artois in disgust led the aristocratic die-hards across the border—first of an increasing class of *émigrés*. Panic, probably in large measure artificially induced, spread into the provinces, where peasants began to take vengeance on hated landlords and destroy the written records of their feudal obligations. Impressed by these developments, prelates and nobles hastened during an emotional session on the evening of August 4 to renounce feudal privileges which by then the near anarchy had rendered largely academic. Included in this impulsive renunciation were the clerical tithes. By August

13 these pledges had been formally enacted into law, and the Assembly's "Rights of Man" included the declaration: "The National Assembly destroys the feudal regime entirely."

Storming of Versailles. Formulation of the constitution, however, was interrupted by new disturbances. When the court again manifested a supposed reactionary tendency—or intoxicated loyalists talked too freely —the Parisian demagogue Marat informed the citizens that counter-revolution was being plotted at Versailles. A mob, in large part feminine, marched on Versailles, October 5, followed at a distance by Lafayette and his newly formed bourgeois National Guard. The rioters invaded the Assembly with their demands for bread. While the president, Mounier, went to negotiate with the court, the bishop of Langres, presiding in his absence, was insulted and ridiculed. The rioters were finally appeased for the time being and settled down for the night. Lafayette persuaded the king to substitute his civic guard for the royal troops. Early the next morning, however, the mob anticipated Lafayette, surged through the civilian guard afraid or unwilling to fire on it, and sacked the palace, where it narrowly missed capturing the queen, whom it gave every indication of murdering. Lafayette belatedly restored order by persuading the king to promise to move to the Tuileries in Paris, and the balcony appearance of the still beloved monarch put the Parisians in good humor. They transported the royal family in a carriage to Paris, and installed the "Baker's family" in a near prison at the Tuileries Palace. The Assembly followed the monarch to Paris where it was installed in the Manege, much more accessible to mob pressure and threats from the galleries.

(2) THE CONSTITUTION: SECULAR PROVISIONS

"Rights of Man and the Citizen." Protracted debates had been going on regarding the "rights of man" which were elaborately defined according to prevailing deist and rationalist philosophy. The work, which proceeded in piecemeal fashion, may be here summarized. In place of the Old Regime of "arbitrary fiat," was to be substituted what purported to be a government by law. Thus Article 1 declared that: "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights"—about duties the Liberals were much less emphatic. Abbe Sieyès took the lead in proclaiming freedom of speech, of the press, from arrest, of trial; moreover, "no one may be disturbed for his opinions, even in religion, provided that their manifestation does not trouble public order as established by law" (Article 10). Private property was highly safeguarded, and the original Declaration of August, 1789, proclaimed it a "sacred and inviolable right."

Political administration. But slogans more than practical statesmanship ruled the day, and fear of tyranny led to a clumsy administrative

machinery on a theory of separation of powers. The king was named chief executive, but given slight control over elective officials in charge of executive bureaus, themselves denied seats in the legislature. A uni-cameral legislative assembly took the place of the estates, but a self-denying ordinance forbidding re-election promised another inexperi-enced body. Legal *parlements* were replaced by elected judges who soon became tools of the dominant faction. The local provinces were replaced by eighty-three *départements* deliberately suppressing tradi-tional boundaries, customs, and dialects. These *départements* and their subdivisions were made autonomous under a host of elected officials. Though all males over twenty-five were made "passive citizens," only "active citizens," determined by a high property qualification, were al-lowed to vote. Electoral procedure was so indirect and complicated, elections and candidates so numerous, that soon all but purposeful Jacobins were discouraged in its exercise.

(3) THE CONSTITUTION: RELIGIOUS PROVISIONS   9/26

Secularization of property. Financial difficulties were an occasion for anticlerical legislation, for the Assembly dared not enforce the old taxes and feared to impose new ones. On October 10, 1789, the worldly Bishop Talleyrand of Autun proposed that all the ecclesiastical property be placed at the disposal of the "Nation." After acrimonious debate, con-fiscation was voted on November 2 by the narrow margin of 368 to 346. Mirabeau then proposed the *assignats,* interest-bearing notes to be issued in large denominations and backed by the church property as collateral, and in the face of a passive and silent hierarchy sales began in Decem-ber. The secular clergy were offered in recompense a salary of 1,200 francs from the state treasury; Mirabeau felt they would become "public officers" subject to governmental control. Though nationalization indeed cooled clerical ardor for the Revolution, the Assembly still believed that it had done nothing more than substitute its sovereignty over the ec-clesiastical order for that of the crown. On February 13, 1790, the sup-pression of the religious orders was voted, the Assembly graciously of-fering the religious a dispensation of their vows, although leaving them but meager means of support. Nuns might remain in their convents and only six hundred of thirty-seven thousand took advantage of the "dis-pensation." Male religious who wished to remain were ordered grouped in a few "concentration monasteries," irrespective of rule or order. Even conscientious religious preferred not to remain on such terms; they sought work or asylum in the parishes or with their families.

Regimentation of clergy. During the debates on the religious settle-ment, secularists observed that: "The Church is in the state; the state is not in the Church." Since separation of Church and state was still

inconceivable to many Frenchmen, the Assembly on July 12, 1790, voted the "Civil Constitution of the Clergy." This made some provisions under four titles: ① Existing eighteen archbishoprics were to be reduced to ten, and 135 dioceses to 85, one for each *département*, while towns having less than 6,000 inhabitants were restricted to a single priest. ② Parishes were to be equated with communes, and pastors were to be elected by the district assemblies. They were to receive canonical institution from the bishop, but might name their own assistants. Bishops in turn were to be elected by departmental electoral colleges, and instituted by the metropolitans. True confirmation by the Holy See was excluded; Rome was merely to be notified of an accomplished fact. ③ Prelatial revenues were curtailed in favor of the poorer curates. Bishops were now allowed 12,000 to 20,000 livres; minor prelates 3,400 to 4,000; pastors, 1,200 to 4,000; assistants, 700 to 1,200. ④ Clerical residence was required under pain of forfeiture of salary: bishops and pastors must obtain governmental leave for all absences.

Clerical schism. Pope Pius VI hesitated to condemn this measure immediately, though he requested the king not to sanction it. The papal request arrived a day late; Louis XVI had signed on July 22. Even then the pope delayed formal condemnation of the Civil Constitution until April 13, 1791, although he had previously sustained clerics who defied it. The French hierarchy had denied the Assembly's competence to enact the Civil Constitution, but on November 27, 1790, the Assembly retorted by exacting an oath, effective January 4, 1791. Abbé Gregoire led 62 priests in the Assembly in taking the oath. Of 160 bishops, only Cardinal Brienne of Sens, Talleyrand of Autun, Jarentes of Orléans, and Savine of Viviers, among the ordinaries, took the oath, along with three auxiliaries. The majority of the non-juring bishops became *émigrés* in 1790, while Talleyrand on February 24, 1791, inaugurated a schismatic hierarchy by consecrating Marolles and Expilly. Though the consecrator deserted the ecclesiastical state shortly afterwards, he assured Father Emery of St. Sulpice he had had the proper intention. Thus the "constitutional" or juring hierarchy came into being. Exact figures on the attitude of the lower clergy are not available, but about forty-five per cent seem to have taken the oath at first, though some of these later retracted. Although the constitutional clergy were placed in control of the nationalized churches by the Assembly, many Frenchmen, especially the peasants, continued to support the "non-jurors," and in some instances forcibly kept them in possession. When the king resisted penalties for the non-jurors, the Assembly on May 9, 1791, temporized by allowing the latter to say Mass in the churches with the jurors' leave. As a consequence, many French parishes had two titulars. Thus the Civil Constitution effected the first real break in the ranks of the Third Estate, alienating the Revolution

not merely from the throne, but from the altar as well. The king, having ratified the Constitution with misgivings, was filled with remorse and now secretly intrigued with foreign powers in opposition to the new regime.

Ideological conflict. Meanwhile, Europe had begun to take sides in regard to the French Revolution. Jacobin clubs and masonic lodges sought to create a favorable "fifth column," while the *émigrés* spread tales of woe. Monarchs, at first disposed to rejoice at France's discomfiture, began to fear for their crowns. Incorporation of Alsace-Lorraine embroiled the empire, and occupation of Avignon involved the papacy. Queen Marie Antoinette entered into communication with her brother, Emperor Leopold II, and the royal family attempted to flee to Metz on June 20, 1791, in order to co-operate with an army of liberation. Halted at Varennes, the king was ignominiously brought back to Paris. Henceforth he was discredited and quite powerless to halt a radical trend. Yet he gave formal sanction to the Constitution, September 14, 1791, and the Assembly dissolved. Supposedly the Revolution was over, but there would yet be some bloody amendments to the "Constitution of the Rights of Man and the Citizen."

C. *Legislative Assembly (October, 1791 to September, 1792)*

(1) POLITICAL SITUATION

Domestic shift to the Left. The newly elected legislature was composed of more extreme revolutionists, for only five per cent of the people had voted and Jacobin electoral propaganda had been largely successful. The Girondins constituted the dominant party, drawn chiefly from the region of that name in the south of France. Their leaders were agnostic or atheistic lawyers, often pompous theorists who aped Roman classicism. The party was largely bourgeois in composition; if it had any definite program, it inclined to favor federation of local units. On the other hand, the Jacobins were predominantly Parisian and tended to be centralist in politics. Their chiefs proved more responsive to the mob. The doctrinaire theorist Robespierre was at first overshadowed by a brutal realist, Danton. The old Right had fled, and the former Moderate Right, having lost its great strategist, Mirabeau, remained an uninfluential minority. The Plain was as vacillating as before, prone to bend under pressure of the proletarian Parisian populace, controlled by Marat.

Foreign menace. The king's unsuccessful flight had not merely destroyed his prestige: it had focused attention on the foreign intervention secretly invoked by the court and openly demanded by the *émigrés*. The Assembly strove to force the latter to return to France under penalty of judicial death sentence and confiscation of property. This measure did little more than stress the ideological nature of the conflict into which

France was to draw most of Europe. The menace of foreign intervention on behalf of the king and against the Revolution now formed a background for the deliberations of the Assembly, and inclined it in self-defense to ever more extreme measures. In Germany, with Prussian support for a change, the Habsburgs mobilized the resources of the antique Holy Roman Empire. The Assembly adopted a defiant attitude toward alien threats, and on April 20, 1792, forced the king to declare war upon his would-be rescuers. This brought down on France the armies of the First Coalition (1792–97). At first a succession of French ministries mismanaged military operations, but the Assembly merely blamed the royalists and the clergy for disasters. Vastly superior allied forces slowly penetrated France against undisciplined militia. Allied propaganda, however, boomeranged for it made the Radicals more desperate.

Fall of the monarchy. When the Prussian commander Brunswick issued an inept threatening manifesto, the Assembly on July 11 proclaimed the country in danger, and presently evoked a *Levée en masse*, the first total mobilization of a nation for war. Popular suspicions of the king's loyalty to France culminated in an attack on the Tuileries, August 9–10. The Swiss Guard was massacred and the royal family forced to take refuge with the Assembly. This, after suspending the king from his functions, consigned him to the old house of the Knights Templar under close surveillance. Radicals gained control of the Assembly which soon dissolved, calling for a new constitutional convention to provide republican institutions for France. The monarchy had terminated; its abolition the following September 21 merely confirmed this.

(2) ECCLESIASTICAL REPERCUSSIONS

Anticlerical legislation was the natural consequence of the fact that the moderate Leftists now in power came to identify the non-jurors with the *émigrés* and the foreign foes of the Revolution. As early as November, 1791, the Assembly had threatened the non-jurors with deportation and had annulled the property rights of such of the faithful as had deserted the ministrations of juring clergy. The king, however, had vetoed this legislation and rural sentiment veered more strongly in favor of the non-jurors. But in May, 1792, war excitement enabled the Assembly to override the royal veto by again voting exile for non-jurors and seizing all church goods for the benefit of the jurors. An effigy of the pope was insulted by a Parisian mob, the church of Ste. Geneviève converted into the Pantheon, and the papal territory of Avignon formally annexed to France.

Persecution was not long in following. Abbé Raynau, archdeacon of Senez, is the first priest known to have been killed during the Revolution. He was slain on June 6, 1792, and at least twenty-two others are

known to have been killed before the September massacres opened the violent phase of the Revolution. When Danton came into power as virtual director of the provisional government, August 10, 1792, the arrest of all non-jurors was ordered. The Assembly concluded its labors by usurping jurisdiction over marriage: civil marriage, clerical matrimony, and divorce were legalized. But the massacres of September soon made brutally clear that the constitutional phase of the French Revolution had ceased for a time, and that a violent period, justified as a war measure, was opening.

70. FRENCH VIOLENT REVOLUTION 9/29

A. *The Convention (September, 1792 to October, 1795)*

(1) REPUBLICAN BAPTISM BY BLOOD

September massacres. Imprisonment of the clergy continued throughout August. While the lame duck Legislative Assembly was making way for the Convention, real power lay with the Commune of Paris. The Right had fled, the Center went into hiding, and the Moderate Left was intimidated by the extremists. On August 30, Danton suggested a general search for concealed weapons in the city, and this gave occasion to murder. Danton, if not personally desirous of the massacre, abetted it by entrusting the search to the bloodthirsty Marat. At the latter's suggestion the guards were removed from the prisons, and for some days the government's eyes were closed: indeed, a committee of investigation reported that "it was too dark to see anything." Jacobin orators then stirred up the populace to exercise their "sovereign justice" by killing all "counterrevolutionaries." From September 2 to 6, mobs invaded prisons and dwellings to kill the "enemies of the Revolution" outright, or drag them before improvised tribunals which passed routine death sentences. All known non-jurors, save Monsignor Salamon, the secret papal nuncio, were killed. Exact statistics are impossible, but the number of victims is placed between eleven hundred and fifteen hundred, among whom there were about four hundred priests. The massacres precipitated widespread emigration on the part of the French clergy: some thirty thousand to forty thousand fled or were deported. Heroic non-jurors who remained had to go underground, while France was terrified into acceptance of a Jacobin dictatorship.

Republican inaugural. The elections for the Convention, the new legislature, were conducted under shadow of the September massacres. Only six hundred thousand voters dared turn out, and this resulted in another sharp shift to the Left in the political composition of the new body. Even the former Moderate Right had now vanished. The Girondists, formerly a comparatively Moderate Left, soon were branded by Jacobins as "Rightist Reactionaries," while the Radicals under Danton,

Marat, and Robespierre took over active leadership of the Convention.
Encouraged by the unexpected and somewhat mysterious French victory
at Valmy over the allied invaders, September 20, 1792, the Convention
abolished the monarchy and designated September 22 as the beginning
of the Year I of a new Revolutionary Calendar.

Regicide. With such measures the Girondists, republican constitu-
tionalists, would have been well satisfied. But the Jacobins clamored for
the execution of the king as a political necessity. For some time the
Girondists demurred, but under popular pressure were rushed from half
measure to half measure until at length they acquiesced in a death
sentence for Louis XVI. After a sensational trial, the former king was
condemned to death by 361 votes to 360 out of a possible 749. On
January 21, 1793, the election of Duke Hugh Capet in 987 was undone:
pedantically designated as "Citoyen Capet," his descendant Louis was
executed. Incompetent as a ruler, he yet knew how to die as a Christian
gentleman. Royalist sentiment, apathetic before the abuses of the *An-
cien Régime,* now revived and reached fanatical proportions among
some of the *émigrés,* including many of the prelates. On the other hand,
within France a regicide oligarchy had been created which was ir-
revocably committed to the Revolution and the war against foreign in-
tervention. Having gambled all, the Revolution must perforce subscribe
to Danton's slogan: *"L'audace, toujours l'audace."* In self-defense, the
Convention inaugurated a "Reign of Terror."

(2) The Reign of Terror (1793–94)

Civil conflict. In March, 1793, a royalist insurrection began in La
Vendée in the west of France, and this gave the Jacobins the ample
pretext for crushing all opposition by summary methods. From March 4,
1793, the executive was committed to a "Committee of Public Safety,"
armed with dictatorial powers. Thirty-one Girondin deputies were ar-
rested in June and the rest frightened into absenting themselves. Thus
purged, the Convention became a Jacobin tool. It voted the committee
plenary powers over conscription, war, life, and personal property. Ar-
rests were made on mere suspicion; prisoners were seldom allowed much
defense, and often were condemned in groups without even an op-
portunity to speak for themselves. The Terror, then, was the plan of a
select minority to force Frenchmen to become revolutionaries whether
they willed or no. The queen was executed in October, 1793, one of
over five thousand victims of the Terror which raged against Girondin
bourgeoisie as well as aristocrats; the grand total throughout France may
have reached twenty or thirty thousand. The guillotine became the
"national razor," and hysterical fashions *à la guillotine* were adopted.
In the Midi the infamous Carrier found the guillotine too slow for he

had two thousand victims drowned in the Loire. Fouché, ex-Oratorian, conducted judicial massacres at Lyons. And in October, 1793, the Vendée uprising was crushed in a holocaust of slaughtered prisoners of war. Meanwhile, under the brilliant direction of Danton and Carnot, the French had forced the allies back across the Rhine. Belgium and the Rhineland were invaded, and Napoleon Bonaparte had recaptured Toulon from the British fleet. The Republic was more than saved.

Religious persecution began when the Convention on March 19, 1793, proscribed all priests. On April 23, the death penalty was decreed for non-jurors still exercising their functions, and deportation for others. Though married clerics were exempted from these penalties in November, the Terror eventually began to rage against all priests, and the constitutional clergy in large part apostatized or submitted to Rome. On November 6, 1793, the constitutional bishops, Gobel of Paris and Lindet of L'Eure, had abjured the Faith in presence of the Convention, and four days later Gobel attended the fete of the Goddess of Reason in Notre Dame. Such constitutional clergy as remained at their posts went through at least a formality of marriage. Iconoclasm, official or voluntary, had free reign; Catholic worship was proscribed.

Rationalist aberrations. In a delirium of rationalist frenzy, all traditions, but especially Christian ones, were rejected. Men substituted pagan terms for their Christian names; cities, streets, and squares were renamed; all titles yielded to "citoyen"; knee breeches were abandoned for long trousers—for it is an ill wind that does not blow some good. Universal secular education was decreed, though few schools were actually organized. A utilitarian culture of heart and body was proclaimed. The press came into its own as an instrument of propaganda. The new calendar designedly played havoc with cherished Christian feasts, while naturalist cults were flaunted. The Republican ritual had its "Decalogue," its hymns, its choral readings from Rousseau, its pilgrimages to shrines of liberty; there were civic baptisms and patriotic holy water fonts. The enthronization of a showgirl as "Goddess of Reason" in Notre Dame cathedral is notorious, but it might be noted that this was but part of a general policy. We have the detached view of an English Protestant observer: "When the festival of Reason is to be celebrated by a *département*, a delegate arrives some days in advance, accompanied by a goddess, if the town itself cannot supply a suitable one. She is attired in a Roman tunic of white satin, usually taken from a theatrical wardrobe, and wears a red cap trimmed with oak leaves. Her left arm rests on a plough, in her right hand she holds a lance. Her foot is on a globe and around her are the mutilated symbols of feudalism. In this pose the goddess with all her paraphernalia is borne along by the mayor, the judges and other officials, who whether enraptured or enraged, have

to present an appearance of respect. . . . Installed on an altar . . . she addresses the people who in return pay her homage. . . . Wherever possible a priest is procured to abjure his Faith in public and to declare that Christianity is nothing but a fraud. The festival ends with a bonfire in which prayer-books, saints' images, confessionals, and other pieces of church furniture are burnt. Most of those present stand looking on in silence, struck dumb with horror and amazement; others, either drunk or paid, . . . dance around. . . ."[15]

(3) JACOBIN RIVALRIES (1794)

Struggle of factions. Although the Terror had repressed revolt at home and thrust back foreign armies, its Jacobin sponsors began to turn on one another early in 1794. In January, the faction of *"Enragés,"* indignant critics of everything, were the first to be liquidated; their leader, the ex-priest Jacques Roux, committed suicide. Next Danton and Robespierre united against Hébert's "Communists," atheistic proletarians of leveling tendencies. These *sans-culottes* had terrorized terrorists and seemed to kill for the joy of it. In March, Hébert and his followers, denounced of undermining the Revolution by extremism, were arrested and guillotined. Next Robespiere turned on Danton and the "Indulgents," who argued that since the Terror was but a means to victory in war, it ought to cease with victory. During April, the blood-weary Danton was overcome without offering much resistance.

"Reign of Virtue." Robespierre and his "Purists" were now the sole survivors. Robespierre argued that the Terror must continue until Republican principles had been everywhere established. This precise, incorruptible, pedantic lawyer was a Deist and doctrinaire. Having substituted worship of the "Supreme Being" for that of the "Goddess of Reason," on June 8 he presided as high priest at a new festival, that of the "Supreme Being." But though Atheism was thus officially repudiated, persecution of practicing Catholics did not cease. Sister Marguerite Rutan died at Dax, Blessed Magdalene and other Daughters of Charity were executed in June, and thirty-two nuns were put to death at Orange during July, 1794. Everywhere it was made clear that the "Supreme Being" had but one prophet: Robespierre. It was no longer enough to be a Jacobin; one had to be positively for Robespierre. It was ordered that trials of those accused—often on mere suspicion or indictment by a Purist leader—were to be conducted without allowing the accused to speak. During the six weeks of the "Reign of Virtue," thirteen hundred heads fell in Paris alone.

[15] Ludwig Pastor, *History of the Popes* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1953), XL, 208.

(4) Conservative Reaction

Thermidor. Robespierre eventually overreached himself, since sheer dread for their own lives induced collaborators to turn against him to escape his sensitive suspicions. Fouché, disgraced for his rule at Lyons, feared chastisement. When he started a whispering campaign against Robespierre in the Jacobin club, Robespierre retaliated by indicting his unnamed enemies in the Convention. But in announcing a new purge of his foes, he made a tactical error, for now all members felt insecure. Fouché anticipated the purge on 9 Thermidor—July 28—by denouncing Robespierre in the Convention and later seizing him and his chief lieutenants. Robespierre and his associates then followed their many victims to the over-worked guillotine.

Moderate revival. Fouché and his fellow conspirators were themselves terrorists: they had intended to continue the iron rule—against someone else. But at once they were hailed on all sides as liberators who had put an end to the Terror. So genuine and spontaneous was this popular sentiment, that the Thermidorians found it expedient to acquiesce in the role assigned to them. Accordingly they permitted the surviving Girondists to return to the rump Convention, while the Plain, hitherto "motionless amid evil deliberations," re-emerged to second the bourgeois, plutocratic trend of that reconstituted body. A new constitution (August, 1795) called for a bicameral legislature, and a five-man executive, the Directory. Jacobins objected to this proposal, but 13 Vendémiaire (October 5) saw Barras and Bonaparte defend Thermidor by a "whiff of grapeshot." It was the first time that a leftist uprising had failed. Having perpetuated two thirds of its members in the new legislature, the Convention adjourned on October 26, 1795.

Lull in persecution. Thermidor did not at once halt the persecution of the Church. Indeed, the Convention by suppressing the budget for public worship, September 18, 1794, implied that religion was a thing of the past. But once more popular opinion failed to agree with the men in power, and without awaiting governmental authorization Catholics resumed public worship on all sides. Thereupon the Convention tried to wash its hands of the religious issue by decreeing, February 21, 1795, separation of Church and state. Freedom of worship was simultaneously proclaimed for the entire nation. Many non-jurors now came out of hiding or returned from abroad to resume their public functions. Constitutional Bishop Gregoire tried to rally the jurors as well, but many of these had renounced their priesthood. Disputes for possession of the churches were resumed between jurors and non-jurors so that on May 30, 1795, the Convention proposed to authorize the function of any priest

who would take a new oath of "loyalty to the Republic and its laws."
Royalists and *émigrés* denounced this as a betrayal of sacred duties of
allegiance, but Father Emery of St. Sulpice, who had almost miracu-
lously survived the Terror, declared that merely political issues were
involved. He accordingly led many non-jurors in taking the new pledge.
His attitude was eventually upheld in substance by Pope Pius VI, for on
June 8, 1796, the papal bull, *Pastoralis Sollicitudo,* directed French
Catholics to obey the Republic in all just legislation. Unfortunately the
French Republic would not prove equally tolerant and progressive, and
the new Directory, far from reaching an accord, would, after a period of
"unfriendly neutrality," launch a new persecution. Nevertheless the Ther-
midorian regime, in contrast to the Terror, afforded the Catholic clergy
and the faithful a much needed period for recuperation and reorganiza-
tion. French society would never return as a unit to the simple faith of
the *Ancien Régime,* but never again would the French Church forget
the martyrs of the Revolution and their legacy of initiative and heroism.

B. The Directory (1795–99) ¹⁰/₃

(1) THE PLUTOCRATIC DIRECTORY (1795–97)

The early Directory maintained its rule in the interests of bourgeois
businessmen by forcibly suppressing intermittent Jacobin uprisings. The
one director of first-rate ability, Carnot, was to be forced out in 1797.
Though one member of the five-man executive was to retire each year,
it was always Barras, unprincipled soldier of fortune, who remained.
Important chiefly by reason of duration, Barras was typical of the
Directory's self-seeking, avaricious, incompetent leadership. But Barras
had a valuable protégé in Napoleon Bonaparte who had quelled the
rising of Vendémiaire, and now proceeded to win victories in Italy.
At home pleasure became the order of the day. After the strain of the
Terror, society experienced a great relaxation of moral standards. Family
life was wrecked by easy divorce. Elementary modesty was flouted on
the streets. Political corruption and nepotism were rife. Since the wealthy
refused to shoulder their share of the tax burden, finances were again in
a sorry state until somewhat relieved by the booty amassed by General
Bonaparte's Italian victories. Police Commissioner Picquenard com-
plained: "Nobody can form any idea of the public depravity. . . .
Royalists smile on this depravity; they feel how much the spirit of dis-
solution that is entering every class is doing to degrade the republican
spirit. . . . Catholics are filled with sorrow for the fate of religion." [16]
But though Pope Pius VI had directed Catholics to submit to the Re-

[16] Louis Madelin, *French Revolution* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928),
p. 555.

public, and had himself refused to join the First Coalition against France, he was badly treated by the diplomats and generals of the Directory. Public opinion veered back to the monarchists, and a great number of moderates were elected early in 1797 to the two legislative houses, the Council of Ancients and Council of Five Hundred. These moderates proposed to abolish the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and concede official recognition to the non-jurors.

(2) THE RADICAL DIRECTORY (1797–99)

Jacobin reaction. This trend toward conservatism, if not to monarchism, alarmed the clique of Thermidorians who had been thus far exploiting the Directory. They and the army, largely Jacobin, combined to purge the government of reactionary elements. The result was the *coup d'état* of 18 Fructidor (September 4), 1797. With the support of General Augerau, Barras replaced conservative directors with Jacobins, and purged the legislatures of 154 alleged royalists. Fructidor, then, represents a reaction to Jacobin views.

Renewed persecution was to be expected. A new anti-religious campaign got under way. Although it professed to restrict itself to measures short of the death penalty, it must be remembered that the maximum legal sentence, deportation to French Guiana, was more often than not lethal. During 1797 a new oath required the clergy to profess "hatred for royalty and anarchy." The French hierarchy were divided on the morality of this profession, and Father Emery remained neutral. A period of perplexed consciences ensued until the Holy See indicated its disapproval. From France, to which Belgium had been annexed by the victorious republican arms, some ten thousand priests were deported during this "Second Terror." Providentially the British navy in many instances prevented execution of the sentence; of the deported clergy 258 actually reached French Guiana, where 118 died.[17] A new monarchist uprising broke out in the Vendée.

"Theophilanthropy" meanwhile was being sponsored by Director Revelliere. In this revival of Deist secularism, efforts were made to enforce the Revolutionary calendar with its ten-day week. The Theophilanthropists possessed themselves of some of the leading Catholic churches. Their dogma was confined to the existence of God and the immortality of the human soul; their moral stressed solidarity and tolerance; their liturgy was composed of hymns and lectures on the "Father of Nature," together with readings from Socrates, Zoroaster, Seneca, the Koran, and even the Bible. But long before the Directory's fall this artificial religion had been defeated by indifference and ridicule.

[17] E. Hales, *The Church in the Modern Era* (New York: Hanover House, 1958), p. 49.

(3) Papal Sufferings

Papal-French relations. Pope Pius VI, advised during the early stages of the French Revolution by his envoy, Monsignor Salamon, had consistently sustained the non-jurors, to whose bishops he granted ample special faculties. His threats and censures of the jurors were regarded by the French Republic as political acts—French rulers even objected to the pope's announcement of prayers for France as having political overtones. Not merely did the Republic annex Avignon, but its armies invaded the Papal States in 1796, even though the pope was not at war with France. In February, 1797, the victorious General Bonaparte dictated the Peace of Tolentino, which obliged Pius VI to cede Avignon and the Romagna, and to yield an indemnity of 46,000,000 scudi and precious art objects.

The Roman Republic. Bonaparte's brother Joseph as the French ambassador to Rome was instructed to foment a republican party in the Papal States. On December 28, 1797, a few hundred rebels were found to shout for: "Liberty; long live the Republic; down with the pope." Backed up from February, 1798, by French troops under General Berthier, three hundred organized "patriots" met in the Forum to declare the pope deposed from temporal rule in favor of seven consuls. When the Roman populace failed to respond enthusiastically to this engineered regime, Berthier feared that the pope's continued presence in Rome might inspire a reaction in his favor. Hence he was ordered to go to Siena. When the octogenarian pontiff begged to be allowed to die at Rome, Berthier retorted brutally: "You can die anywhere." Without preparation, the pope was hustled into a mail coach and driven to Siena where he remained for three months under moderate confinement. During his absence the "Roman Republic" was to collapse when the Russian general Suvorov's counter attacks drove back the French armies in Italy (1799).

Death of Pius VI. Meanwhile Pope Pius VI, transferred to the Carthusian monastery at Florence in May, 1798, could still correspond with the outside world. Cardinals Altieri and Antici, who had deserted him during the Roman Republic, were deposed, September, 1798. On March 28, 1799, the pope, now ailing and partially paralyzed, began his "stations of the Cross": he was dragged to Bologna, through Modena, Reggio, Parma, Turin, carried on a stretcher over the Alps to Briançon and Grenoble, and finally lodged in the abandoned city hall of Valence, France, on July 14, 1799. When French peasants greeted him enthusiastically, the pope was ordered on to yet another prison. This was more than he could stand: on August 28, 1799, he died at Valence, begging forgiveness for his enemies, peace for Europe, restoration of the

Faith to France, the return of the papacy to Rome. But as the French themselves used to say, *"qui mange du pape meurt";* four days previously, Napoleon Bonaparte had left Egypt to overthrow the Directory.

71. FRENCH NAPOLEONIC REVOLUTION

A. *The Consulate (1799–1804)*

(1) BONAPARTIST INAUGURAL (1799–1800)

"Heir of the Revolution." Napoleon Bonaparte, self-styled "son of the Revolution," was a Corsican individualist, hitherto unsuccessful in local politics, which he had sandwiched with his military career. A student of Reynall, Rousseau, and the *philosophes*, he had become a Freemason and an ardent Jacobin. After distinguishing himself at Toulon, he was rapidly promoted in the army. Arrested during the Thermidorian Reaction, he had been freed in time by his patron, Barras, to defend the Convention against an attempt of the mob. His services to Barras made possible his command of an army at an early age. Between 1795 and 1797 Bonaparte won military fame in Italy while evading too close identification with the domestic political factions. His Egyptian campaign seems to have been designed by the Directory in order to shelve a popular rival, but it served to win Bonaparte more glory—always enhanced by the latter's own propaganda. Son of both the *Ancien Régime* and the Revolution, Bonaparte reappeared in France at a critical time. He dreamed alike of being philosopher king and revolutionary zealot, some benevolent despot who would ensure equality and fraternity, if at the price of liberty. His ambitions grew to embrace an empire, French instead of German, secular instead of "Holy." Whether this would also include the Catholic Church depended upon circumstances: for, "my policy is to govern as the greatest number wish to be governed. . . . It was this policy which made a Catholic of me when I had finished the War of Vendée, a Mussulman when I had established myself in Egypt, and an Ultramontane when I had gained the good will of Italy. If I governed a Jewish people, I would re-establish the Temple."

Brumaire. On his return to France, October 8, 1799, Bonaparte, while professing a desire to retire to civilian life, began an unavowed campaign for public office. He declared himself against militarism and religious persecution; he was for light taxes, economy in government, free enterprise, security of private property; in short, let there be moderation in all things and unity of all factions under a strong and stable government. Abbé Sieyès, leader of the Plain and constitution-maker of the Republic, was captivated by this program and decided that a new constitution might usher in a government forceful enough to protect the plutocracy and the masses. Calot the financier—like Thyssen for Hitler—promised

to back Sieyès and Bonaparte. Barras was partly bribed and partly intimidated into refraining from resistance. With the assistance of Talleyrand, and the connivance of his brother Lucien Bonaparte, president of a branch of the legislature, Napoleon prepared a *coup d'état* for 18 Brumaire (November 9), 1799. At the head of his troops Napoleon harangued the legislators on the weakness of the Directory and the need of stronger government. Though he played his part badly—almost fainting in the melee—Napoleon was saved by his brother Lucien. Holding a dagger to Napoleon's breast, Lucien in approved Jacobin style assured the legislators that he would be the first to kill his brother were he to prove a traitor to the Revolution. Enough deputies were induced to name Bonaparte, Sieyès and Ducos provisional consuls to prepare a new constitution; dissenters fled or were thrown—gently—out of the window. Calot, observing the proceedings, instructed his brokers: "Buy." A dictatorship by Napoleon Bonaparte was about to begin its brilliant fifteen years.

(2) POLITICAL SETTLEMENT

A new constitution, adopted on Christmas, 1799, and promulgated on New Year's Day, 1800—thus did Napoleon subtly begin to lead France back to the Christian calendar—transformed the Republic into a veiled dictatorship. Sieyès had intended that the executive should consist of a commission of three consuls, but Bonaparte practically amended this to designation of himself as *first* consul with authority to promulgate laws, appoint most of the councillors, ministers, diplomats, judges, and generals, under the sole restraint of a merely consultative vote of the other consuls. The triumvirate ultimately named were: Bonaparte, the *novus homo,* Lebrun, moderate royalist, and Cambacérès, regicide. Though the Republic nominally continued until 1804, from the first Bonaparte was supreme since the legislative power was so divided that it was unable to check him effectively. For a council of state, named by the First Consul, had sole right to propose laws. These were debated by a tribunate which, however, had no authority to vote on them. Voting was done in a legislative court which was denied any right to discuss the proposals. Finally a senate made some appointments to minor posts. After Bonaparte had been proclaimed consul for life in 1802, even some of these forms of democracy disappeared.

Administration. Bonaparte, once an amnesty had put an end to the Second Vendean Insurrection, tried to minimize factions. He restored civil rights to relatives of *émigré* aristocrats whom he sought to attach to the new regime, and *émigrés* were included in his council of state along with regicides. Liberal pensions conciliated generals prone to revolt.

Choosing a ministry from all factions, Bonaparte pushed forward administrative centralization. Elected local prefects, sub-prefects, and mayors were replaced by direct appointees from Paris.

The Code Napoleon, Bonaparte's revision of Roman Law, was to prove his most enduring contribution. This compromise between the classical and the common law imposed a uniform, secularistic code, eventually imitated by most of Latin Europe. Though liberty was curbed, all citizens became equal before the law. Freedom of choice of occupation opened a career to non-nobles, though Bonaparte never understood the full implications of the Industrial Revolution. Article 1781 accepted employers' unsupported testimony regarding the proper amount of wages to be paid workingmen. Freedom of conscience was allowed and liberty of cult proclaimed. All children were to share equally in inheritance. Civil marriage was made available to all, and divorce allowed on certain conditions. A regimented national school system was planned. It was to be capped by a national university on secularist and rationalist principles, but this latter institution did not immediately influence the lower schools. Schools, even catechetical, were used for civilian training in a nationalistic, even chauvinistic, loyalty to the new regime. Newspapers, clubs, and theaters were carefully controlled. Bourgeois desires were satisfied by safeguarding of private property, and criminal procedure was made more humane. For good or ill, one could say with one of Bonaparte's aides: "In three years he has ruled more than the kings for a century."

Military vindication. Since 1798 France had been at war with a second coalition of Great Britain, Russia, Austria, Sicily, Portugal, and Turkey. Before Napoleon's return from Egypt, Italy had been lost and France invaded. Allied advance stalled, however, with Russia's withdrawal in October, 1799, and in June, 1800, Bonaparte's great victory at Marengo broke the back of the allied coalition. By February, 1801, Austria and the continental foes consented to the Peace of Lunéville which recognized French annexation or domination of the Netherlands, the west bank of the Rhine, Switzerland, and all of Italy north of an already truncated Papal State. Though Great Britain, save for a brief truce (1802–3), continued the war at sea until Bonaparte's Waterloo in 1815, until 1805 she could find none to support her on land. Bonaparte had restored French leadership on the Continent, and could devote himself to sharing the real and imaginary blessings of the French Revolution with the satellite republics of Batavia (Holland), Helvetia (Switzerland), Cisalpine (Lombardy), etc.

B. *The Religious Settlement*

(1) ELECTION OF POPE PIUS VII

Difficult conclave. The task of choosing a successor to Pope Pius VI who had died in France in August, 1799, was delayed and greatly complicated by the Italian wars and attempts of governments to dominate the papacy for political motives. Even before the late pontiff's death, Napoleon had written his brother Joseph, then ambassador at Rome, that if possible he was to prevent choice of a successor. The Roman Republic obviated normal electoral procedure, and it was not until November, 1799, that thirty-four cardinals could assemble at the Abbey of St. George on one of the Venetian islands, under Austrian protection. The conclave was protracted by the usual counterintrigues of France and Austria, now accentuated by grave ideological differences. It seemed that Cardinal Bellisome would be selected, subject to the approval of Emperor Francis II, but Monsignor Consalvi, secretary of the conclave, persuaded the cardinals to reconsider while they were awaiting the imperial response. On March 14, 1800, without awaiting imperial sanction, the cardinals elected Gregorio Chiaramonti, bishop of Imola, who had made several public pronouncements to the effect that Democracy could be easily harmonized with the Church's mission. On March 21 he was crowned as Pope Pius VII. Bonaparte had made no attempt to hinder the collapse of the artificially created Roman Republic, and Emperor Francis so far relented from his initial displeasure as to provide an Austrian ship to bring the new pope to Rome on July 3. Pope Pius was enthusiastically received by the Roman people. In August he named Consalvi cardinal secretary of state, and the latter served in that capacity throughout the long pontificate (1800–23), except for the period 1806 to 1814 when Bonaparte's pressure induced the pope to substitute Cardinal Pacca, at least for formal relations.

(2) THE CONCORDAT — *Updated Concordat of Bologna*

Negotiations commenced unofficially in July, 1800, when Bonaparte sounded out the aged and diplomatically inexperienced Cardinal Martiniana of Vercelli about some understanding between the Church and the new French government. These talks were officially pursued at Paris the following November by Monsignor Spina for the Holy See and Abbé Bernier for the Consulate. Though Spina, who arrived in lay attire, secured tentative accord on many points, the negotiations reached a deadlock on the point of hierarchical reorganization in May, 1801. Thereupon Cardinal Consalvi himself came to discuss matters with foreign minister Talleyrand, with some help from Father Emery. Consalvi had to resist Bonaparte's efforts to stampede, confuse, or fatigue

him, and brought the tortuous negotiations to an agreement on July 15, 1801. This was ratified by the pope on August 15 and by the First Consul on September 8. The Concordat was promulgated on Easter Sunday, April 10, 1802, when the bells of Notre Dame rang for the first time in a decade.

Provisions. The articles of the Concordat provided the following: 1) Catholicity was declared the privileged cult of the majority of Frenchmen, but not the state religion and other religions continued to be tolerated. 2–3) A compromise was to be reached about the sees of the Old Regime and the "Constitutional" ones of the Republic: pope and consul would use their authority to secure the resignations of uncooperative prelates. 4–5) Future episcopal selection would be regulated according to the Concordat of 1516: the First Consul would nominate and the pope confirm. 6–7) Bishops and other ecclesiastics would be obliged to take an oath of fidelity to the state. 8) Public prayers would be offered for the Republic and its Consuls. 9–10) New parochial boundaries were to be arranged and episcopal appointment of pastors subjected to governmental review. 11) The government would no longer endow chapters and seminaries. 12–13) Ecclesiastical property still under governmental control would be returned; that already in private possession would be condoned. 14–15) The government engaged to pay clerical salaries, leaving the faithful free to endow their churches. 16–17) The First Consul would enjoy the personal privileges of the former kings, though in the event of a non-Catholic holder of the office a new arrangement would be reached.

Restrictions. To the Concordat the First Consul in time published unilateral appendices termed "Organic Articles." These were the most vexatious: 1) The *exequatur* was claimed: no papal document might be received in France without governmental authorization. 2) Papal nuncios might not enter French territory without similar leave. 3) Conciliar decrees needed governmental sanction for promulgation. 4) National councils might not be held without the same approval. 6) The government claimed the right to hear appeals in cases of alleged violation of the "Customs of the Gallican Church." 12) Bishops shall be addressed merely as "Monsieur." 20) They may not leave their dioceses without governmental permission. 25) No one may be ordained unless he possesses property of 300 francs' value. Despite papal repudiation, Bonaparte repeatedly tried to apply these and other restrictions to the Concordat. He strove to regulate the seminary curriculum, demanded adoption of a single catechism and liturgy for the whole of France, forbade institution of new feasts, pretended to regulate preaching and matrimonial rites, and meddled in clerical administration and finances. In time, however,

this obnoxious secular interference alienated erstwhile Gallicans from the state to closer co-operation with the Holy See.

(3) French Ecclesiastical Reorganization

The new hierarchy. At Bonaparte's insistence, the eighty odd departmental sees were reduced to sixty, of which ten were to be metropolitan. Great difficulty was experienced in finding a new hierarchy, but the new organization was virtually complete by July 29, when Bonaparte's uncle, Cardinal Fesch, was named to the primatial see of Lyons. Of the new bishops, sixteen were progressives from the Old Regime, twelve were penitent "constitutionals," and thirty-two were priests newly consecrated. Few of the bishops of the Old Regime were enthusiastic about the Concordat, and several, headed by Coucy of La Rochelle, refused to resign. These came to constitute an enduring but relatively unimportant schismatic *"Petite Église"* which was not extinguished until 1894. On the other hand, Grégoire persisted until his death in 1831 as representative of a group of constitutional intransigents who refused to submit to the Holy See. On the whole, the new hierarchy was composed of realistic and hardworking men who tried to do their best in a bad situation. The new arrangement removed all temporal advantages from the lot of prelates, but also took away temptation for worldly ambition. Eventually the French hierarchy became more devoted to the Holy See; Gallicanism had received its death blow—though it was a long time in dying.

The new clergy. Not only were the bishops thus greatly reduced in numbers, but the French clergy could at first muster but a third to a half of its pre-revolutionary numbers. Seminaries had almost ceased to function. They were now hastily reconstituted, but not only were professors few and material resources discouraging, but vocations had fallen off. Yet ordinations arose from 344 in 1807 to 1,504 in 1816. These assembly line tactics turned out a poorly educated clergy which may have been less fitted to win back the French intelligentsia. Still, had all of them had the compensating virtue of one of those ordinands, the Curé of Ars, this might not have mattered. Government salaries were inadequate, and parsimony and donations of the faithful were needed to fill out the deficit. The clergy were far from being independent of secular control, and had to administer the sacraments at the cost of great personal sacrifice for slight material reward. By 1809 there were still but thirty-one thousand priests and many parishes were without pastors, although Brittany and a few other Catholic regions were better provided than the average.

Papal-governmental relations. From 1801 to 1808 Pope Pius VII was

represented in France by his legate, Cardinal Caprara, *persona grata* to Bonaparte by reason of his impressionable and pliant temperament. The Consul was represented in religious matters by M. Portalis, minister of public worship. Though a Gallican, Portalis was comparatively considerate of papal interests. Abbé Bernier, a non-juror who had rallied to the Consulate, remained liaison officer. Although promising from time to time to withdraw the "Organic Articles," e.g., on the eve of imperial coronation in 1804, Bonaparte continued to threaten the Holy See and the French clergy with this new Pragmatic Sanction. Later Cardinal Caprara allowed celebration of the feast of a "St. Napoleon" (unknown to the Roman Martyrology) on August 15, and approved of the imperial catechism which exacted of children a lengthy response of twenty-five lines on their duties to "Napoleon, our emperor."

(4) CONTINENTAL ECCLESIASTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

In Italy, Napoleon Bonaparte was willing to conclude a concordat which recognized the Church as the state religion, and conceded the clergy greater freedom than in France. The draft of this pact, the "Organic Law," was favorably received by the pope during 1802, but on June 23, Vice-President Melzi of the Italian Republic—of which Bonaparte himself was president—instituted a meddling ministry of public worship. New negotiations became necessary until a satisfactory accord was reached on September 16, 1803. But when promulgating this on January 24, 1804, Bonaparte's deputy appended a certain "Supplementary Decree," largely in the spirit of the French "Organic Articles"; e.g., bishops might not ordain or leave their diocese without governmental permission and civil marriage had to precede sacramental. Pius VII protested and through Cardinal Fesch's intervention Italian anticlericals were somewhat restrained. But governmental violations of the pact became chronic, and under the empire culminated in a papal-imperial rift.

In Germany, which came increasingly under Bonaparte's domination between 1801 and 1805, the French Consul also hoped to effect an agreement with the Church. After negotiations between Monsignor Severoli and Herr Franck, a draft was presented to the pope for confirmation in November, 1804. The proposal was, however, rejected by the pope because of the schismatic tendencies of Dalberg, Febronian-minded bishop and Bonaparte's candidate for primate of a new German state church. Dalberg's objective seems to have been a national patriarchate, and his attitude prevented ecclesiastical peace in Germany throughout the Napoleonic Era. Dalberg, as will be seen, was rebuffed at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and after his death in 1817 the Holy

See was able to conclude limited agreements with individual German states.

72. NAPOLEONIC IMPERIALISM

A. *Imperial Ascendancy* (*1804–8*)

(1) IMPERIAL SUNRISE

The coronation. On May 18, 1804, subservient legislative bodies proclaimed Napoleon Bonaparte "Emperor of the French." Bonaparte next sought papal confirmation of his new title, and Cardinal Consalvi persuaded Pope Pius to assist at the coronation in Paris in the hope that a revitalized Christendom might be created in the image of Charlemagne. But even before the ceremony, Bonaparte insisted that the traditional ritual be pared of theocratic vestiges: the medieval "*accipe coronam*" ought to become "*coronet te Deus*" in order to stress divine right monarchy. As it actually turned out, Bonaparte crowned himself with the pontiff little more than a passive spectator. For even such assistance Pope Pius had exacted promises of faithful observance of the Concordat and of complete restoration of the Papal States. Bonaparte did not keep his pledges, and upon his return to Rome Pius VII found that members of the curia ill concealed their conviction that he had lent the French ruler great prestige without obtaining any compensating advantages.

Imperial success. Internally, the new form of government made little real change in Bonaparte's dictatorship, though a new peerage was created and subordinate officials were given high-sounding titles. But outside of France, the imperial title, together with his assumption of the title of "King of Italy" in 1805, challenged what remained of the old European order. Austria, still in possession of ceremonial primacy as head of the Holy Roman Empire, was induced by Britain's William Pitt to join yet a Third Coalition against the upstart monarch. But on the first anniversary of his coronation, December 2, 1805, Bonaparte won the brilliant victory of Austerlitz. The Treaty of Pressburg forced Francis II of Austria to cede Venice to France and allow her a free hand in reorganizing Germany. On July 12, 1806, Bonaparte formed the western half of Germany into the "Confederation of the Rhine" with himself as protector. This meant the destruction of the thousand-year Holy Roman Empire, and Francis II formally abdicated the ancient title on August 6—having already assumed a new title of "Emperor of Austria." Such sweeping changes had alarmed Prussia. She entered the war only to be speedily crushed at Jena, October, 1806. Bonaparte pushed through Prussia to bring Russia to terms by the battles of Eylau and Friedland. The Treaty of Tilsit, July, 1807, concluded the German

phase of the war, and charmed Alexander I of Russia into an alliance which cost him no territory. Prussia, however, was halved by cessions to the Confederation of the Rhine and erection of a dependent "Grand Duchy of Warsaw" out of Prussian and Austrian Poland. British Hanover became the nucleus of a "Kingdom of Westphalia" for brother Jerome Bonaparte, though Great Britain, saved from threat of invasion by the naval victory of Trafalgar, October, 1805, fought on at sea. But on land, which alone seemed to matter, Bonaparte had apparently made good his claim to empire: he was undisputed master of Western Europe and Alexander of Russia his dazzled junior partner. Bonaparte therefore had no difficulty in deposing the Neapolitan Bourbons in 1806 and placing brother Joseph on that throne. Then late in 1808 he interned the Spanish Bourbons and promoted Joseph to Madrid, brother-in-law Joachim Murat replacing Joseph at Naples. Brother Louis Bonaparte had already been named "King of Holland"—only Lucien had the independence and republican principle to refuse a crown. Principalities were carved out for other relatives and servitors; by 1811 the French State had expanded to 128 *départements* under its direct rule, with most of western Europe tributary or cowed. The "Man of Destiny" could proclaim: "The Civil Code [Napoleon] is the code of the age!"

(2) PAPAL-IMPERIAL ESTRANGEMENT

Neo-Caesaro-papism. Though Pope Pius VII had lent tacit approbation to this "revolutionary imperialism," he soon found out that it was merely old Caesaro-papism writ large. Bonaparte's imperial policy was well expressed in his boast to the pope: "I am the successor of Charlemagne; you are the sovereign, but I am its emperor." Not only did Pius VII not receive back the lost Romagna, but he found it definitively incorporated in a new "Kingdom of Italy" of which Bonaparte was king and his stepson Eugène Beauharnais viceroy—later he would bestow on his son, "Napoleon II," the title of "King of Rome." The Napoleonic Code, with its sanction of civil marriage and divorce, was introduced into Italy. Papal protests proved unavailing, and by October, 1806, imperial interference with Italian ecclesiastical jurisdiction had reached such proportions that Pius VII had begun to retaliate by refusing canonical institution to governmental nominees to sees. A further difficulty lay in Jerome Bonaparte's divorce. Bonaparte had been grooming his brother for the kingship of Westphalia, and insisted that his marriage to Elizabeth Patterson witnessed by Bishop Carroll of Baltimore was invalid by reason of "lack of imperial consent." The pope, however, retorted that "secular authority has no power to establish impediments to marriage as a sacrament." But the Bonapartes ignored the papal admonition, and Jerome, after a civil divorce, married Catherine of Würtemburg. In

1805, moreover, Napoleon Bonaparte had defied papal territory by occupying the port of Ancona, and had ridiculed theocratic claims to bestow investiture upon the king-designate of Naples, Joseph Bonaparte.

Economic warfare presently brought about new disagreements between the papacy and the Bonapartist system. On November 21, 1806, by decree Bonaparte had inaugurated his "Continental System," a paper blockade of Great Britain designed to prevent European and other neutral states from trading with this one inaccessible foe of France. Great Britain retaliated with "Orders in Council," blockading the continental ports. Neutrals were torn between the two camps. The United States, despite ample grievance against both powers, finally declared war on Britain alone. Tiny Denmark tried to preserve her neutrality; whereupon the British seized the Danish fleet and the French occupied Danish territory. After that, while private blockade running flourished and some trade was officially winked at, no continental state would risk open defiance of the Continental System. This made all the more courageous the pope's refusal to abide by it. Bonaparte insisted that all Englishmen be expelled from Rome, for not only were they heretics, but "my enemies ought to be yours." Pius VII, after consulting the cardinals in consistory, replied in effect that the spiritual mission of the papacy required papal impartiality toward all amid the temporal rivalries of nations. Despite Bonaparte's threats, the pope refused to conform to the anti-British embargo. Thereafter Bonaparte refused to entertain direct diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Recalling the pacific Cardinal Fesch, his ambassador extraordinary, he replaced him with the regicide Alquier. Thus papal-imperial relations became strained to the breaking point. But Bonaparte's political and economic imperialism at last began to backfire: Russia became alienated and Alexander I entered secret negotiations with Bonaparte's foes, including the traitor Talleyrand. In Spain, moreover, popular resistance was the first instance of a counter-nationalism aroused by the French Revolution. Spanish guerillas enabled the British forces to find a foothold on the Continent and to dig a festering sore which within six years would poison the entire imperial system.

B. Imperial Decline (1808–15)

(1) PAPAL-IMPERIAL BREAK

Seizure of Rome. Open rupture between pope and dictator came on February 2, 1808, when French troops occupied Rome unopposed. The pope put up a placard of protest, recalled Cardinal Caprara, and thus severed diplomatic relations. In April the occupying forces penetrated into the papal residence at the Quirinal and French officers interfered with the pontifical household. Cardinal Consalvi deemed it prudent to

resign as secretary of state to placate Bonaparte, although he remained in secret a trusted papal advisor. From 1808 to 1814 the conservative Cardinal Pacca discharged the office of secretary until Cardinal Consalvi could be reinstated. On May 17, 1809, a grandiloquent decree "from imperial field headquarters, Vienna," proclaimed that the papal city of Rome had been annexed to France. During July, the pope was arrested and roughly bustled by night and day trips to Savona, where he remained under guard until June, 1812.

Papal detention at Savona. Pius VII had replied by excommunicating all responsible for this detention of Christ's Vicar, July, 1809. But though secretly distributed by Father Emery and others, this decree was never openly promulgated in France. Bonaparte, however, was under no illusions about his censure; he exclaimed: "I received news that the pope has excommunicated me; he is a madman who should be shut up." Bonaparte took malicious pleasure in communicating the news to time-serving Gallican prelates who continued to attend imperial fetes on the ground that Bonaparte had not been explicitly named in the censure, or that Gallican privilege prevented an anathema from taking effect on a French ruler. Meanwhile the pope was held strictly incommunicado in the episcopal residence: he was refused visitors and his mail was censored. Yet he bore his sufferings with Christian patience. Once again the "poor monk Chiaramonti," he washed and mended the few garments that he had been allowed.

Napoleon's divorce. Napoleon Bonaparte believed that an upstart monarch must have a direct heir, and that his aging childless wife, Joséphine Beauharnais, could not give him one. Though at first but civilly wedded to Bonaparte, she had revealed her scruples to the pope on the eve of the imperial coronation in 1804. The pope had insisted upon having the marriage canonically rectified, and Cardinal Fesch had received papal delegation to marry the couple privately. Yet Gallican clerics, headed by Cardinal Maury, since 1808 archbishop of Paris without the favor of the Apostolic See, complacently annulled the marriage on the supposed ground that Cardinal Fesch was not Napoleon's pastor as required by Trent, and for presumed lack of consent. After a *senatus-consultum* of December, 1809, had declared the marriage dissolved, Bonaparte in April, 1810, contracted a union with Maria Louisa of Austria before Cardinal Maury. Maury and those fourteen cardinals who assisted at the ceremony retained Bonaparte's favor and continued to wear their cardinalatial insignia. Cardinal Consalvi and twelve other members of the Sacred College who had declined an invitation to the wedding were forbidden to wear their insignia and henceforth were dubbed the "black cardinals." Under the circumstances, however, the new style was very becoming.

(2) Papal-Imperial Contest

Conciliar maneuvers. Though Bonaparte seems to have been personally indifferent to papal censures, he still valued papal prestige as a political asset and strove to avoid alienating many of his subjects by a formal schism. In this regard his most serious problem lay in the fact that since 1808 the pope had been refusing canonical institution to imperial nominations to French dioceses. When Pius VII in 1811 reproached Cardinal Maury for his intrusion into the see of Paris, the question of legitimacy became critical. From 1809 Bonaparte had consulted an "ecclesiastical committee" to devise a solution for the situation. Cardinals Fesch and Maury had made an evasive report opining that, although Bonaparte was not under excommunication, he ought to obtain papal sanction for episcopal installation. In 1811 he was advised to call a national council. Father Emery, who had refused to sign the previous report, upheld papal authority to Bonaparte's face, and so impressed the well-meaning Cardinal Fesch that he subsequently led the clergy in protestations of loyalty to the Apostolic See, though combined with the temporizing recommendation that the pope be consulted about canonical institution. Three prelates visited Pius VII and by threats of schism in the forthcoming council, extorted from him conditional assurance that within six months canonical institution would be forthcoming. But not only was this concession conditioned by the pope's liberation and an opportunity to consult with his advisors, but the pontiff revoked it within twenty-four hours. The national council which met at Notre Dame, June, 1811, comprised ninety Frenchmen, forty-two Italians, and a few Germans. It refused to be intimidated, rejected an unsigned assurance brought from Savona by the three prelatial intermediaries, and demanded the pope's liberation. Bonaparte dissolved the council and imprisoned some of its leaders. Next Maury assembled eighty compliant prelates who demanded that the metropolitans supply the missing canonical confirmation. A new deputation went to Savona to exact papal consent to this plan. On November 22, 1811, the pope, without recognizing the assembly as a legitimate council, was yet disposed to allow the metropolitans to grant canonical institution "in the name of the pope." This, however, proved unacceptable to Bonaparte.

"Concordat of Fontainebleau." During June, 1812, the ailing pontiff was transported to Fontainebleau in France to be subjected to new imperial pressures. After his return from Russia, where the repulse of the Grand Army had made his position critical, Bonaparte engaged in a six-day conference with Pius VII during January, 1813. The kindly pontiff seems to have been impressed by Napoleon's undeniable charm. The "red cardinals" induced the pope to make certain tentative con-

cessions: authorization for the metropolitans to concede canonical institution if the pope failed to do so within six months; and acceptance of financial compensation in exchange for the confiscated Papal States. Yet such points were clearly tentative, for the memorandum was designated as a "basis for definitive settlement," and was conditioned by the "approval of all the cardinals." But when Pius consulted the "black cardinals," both Consalvi and Pacca convinced him that the concessions were incompatible with papal primacy. Humbly remorseful, the pope on March 24 retracted his concessions in a letter to Bonaparte. But the latter, suppressing the papal revocation, published the memorandum on March 25 as the definitive Concordat of Fontainebleau. When, however, Bonaparte followed it in practice, Pope Pius on May 9, 1813, declared all archiepiscopal ratifications of episcopal nominations null. Thereafter he remained adamant.

(3) PAPAL TRIUMPH

Napoleonic collapse. At the height of his power, Napoleon Bonaparte had jeered at papal rebukes: "What does the pope mean by denouncing me to Christendom? Does he think that the arms shall fall from the hands of my soldiers?" The Russian campaign of 1812 provided an almost literally affirmative answer. During the summer Bonaparte's army had invaded Russia to punish her for non-adherence to the Continental System. Though Moscow was captured, no decisive victory could be won. During the wintry retreat to Germany the greater part of this force of half a million disappeared—they were dead, captured, or deserted—leaving their weapons lying in the snow. This first serious reverse encouraged all the subject peoples, and the nationalism evoked by the French Revolution now turned against it. Spaniards, aided by an English expeditionary force, had long harassed French forces; now they drove them out of the Peninsula and invaded southern France. Germans, belatedly catching the nationalistic fever, joined the Russians on the eastern front. Bonaparte desperately raised a new army, but at the "Battle of the Nations," Leipsic, October, 1813, he was decisively defeated and forced to retreat to France. Thereafter his admittedly brilliant maneuvers could merely delay surrender. At last on April 6, 1814, he returned to Fontainebleau, but to abdicate his imperial crown.

Papal liberation. Pope Pius, however, was no longer there. In December, 1813, Bonaparte had given orders for his return to Savona, and there on March 17, 1814, the captive pontiff received the French government's assurance that he was free. Rome, however, was still occupied by the imperial lieutenant, Joachim Murat of Naples, who now betrayed his master by a secret treaty with Austria which proposed to purchase his alliance by the gift of papal territory. This secret diplomacy un-

expectedly came to light and was soundly denounced by the British envoy Bentinck, and hastily disavowed by Austria. Though large portions of the pontifical dominions remained under Austrian or Neapolitan control, Pius VII was able to return to Rome on May 24, 1814.

"The Hundred Days" may be briefly treated here out of chronological order to conclude Bonaparte's career. Relegated to Elba after his abdication, he felt encouraged by Allied bickerings at the peace conferences to make a new bid for power. He landed at Cannes on March 1, 1815, and was able to rally his old officers and occupy Paris. Both Bonaparte and the Allies now sought the moral support of the pope, but he continued severely impartial, and the French clergy showed little enthusiasm for the returned dictator. Murat's alliance with Bonaparte forced the pope to retire temporarily to Genoa, but Murat's speedy capture and execution removed this menace, and Pius was back in Rome on June 7, 1815. Further problems from Bonaparte, moreover, were cut short by the latter's defeat at Waterloo, Belgium, by Wellington and Blücher on June 18. Four days later Bonaparte abdicated a second time. Failing to escape to the United States, he surrendered to the British who transported him to St. Helena for the remainder of his life. Pope Pius granted asylum for Napoleon's mother and relatives in the Papal State, intervened on behalf of the deposed ruler, and had the satisfaction of learning that Napoleon Bonaparte died apparently reconciled with the Church, May 5, 1821.

IX

Authoritarian Reaction

73. THE METTERNICH ERA

A. *Political Reaction*

(1) THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA (1814–15)

Political settlement. Between September, 1814, and June, 1815, allied
diplomats conferred about European restoration. The host, Chancellor
Klemens von Metternich of Austria, was the most influential statesman,
although full execution of his reactionary ideas was hindered by the
territorial ambitions of the eccentric Czar Alexander of Russia, British
foreign minister Castlereagh's isolationism, and even by Talleyrand's
adroit diplomacy on behalf of defeated France. Thus the accepted prin-
ciple of "legitimacy" entitling prewar monarchs to restoration to their
thrones and prerogatives came to be qualified by the stubborn demands
of certain allies for "compensations" for their efforts expended in defeat-
ing Bonaparte. After lengthy arguments, the following compromises
were reached. Russia was induced to abate her demand for the whole
of Poland by receiving Finland from Sweden. This in turn necessitated
Sweden's compensation by receiving Norway from Denmark—which
was too small to object. Prussia agreed to forego half of Saxony, a per-
sistent Napoleonic ally, in exchange for territorial additions in the
Rhineland. Austria exchanged Belgium for Venice and a dominant posi-
tion in northern Italy. Belgium could then be given to Holland to form
a "Kingdom of the Netherlands" supposedly capable of resisting either
Prussia or France, and thus protecting the English Channel. In general,
thirty-nine German states already consolidated by Bonaparte were fa-
vored in preference to restoration of some three hundred pre-Revolution-

ary principalities. In place of the defunct Holy Roman Empire, these states were joined in a weak "Germanic Confederation" under Austrian presidency. The Bourbons were restored to France, Spain and Naples, and the Savoyards to Sardinia-Piedmont, augmented by the former Republic of Genoa. Great Britain contented herself with retaining a few territories picked up in previous wars: Malta, Cape Colony, etc. The only shred of Liberalism tolerated at the Congress was a resolution to abolish the slave trade.

Ecclesiastical reorganization. Cardinal Consalvi had taken care to meet the leading diplomats before the opening of the Vienna Congress, even going to London on this errand. During the first period of the Congress prior to the "Hundred Days," Consalvi had little success in promoting his objective, complete restoration of papal temporal possessions. He kept aloof from the social life of the Congress and lacked the material inducements used by other embassies, though at Talleyrand's motion the papal nuncio was accorded ceremonial precedence among diplomats as had been traditional. But France held on to Avignon, Austria continued to occupy the Romagna, Murat had the Marches, and Talleyrand himself wanted to keep his Principality of Benevento. Bonaparte's reappearance reunited the allies and they vied with him in seeking papal favor. Murat's capture and execution freed part of the Papal States, and Austria then allowed restoration of her occupied territories, save for a slight "rectification" of the frontier along the Po. As soon as the Holy See had paid the expenses of the occupation forces they would be withdrawn. Talleyrand agreed to yield Benevento for monetary compensation: all that the Holy See had to do was to buy back its own territory from an apostate bishop. But as for Avignon, King Louis XVIII of France explained that though his own intentions were good, public opinion would not permit him to return it. Yet on the whole, Consalvi had restored the bulk of the Papal States, now the only surviving ecclesiastical palatinate, and the diplomatic prestige of the papacy was comparatively high.

(2) Metternich's Concert of Europe (1815–48)

Klemens von Metternich (1773–1859), Austrian chancellor from 1809 to 1848, had taken the lead in Bonaparte's overthrow, and after the Corsican's downfall enjoyed almost comparable political prestige until his own fall before the Liberal outbursts against his "system" in 1848. Metternich was a realist in politics, but farsighted enough to appreciate Europe's need for international solidarity. He felt that men were weary of war and change; he proposed to give them peace and stability. A conservative, Metternich was yet not blind to recent changes. He was a Catholic, though affected by Febronian secularism. For Metternich,

"Politics is the science of the vital interests of states in its widest meaning. Since, however, an isolated state no longer exists . . . we must always view the society of states as the essential condition of the modern world. . . . The establishing of international relations on the basis of reciprocity under the guarantee of respect for acquired rights . . . constitutes in our time the essence of politics, of which diplomacy is merely the daily application." [1]

The **Quadruple Alliance**—not to be confused with the pseudomystic "Holy Alliance"—was the agency on which Metternich relied to implement his views. Austria, Prussia, Russia, and Great Britain were to cooperate in order to maintain the *status quo* established at Vienna. Frequent international conferences would maintain a vigilance against any revival of the ideas of the French Revolution. For some seven years this "concert of Europe" proved entirely successful. Russia's Alexander was converted from flirtations with Liberalism to a repressive policy when his agent Kotzebue was assassinated in Germany during 1819. The same incident enabled Metternich to win most German princes to policies of censorship and repression. During the same year Britain's Tory government issued the "Six Repressive Acts" against social-economic discontent. The assassination of a Bourbon prince in 1820 drove the moderate Louis XVIII of France into the hands of ultra-royalist reactionaries. Carbonari plots in Naples and Piedmont were put down by Austrian intervention. Finally, when Ferdinand VII of Spain had to yield to a Liberal uprising in 1820, Metternich's international punitive expedition rescued him for autocracy by 1822.

Liberal defections, however, began that very year when Canning of Great Britain countenanced Greek rebellion against the Turks and cooperated with the Monroe Doctrine of the United States in regard to Latin American independence from Spain and Portugal. During 1830–31 Metternich had to acquiesce in the substitution of the more liberal Orléanists for the Bourbons in France, and the independence of Belgium from Holland. But at least the new regimes were monarchical in form, and prompt military action had prevented the spread of Liberalism to Central Europe: revolts in Italy and Poland had been suppressed. For nearly two decades more Metternich held down the lid on Liberalism with increasing difficulty. But in 1848 occurred a series of explosions: the Second Republic in France; papal concessions in Rome; overthrow of absolute monarchs in Germany and Italy, together with projects for national unification under Liberal auspices. Finally Metternich himself under the incognito of "Mr. Smith" had to seek temporary asylum in England. To be sure, his system gradually returned within the next few years, though with increasing concessions to Liberalism as the *bour-*

[1] Helene DuCoudray, *Metternich* (Yale University Press, 1936), p. 167.

geoisie were gradually fused with the nobility. Absolute monarchy accepted more and more "constitutional" restraints as time worked a compromise between the Old Regime and Liberalism that was neither Democracy nor Proletarianism. By the end of the nineteenth century, Liberalism began to share the stage with Nationalism and Socialism in the ideological parade.

B. *Intellectual Currents*

(1) VOGUE OF ROMANTICISM

"Romanticism was not merely a literary movement. . . . From the literary aspect, Romanticism was the movement of liberation from the classical rules of composition, from the logical order in speech, from the restricting unities of tragedy. It meant a free rein to fantasy, escape from the present, worship of the past, a leap into the unreal. It was the irrational turned toward the sensual, the mystical bordering on the orgiastic, the substitution of the passional for the lyrical, the abandon of the idea for experience of the concrete. All this brought confusion, but it gave a means for renewing the material and technique of poetic and artistic expression. . . . The underlying exigencies of the Romantic movement were sound: a return to historical, traditional, ethnical, religious, and popular values—not a return such as some, in their exaggeration, wanted, to even the style and incongruities of a Middle Ages that could not be brought back to life, but taking such values as permanent values of the historical process, successively realized by the culture of the various ages. . . . The Romantic movement was at bottom a movement of Catholic liberation, albeit with an immense confusion of ideas and sentiments and with an unloosing of passions and signal deviations and distortions."[2]

A **new dogmatism** was in marked contrast to the cynicism of the "Enlightenment," though, as Madame de Staël expressed it, the content of this dogma seemed secondary: "I do not know exactly what we must believe, but I believe that we must believe! The eighteenth century did nothing but deny. The human spirit lives by its beliefs. Acquire faith through Christianity, or through German philosophy, or merely through enthusiasm, but believe in something."[3] It is not surprising, then, that Romanticism took some rather confused lurches in different directions. Pietism revived in Germany; Methodism won new converts in England and the United States, while Anglicans at Oxford, Liberals in France, and Febronians in Germany sometimes set out on the path to Rome.

[2] Don Luigi Sturzo, *Church and State,* trans. Barbara Carter (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939), pp. 408–10.

[3] Frederick Artz, *Reaction and Revolution* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1953), p. 49.

Meanwhile non-scholastic philosophy veered from Hume's scepticism to a search for a new principle of authority. Immanuel Kant promised a new certainty in his "categorical imperative"; Fichte and Schelling called on the will, Jacobi on a "sentimental faith," Hegel elaborated the Absolute Idea, concreted in the Prussian state. Marx reacted against Hegelian Idealism to use his technique in Dialectical Materialism, while Kierkegaard scorned Hegelian religious rationalism for existential experience—not that these two latter offshoots created much stir in the contemporary scene. Romanticism was nearly as slippery to define as Liberalism, with which it was often allied in political aspirations. Romanticism was in part disillusioned by the ultimate failure of the 1848 Liberal Revolutions to achieve a prompt millennium, and during the second half of the nineteenth century many intellectuals inclined toward a tougher "Realism," even if they did not subscribe wholly to "Materialism."

(2) Church-State Relations

Restored Confessionalism. In the Catholic countries the restoration of the monarchy usually entailed the re-establishment of the Church and its privileges. But the clock could not be turned back. Much of the "divinity that doth hedge a king" had rubbed off and the so-called "Union of Throne and Altar" could never again enjoy the serene and unchallenged position it had with the common people before the Revolution. Indeed, there was danger that the political animosities aroused against the restored monarchies would be directed against the Church and its clergy as well. This was particularly true wherever the monarchs, whatever their private beliefs or morals, ostentatiously paraded external devotion to the Church in the effort to bolster their tottering regimes. In this way the prelates, usually bound to take an oath of allegiance, were committed in advance to what proved to be the losing side. Whereas in the Middle Ages the Church stood outside and above politics as the champion of the moral law and, if need be, of the basic liberty of the Christian man, now too often prelates and clergy felt that they must soft-pedal their criticisms of the monarchy lest they be accused of ingratitude or deliver over the country to Liberals or Jacobins. The gulf between the clergy and the common people was often widened, and the latter instead of regarding the Church as sharing their lot of oppression, sometimes jumped to the conclusion that the Church was on the side of the rich and the powerful. A special case was the survival of the antiquated medieval temporal government of the Papal States which would prove an embarrassing problem even for loyal Catholics, while exposing the weaker brethren to specious assertions of the demands of modern progress. Already, however, there were appearing

would-be mediators between Church and state of varying principles: Félicité de Lamennais, Frédéric Ozanam, Ketteler, Don Bosco.

Secularist Indifferentism, especially, endangered the restored established Churches. The classic summary of this theological Liberalism is found in the *Syllabus Errorum* of Pope Pius IX, though it must be noted that its sometimes blunt and uncompromising expressions are due to the juxtaposition of abbreviated and bald assertions extracted from various documents where the context permits a more moderate and accurate exposition. According to the papal secretary of state, Cardinal Antonelli, the following propositions, among others, were at least "reprobated and proscribed": 15) "Any man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, led by the light of reason, he deems true." 16) "Men can find the way of eternal salvation and attain eternal salvation in the cult of any religion." 20) "The ecclesiastical power ought not to exercise its authority without the permission and consent of the civil government." 26) "The Church does not have the native and legitimate right of acquisition and possession." 39) "The state, as the origin and font of all rights, enjoys a right circumscribed by no limits." 45) "The entire government of public schools . . . can and ought to be attributed to the civil power." 55) "The Church is to be separated from the state and the state from the Church." 67) ". . . Strict divorce can be sanctioned by the civil authority." 73) "True matrimony can exist between Christians by force of a civil contract alone. . . ." 77) "It is no longer expedient in our age that the Catholic religion be considered the sole religion of the state. . . ." 79) "Liberty of worship, of thought, of speech do not harm public morals." 80) "The Roman pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to and compromise with progress, with Liberalism, and with modern civilization." Liberals found these "hard sayings" indeed.

[handwritten margin note: Well church you lose out]

(3) RELIGIOUS TRADITIONALISM

Catholic return to tradition. Within the Catholic Church and to a considerable extent outside of it also there occurred not precisely a reactionary movement, but a return to tradition. Authoritarianism but not Absolutism was reverenced, with more or less admixture of Romanticism. In France, Joseph, comte de Maistre (1753–1821) and François, vicomte de Chateaubriand (1768–1848), while differing in their estimates of the French Revolution and its political lessons, both glorified Christianity and the papacy. "Catholic Liberals," Félicité de Lamennais (1782–1854), Jean Lacordaire (1802–61) and Charles, comte de Montalembert (1810–70), tried to reconcile the Church with a Liberal Democracy. In England, John Henry Newman (1801–90), though scarcely a Romantic, was certainly a leader in a movement of return to theological traditions,

while Frederick Faber (1814–63) supplied the enthusiasm and August Pugin (1812–52) the Romanticism. In Germany, Johann Möhler (1796–1838) was a sort of Teutonic Newman; Clemens Brentano (1778–1842) and Joseph Görres (1776–1848) became Romantic protagonists of the Church, while Friedrich von Schlegel (1772–1829), a convert, revived interest in Christian art. In Italy, Alessandro Manzoni (1785–1873) and Giuseppe Mazzini (1805–72) were both Romantics, but the former in harmony with the Church, and the latter in fanatic opposition. In Spain, Jaime Balmes (1810–48) and Donoso Cortés (1809–53) flayed Liberal half-truths, while in the United States, Orestes Brownson (1803–76) was akin to this group.

"Fideism," however, represented a definite excess in this Traditionalism. By reaction against Rationalism, Fideism and Traditionalism in varying degrees belittled the power of human reason to know God's existence and other religious truths, and had recourse to a primitive revelation to explain their derivation. Louis, vicomte de Bonald (1754–1840), and to a degree Lamennais, extended the scope of faith or tradition to all natural truths. Less sweeping were the views of Louis Bautain (1796–1867), which he was obliged to retract in 1840 (Denzinger 1622–27), and Augustine Bonnetty (1798–1879) and Joachim Ventura (1792–1861), who insinuated that medieval Scholasticism tended toward Rationalism. Bonetty's views were condemned by the Holy Office in 1855 (Denzinger 1649–52), and he at once submitted. Mitigated Traditionalism survived at Louvain in the teaching of Casimir Ubaghs (1800–1875). Ubaghs' views had been denounced to the Holy Office in 1843, but Cardinal Steryx interposed to prevent condemnation until 1864, when Ubaghs retired.

"Ontologism" was closely allied with Fideism in the sense of a pietistic reaction of well-meaning men against Rationalism. Its exponents included Vicenzo Gioberti (1801–52), Auguste Gratry (1805–72), and Antonio Rosmini-Serbati (1797–1855), who held for a form of natural intuition of the divine essence. Rosmini was acquitted by an investigating commission in 1854, but extreme expressions of this theory were condemned by the Holy Office in 1861 (Denzinger 1659–66), including the claim that "at least an habitual immediate cognition of God is essential to the human intellect so that without it it can know nothing." Pope Pius IX's admiration for Padre Rosmini's virtue preserved him from further prosecution during their lifetimes, but Pope Leo XIII, who as Cardinal Pecci had vainly tried to obtain a condemnation of Rosmini's views at the Vatican Council, ordered a searching investigation in 1887, which resulted in the posthumous condemnation of forty of Rosmini's propositions (Denzinger 1891–1930). Some elements of Ontologism have also been detected in Ubaghs, Maret, and perhaps Brownson.

In brief, these men and many others fiercely challenged the smug and blasé Rationalism of the eighteenth century. Whatever they were, they were enthusiastic, and as such, portended change. For all its vaunted political stability, therefore, the Metternich Era did not prove intellectually stagnant. Unfortunately the same years saw a low ebb of Scholasticism so that various theologians and philosophers were tempted to essay a new doctrinal synthesis on the basis of revolutionary philosophies. This trend, applying Kantianism to dogma, eventually produced Modernism.

74. CAPETIAN FINALE

A. Bourbon Absolutism (1814–30)

(1) MODERATE RESTORATION: LOUIS XVIII

Political background. After Bonaparte's abdication, Louis Stanislas, comte de Provence, younger brother of King Louis XVI, began what he blandly described as the "nineteenth year of my reign"—dating from the death of his nephew, called "Louis XVII," in 1795. Though he thus officially ignored the Revolution and Bonaparte, this shrewd and indolent monarch was not unaware that times had changed. He sought to restore the substance of the Old Regime, while making seemingly voluntary concessions to Liberalism. Then he granted a "Charter" or constitution which introduced some of the new political ideas under the guise of free favors of a benevolent despot. It provided for a House of Peers nominated by the king, and a Chamber of Deputies elected by restricted suffrage, and offered certain guarantees of civil and religious liberty. In practice the restored Bourbon regime was at first not unlike contemporary Tory rule in Great Britain. This middle course dissatisfied not only the Liberals, whose idol was Louis Philippe, duc d'Orléans, son of *Égalité*, but also the Ultra-Royalists, led by the king's brother, the comte d'Artois, who denounced all concessions to Liberalism. Following the assassination of the king's nephew, the duc de Berri, in 1820, the Ultra-Royalist influence increased in the government. During 1822 another royal nephew, the duc de Angoulême, was allowed to lead a successful international intervention to restore absolute monarchy in Spain. By the end of the reign, France seemed fully in accord with the Metternich Era.

Ecclesiastical developments. Characteristically, Louis XVIII wished to reject the Concordat of 1801 simply because of its authorship. But by 1817 he agreed to its ratification with certain modifications, and promised to renounce the "Organic Articles" which he had used as a threat during protracted negotiations between Cardinal Consalvi and the comte de Blacas. The new settlement, approved by Pope Pius VII on July 19, 1817, declared the Catholic Church again the state religion, and not merely the privileged cult of the majority. Unlike the Old Re-

gime, the restored Bourbons tolerated other religions. Sunday observance was again legally enforceable, e.g., by closing of cafes. Divorce was suppressed. Seminaries and primary schools were to be under ecclesiastical control. Thirty new sees were erected to be endowed by the monarchy, more church property was restored, and provisions made for future endowment. Except for five *émigré* and four constitutional prelates, the French hierarchy rallied to the Bourbon regime, and there was somewhat of a relapse to Gallicanism. This attitude, however, was no longer unchallenged. A vigorous Ultramontanism appeared, though divided on political ideas. De Maistre, author of *Le Pape* (1819), regarded the Revolution as *"satanique par essence,"* and urged a return to monarchical tradition under papal presidency. On the other hand, Chateaubriand glorified Christianity in his romantic *Genius of Christianity* (1801), and looked to the realization of *Liberté, Égalité, et Fraternité* in a Christian Democracy under papal inspiration. Félicité de Lamennais in his *Essay on Indifference* flayed Gallican subservience to the secular power, while tending toward a theological Liberalism which later came to grief.

(2) Extreme Reaction: Charles X

Charles d'Artois, first of the *émigrés* and uncompromising foe of the French Revolution, now ascended the throne (1824–30). On the whole, he was a more honest and straightforward man than his brother, but his very virtues when applied to his reactionary principles made him an impolitic and irresolute autocrat. Dissolute in early life, Charles had become pious, though he had strong Gallican tendencies. He claimed not to have changed since 1789, and on May 29, 1825, the ancient coronation ceremonial at Rheims was performed for what was to prove the last time. For Charles had declared that "he would rather saw wood than reign after the fashion of the king of England." He was to be given his chance.

Neo-Gallicanism. If the royal government did conciliate the clergy by small concessions, it also strove to dominate them. Thus the king enacted a law against sacrilege and increased ecclesiastical subsidies, but he also insisted on the teaching of the Four Gallican Articles in the seminaries. The *placet* and the *exequatur* were often invoked from the "Organic Articles": during 1826 one papal document was published with reservations, and another was suppressed. In 1827 the king named a bishop to Strasbourg without awaiting papal confirmation, and he continued to insist on the deposition of Cardinal Fesch from the see of Lyons—a demand which Pope Leo XII as consistently refused. Religious orders had reappeared in France with governmental authorization or toleration. When Ultra-Royalist concessions provoked the Liberals into

Jesuit-baiting, the king placated them by naming a Liberal prime minister, Martignac (1828). The latter subjected Jesuit schools to prying regulations, placed minor seminaries under governmental inspection, and limited the number of seminarians. Though the French hierarchy were roused to protest, they ended by accepting the regulations. To be sure, Lamennais flayed this Neo-Gallicanism and summoned the younger clergy to profess uncompromising Ultramontanism. At the same time he abandoned his original Ultra-Royalism for what he eventually styled "Catholic Liberalism." Pope Leo XII prudently suspended judgment on this sort of apologetics. While receiving Lamennais kindly, he distrusted his aims: "He is one of those lovers of perfectionism who, if allowed, would overturn the world."

Revolt in July. Ultra-Royalist strictures induced the king in 1829 to replace Martignac with the authoritarian Jules Polignac. Press warfare between Ultra-Royalists and Liberals, Gallicans and Ultramontanes, became vigorous: Lamennais publicly denounced the French hierarchy for weakness to Archbishop De Quelen of Paris, who replied. Bourgeois Liberals and Republicans revived old accusations against union of "throne and altar." In 1830 Charles X dissolved the Assembly and called for new elections, in which many clerics actively supported the crown. When the Liberals nonetheless increased their hold on the legislature, the king issued his "July Ordinances" designed to muzzle the press and manipulate elections to secure an "Ultra" majority. This was enough; three days later, July 28, Paris arose under Lafayette and Thiers to demand the king's abdication. Archbishop De Quelen was menaced with death, several church edifices were plundered, and priests found it prudent to close the churches and stay off the streets. Street fighting began in Paris. Refusing to preserve his crown by shedding his people's blood, Charles X made a dignified retreat to England, and after some hesitation, Louis Philippe d'Orléans was named the constitutional "King of the French."

B. Orléanist Liberalism (1830–48)

(1) THE ORLÉANIST COMPROMISE

Louis Philippe, monarch in virtue of the July Revolution, for all his attempts to conciliate all parties, depended in the last analysis on the support of the Liberal *bourgeoisie*. Son of that duke of Orléans who as *"Citoyen Égalité"* had voted for the death of his cousin, King Louis XVI, Louis Philippe inherited Liberal pretensions. He posed as "Citizen King," paraded the streets in frock coat and umbrella, and made himself accessible to all. But after an attempt at his assassination (1835), the king grew suspicious and his increasingly repressive rule demonstrated that after all he was a Capetian dynast.

Political status. The "July Monarchy" nevertheless continued in office for some time by favoring the interests of those capitalists and industrialists who appeared in the wake of the rapid introduction of the Industrial Revolution on the Continent after the Napoleonic Wars. This development, however, brought the attendant social ills of the factory system. The French proletariat with Gallic directness rushed to the Socialism of Louis Blanc (1811–82) who advocated corporate factories. While laissez-faire economics forced the Orléans monarchy to adopt a pacifist foreign policy, nationalists recalling Bonaparte's conquests began to give heed to the propaganda of the latter's nephew, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. At the same time the king's reversion to Capetian dynastic schemes—the attempt to place one of his sons on the Spanish throne—threatened the friendship of British Liberals. Louis Philippe's concessions to the Church, meager as they were, alienated thoroughgoing anticlericals and unconverted Republicans. Finally, the king gave his confidence to a Huguenot, François Guizot, prime minister from 1840 to the fall of the regime in February, 1848. Guizot, eminently respectable, was a typical bourgeois Liberal who denied peaceful redress by limiting the suffrage to the wealthier classes. It proved to be only a question of time before all these many critics of the unheroic Orléanist monarchy, at first divided among themselves, would unite to send Louis Philippe to Charles X's English asylum.

Ecclesiastical policies. The Liberal government reverted to the Bonapartist designation of the Catholic Church as merely the religion of the majority rather than that of the state. Clerics went into political disfavor, a papal nuncio was refused admittance, sacrilege no longer had a legal penalty, and the budget for the support of the cult was reduced. Significantly the new secularism removed the crucifix from the courts—though it was restored later when the regime began to totter. Financial and educational measures hostile to the Church were consistently pursued throughout the reign, though toward its close negotiations for an understanding were on the way. But even if governmental hostility toward the Church decreased in time, most of the clergy remained legitimists, i.e., loyal to the rightful Bourbon pretenders to the throne, and cool to Louis Philippe. Reactionaries, not untinged with Gallicanism, continued to idealize the union of "Throne and Altar" under the Old Regime. These erstwhile Ultra-Royalists spurned Louis Philippe as an usurper, while from the other direction came the mounting criticism of the "Catholic Liberals."

(2) Catholic Liberalism

Progressive leaders who styled themselves "Catholic Liberals" protested against what they deemed excessive Gallican subservience to the

state. De Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert, with a host of disciples including Gerbet, Rohrbacher, Gueranger, De Coux, D'Eckstein, championed papal leadership while courting the lower classes by advocating a democratic regime in which Church and state would be practically separated, somewhat along American lines. Their hope lay in a modernized, democratic, spiritualized Church, uniting a commonwealth of nations under the banner of "God and Liberty."

L'Avenir was their organ of expression, begun on October 16, 1830. Liberty for France to them meant liberty of teaching, liberty of the press ("the strongest guarantee of all the others"), liberty of assembly, freedom of election, political liberty. These Catholic Liberals also agitated on behalf of the independence of Belgium, Poland, Ireland, and Italy. Lamennais and Lacordaire were prosecuted by the Orléanist government during January, 1831, for opening a free school, but were acquitted. But their continuing attacks on the monarchy and the Gallican hierarchy brought down upon them official condemnations. The government subjected *L'Avenir* to endless legal prosecutions—usually with scant success, while the prelates, led by Cardinal De Rohan, blacklisted the paper and drew up a list of its alleged theological errors. Anticipating denunciation to Rome, Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert suspended publication in November, 1831, and proceeded themselves to lay their cause before Gregory XVI at Rome.

Papal condemnation. Pope Gregory was personally anything but liberal, but he might legitimately object to a defense of separation of Church and state as an ideal regime. Even more dangerous was Lamennais' implication that faith, stemming from a primitive revelation, rather than unaided reason, established God's existence, and his corollary that profession of the Catholic faith was a matter of indifference provided that non-Catholics lived honorably. After careful examination, the pope condemned the tenets of *L'Avenir* in his encyclical, *Mirari Vos* (1832). Though its language was rather severe, the papal document refrained from citing the editors by name.

Penitent and impenitent Liberals. Lacordaire and Montalembert submitted, and Lamennais, apparently in bad faith, allowed them to add his name to a profession of loyalty. Yet this brilliant but largely self-taught scholar was intellectually dissatisfied and prone to rebel. His friends were unable to reconcile him to simple obedience; after a period of sulking, Lamennais definitely broke with the Church, April, 1834, by publishing *Paroles d'un Croyant*, which renounced belief in Christ and His Church for faith in humanity, something akin to Comte's Sociologism. Gregory XVI condemned this work the same year and excommunicated its author *nominatim* in *Singulari Nos*. Far from submitting, Lamennais drifted farther from the Faith and died, apparently unre-

pentant, in 1854. On the other hand Lacordaire, in submission to Archbishop De Quelen of Paris, began a series of brilliant apologetical sermons in Notre Dame (1835). Interrupting these to enter the Dominican novitiate, he reintroduced that Order into France in 1840. He then resumed his orthodox campaign for "God and Liberty" until virtually silenced in 1853 by the second Bonapartist dictatorship. While Montalembert worked diligently, if not always successfully, for Catholic education and revival of medieval history, Dom Gueranger initiated a liturgical movement and Rohrbacher turned to Church history apologetics.

(3) CATHOLIC SOCIALISM

St. Vincent de Paul Society. Unfortunately the Catholic Liberals, themselves largely from the noble or middle classes, were not sufficiently aware of the social problems of the proletariat. One exception to this fatal shortsightedness was Antoine Frédéric Ozanam (1813–53), professor of law at Lyons. In 1833 he provided a practical remedy for poverty by founding the lay organization of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, a revival of St. Vincent's auxiliary charitable associations. But Ozanam came to realize that not merely charity, but social justice as well was due the workers. Impressed by the Socialist rising of June, 1848, he pleaded: "It is time to prove that we can plead the cause of the proletariat, to pledge ourselves to the solace of the suffering classes, to seek the abolition of poverty, without becoming a participant of the doctrines which unchained the tempest of June, and which are still spreading their dark clouds around us." This plea, which was being made simultaneously at Frankfurt, Germany, by the future Bishop Ketteler, was but faintly heard in France. Notable exceptions to this indifference were the Harmel managed cotton mills at Val-des-Bois, founded in 1840, and the social leaders, Bargemont (1784–1850) and Charles Perin (1815–1905).

Domestic missions were organized in France by Fathers Rauzan (1765–1819) and Forbin-Janson (1785–1844), and these were given a more lasting form by the Marianists, founded in 1816 by Père Chaminade, the Marists, by Pères Champagnat and Colin, and the Oblates of Père Mazenod (1782–1861).

The Society for Propagation of the Faith, founded in 1822 by Pauline Jaricot (1799–1862), may perhaps be not utterly alien to the category of social works, for it began with the humble pittances of poor working girls. It is true that Jaricot's own institution on behalf of social reform came to constitute the dark night of her spiritual life, but she is more to be commended for trying than to be blamed for failing. The Propa-

gation of the Faith movement was powerfully promoted by her contemporary, Bishop Forbin-Janson. Practically exiled by the French government for his refusal to subscribe to the Four Gallican Articles, the bishop became the Holy See's representative in visits to the American and Canadian missions between 1839 and 1841. After making his report to Rome, Pope Gregory XVI praised him "because of his wonderful zeal for the propagation and defense of the Catholic faith in the United States of America." The French Society for the Propagation of the Faith survived difficult beginnings, providentially prospered, and was incorporated into the Roman curia by Pope Pius XI during its centennial year, 1922.

75. TEUTONIC TRANSFORMATION

A. German Reorganization (1800–15)

(1) IMPERIAL DISSOLUTION

Secularization. The Napoleonic victories put an end to the ancient Holy Roman Empire in 1806. As early as 1801 French annexations necessitated a reapportionment of territories to "compensate" dispossessed magnates, especially in the Rhineland. To this end recourse was had in 1803 to a general secularization of the ecclesiastical palatinates. Then the Diet of Regensburg issued the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss*, which verbose legal theft deprived the Church in Germany of temporal rule over 3,500,000 subjects, of three electoral votes, and of an annual revenue of $10,000,000. Though Cardinal Consalvi requested restoration at the Congress of Vienna, it was in vain. The Church in Germany never received any adequate reimbursement for this robbery of the pious bequests of centuries, and the German clergy were largely cast on the resources of the faithful during the nineteenth century.

Febronian alienation. This impoverishment, however, may have averted the greater evil of a schismatic German Church. Bonaparte's ecclesiastical tool in Germany had been Karl von Dalberg (1744–1817), coadjutor of Mainz. At the secularization of 1803, not to lose his worldly status, Dalberg transferred his metropolitan rights to Regensburg, and with Bonaparte's approbation carved out a temporal principality for himself. Next Dalberg was pressed upon Pope Pius VII as primate of a subservient German hierarchy according to the erroneous Febronian views. When the pontiff refused to be content with a mere primacy of honor over Germany, Bonaparte and Dalberg put their project into execution within the French-dominated Confederation of the Rhine. Dalberg as primate altered diocesan boundaries and installed henchmen without recourse to the Holy See. Ignaz von Wessenberg (1774–1860) became Dalberg's vicar and aide in introducing Febronian concepts of

a German national Church. Papal refusal of canonical institution to Dalberg's hierarchy completed the organizational confusion of the Church in Germany.

Febronian defeat. After the Battle of Leipsic (1813) had freed Germany from French domination, Dalberg was obliged to renounce his secular principality, but continued to hold on to the see of Regensburg. To the Congress of Vienna Dalberg's deputy Wessenburg proposed a national Church with a German jurisdictional patriarchate under honorary papal precedence. The ex-elector of Trier, Archbishop Clemens von Wettin, who had long failed to rebuke his auxiliary Hontheim (Febronius) in the eighteenth century, now made belated amends by opposing this project. But what most effectively countered Dalberg's plan was the desire of the German magnates to preserve state autonomy in ecclesiastical as well as secular affairs. For at the Congress, the German princes defeated a restoration of the Holy Roman Empire as well as a strong federal union, and contented themselves with a league of independent states similar to the United States under the Articles of Confederation. Cardinal Consalvi, in order to defeat Dalberg, sided with the magnates' aspirations to the extent of consistently speaking of the "Catholic Churches in Germany." Dalberg's scheme was therefore rejected and the German Church received no national organization. Instead, hierarchical reorganization was subsequently undertaken through concordats with individual states, e.g., Bavaria (1817–1933) and Austria (1855). Dalberg held out at Regensburg until his death in 1817 and Wessenberg hampered Swabian ecclesiastical jurisdiction until 1827. Febronianism was not entirely extinguished even among German prelates, but a rising tide of Ultramontanism would soon render it old-fashioned.

(2) Catholic Revival

Ultramontanism. Febronianism had failed because it was already challenged by a Catholic revival similar to that occurring in France and England. This movement sought to restore society under the leadership of the papacy and soon developed a powerful current of Ultramontane sentiment which counteracted the Febronian faction among clergy and laity: the Prussian Mixed Marriage Controversy, presently to be treated, was the final demonstration that Febronianism was out of date in Germany.

Münster Circle. The first manifestation of this revival appeared in Westphalia where the "Münster Circle" was founded by Canon Franz von Fürstenberg (1729–1810). As temporal administrator (1762–80) of the prince-bishopric, he had fostered agrarian reforms which reduced serfdom, introduced a system of Catholic education free from Febronian

and Rationalist influences and employing modern methods, and had tried to train a solidly Catholic clergy and laity in his Münster University (1771). Canon Fürstenberg continued to direct education until the 1803 secularization, but his ideals survived under Father Bernard Overberg (1754–1820) who added normal schools to the program. These educators' efforts attracted the patronage of Lady Adele Schmettau (1748–1806), wife of a Russian nobleman, and mother of the American missionary, Father Demetrius Gallitzin (1770–1840). After returning to the practice of the Catholic Faith in 1786, she sponsored a literary group which publicized and aided the revival. In 1800 the circle was augmented by the conversion of the classical scholar, Count Friedrich zu Stolberg (1750–1819), a sort of German Chateaubriand. At Cologne he inaugurated a rebirth of Christian art. This in turn inspired the "Nazarean School" of German painters at Rome, and the Düsseldorf School in the town of that name. Clemens von Droste-Vischering (1773–1845), subsequently archbishop of Cologne during the Prussian Mixed Marriage Controversy, was also a member of the Münster Circle.

Landshut Group. Another associate of the Münster Circle, Johann Sailer (1751–1832), carried the revival to Landshut in Bavaria where he became bishop of the reorganized see of Regensburg in 1829. As professor and bishop he sought to train good priests; as writer of devotional works he sought to develop piety among the laity. Bishop Sailer brought back to the Faith Melchior von Diepenbrock (1798–1853), later the zealous bishop of Breslau, and Clemens Brentano (1778–1842), Romantic apologist for the Church, and protagonist of the stigmatic, Anne Catherine Emmerich (1774–1824). Bishop Sailer also exercised a good influence upon Prince Louis I of Bavaria (1786–1868), patron of the Munich School.

Munich School. On his accession to the Bavarian throne in 1825, Louis I transferred the Landshut college to Munich to make of it a truly Catholic university. To this end in 1827 he summoned Joseph Görres (1776–1848) to become professor and to preside over an extracurricular academy of Catholic scholars. Görres was an ex-Jacobin disillusioned of Liberalism who had been a German patriot in the resistance to Bonaparte, and was becoming a great literary apologist for the Church. He became widely known through lectures, books, and articles, chiefly in a new review, *Der Katholik*, which was the leading organ of Ultramontane expression. Against Hegel's pantheistic *Philosophy of History*, Görres pleaded for a Christian interpretation of historical development, and himself edited a series entitled *God in History* from 1831. His *Historisch-Politische Blätter* traced some of the ideas later put into practice by the Catholic Center Party. Among Görres's disciples at Munich were the Catholic scholars and his son Guido Görres

(1805–52), also an editor; Georg Phillips (1804–1872) and Karl May (1799–1867), lay experts in both civil and canon law; Father Joseph Allioli (1793–1873), translator of a new Catholic German version of the Bible; Father Johann Möhler (1796–1838), theologian and patrologist; Peter Cornelius (1805–64), Christian artist; Franz Streber (1805–64), archaeologist; and Johann Ignaz Döllinger (1799–1890), the brilliant but caustic historical scholar, who did good work before becoming an "Old Catholic" apostate. Theirs was to be a vocation in line with Bishop Sailer's ideal for the men of the nineteenth century when ecclesiastics "must know more, do more, and be ready to suffer more" than formerly. The School enjoyed the patronage of Prince Louis, who also founded the Ludwigverein, a missionary aid society which greatly assisted the spread of the Faith in the United States. Though the Spanish actress, Lola Montez, later distracted his attention, Prince Louis was on the whole quite favorable to the Church until his deposition in the 1848 Revolutions.

B. German Liberalism (1815–48)

(1) LIBERALISM AND THE STATE

The "Metternich System." For thirty years the Austrian chancellor, Metternich, worked tirelessly to maintain in Germany the status quo established by the Congress of Vienna. He was opposed, therefore, to the realization of German national unity, which would be likely to disrupt the multinational Habsburg monarchy. Instead, he endeavored to perpetuate Austrian presidency of a loose Germanic Confederation. Metternich likewise repressed Liberalism as a legacy of the French Revolution and a tenet of the secret societies. To achieve his objectives he jailed nationalist agitators and garrisoned territories with alien troops. Rigid censorship of the press and careful police surveillance, especially of the universities, long rendered the Habsburg dominions impervious to change. Other German states, however, thought it expedient to compromise with Liberalism. In particular, Frederick William III of Prussia (1797–1840) granted a charter; whereupon Liberal patriots and masonic agitators hailed Prussia as potential head of the Germany of the future. Archduke Karl of Saxe-Weimar made his dominions a haven for Liberals, and Metternich's protests were unavailing until 1819 when Karl Sand, a Liberal student, assassinated Kotzebuie, an agent of Russian autocracy. Metternich utilized the princes' alarm over this incident to induce the Diet of Carlsbad (1819) to promulgate decrees supervising the universities, censoring the press, renouncing existing Liberal constitutions and establishing a central bureau of investigation at Mainz. Measures of this type served to keep the Germanic Confedera-

tion externally tranquil through the European disturbances of 1830–31, and even to the eve of the year of universal eruption of Liberalism: 1848.

Restoration ideologies. "Metternich, antiliberal, antinational, opposed to the ideals of the French Enlightenment and Revolution, set the reactionary pattern of the period. . . . Hegel combined the rationalism of the eighteenth century with the new individualizing Historicism of the nineteenth. His theory of the dialectic was an attempt to find a logic and inner meaning in the process of history that was open to rational and scientific observation and analysis. . . . His acceptance of the Prussian patriarchal state of his own time as the concrete realization of his political ideal . . . marked a definite break with the liberal, rational, and universal tradition of the Enlightenment. . . . Politically, the period following 1815 was 'one of disillusionment, of hopes belied, promises broken, and reforms deferred.' . . . The Revolution of 1848 had a positive significance in subsequent German history. It represented the first entry of the broad masses into politics, and whatever movements of political Liberalism and Radicalism developed in later years, they were nourished and fed by the experience, the memories and the inspiration of 1848. Political Catholicism was initiated in the movement of 1848; the working classes developed a greater self-consciousness, and the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels became one of the basic documents of the proletarian movement." [4]

(2) LIBERALISM AND THE CHURCH

Hermesianism. Georg Hermes (1775–1831), ordained in 1799 and subsequently professor of theology at Münster, became influenced by Kant to the extent of constructing a system of hypothetical doubt. He was sustained by his bishop, Baron von Spiegel, intruded by Bonaparte, and later archbishop of Cologne. But the vicar-general, Droste-Vischering, was convinced of his heterodoxy and secured his posthumous condemnation by Rome. Johann Möhler (1796–1838) was for a time influenced by Hermes, but was eventually disabused by patristic studies in which he anticipated Newman and the Oxford Movement. He was an exemplary priest and died in good standing. Anton Günther (1783–1863) was brought back to the Faith by St. Clement Hofbauer. Ordained in 1820, he remained an unattached cleric. Like Hermes, he was led by his prejudice against Scholasticism into Kantian metaphysical vagaries. Condemned by Rome in 1857, he left some doubts as to his submission. Froschammer (1821–83) was also condemned in 1857 for

[4] Koppel Pinson, *Modern Germany* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954), pp. 51–52, 107.

various errors, but claiming that philosophy was independent of ecclesiastical authority, refused to submit. The forces that would culminate in Modernism were already at work.

In Austria, despite the good dispositions of Francis II (1792–1835) and Ferdinand (1835–48), the court remained permeated with Josephinist adherents who strove to control the Church through a governmental agency, the "Ecclesiastical Commission." Universities and schools had been proclaimed neutral by Emperor Joseph II, and later-day Josephinists tried to make them so in practice. Thus, St. Clement Hofbauer (1751–1820), the "Apostle of Vienna," was obliged to make use of what today would be called a "Newman Club" in the supposedly Catholic city and University of Vienna. On the other hand, except for the appropriation of the large palatinate of Salzburg, Austrian ecclesiastical property and diocesan boundaries had remained substantially intact through the revolutionary era. Though the government permitted greater clerical influence upon educational supervision as time went on, no complete accord could be reached with the Holy See despite attempts at a concordat in 1819 and 1833. Except for Bavaria, other nominally Catholic states—whose detailed history cannot be traced here—were even less co-operative with the Church.

In Prussia, the acquisition of the Rhineland at the Congress of Vienna brought many Catholics into this hitherto predominantly Protestant state. As previously noted, Frederick the Great (1740–86) had initiated a policy of religious tolerance, and Pope Pius VII was able to utilize this spirit to reach an agreement with King Frederick William III (1797–1840) regarding the erection of dioceses and vicariates within Prussian frontiers. According to the bull, *De Salute Animarum* (1821), cathedral chapters were authorized to select bishops, subject alike to papal confirmation and royal veto. Seminaries were to be established in each diocese. For a time the Prussian government, while directed by the anti-masonic premier, Baron von Hardenberg, was almost more gracious toward Catholics than were the Catholic princes. But after Hardenberg's retirement in 1822, a major controversy arose about mixed marriages. While its history is here traced for Prussia alone, where it assumed the most serious proportions, it should be noted that similar struggles went on simultaneously in many other German states.

(3) PRUSSIAN MIXED MARRIAGE CONTROVERSY

Governmental attack. In 1825 a Prussian law of 1803 requiring all children of mixed marriages to be raised in the father's religion was extended to the Catholic Rhineland. When Catholic pastors refused to bless marriages in which the Catholic education of all prospective children was not guaranteed, the Prussian government voided all such pre-

matrimonial contracts. When the dispute was referred to the Febronian archbishop of Cologne, Baron von Spiegel, this prelate weakly sanctioned the law, pending consultation with the Holy See. The Roman response was delayed by the death of Pope Leo XII (1829), but in March, 1830, the new Pope Pius VIII replied with *Literis Altero*. This document directed pastors to warn the faithful against such mixed marriages and to strive to obtain the canonically required promises. But in case these were not forthcoming, the pastors were allowed to assist passively at the exchange of vows without religious ceremony. Since the Tridentine decree *Tametsi* had never been promulgated in Prussia, such marriages would then be illicit but not invalid. The king, unsatisfied even with these maximum concessions, induced the pliant Archbishop Spiegel to suppress much of the papal directive and to order pastors to give the nuptial blessing in practically all cases.

Catholic defiance. But in 1836 Clemens Droste-Vischering, a member of the Ultramontane Münster Circle, succeeded Spiegel at Cologne. He was still in ignorance of the full facts, but by 1837 the Holy See had obtained information of Spiegel's secret pact. Pope Gregory XVI then ordered instant promulgation of *Literis Altero*. The new archbishop thereupon examined the documents in his predecessor's archives, which had been concealed even from some of the suffragan bishops. Henceforth Droste-Vischering displayed himself a resolute champion of the papal mandate. Except for his Febronian chapter, the archbishop's clergy were only too happy to follow the wishes of the Holy See against the government. The king imprisoned the archbishop in November, 1837, and ordered the chapter to elect a vicar-capitular. Though the latter complied, their nominee, Hugsen, was disregarded by the greater part of the clergy and the laity. German Catholics were roused to the support of the captive prelate by Görres whose *Athanasius* compared his lot to that of the great foe of Arianism. Archbishop Dunin of Gnesen, hitherto passive, now himself promulgated *Literis Altero*, and in 1839 was also put in detention. Bishop Sedlnitzky of Breslau indeed sided with the government, but was obliged to resign his see when his clergy denounced him to Rome. Thereupon the bishops of Culm and Ermland hastily changed to the papal side, as aroused Ultramontane sentiment excoriated Febronianism.

Government capitulation followed the old king's death in June, 1840. The new monarch, Frederick William IV (1840–61), realized that the controversy ill served his dream of German unification under Prussian presidency. He permitted Archbishop Dunin to return to his see, while the ailing Droste-Vischering—since 1839 under house arrest instead of in prison—was released to proceed to Rome where the Prussian government instituted discussions. After the king had agreed to accept the

papal directive unconditionally and to withdraw the governmental *placet* and *exequatur*, a way was open for a settlement of the dispute. The government withdrew its charges against Droste-Vischering, while the Holy See saved royal prestige by sacrificing the "New Athanasius" as it had the first one. Though the aged prelate retained title to his see, he remained at Rome, leaving the administration in the hands of a coadjutor, Johann von Geisel, acceptable to the king. On his part, the king tried to make amends by admitting some Catholic representatives to his "ministry of cult" where they could advise him on Catholic interests in legislation, and by contributing generously to the completion of the five-hundred-year-old Cologne Cathedral—it was finished in 1880.

Canonical postscript. The concessions of *Literis Altero* remained the norm for mixed marriages in Prussia and several other German states until 1918, and even *Ne Temere* which in 1908 required interrogations for validity did not alter these special pontifical concessions. But in 1918 not only did the New Code of Canon Law revoke the concessions of *Literis Altero,* but the democratic revolutions in Central Europe following World War I swept away the meddling monarchical governments which had extorted them from the Holy See, for arrangements similar to the Prussian had been made with Austria (1841), Hungary, and Bavaria.[5]

76. THE PAPACY AND ITALIAN LIBERALISM

A. *Italian Reorganization (1815–30)*

(1) POPE PIUS VII (1800–1823)

Italian restoration. For a decade (1802–13) a Republic and kingdom of Italy had existed under Napoleonic leadership. Though this comprised only a part of the Italian peninsula, it had awakened nationalist aspirations. But since for Metternich, "Italy was a mere geographical expression," the Congress of Vienna ignored any desires of Italian patriots for unity and imposed a political system which was destined to endure without substantial change until 1859. The Papal States and the Two Sicilies were restored to their former rulers without major alteration. Sardinia-Savoy-Piedmont was permitted to annex Genoa and remained the only dynasty Italian in sentiment; hence it soon became a rallying point for patriots. Lombardy, with the former Republic of Venice, became an Austrian province. Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Lucca, and Guastalla became Austrian protectorates—Lucca was annexed by Tuscany in 1847 and Guastalla absorbed by Modena in 1848.

Pontifical restoration. Pope Pius VII made his definitive return to

[5] H. Noldin, S.J., *De Sacramentis* (twenty-first edition; Oeniponte: Pustet, 1901), III, n. 651.

Rome—after the Hundred Days—on June 7, 1815. Cardinal Consalvi, again papal secretary of state, secured the almost complete restoration of the papal temporal states, but the problem of reorganizing the administration remained. The *Zelanti,* led by Cardinal Bartolomeo Pacca (1756–1844), pro-secretary from 1808 to 1814, inclined toward conservative reaction, and during Cardinal Consalvi's absence at Vienna, Monsignor Rivarola, provisional administrator of the Papal States, had practically ignored the revolutionary developments in restoring the old system of government. On the other hand, the *Politiques,* led by Consalvi (1757–1824) himself, favored a compromise between the Old and New Regimes. The cardinal secretary of state eventually convinced Pius VII of the expediency of the latter program, which was the basis of a *motu proprio* issued by the pope on July 6, 1816. By this decree the pontifical territories were subdivided into legations on the model of the new French departments. The clerical legates were to be assisted by lay subordinates, and advised by provincial councils, though these were named from Rome rather than elected. Justice and administration were separated; a new civil code tried to harmonize the better features of the Code Napoleon with the canon law. Torture was abolished, and feudal privileges of the nobility sacrificed to equality of taxation. Other progressive measures, chiefly economic, were planned, but want of funds would keep them merely on paper. During 1818 a concordat was negotiated with the Two Sicilies which may represent standard papal *desiderata* in Italy: recognition of the Church as the state religion; renunciation of the *placet;* acceptance of endowments by the Church in condonation of confiscated properties; redrawing of diocesan boundaries, and subjection of royal nomination of prelates to papal confirmation.

Carbonari uprisings. Yet youths enamored of extremist views of the Jacobin Revolution regarded these changes entirely inadequate. The secret society of the Carbonari ("Charcoal Burners"), which seems to have been formed about 1800, began to work for the overthrow of "priestly government." An abortive revolt in the Papal States during 1817 led to the arrest and condemnation to death of the ringleaders, but the pope commuted the sentences to life imprisonment. Cardinal Pacca had issued an edict against these Carbonari in 1814, but it was not until 1821 that the kindly pontiff could be induced to pronounce definitive condemnation. This censure seems to have precipitated the dissolution of the Carbonari, but similar societies took their place. With these, however, the aged and patient Pius VII did not have to deal, for he died on August 16, 1823, to be followed within six months by his faithful aide, Cardinal Consalvi. Though not a strong character, Pius VII had won general European admiration for his patient sufferings at Bonaparte's hands, and for his willingness to meet new ideas half way.

(2) Pope Leo XII (1823–29)

Annibale della Genga (1760–1829), vicar-general of Rome, was elected by the *Zelanti* on September 28, after their first candidate, Cardinal Severoli, had been vetoed by Cardinal Albani in the name of Francis II of Austria. Cardinal della Genga had disagreed with Cardinal Consalvi regarding the postwar settlement, had remained without sympathy for the diplomatic policies of Pius VII, and had consequently remained in the background during the preceding pontificate. Austere, sickly, retiring, he never gained much popularity, although his health, if precarious, sufficed for six years.

Conservatism, even reaction, marked Pope Leo's governmental policy in the Papal States. Though he granted a friendly audience to Cardinal Consalvi, the pope chose a definite reactionary, Cardinal della Somaglia as secretary of state (1823–28). Repression became the order of the day. Theaters and colleges were supervised, meeting places of the Carbonari searched, brigandage suppressed. The local councils of the legations were abandoned, and some of the privileges of the nobility restored. Legate Rivarola sentenced 508 suspects: seven to death and thirteen to life imprisonment; others were given long terms or put under strict supervision. Rivarola's life was attempted. He was dismissed, but his successor issued seven more death sentences. There were, however, useful measures: a new system of public education began in 1824, the Roman College was restored to the Jesuits, and the Vatican Library and press promoted.

Diplomatic affairs had little interest for the pope, yet he courageously reorganized the Latin American hierarchies, despite the vehement opposition of the Spanish monarchy. Pacts were also concluded with Hanover (1824), and the Netherlands (1827), and the Rhenish hierarchy reorganized.

Spiritual leadership was the pope's chief concern and here he displayed both intelligence and zeal. His encyclical of May 5, 1824, *Ubi Primum*, condemned Indifferentism and the Rationalist Bible Societies, and in 1825 *Quo Graviore* renewed the condemnation of the Carbonari and Freemasons. The Holy Year Jubilee, omitted in 1800, was resumed in 1825. The pope was particularly solicitous for the foreign missions and reunion of Oriental Dissidents. Leo XII departed life in an edifying manner on February 10, 1829, but was little mourned by his restless contemporaries.

(3) Pope Pius VIII (1829–30)

Francesco Castiglione (1761–1830), cardinal-bishop of Frascati, and candidate of the *Politiques* at the last conclave, now at last obtained the

required number of votes on March 31 in a conclave again plagued by
secular interference: Francis of Austria and Charles X of France sought
a conservative, and Charles Felix of Sardinia a liberal. The new pope
was moderate and conscientious, but was physically ill-favored and in
constant pain. Though little able to assist at liturgical functions, he still
took an active interest in diplomacy.

Moderation characterized this short pontificate. Without relaxing his
predecessor's condemnation of secret societies or rationalist groups, Pope
Pius did abolish his repressive measures. Taxes were lowered and em-
ployment relief provided. But revolution was nonetheless brewing
when the pope died at Rome on December 1, 1830, though prompt
measures by the interim government ensured the security of the conclave
of December 13.

In diplomacy, Pius VIII, as has been seen, went to the limits of con-
cession in the Prussian mixed marriage dispute. When Louis Philippe
replaced Charles X on the French throne, the pope recognized the new
government without difficulty, and directed reluctant French prelates
to support it. British Catholic Emancipation (1829) was the chief lasting
boon for Catholics in the political sphere during the pontificate, for in
response to the French July Revolution, Jacobin Liberalism erupted
anew in Italy while the conclave went into session.

B. *Repression of Liberalism* (1830–46)

(1) ITALIAN PARTIES

Jacobin Republicans. Giuseppe Mazzini (1805–72), charging that the
Carbonari were now ruled by an aging oligarchy, had formed a new
group of rebels called "Young Italy." Its members agitated for a radical
republic with greater emphasis on Democracy than the bourgeois Car-
bonari had placed. According to Mazzini: "Young Italy is unitarist and
republican. . . . The means which Young Italy plans to use for the
attainment of its end are education and insurrection. Education, for
instance by the spoken word and by books, will give twenty million
Italians an awareness of their nationality so that the insurrection finds
them ready against their oppressors. . . . The Italian people is called
upon to destroy Catholicism in the name of the continuous revelation." [6]
Young Italy was to make its great effort during the Roman Republic of
1848–49, would fail, and be in turn discredited. It is doubtful if their
violent break with Italian clerical and aristocratic traditions could have
won lasting success during the nineteenth century.

Clerical Federalists. Some "Liberal Catholics," led by Padre Vincenzo
Gioberti (1801–52), sought a federation of autonomous Italian states

[6] Fernand Mourret, S.S., *History of the Catholic Church,* trans. Newton Thompson
(St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946), VIII, 236.

under papal presidency. In his *Primato Morale e Civile degli Italiani* (1843), Gioberti denounced revolution and conspiracy as futile means toward Italian unification, and defended the traditional cultural leadership of the papacy. But in his *Gesuita Moderno*, Gioberti turned to baiting Jesuit Ultramontanes. The Federalist cause was also sustained, with some modifications of thought, by the writings of Cesare Balbo (1787–1853) and Massimo Taporelli (1798–1866), marchese d'Azeglio. This group, which included Liberals and Romantics of the Chateaubriand type as well as the old Guelf nobility, desired to preserve papal sovereignty at all costs. Realization of this program, however, would have identified the papacy with Italian nationalism and it was doomed by papal repudiation.

Liberal monarchists. A third group hoped to unify Italy into a constitutional monarchy under the House of Savoy. Their leader was a Mason, Count Camillo di Cavour (1810–61), almost continuously premier of Sardinia from 1852 to his death. Though he proclaimed a "free Church in a free state," in practice his program involved abolition of the Papal States and reduction of the papacy to a national primacy. He expected to engineer a *fait accompli* and then placate the Holy See by expressions of regret and financial reimbursement. His party included a large number of compromising Catholics, torn between their love and loyalty for the Holy See and their ambitions for a unified Italy. The party's leaders represented the dominant class of the century, the industrial and capitalist *bourgeoisie*. Piedmont as yet comprised the only industrialized area in Italy, and its leaders looked with favor on the British monarchy where administration was in accord with laissez-faire theories. Viscount Palmerston, influential British statesman, lent Cavour powerful backing, and Napoleon III of France was eventually prodded into half-hearted military intervention. King Charles Albert of Sardinia (1831–49), like Napoleon, seems to have had links with the Carbonari in his youth, and it is possible that political blackmail, if not threats of assassination, forced him to play the role assigned. Stampeded into a war beyond his resources, he abdicated and went into exile, leaving the throne to a son, Vittorio Emmanuele II, whom Pope Pius IX was to describe as the "compliant tool of Freemasons."

(2) POPE GREGORY XVI (1831–46)

Mauro Bartolomeo Capellari (1765–1846), a Camaldolese monk and only a priest at the time of his election, was chosen as pope after a fifty-day conclave, February 2, 1831. The delay had been occasioned by the veto of the promotion of Cardinal Giustiniani by Ferdinand VII of Spain. Capellari's election may be regarded as a victory for the *Zelanti;* as prefect of *Propaganda Fidei*, he had been chiefly concerned with purely

ecclesiastical matters. Unlike his immediate predecessors, he enjoyed good health. An ascetic, he was firm and unyielding on all doctrinal and disciplinary questions, but his administrative talents were mediocre. Although he devoted himself to reform in economic affairs, at the end of his pontificate his chancery was running on a budgetary deficit. It is not surprising, then, that Metternich, protesting that the pope "did not know how to govern," would fain have become his tutor. Gregory XVI nonetheless was resolved to maintain his independence of action.

Jacobin revolt. The revolutionary agitation had spread to the Papal States during the conclave, and two days after the pope's election, Bologna set up a Jacobin provisional government. Cardinal Benevenuti, sent to suppress the insurrection, was taken prisoner. Riots in Rome were put down with difficulty. Hence, the new secretary of state, Cardinal Bernetti, appealed to Austria for assistance. Metternich was only too happy to oblige and Austrian troops speedily dispersed the rebels of Bologna by the end of March, 1831. Some of the refugees were given asylum by the bishop of Imola, Giovanni Mastia-Ferretti, the future Pope Pius IX.

Alien intervention. In May, 1831, the Quintuple Alliance dictated a memorandum to the pope, recommending that he introduce the following reforms into the Papal States: a general amnesty; elective communal and provincial councils; a lay judiciary and civil service; and a central assembly of nobles to advise on administration and finance. The pope was happy enough to grant an amnesty, but aside from some gestures toward greater lay participation—by restoring Pius VII's councils—he refused to be lectured. The allied sovereigns did not insist; indeed, did three of them, the rulers of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, grant as much to their own subjects? During August, 1831, moreover, Pope Gregory freed himself from diplomatic problems by announcing in *Sollicitudo Ecclesiarum* that the Holy See would automatically recognize the *de facto* existence of new governments, without thereby committing itself to a judgment upon their legitimacy.

Conservative reaction characterized the remainder of this pontificate. Radicals, denouncing the papal refusal to concede the suggested reforms, rioted anew. At the request of Cardinal Albani, special commissioner, Austrian troops returned in January, 1832, but this time France also sent an expedition to Ancona. Despite papal protests, Austria and France maintained "protective" and mutually suspicious garrisons at Bologna and Ancona until 1838. Cardinal Bernetti tried to placate disaffected elements by some nonpolitical concessions: reopening colleges; revising taxation; naming chambers of commerce and lay judges. But the pope had lost confidence in concessions and during the last decade of his pontificate sustained a new secretary of state, Cardinal Lambruschini

(1836–46) in a reactionary policy which paid no heed to popular clamor and repressed all signs of discontent. "Young Italians" who tried a new revolt at Bologna in 1843 were sternly suppressed but they did not cease their denunciations of "pontifical and clerical tyranny," and their outcry was taken up by Liberals throughout Europe. Federalists received no encouragement from the pontiff who continued to rely on Metternich's armed backing until his death on June 1, 1846. As separately noted, the pope had condemned the theological Liberalism of Hermes and Lamennais.

(3) PAPAL TEMPORAL RULE AT MID-CENTURY

Estimates of the efficiency of papal temporal administration during the nineteenth century were highly colored by the clerical or liberal views of their authors. The following contrasting appraisals are given in an endeavor to strike some sort of a balance.

Favorable estimate. Alphonse de Rayneval, member of the French embassy at Rome during the Orléanist and Bonapartist regimes, pointed out that a vast majority of civil officials were laymen: there were less than two hundred clerics engaged in temporal administration, and of these less than half were in sacred orders. The civil property and commercial codes were as modern as the contemporary French laws. The papal government bought up the paper money of the Roman Republic (1848–49), and yet soon balanced the budget again. The rate of taxation was half that in France: 22 francs against 45. He concluded: "The pontifical government has not failed in its duty; it has marched regularly on the way of reform, and has made great progress."[7]

Unfavorable estimate. On the other hand, Luigi Farini, undersecretary of Pius IX in 1848, believed that the native soldiers were poorly paid and disciplined, and so untrustworthy that reliance was had on foreign mercenaries. Commerce was anemic and large industry absent. Robber bands threatened the country districts. Government bureaus were in a chaotic condition, and inordinate and inequitable taxes imposed on the people. Maladministration made economic conditions deplorable; large reserves of wealth were immobile. Citizens were not equal before the law, and the course of justice was slow, tedious, and costly. The national debt amounted to 37,000,000 scudi with a five per cent interest charge and a yearly deficit of at least a million. Education he believed woefully deficient in all its branches, not excluding that of religious instruction. Thousands of citizens were "admonished," and therefore ineligible for office. Military commissions were in permanent session. Pope Pius IX, however, "knew nothing of this, for his favorites took care that business

[7] Reuben Parsons, *Studies in Church History* (Philadelphia: J. J. McVey, 1909), V, 527.

affairs were never discussed." [8] Some confirmation of these charges would seem to be found in a remark attributed to Pope Gregory XVI in 1843: "The civil administration of the Papal States stands in need of a thoroughgoing reform, but I was too old when I was elected pope; I did not think that I would live so long, and had not the courage to undertake the task. For whoever undertakes it must carry it through. A younger pope will be chosen as my successor, and it will devolve upon him to accomplish this task, without which it will be impossible to go on." [9]

77. RUSSIAN AUTOCRACY

A. *Gestures toward Liberalism* (*1796–1825*)

(1) CZAR PAUL (1796–1801)

Legacy of Catherine the Great. Russia had been welded into a great power by Peter the Great (1689–1725) and Catherine the Great (1762–96). The former had taken from Sweden in 1721 the Baltic Provinces where he located his capital Petrograd with a "window on the Baltic." The latter had annexed Catholic Poland-Lithuania in three partitions (1772–95), besides acquiring an outlet to the Black Sea by wresting the Crimea from Turkey (1774–92). Until 1918, then, large numbers of Catholics lived under Russian czardom, divided between the Latin and Oriental Rites. The czars generally pretended to be the heirs of the Byzantine Basileus and aspired to free the Turkish-dominated patriarch of Constantinople, and then to make of him a court chaplain for controlling all Graeco-Slav Christians, including, if possible, some eight million Ruthenian Uniates. And the Communist dictators have substantially returned to this policy.

Paul Petrovich (1754–1801) had been kept in leading strings by his German mother, Catherine of Anhalt, who had usurped the Russian throne after murdering his father. For greater reason than Victoria's son, Edward of Wales, Paul sought to assert his individuality by a complete change of policy. It is true that he did not proceed far on the road to political Liberalism, although in 1797 he delivered an initial blow to feudalism by restricting the serfs' labor for their landlords to three days a week. On the other hand, he returned to the use of torture in judicial procedure and used his power in tyrannical, erratic, and at times almost insane fashion. He came to admire Bonaparte as a strong man and to dissent from the anti-French coalition. Finally on March 11, 1801, discontented and inebriated officers slew him, with at least the foreknowledge of his heir, Alexander Pavlovich.

Ecclesiastical reorganization. By the norms of the established Greek

[8] Franz X. Seppelt and Clement Löffler, *Short History of the Popes* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1932), p. 416.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 407.

Orthodox Church, however, the czar was deemed a religious Liberal by the loyal Russians. He had traveled in Italy while crown prince and had a friendly audience with Pope Pius VI—to whom he sent a fur coat for his trip to Vienna. On his accession to the Russian throne, Paul requested diplomatic relations with the Holy See and in 1797 Pius VI named Cardinal Litta as special envoy. The papal representative presented a memorial requesting fulfillment of the guarantee of Catholic freedom of cult promised by Catherine II, and re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy seriously disrupted by her machinations. The czar proved agreeable, and worked out with Cardinal Litta an arrangement whereby the Latin and Ruthenian dioceses might be reorganized, and many churches and monasteries seized by Catherine were restored. On November 15, 1798, Pope Pius VI erected the metropolitan sees of Mohilev and Polotszk, the first to preside over five suffragan Latin dioceses, and the latter over two suffragan Ruthenian jurisdictions. Since persecution by the Russian government had ceased, many Ruthenians who had been constrained to conform externally to the Orthodox Church now dared proclaim anew their allegiance to the Holy See.

(2) Czar Alexander I (1801-25)

Alexander Pavlovich (1777–1825) succeeded to the throne in virtue of his father's assassination. He long remained torn between the Liberal notions instilled by his Swiss tutor La Harpe, and the autocratic habits drilled into him by his military mentor, General Sakikony. Alexander's almost lifelong wavering among these and other influences rendered him something of an enigma, both to his subjects and to European statesmen. Alexander seems to have been a hesitant idealist, open to new ideas even to the point of credulity, but in the last analysis arbitrary and self-willed. He would be liberal indeed—provided no one disagreed with him. His personal religious convictions veered from Greek Orthodoxy to the pseudo-mysticism of Baroness Krüdener and the Protestant Rationalism of the Bible Society. Comte De Maistre, French ambassador at St. Petersburg, introduced Catholic ideas to the court, and toward the end of his life Alexander was inclined in the same direction by General Michaud. The Jesuit Father Gagorin affirmed "off the record" that the czar had even requested the Holy See for a priest in order to receive instructions in the Catholic Faith, and that only his death prevented this. On the other hand there is the legend that Alexander did not die on December 13, 1825, as generally (and it would seem correctly) assumed, but abdicated and lived on until 1864 as "Fyodor Kuzmich," an eccentric ascetic.

Political policies. Alexander's brain trust, the "Informal Committee," discussed many liberal reforms and even meditated grant of a con-

stitution. In 1803 an edict regulated optional emancipation of serfs. After the Peace of Tilsit (1807) with Bonaparte had temporarily relieved the czar from foreign cares, he confided the task of liberalizing the Russian autocracy to Michael Speranski (1772–1839). In 1810 a council of state was set up to supervise administration, and legal, financial, and bureaucratic reorganization on Western models was planned. But when Speransky drafted a constitution (1812), conservative opposition from the privileged classes secured his dismissal. The French invasion of that year obliged Alexander to appeal to the traditional elements in Russia, and after the alien peril had been repulsed, he selected the reactionary General Arakcheiyev (1769–1834) as chief advisor. The masonic-Liberal group of cosmopolites protested the czar's conservative trend and Paul Pestel (1793–1826) organized secret societies among army officers to promote Liberalism. But Kotzebue's murder in 1819 increased Alexander's distrust of Liberalism, and he confessed to Metternich: "You have nothing to regret, but I have." Thenceforward benevolent despotism became his policy in Russia, though Finland, acquired from Sweden in 1809, was granted an autonomous position under a feudal constitution.

Polish status. Acquisition of the Napoleonic puppet Grand Duchy of Warsaw gave Alexander two thirds of the former Polish territory. The Congress of Vienna confirmed this as his "Kingdom of Poland" at gunpoint: Alexander told Castlereagh: "I conquered the duchy and have 480,000 men to keep it." Yet the new "King of Poland" essayed a liberal program which he denied to Russia itself. Under the influence of a Polish friend of his youth, Prince Adam Czartoryski (1770–1861), he conceded a constitution which provided for a Polish legislature, a separate administration and army. Polish was declared the official language, and freedom of speech and of the press proclaimed. Later, however, Czartoryski was supplanted by the brutal Novosiltsov and his secret police. Polish resentment, however, required the open provocation of Alexander's successor before breaking into revolt.

(3) ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS UNDER ALEXANDER I

Hierarchical organization. Toward the Catholic Church in Russia Alexander for the most part continued Paul's comparative benevolence. He was imposed upon, however, by a Catholic quisling, Stanislaus Siestrzenceiwicz Bohusz (1730–1826). This ambitious prelate had accepted the see of Mohilev in 1773 from Catherine II without papal sanction, and had subsequently manifested extreme Febronian tendencies. Yet in the interests of peace, Pius VI had recognized him in 1783, and retained him in 1798 as titular head of the hierarchy. The pope tried to neutralize his pernicious influence, however, by giving him a coadjutor,

the Jesuit Bishop Benislawski. But during 1801, Archbishop Bohusz persuaded Alexander to erect a "Catholic College," a bureau which would correspond to the Orthodox "Holy Synod" in advising the monarch. As head of this secular agency, Bohusz proceeded to name suffragans, annul marriages, and secularize monasteries without recourse to the Holy See. To give himself greater freedom he induced the czar to dismiss the papal nuncio. When, however, the archbishop who would be patriarch extended favors to the rationalist "Bible Society" in 1816, Pope Pius VII sharply rebuked him. During 1817 the pontiff took occasion of the separate political entity of "Congress Poland" to withdraw from Mohilev most of Bohusz's subjects by erecting the new ecclesiastical province of Warsaw with seven suffragan dioceses. Thenceforward the province of Warsaw possessed jurisdiction over most of the Polish Catholics, while that of Mohilev was restricted to Russians and Lithuanians.

Catholic influences. By a curious "reverse Machiavellianism" Catherine II had imitated Frederick the Great of Prussia in protecting the Jesuits when they had been suppressed in Catholic Europe. With the tacit approval of the Holy See, the Jesuit province continued to survive in Russian Poland, and concerned itself with the national education which Russian rulers deemed necessary as a soothing syrup for Polish nationalism. This anomalous situation lasted under Paul and Alexander until 1820 when election of an international superior-general for the revived Society induced the czar to banish them—just when other lands were welcoming them back. During their Russian sojourn, however, the Jesuits had influenced Russians as well as Poles, and the French Father Sugurgue founded a Catholic academy in St. Petersburg. Count De Maistre as French ambassador favorably impressed members of the high society of the Russian capital. Not only did Madam Gallitzin return to the Faith, but a number of Russians became converts: the diplomat Koslovsky, Countess Golovin, Lord Odoyevsky, and others. Balabin, Martynov, and Gagarin entered the Jesuit Order; Count Shuvalov became a Barnabite, Wladimir Petcherin a Redemptorist, and Nathalie Narishkin a Daughter of Charity of St. Vincent. But in 1815 the Catholic academy was closed and after De Maistre's departure from St. Petersburg conversions from the Russian aristocracy dwindled, for many had to pay for their Faith by suffering exile. But Catholicity was no longer utterly foreign to Russian religious life, and toward the end of the century a "Russian Newman," Vladimir Solovyev, entered the Catholic Church by way of historical-theological research.

B. Autocratic Reaction (1825–55)

(1) CZAR NICHOLAS I (1825–55)

"**Decembrist mutiny.**" Alexander, having no surviving children, had designated his conservative younger brother Nicholas (1796–1855) to succeed him in preference to his unstable elder brother Constantine (1779–1831). Although Constantine himself had agreed to this arrangement in 1822, the Liberal secret societies staged a mutiny, December 26, 1825, for "Constantine and Constitution." Constantine promptly repudiated the uprising about which some of the common soldiers knew so little that they supposed "Constitution" to be Constantine's wife. Czar Nicholas firmly suppressed the mutiny and used it as an object lesson for countermeasures. The incident confirmed him in his horror of Liberalism, and undeviating Autocracy became his avowed principle.

Polish revolt. The czar accordingly viewed with disfavor his "Kingdom of Poland" under Constantine's regency, and at once began to restrict Polish liberties through Russian agents. Religious houses were forbidden to receive novices without governmental leave. In 1830 Nicholas demanded transfer of matrimonial jurisdiction from canonical to civil courts, but the Polish Diet objected. Though Constantine somewhat softened the application of the czar's decrees, Poles formed secret societies of their own despite the submission preached to them by the Catholic hierarchy. In November, 1830, the rumor that Nicholas was about to employ Polish troops in suppressing the Belgian revolution with which they sympathized, induced Polish Liberals to rebel. In expectation of aid from the liberal regime of Louis Philippe of France, they assassinated Russian officials, drove out Prince Constantine, and asserted their independence. From January to September, 1831, they fought desperately but unsuccessfully against superior Russian forces. They were short of munitions, divided between Moderates and Radicals, and elicited little outside aid. Prince Adam Czartoryski, their one statesman, was placed at the head of the provisional government too late to prevent collapse, and he fled the country to spend the rest of his life in Western Europe trying to organize relief for Poland.

Polish repression. As soon as he had suppressed the military uprising, the czar revoked the Polish constitution and simply annexed the "Kingdom" to his Russian dominions. Russian troops were quartered in the country and hundreds of Poles executed or exiled to Siberia. Thereafter Russian czardom pursued quite consistently an attempt to exterminate Polish nationalism: its language, customs, and if possible, its religion. Religious houses were suppressed and interference in ecclesiastical discipline and cult began. Save for the brief interval (1837–38), the metropolitan see of Warsaw was kept vacant from 1829 to 1857, and

administrators had to labor under near catacomb conditions. Gregory XVI, deceived by Russian diplomats, issued a letter on June 9, 1832, blaming the rebels and urging submission to the Russian government; later the pope admitted that he had been misinformed and told General Zamoyski that fear of reprisals against the Polish people had prompted his action. But Polish nationalism almost fused with religious loyalty to set up a solid resistance to Russian pressure; after a century of persecution, this judgment still seems correct today.

(2) Nicolaite Persecution

Ruthenian restraints. Nicholas I reverted to Catherine's Caesaropapism. In 1825 Uniates were forbidden to communicate with the Holy See and a series of persecutions strove to drive them into schism. In 1828 Ruthenian diocesan organization was altered and subjected to regulation by a government bureau of religion. Large-scale confiscation of property and suppression of religious houses followed. Clerics were subjected to minute surveillance; children seized to be trained as schismatics; and any attempt at Uniate proselytism was punished with prison or exile. Mixed marriages were to be performed in the Orthodox Church and all children raised in that religion. The new archbishop of Mohilev, Caspar Cieciszewski (1827–31), protested in vain on behalf of the Latins, and after his death his see was kept vacant until 1848. Meanwhile the Ruthenian metropolitan, Archbishop Bulhak of Polotszk (1815–38), was hampered by a disloyal coadjutor, the Lithuanian Siemaszko, and other compliant bishops installed in Ruthenian sees to prepare for separation from Rome. The czar, well aware of the archbishop's prestige among Russians of all faiths, awaited his death in 1838 to consummate his designs. Then Siemaszko and two episcopal accomplices with thirteen hundred priests published an "Act of Union" with the Greek Orthodox Church, February 24, 1839. Non-jurors were imprisoned or exiled, their churches confiscated, Catholic religious worship outlawed; externally the Uniate Ruthenian Church had ceased to exist.

Czarist propaganda tried to represent all Latin Rite Catholics as aliens who might be tolerated because they could not be integrated; all Catholics of Oriental Rites, however, were lectured on their patriotic duty to conform to the state church. Pope Gregory XVI delayed until July 22, 1842, to denounce the czar's persecution. Nicholas was somewhat perturbed by this publicity, for he had hoped to conceal his religious discrimination from Metternich, his political ideal. This concern for his European reputation may have prompted the czar to visit Rome in 1845. His audience with Gregory XVI was stormy and produced no immediate effect. But when the new Pope Pius IX succeeded, Nicholas reached a modus vivendi in August, 1847, whereby diocesan limits were

redefined and canonical episcopal appointments allowed to be made. Though restricted "liberty of cult" was proclaimed for both Russia and Poland, no agreement could be reached regarding free communication with the Holy See and matrimonial discipline. The czar seems to have designed the pact chiefly for propaganda purposes, for it remained almost a dead letter. Curiously, Nicholas's pretended zeal for religion boomeranged, for his claim to exercise a protectorate over Orthodox Dissidents in the Turkish dominions became a technical cause of the Crimean War. Great Britain and France rightly judged his policy was but a blind for penetration of the Balkans and inflicted serious reverses on the Russians. Nicholas died during February, 1855, and his successor hastily (1856) extricated himself from an untenable position by what proved to be temporary territorial and military concessions.

78. BRITISH CATHOLIC REVIVAL

A. *British Political Background* (1832–65)

(1) THE VICTORIAN COMPROMISE

The 1832 Reform Act enfranchised wealthy financiers and industrialists, admitting the middle class to a share in the government with the aristocracy. Once accepted politically, however, the beneficiaries proved adamant against further extension of the vote. The ensuing regime was Liberal without being democratic. This conservative attitude characterized the first part of Queen Victoria's reign (1837–1901) and is known as the "Victorian Compromise" between the ideas of the Old Regime and the French Revolution. Until his death in 1865 the dominant political figure was Viscount Palmerston, almost continuously as foreign secretary, home minister, or premier. Reputed "patriarch of Freemasonry," he was bluntly anti-Catholic in attitude. Since Catholic emancipation, his power to harm was limited at home, but it was often exercised abroad, especially in Portugal, Spain, and Italy. His resolute opposition to Democracy, moreover, led him to espouse the Southern cause during the American Civil War; only Prince Albert's intervention is believed to have averted British involvement. Finally, Palmerston was an imperialist: his defense of Don Pacifico by his "Civis Romanus sum" speech was a symptom of the reviving or "Second British Empire."

Liberal measures included the Municipal Corporations Act, extending the 1832 reform to local government, the abolition of Negro slavery (1833); the Factory Act (1833) providing for government inspectors; and the Poor Law (1834) which constrained paupers to the grim discipline of the "workhouse" excoriated by Charles Dickens. The Education Act of 1834 seems to have been originally designed as a step toward universal secular training by offering state aid to schools permitting government inspection. But stout resistance by religious groups diverted

the official policy to one of equal support for all schools. Publicity for parliamentary debate was granted Hansard, and in 1839 the Penny Postage Act brought the mails within reach of all. The Bank of England was chartered by parliament (1844) and came to have the sole right to issue currency as other banks gradually lost the franchise. The British Companies Act (1855) permitted formation of joint stock corporations with limited liability.

(2) PROLETARIAN DISSENT

Chartism. Commoners had been forbidden (1799, 1800) to form combinations to seek higher wages or shorter hours lest "freedom of contract" be infringed. Though trade unions were permitted in 1824–1825, they were expressly debarred from agitation for these objectives. Denied legal redress, the disgruntled workingmen sought reform of the suffrage under the lead of Bentham, Mill, and Place. But national unions failed for want of good methods: workers were prone to violence and an educative campaign was poorly managed. From 1838 Fergus O'Connel demanded a workingmen's "Charter" in his newspaper. The appeal enlisted sympathy and during the uprisings of 1848 on the Continent, British chartists demanded: universal male suffrage, uniform electoral districts, payment of parliamentary members, removal of property qualifications for office-holding, and annual elections. Mammoth petitions with five million signatures were to be presented to parliament on April 10, 1848. The alarmed ministry commissioned the duke of Wellington—with Napoleon Bonaparte's nephew as deputy!—to organize posses to prevent violence. But the event proved a fiasco: rain dispersed the crowd and only a few petitions arrived. These were found to contain many fictitious signatures—e.g., of Queen Victoria—and the movement collapsed under ridicule. Yet a century later all of the Chartists' demands save the last had been enacted into law. The proletariat received a modicum of *panem et circenses* in the Crystal Palace Exposition of 1851, first of modern exhibitions of industrial progress.

B. The Oxford Movement (1826–74)

(1) ORIGINS

The Anglican Establishment had been reduced by Deism and Rationalism to almost a corpse during the eighteenth century. Its pompous façade became the target of an increasing number of attacks from religious Liberals, at a time when Tory political rule was being criticized by Whigs prior to the 1832 Reform Act. At Oxford University at the opening of the nineteenth century the *Noetics* led by Whately and Arnold disparaged external organization and proposed a renewal of

Anglicanism through stress upon humanitarian social works instead of dogma and discipline.

An **orthodox reaction** to such attacks was not long in developing. Liberal sallies brought Conservative religious thinkers to give attention both to the foundations for their beliefs, and to the problem of revitalizing Anglicanism by renovation rather than revolution. The first leader of this reaction was John Keble (1792–1866), whose *Christian Year* (1826) was its initial literary manifestation. He was, however, of a retiring, scholarly disposition and withdrew to his father's rectory soon after the start of the controversy to engage chiefly in literary argument. Forensic leadership passed to a disciple, Richard Hurrell Froude (1803–36), a romanticist, who resurrected Primate Laud's "High Church" principles from the seventeenth century to combat the Liberals.

John Henry Newman (1801–90) entered Oxford in 1816 and at first associated chiefly with Richard Whately (1787–1863) from whom he derived two ideas: insistence upon the visible nature of the Church, and on its independence of the state. Newman was led to make more profound inquiries into dogmatic problems and these brought him nearer the Conservative position. About 1828 he came under Froude's influence and imbibed some of his enthusiasm and piety. As tutor at Oriel College and Vicar of St. Mary's (1828), Newman himself began to exercise a limited sway, attracting kindred spirits in Edward Pusey (1800–1882), Robert Wilberforce (1802–57), and Ambrose St-John (1815–76), of whom the latter two followed him to Rome.

Erastianism, or the theory of secular supremacy in religious affairs, became the issue for the birth of the Oxford Movement. The Peel election at Oxford in 1829 marked Newman's definitive break with the Noetics. Peel sought re-election to parliament after announcing his support of Catholic emancipation. Newman feared that this would be but a prelude to Anglican disestablishment. By prevailing on the Oxford constituency to reject Peel he provoked a clash between Liberals and Conservatives. In search of arguments, Newman turned to patristic sources. A visit to Italy, together with an interview with Dr. Nicholas Wiseman (1802–65), then rector of the English Catholic College at Rome, somewhat strengthened his patristic stand. After an illness at Naples—whence "Lead Kindly Light"—Newman returned to England in 1833 to find his fears confirmed: the triumphant Whigs were now proposing to disestablish certain Anglican sees in Ireland. Newman had come to feel that Anglicanism was a divine institution enjoying the apostolic succession of the episcopacy. Hence, he opposed the measure (*Erastic*) with all his might—and postponed Irish disestablishment until 1869, when he had ceased to be an Anglican. According to Newman himself,

John Keble's *Sermon on National Apostasy*, July 14, 1833, delivered against this Erastian program, marked the beginning or at least the external manifestation of the Oxford Movement.

(2) CLIMAX

Tractarianism. In September, 1833, the Oxford Conservatives began to publish *Tracts for the Times*, a series of articles by Newman and others on points of patristic tradition, apostolic succession of the episcopacy, the sacramental and liturgical system, and ecclesiastical discipline. These activities marked out Newman as active leader of the movement after Froude's death in 1836, though from 1835 Pusey contributed more lengthy and learned articles on ritualism, in which Newman himself was but slightly interested. Anglican clerics were aroused for or against the Tractarians, and the prelates generally frowned on them lest the bogey of Romanism draw down secular strictures or disturb their comfortable benefices.

A "Via Media" theory was expounded for the first time during 1834 in Newman's Tracts 38 and 41. According to this, although Catholics had departed far from primitive tradition by introducing novelties, Protestants erred in the opposite direction by abandoning essential truths. A purified Anglicanism would be a safe middle course between two erroneous extremes. Appointment of the Latitudinarian Dr. Renn Hampden to a theology professorship at Oxford in 1836 provoked a storm of protest from the Tractarians against the Erastian indifference to "heresy." Meanwhile Dr. Newman supplemented his influence by renowned sermons at St. Mary's.

The "Branch Theory." On his return to England in 1836, Dr. Wiseman joined Daniel O'Connell in founding the *Dublin Review*. His articles in this organ and his popular lectures soon established Wiseman as an effective apologist for the Catholic Church, and his prestige was augmented by his episcopal consecration in 1840. Dr. Wiseman persisted in drawing Newman's patristic arguments to their logical conclusions. When Wiseman pointed out from St. Augustine that union with the Holy See was a patristic dogma—for *"securus judicat orbis terrarum"*—Newman found it difficult to justify his *via media* position. Obsessed by the similarity of the Anglican status to that of early heretics and schismatics, he began to belabor Protestants more than Catholics, and advanced toward a "Branch Theory": Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches were but accidental and ritual variations of one true Christian society. In 1841 his Tract 90 tried to reconcile the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles with the Council of Trent—an impossible task, even for Newman.

Parting of the ways. But Tract 90 had antagonized the Anglican

hierarchy and Newman was censured. Without retracting his stand, he suspended publication of the Tracts and imposed silence on himself. Pusey and Ward, however, defended the incriminated treatise vigorously. At the same time (1841) proposal of a see at Jerusalem to be occupied alternately by an Anglican and a Lutheran gave new proof of Erastian disregard for episcopal succession, and new affront to Newman who by now excluded Lutherans and other Protestants from his "true Church." During 1842 he retired to his Littlemore benefice, abdicating leadership of the Oxford Movement. The Tractarians now began to divide: Moderate Ritualists, led by Pusey, deemed the Branch Theory an adequate solution within the existing Anglican Establishment; Progressives, made articulate by William G. Ward (1812–82) in his *Ideal of a Christian Church* (1844), insisted on radical changes in Anglicanism in the direction of Rome. When Ward was censured and degraded by Anglican prelates, he led an exodus to Rome in August, 1845. Dalgairns and St-John followed, and at length Newman was received into the Church, October 8, 1845, by Padre Domenico Barberi (1792–1849), a Passionist mystic who had long sacrificed himself for the English mission.

(3) Sequel

Catholic converts. Ward and Newman headed a stream of Oxford converts, comparatively few in number, but enjoying immense prestige. None was more influential than Frederick Faber (1814–63) who brought his whole Anglican community of forty enthusiasts into the Church in 1845. Ordained to the priesthood and joining the Oratorians, he was commissioned in 1849 to found the London house, whence his sermons and books influenced many. Newman himself was ordained priest and established the Oratory at Birmingham. His *Essay on Development of Christian Dogma* appealed to those still hesitating at Oxford, though his justified attacks on the renegade Italian cleric, Dr. Achille, led to his fine for libel (1852) when Wiseman misplaced the documentary proofs. In 1847 promotion of Dr. Hampden to the Anglican see of Hereford and nomination of the clearly heretical George Gorham to the vicarage of Bamford Speke antagonized the Tractarians anew. This was compounded in 1850 by the disgraceful hubbub about the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy and the upholding of Gorham's appeal by the secular Privy Council over the decision of the Anglican prelate Phillpotts. Another wave of converts to Rome followed: in 1849, Thomas Allies (1813–1903), the historian, and Frederick Capes (1816–88), journalist. During 1850–51 came Henry Edward Manning (1808–92), Henry Wilberforce, Lord Fielding, Bellasis, Maskel, Monsell, John Pollen, and others. With special permission from Rome obtained by Wiseman, Manning was

ordained priest within ten weeks of his conversion. Later he studied in Rome and founded the Oblates of St. Charles. Capes founded the *Rambler* in 1848; its Liberal views brought censure and Capes temporarily relapsed, but later returned to die in the Catholic Church. Cambridge University also had converts in Kenelm Digby, Romanticist; Ambrose Phillips, founder of a Trappist monastery; and George Spencer, later a Passionist. August Pugin (1812–52), converted in 1833, was a fanatical champion of Gothic architectural restoration, for which the Catholic earl of Shrewsbury (d. 1852) proved a generous patron.

Anglican ritualists. Keble and Pusey, however, remained in the Established Church to found the "High Church Ritualist" faction. Pusey's sermons insisted on the "objective presence" of Christ in the Eucharist, while rejecting transubstantiation. He likewise introduced optional confession and many Roman liturgical practices. But Anglican prelates with but one exception emphatically repudiated such views. For a time High and Low Church parties united to denounce the Broad Church views of Williams and Wilson in their *Essays and Reviews* (1860). But though condemned by the Anglican prelates, these "heretical" clergymen appealed to the Privy Council, which sustained them in 1864. During 1865, moreover, the Privy Council set aside Metropolitan Gray of South Africa's condemnation of his suffragan Colenso's Liberal expressions. The Tractarians took refuge in Ritualism and in 1873 some 483 clergymen petitioned Convocation for appointment of qualified confessors. Protestant indignation was aroused and in 1874 the House of Lords banned Ritualism. This was really the end of the original Oxford Movement, although controversy continued to disturb the Anglican body. Dr. Benson as primate of Canterbury effected a compromise in 1890. Pusey's successor as Ritualist leader, Charles Gore (1853–1932), Anglican prelate of Oxford (1911–19), admitted some Liberal theological ideas. In 1928 High Church emendations of the *Book of Common Prayer* were rejected in the House of Commons.

C. Catholic "Second Spring" (1850–70)   *Nov. 10, 1972*

(1) HIERARCHICAL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Catholic growth. Since the beginning of Catholic relief (1778), life among English Catholics had shown signs of revival. Douay College in Belgium, which had been closed during the French Revolution, had been reconstituted in England for clerical training at St. Cuthbert's and St. Edmund's Colleges. The English College at Rome, closed in 1798, had reopened in 1818 with Wiseman as a student. Ordained in 1825, Wiseman became its rector in 1828. He later in 1840 headed St. Mary's College-Seminary at Oscott, which he made into a "reception room" for Oxford converts. By 1840 Catholic population increase, especially

through Irish immigration, required the erection of four new vicariates besides the existing four. By 1850 Catholics in England numbered nearly a million.

Ex Porta Flaminiana. In order to give adequate Catholic leadership and stimulate further Oxford conversions, Pope Pius IX on September 29, 1850, revived the Catholic hierarchy by creating the metropolitan see of Westminster with twelve suffragans. To Westminster he named Nicholas Wiseman, since 1847 vicar-apostolic of the London District. On October 7, Wiseman, who had also been promoted cardinal, jubilantly announced from Rome—"From out the Flaminian Gate" his pastoral was dated—that the Catholic Church had officially reappeared in a land where it had been in hiding since the deaths of Mary I and Cardinal Pole in 1558.

"No popery." Classical scholars recalled that Roman legions used to march to conquest from the Flaminian Gate. Riding on the crest of vociferous "no popery" outbursts, Premier Russel in 1851 introduced the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill forbidding assumption by Catholic bishops of titles of ancient sees now Anglicanized and withholding legal recognition of the new Catholic dioceses. The Lord Chancellor cited Shakespeare: "Under my feet I stamp thy cardinal's hat in spite of pope or dignities of Church" (I Henry VI, i, iii, 49). But shortly after his return to England, November, 1850, Cardinal Wiseman met this with an *Appeal to the English People.* He assured the Westminster chapter that he would claim no jurisdiction over the Abbey and would continue to pay his entrance fee; the poor of the surrounding slums would be his portion. Not in vain did he call for "fair play." The *Times* congratulated him on "recovering the use of the English language," and *Punch* lampooned Russel as an urchin writing "No Popery" on Wiseman's door and running away. Russel, indeed, got his bill, but dared not enforce it; it was formally repealed by Gladstone in 1871.

Catholic organization. The new hierarchy held its first provincial council in 1852, at which Newman preached a memorable sermon on the "Second Spring" of Catholicity in England. The Council reorganized discipline, but also revealed Wiseman's somewhat cavalier attitude toward his suffragans, a breach widened when George Errington became his coadjutor in 1855. Errington opposed Wiseman's close control of Catholic colleges and was eventually sustained by Rome. He also strove to suppress Manning's Oblates and to dismiss Ward as lay lecturer in theology at St. Edmund's Seminary. Though the Third Provincial Council (1859) supported Errington on many points against Wiseman, the case went to Rome which at length removed Errington (1860). Meanwhile Newman's efforts to found a Catholic University at Dublin (1855–58) foundered, and his proposed chaplaincy for Catholic

students at Oxford—where religious tests were removed in 1854—was turned down by Propaganda on the plea of Wiseman and Manning.

(2) ULTRAMONTANE CONTROVERSIES

Discordant views. Henry Edward Manning, advancing rapidly in Wiseman's favor, promoted introduction of Roman ways to the last detail, thus displeasing some of the elder sons of the Catholic Church in England who had lived heroically, if somewhat unliturgically, through "dungeon, fire and sword." Bishop Errington, Wiseman's coadjutor, put himself at the head of the disaffected group and objected to Wiseman's alleged favoritism toward Oxford converts. The disagreement was compounded by the clash of personalities: Wiseman was brilliant, expansive, negligent of details, and by now ailing; Errington was plodding, meticulous, somewhat unimaginative—though other English bishops shared his resentment at Wiseman's carelessness about the canonical rights of suffragans. But though his arguments against Wiseman were often justified, Errington's continual opposition created a bad impression. Besides, the sentiments of the older Catholics tended to be "Cisalpine" on disciplinary matters and cool toward definition of papal infallibility, while Manning and Ward and many Oxford converts became violent Ultramontanes and champions of a prompt definition of papal primacy. Ward's fanaticism which desired "a papal definition every morning for breakfast" shocked Newman's intellectual subtlety. Like his superior, Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham, Newman tried to adopt a moderate position which caused him to be viewed with suspicion by Manning. Many of Newman's woes stemmed from his unappreciated mediation between extreme groups. Anglicans attacked his intellectual honesty; Ultramontanes suspected him of theological Liberalism. Though Newman accepted a mandate from the hierarchy to reform the Liberal *Rambler,* he was associated by some with its views and soon resigned. In 1864, however, Kingsley's assault on the veracity of the Catholic clergy elicited Newman's devastatingly successful *Apologia,* which he followed with his *Grammar of Assent.*

Primatial succession seemed to spell victory for either group. Though Errington, by refusing to resign gracefully, had made necessary his removal by Rome in 1860, he had retired submissively to private life. At Wiseman's death in 1865 the chapter and the majority of the English hierarchy suggested Errington as his successor at Westminster. Propaganda, indeed, proposed Ullathorne as compromise candidate, but *Pio Nono* overruled all suggestions by naming Manning archbishop of Westminster. With Manning, Ultramontanism won a definite triumph among the English hierarchy and clergy, and the coolness of Newman and Acton to the opportuneness of the definition of papal infallibility caused

them to be suspect for a time. This issue awaited the Vatican Council where Manning's marshalling of the Ultramontanes won a decisive victory. Newman, whose chief theological defect had been lack of precise scholastic training, readily gave his adhesion to the conciliar definition, and Lord Acton also gave satisfactory evidence of submission. Gladstone's pamphlet denouncing the Vatican decree as an assault on secular government called forth Newman's clarification contained in his 1875 *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.* Internecine disputes died away, and in 1879 Manning supported a request for the cardinalate for Newman, and presently the man of action and the scholar were united in the College of Cardinals.

D. *Irish Religious Liberty* (*1829–69*)

(1) ANGLICAN DISESTABLISHMENT

Religious inequality. All of Ireland's troubles were by no means ended with Catholic Emancipation in 1829. Aside from political and economic grievances, glaring religious inequality persisted—the crushing burden of a tax-supported, largely unattended Anglican established religion. In 1829 this had twenty-two prelates and two thousand ministers, many of them non-resident, to be maintained at an annual charge of £800,000. On the other hand, the twenty-two Catholic bishops and eighteen hundred priests subsisted on alms contributed by an impoverished laity. Yet of a population estimated at eight million in 1831, there were six and one-half million Catholics, six hundred thousand Presbyterians, and only eight hundred thousand Episcopalians. Though Presbyterians also had to pay tithes, they received in rebate an annual subsidy, the *regium donum.*

Educational differences were likewise flagrant. Overt and Protestant proselytizing in state schools forced Catholics to maintain "hedge schools" at home and partake of foreign gratuity abroad. Though the concessions of 1782 and 1792 allowed Catholics to become licensed schoolmasters, by 1824, of 11,823 primary schools, all were under Protestant influence save 422. Dublin's Trinity College admitted Catholics to degrees in 1793, but not to fellowships or professorships. Maynooth Seminary was opened in 1795 with governmental subsidies, which continued until 1869.

The "Tithe War" opened in 1830 with parochial resistance to collection of tithes. Armed clashes multiplied, costing the lives of eleven British officers in 1831. O'Connell, now admitted to the British parliament, took up this grievance in 1832. After an ineffective Coercion Bill and other proposals had been thrice rejected, a Tithe Commutation Act (1838) cancelled arrears, reduced existing tithe rates by twenty-five per cent, and converted tithes into a rent charge payable by landlords—

who usually passed it on to the Catholic tenants in the form of higher rents.

Disestablishment could therefore be the only final solution. In 1834 Lord Grey had abolished eight Anglican sees in Ireland, and Irish moderates, led by Maguire, proposed complete disestablishment as a reward for loyalty during the Fenian agitation. The Episcopalians, after failing to justify their privileged position despite a proselytizing campaign, yielded. On July 26, 1869, Gladstone passed the Disestablishment Act to take effect on January 1, 1871. Episcopalianism in Ireland became a private corporation and its prelates lost their seats in parliament. Both the Episcopalian tithe and the Presbyterian subsidy ceased, though the government made generous compensations before putting them on their own.

(2) Social Welfare

Poor relief became an acute religious-social issue in 1838—one hundred workhouses were set up. Though most of these paupers were Catholics, Protestant administrators supervised the unpopular system and sometimes used their commanding position to force apostasy or religious neglect. After 1840, however, measures of municipal reform enabled the Irish to regain control over their local government. Poor relief supervision accordingly changed, and from 1861 the Sisters of Mercy were put in charge of some of the local bureaus by the electorate.

The Irish Famine of 1845–51 resulted from simultaneous rotting of English wheat through rain and a blight on Irish potatoes. Prime Minister Peel tried to import American corn and introduced a sliding scale of emergency prices. Finally the Corn (Wheat) Laws, a protective tariff, were repealed. But within these years some two million Irishmen had died or emigrated. Severe economic stress continued, reducing the Irish population by half during the course of the nineteenth century.

Education progressed slowly under the inspiration of the Irish Christian Brothers, founded in 1802 by Edmund Rice, and various sisterhoods. In 1831, Irish Secretary Stanley secured adoption of a national system of education, neutral in religion, but allowing "released time" for separate religious instruction. Catholics divided as to the prudence of using the project. The hierarchy having failed to reach agreement, Propaganda in 1841 left it to each bishop's judgment to adopt the system in his own diocese. But recurrence of dangers to Faith and the determined opposition of Archbishop Cullen caused these mixed schools to decline in favor of parochial, so that by 1908 there were 482,000 pupils in denominational schools and 192,000 in the mixed schools. Though secular colleges now admitted Catholics, Propaganda deemed Catholic attendance perilous. Yet nationalistic and financial difficulties defeated

Newman's projected Catholic University at Dublin, although after his resignation the medical and science faculties survived and later achieved some sort of accreditation. Carlow Seminary had opened in 1793; Father Hand, C.M., founded All Hallows missionary seminary in 1842, and other institutions followed.

79. AMERICAN GROWTH

A. *Nationalist Expansion* (*1817–53*)

(1) IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS

Delayed Democracy. Though by no means as reactionary as contemporary Europe, American leadership did not lack resemblances to Liberal Conservatism. Even when leavened by Jeffersonian humanitarianism, the Federalism of the Founding Fathers was scarcely challenged until the advent of Jacksonian Democracy in 1829. Jackson, however, had much of the autocrat about him, and except for his administration, the dominant branch of the government was the Senate, where Webster and Calhoun, leading spokesmen for North and South, were alike opposed to "tyranny of majority rule." Northern industrialists, though as yet lacking the wealth and influence of their European counterparts, were not overly democratic toward immigrant workers whom they sought to retain as wage slaves. Meanwhile in the South, and for two years longer than in Russia, slavery survived and with it an aristocratic way of life. Rhode Island achieved universal manhood suffrage only in 1844 by Dorr's Rebellion. Even in the United States, then, Democracy was far from universal in the early nineteenth century.

Nationalism, that "the government of the Union . . . is truly a government of the people," remained a thesis of Chief Justice Marshall (1801–35). From this Henry Clay, spokesman for the West, drew a corollary of "Manifest Destiny" to which nineteenth-century politicians were most attentive. For Clay, "true glory . . . will finally conduct this nation to that height to which God and nature have destined it." This came to involve not merely the "American System" of protective tariffs and internal public works at Federal expense, but domination of foreign territory. Ere long, Americans were extorting Florida from Spain, ogling Canada brazenly, warning Europe that the New World was no longer open for colonization—but themselves colonizing Texas and Oregon. Though they did arbitrate the Oregon frontier, it was only to free themselves to annex Texas. This led to war with Mexico and seizure of New Mexico and California. Here politicians and journalists paused only for breath before they shouted for Mexico, Santo Domingo, Cuba—and in 1848 even for Ireland!

Sectionalism, however, loomed to distract expansionists' attention. A North, increasingly nationalistic, industrialized, democratic—at least in

theory—was finding its economic interests differing from those of the South, clinging to the doctrine of "States' Rights" in order to protect its "peculiar institution," as slavery was euphemistically termed. Elder statesmen whose memories stretched back to the Revolution trembled; a second generation of orators sought to reconcile sections: the period opens with the Missouri Compromise (1820) and closes with that of 1850, the last found possible before contention led to blows. It may be partly true that expansion was undertaken to divert men's minds from this domestic row—in 1860 it was proposed at the last minute that North and South join to trounce Mexico. If so, no amount of extroversion could permanently solve the issue of nationalism; it could only be postponed. After the deaths of the compromisers, Webster, Clay, and even in a sense Calhoun, a generation arose that knew not bargaining: Rhett, Seward, Sumner, Stevens. In 1861 the uncompleted dome of the Capitol in Washington was a symbol of the still insecure nature of American national unity.

(2) Democratic Ascendancy and Disruption (1817–29)

Virginia's dynasty. The statesmen of the most populous of the original states during the formative period of Federal Government enjoyed a preponderant share in its administration. Four of the first five presidents were citizens of Virginia. With the advent of the Democratic-Republicans to national control in 1800, this leadership was for a time even more marked. From 1801 to 1825 three Virginians in succession held the presidency for two terms each, the secretary of state usually succeeding as determined by a caucus of Democratic congressional leaders. By 1820 party politics seemed to have yielded to an "Era of Good Feeling."

President Monroe (1817–25) was chief beneficiary of this era, to which his conciliatory temperament contributed. After the end of the War of 1812, it was possible to concentrate upon domestic progress. A rechartered United States Bank promised a sound currency. High tariffs were passed to protect agrarian and manufacturing interests, which, however, soon diverged on their utility. Construction of roads and canals was pushed at Federal direction. After high-handed invasions by General Jackson, Florida was yielded by Spain (1819), and new states were organized in the Northwest and Louisiana Territories. In 1820, however, expansion for the first time encountered difference of sectional opinion. While the northern states had restricted slavery by 1800, the southern citizens were firmly convinced of its economic necessity. From the two sections emigrants carried their ideas into new areas and a rough parity between free and slave states developed. The question of Missouri's admission as a slave state revealed passions so intense that

Jefferson called the debate a "fire-bell in the night." Dissension was temporarily allayed by the Missouri Compromise, which extended a line of demarcation—36° 30′—between potential free and slave territories, and admitted equal numbers of free and slave states. Until 1849 this parity was maintained to give each section equal senatorial representation capable of vetoing hostile legislation. Finally, the "Monroe Doctrine," while assuring Latin America of opposition by the United States to Old World aggression, hinted at a possible protectorate by aggressive Anglo-Saxons in the New World.

An "Era of Bad Feeling" succeeded in 1824 when Treasury Secretary Crawford tried to perpetuate the Virginia dynasty by the caucus method. Illness, however, all but eliminated him from a race hotly contested by State Secretary Adams, War Secretary Calhoun, Speaker Clay, and General Jackson. The Democratic-Republicans dissolved into factions, and aristocratic elder statesmen were challenged by new leaders who catered to the expanding popular suffrage. The close 1824 election went to the House of Representatives, where Clay's choice of Adams, from whom he later accepted the secretariate of state, was denounced as corrupt by Jackson's followers.

President Adams (1825–29), an upright statesman of the old school, conscientious and forthright, all too brusquely rejected the arts of pleasing. Though respected, he was never popular and found his administration almost paralyzed by the union of factions against him; even his farsighted project of Pan-American harmony was rebuffed. The main issue of the 1828 election became the charge of the aggrieved General Jackson that Clay had deprived him of the presidency in 1824. Jackson never proved his point by documents, but won the presidency in the first truly popular election.

(3) JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY (1829–41)

President Jackson (1829–37), a strong-willed, plain-spoken military hero, thus became exponent of a new democratic revolution. He was a simple man, too easily swayed by emotion, but his intuitions were more often right than wrong. His dictatorial methods led his opponents to style him "King Andrew I" and to organize the new Whig party to check him. But Jackson's hold on the masses remained secure. Instituting the popular convention system, he was not only re-elected in 1832, but secured the victory of his designated successor in 1836. On the axiom, "to the victors belong the spoils," politicians replaced dynasts—though he removed but two thousand of eleven thousand officials. The president's popular nationalism brought him alike into conflict with northern capitalism whose monopoly of the Bank of the United States he destroyed,

and with the southern squirearchy whose threats of nullification he sternly repressed: "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved," proved for him more than a phrase.

President Van Buren (1837–41), Jackson's heir, reaped a harvest of his mistakes, without inheriting his force and ability. Speculation and financial experimentation ended in the Panic of 1837. Van Buren's sound remedy, the Independent Treasury, came too late to save him from the customary blame for hard times attached to the party in power. In the 1840 election he fell before the Whigs, who had stolen Democratic political thunder with "Tippecanoe (Harrison) and Tyler too."

(4) AMERICAN MILITARISM (1841–53)

Texan issue. The Mexican province of Texas, which had received many American settlers, revolted in 1835 and established a precarious independence. Lasting security could be achieved only by annexation to the United States, but this was likely to provoke war with Mexico. Annexation and its consequences became the leading issue for a decade. Southerners generally urged annexation of Texas as potential slave territory, an extension of which many Northerners had come to disapprove. The West, after some hesitation, inclined the balance toward annexation, largely from imperialistic motives. British attempts to establish a protectorate over Texas revived Anglo-American animosity, but war was averted by American annexation and the Oregon Compromise of 1846.

Harrison and Tyler (1841–45). Though Harrison's military reputation won the election for the Whigs, it was the semi-Democrat Tyler who conducted the administration when Harrison died within a month of inauguration. Tyler, a lesser politician, became president by accident, and was overshadowed and thwarted by the Whig leader, Henry Clay. Their antagonism nullified constructive measures and led to Whig defeat in the 1844 election. Tyler deemed the electoral result a mandate to annex Texas in the closing days of his term.

President Polk (1845–49), Democratic dark horse candidate, proved a capable war president; for Mexican resentment at ill-disguised American imperialism provoked war (1846–48). This resulted in an easy American triumph which produced the forced sale of California and New Mexico to the United States, though the Federal Government undertook Mission claims. Zachary Taylor won the 1848 election when Polk refused to run for a second term.

Taylor and Fillmore (1849–53). The Whig administration had to deal with sectional disputes about the disposition of the newly annexed territories. California's application for statehood disturbed senatorial parity between sections, and required the 1850 Compromise which extended the division somewhat to Northern advantage, while guaranteeing South-

ern ownership of slaves wherever they might roam. Taylor opposed the Compromise, but his death in July, 1850, permitted his more pliant successor Fillmore to authorize it. In 1853 the Gadsden Purchase from Mexico completed American acquisition of contiguous territory.

B. Catholic Growth (1815–52)

(1) GROWING PAINS

Introduction. The Church in the United States was affected by this national environment. Her greatest problems usually arose from peculiarly American traits, rather than from Old World heresies. A wave of Catholic immigration now excited Protestant apprehensions of what Morse termed a *Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States* (1834). Fears of bigots erupted in recurring movements on behalf of "Native Americanism," "Know Nothingism," the A.P.A., and the Ku Klux Klan. And the Catholic laity's enthusiasm for the democratic dream had still to be reconciled with hierarchy: Trusteeism reached its critical stage. Secularism in education and Liberalism in philosophy were other obstacles to missionary zeal.

"The Catholic Invasion"—thus Maynard [10] aptly described the tide of European immigration which during the period raised the Catholic population from an estimated 195,000 in 1820 to over 3,000,000 by 1860. Shaugnessy has calculated [11] that between 1790 and 1850 over one million Catholic immigrants landed in the United States, and this phenomenon continued to increase without substantial modification until the beginning of immigration restrictions in 1921. During the present period the greater number of Catholics came from Ireland and Germany. Even though the total American population soared from eight to twenty-seven millions during the same span, "Native Americans" came to feel that the Catholic increase was all out of proportion for a "Protestant country" where they had hitherto been a negligible minority. But economic difficulties in Ireland and political troubles on the Continent continued to drive thousands of impoverished Catholics to the United States. Resentment turned chiefly against the Irish, who were not only the more numerous, but were not restrained by the language barrier from entering promptly into American life. While the Irish tended to congregate in the Eastern cities, according to Bishop Hughes' belief that concentration would retain them in the Faith, McGee and others argued that they ought to "go West" to become land owners and self-employed. In the cities the Irish could use the ballot, following speedy and some-

[10] Theodore Maynard, *Story of American Catholicism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942), p. 276.

[11] Gerald Shaugnessy, *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1925).

times routine nationalization, raising fears of an "Irish Catholic peril" in politics. The Germans, who by 1850 constituted twenty-five per cent of the foreign born of the country, went chiefly to the farms and villages of the Midwest and provoked less opposition by their conservative ways.

Americanization. "Willy-nilly the American Church had become catholic in the broadest sense. . . . The Church rendered a distinct service to the nation by the Americanization program which it fostered among its foreign-born members, even under persecution. Measured by modern standards, it was not a scientific program, but the quiet counseling of the immigrants by bishops and by the priests in the parishes, the instruction in Catholic schools, and the information imparted through the Catholic press once it got under way in the 1820's constantly assimilated newcomers to the American way of life." [12]

(2) NATIVIST REACTION

Propaganda. Early anti-Catholic papers were the *Boston Recorder* (1816), the Baptist *Christian Watchman*, and Morse's *New York Observer*. Catholics retorted with Bishop England's *Catholic Miscellany* (1822–60), the *New York Truth Teller* (1825), and the Boston *Jesuit*, later more diplomatically renamed the *Pilot* (1829). When the ministerially supported *Protestant* appeared weekly in 1830, Father Hughes contributed fantastic tales under an alias, and then exposed them to the discredit of the paper. His literary controversy with the Presbyterian minister, Dr. Breckinridge (1831), attracted wide attention, fanned by Morse's book, *Foreign Conspiracy*, in 1834. In the latter year began the "convent horror" series: Mrs. Sherwood's *Nun* related the thrilling escape of a Turin heiress from a convent dungeon; Rebecca Reed's *Six Months in a Convent* told of sadistic penances imposed on "Ursulines" by a flute-playing bishop who wanted a "bushel of gold"; finally the *Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk* ascribed immoral conduct and smothered infants to a Montreal convent. Though the Protestant editor, William L. Stone, investigated and asserted, "Maria Monk is an out and out impostor and her book is in all its essential features a tissue of calumnies," such rebuttals usually received less publicity than the books.

Violence. This incitement led to attacks on Catholic institutions during the 1830's and 1840's. In 1834 a mob, aroused by a Congregationalist minister, Dr. Beecher, attacked and burned the Ursuline convent in Boston on pretext of rescuing a novice. In its fury the mob went on to attack Catholic buildings and desecrate the cemetery. Though Mayor Lyman led decent Protestants in a protest meeting, anti-Catholic forces

[12] John Tracy Ellis, *American Catholicism* (University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 50–51.

in the state legislature repeatedly blocked measures for indemnity. The escape of the culprits was a signal for other outbreaks, especially in the East. The most serious incident was a three-day riot at Philadelphia in 1844. The attack was provoked by Bishop Kenrick's request to save Catholic children from reading the Protestant version of the Bible and attending the sectarian religious classes in the public schools. When the city council granted the request, bigots with the connivance of police and other officials burned two churches and the seminary, plundering Irish Catholic residences, and killing thirteen and wounding fifty. The mild bishop ordered all religious services suspended until the state troops had restored order. Meanwhile in New York, Bishop Hughes's request for a Catholic Bible and educational subsidies from the state legislature had provoked threats of similar riots. But Bishop Hughes inspired Irish members of the "Church Militant" to arm in defense of their institutions, and practically forced the authorities to provide police protection (1844). This firm stand deterred bigots, already discredited among most Protestants for their violence, while the Oregon and Texan threats of foreign war temporarily diverted the American public's attention.

Politics. Meanwhile Samuel Morse was electrifying America in more ways than one. Sunday and public school libraries featured his book denouncing the machinations of "Jesuit emissaries of the Holy Alliance," i.e., Metternich's Austrian Order. Yet the early concessions of Pius IX to Liberalism in the Papal State were saluted as signs of conversion by the Federal Government. These and the pressing need of negotiations with Catholic Mexico induced President Polk to obtain Congressional consent to the opening of diplomatic relations with the Papal State during 1848. The President had also requested the hierarchy to select two Catholic chaplains for the armed forces; they chose the Jesuits, John McElroy and Anthony Rey, to counter Mexican propaganda against the "heretical" American invaders. After the war, questions concerning church property in the ceded lands were peacefully settled with the State Department by Archbishops Eccleston of Baltimore and Hughes of New York. International litigation eventually won a judgment from the Hague Court in 1902 against Mexico for impounding the missionary "Pious Fund," but Mexico paid little. All these negotiations led Representative Leven to warn Congress somberly: "How many Jesuit senators shall we have in the course of the next twenty years!" His misstatements were exposed by Representative Maclay of New York, and the future president, Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, also defended Catholics in Congress. But the 1850's were to witness worse storms: "Know-Nothing-ism."

(3) Crisis of Trusteeism

Norfolk-Charleston schism. As early as 1804, the Norfolk trustees had ruled that: "When the priest chooses to be present at the meetings of the council, his place shall be at the right hand of the president. The priest shall never address them unless when information is asked of him by the president." Dr. Fernandes became in 1809 leader of this board of lay despots who perpetuated themselves in office. In 1815 they demanded the removal of their pastor, Father Lucas, and when refused, denounced to Rome the "Machiavellic" policy of Archbishop Neale of Baltimore (1815–17). When they failed to obtain immediate consent to their demands for a bishop of their own, they joined hands with Dr. Gallagher and other disaffected clerics in Charleston to urge the Irish Friar Hayes to obtain consecration from the Jansenists of Utrecht and become their bishop—he refused. Archbishop Marechal of Baltimore (1817–28) placed the blame on the example of the Protestant vestry system which Fernandes and other nominal Catholics were abusing. The Holy See decided to erect Charleston into a see to which it named the brilliant John England (1820–42). The new bishop at first had much to suffer from these trustees, but he soon devised the successful policy of appealing to the faithful to oust them. By 1824 he had prevailed on the dissenters to resign claims contrary to Catholic discipline in favor of an incorporated general diocesan fund of which the bishop would be ex officio chairman of the board of trustees. Ardent convert to things American, the bishop then drew up a diocesan constitution, providing for annual conventions of a bicameral legislature with an "upper house" of clergy, and a lower "house of lay delegates," to whom he gave a "state of the diocese" message in reporting financial needs. This novel machinery, however, was discontinued by his successors.

Philadelphia schism. Trusteeism in Pennsylvania was complicated by German aspirations for a national church. Attempts to combat Trusteeism by the Irish bishops, Michael Egan (1810–14) and Henry Conwell (1819–42), proved quite ineffective. The former had been resisted in the administration of his own cathedral; the latter, arriving after a tranquil interim under the German administrator, Father Barth, at once clashed with trustees. These used Father William Hogan, rector of the cathedral, as their tool. The bishop failed to secure favorable trustees and his excommunication of Hogan produced little result, for presently on Hogan's retirement the trustees put forward a clerical charlatan, Antonio Inglesi. Despite a decision in his favor by Chief Justice Tilghman of Pennsylvania, the aged bishop wearied of the struggle. In 1827 Conwell capitulated to the trustees by granting them a veto on pastoral appointments. But in 1828 Conwell was called to Rome, and though

allowed to retain his titular dignity, he was obliged to entrust adminis-
tration to a coadjutor. When Bishop Francis Kenrick took over this post
in 1830, the trustees closed the cathedral and other city churches against
him, nor were they disturbed in their stand by his interdict. The bishop,
who had become an American citizen, solved this impasse by an appeal
to the faithful to elect new trustees, renounce their claim to nominate
pastors, and yield church property to episcopal control. So wholehearted
was the response of his Catholic people, that within three months the
trustees themselves submitted to episcopal terms. John Hughes, the
bishop's secretary, thus learned tactics he later used as bishop of New
York. After Kenrick's transfer to Baltimore, the Know-Nothing Penn-
sylvania legislature in 1855 outlawed episcopal corporate control. Until
an adverse court ruling in 1914 and its repeal in 1935, this statute was
occasionally abused by trustees of nationalistic parishes.

New York troubles. Bishop Concanon, New York's first ordinary, never
reached his diocese, and his successor, John Connolly, found Trusteeism
well entrenched. The situation was complicated by rivalry between
the Irish and the French, and St. Peter's Church and Father Malou were
storm centers until the bishop's death in 1825. Matters did not greatly
improve under the third bishop, Jean Dubois (1826–40), whose long
residence in America did not absolve him in nativist eyes of a stigma of
foreign birth. But his coadjutor, John Hughes, who assumed administra-
tion in 1838, had gained experience of Trusteeism. He launched a com-
paign against obstructionist trustees at a Catholic mass meeting, and
within four years the trustees, whose mismanagement had bankrupted
five parishes, were obliged to yield title to the bishop. During the Know-
Nothing ascendancy, disaffected Catholics of the trustee party secured
the Putnam Act (1855) which permitted them to overrule the bishop
on the ground that he had obtained title by coercion. When Irish sup-
port of the Union was needed, however, Senator Connolly and his legal
aide, Charles O'Conor, were able to have this measure repealed (1863),
and replaced by a model incorporation law explicitly giving the ordinary
preponderant control.

New Orleans litigation. The deeply rooted French patronage system
in Louisiana had permitted Padre Sedella to defy his superiors at the
cathedral. Even after his death in 1829, the trustees obtained an act
of the state legislature (1837) allowing them to mortgage the cathedral
against the will of Bishop Blanc. The head of these trustees, a masonic
grand master, was determined to resist the bishop's spiritual as well as
his temporal authority. In 1842 the trustees refused to accept the bishop's
nominee as rector, though under threat of interdict they pretended to
receive him while denying him real rule. To the bishop's rebukes they
retorted with a $20,000 suit for libel: he had termed them "schismatics,"

which of course they were not. Finally in 1844 the State Supreme Court, in the case of the "Wardens of Church of St. Louis versus Antoine Blanc, Bishop of New Orleans," decided that the patronage law was abrogated and the Church disestablished in Louisiana; hence the trustees had no standing in civil law. In litigation involving other parishes the bishop was less fortunate, but by 1845 the worst was over.

General settlement. The foregoing were but the more notorious cases of Trusteeism. Pursuant to instructions from the Holy See, the First Provincial Council of Baltimore had decreed in 1829: "We most earnestly desire that no church shall be erected or consecrated in future unless it is assigned by a written document to the bishop in whose diocese it is to be erected. . . . We further declare that no right of patronage of any kind which the Sacred Canons recognize now belongs to any person, congregation of laymen, board of trustees, or any other persons whatever in this province." Advised by Attorney-General Taney of Maryland, later chief justice of the United States Supreme Court, Archbishop Whitfield of Baltimore obtained from the State of Maryland in 1834 the first act recognizing a Catholic bishop as a "corporation sole." This system safeguarded episcopal jurisdiction while assuring the proper transmission of diocesan property from one ordinary to his legitimate successor. It avoided possession by the bishop in fee simple of diocesan property to be transmitted by will, a mode that could lead to confusion of diocesan and private funds, as occurred in Cincinnati in 1888. The corporation sole method was imitated in Chicago (1845) and in California (1852), and presently became the most common procedure. The Roman Curia in 1911, while permitting this method, preferred as the ideal a "parish corporation" system.[13]

(4) EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

Secular public schools. About 1840 Horace Mann of Massachusetts initiated the trend to the public school in place of the Congregational religious schools hitherto prevailing in New England. The new institutions were patterned on foreign models, according to the theories current in Switzerland and Prussia. Mann himself adapted Cousin's report on Prussian education to American needs, and his views were endorsed by many immigrants from northern Europe. A curriculum designed for an agrarian civilization was gradually adapted to an industrial one, stress being laid on immediate proficiency for business or the trades. Practical aspects of life were emphasized, and one of the chief incentives offered a student was the potentially increased earning power of graduates. Undoubtedly the American public school system aimed at "democracy of opportunity" and "preparation for life," but religion was increasingly

[13] Patrick Dignan, *History of Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property in the United States* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1933).

excluded from any influence upon the curriculum. The effect of this trend on religious instruction in non-Catholic schools is graphically depicted by Cubberly: [14] in 1775, "Bible & Catechism"; in 1825, "Good Behavior, Manners & Morals"; in 1850: "Manners & Conduct"; in 1875, "Conduct"; and by 1900 the column is blank.

Parochial schools. To counteract this secularization, the Baltimore provincial councils directed the clergy to set up "necessary schools . . . in which the young are taught principles of faith and morality" (1829). Father Conelly incorporated his parochial school at Lowell, Massachusetts within the public school system in 1831, retaining religious instruction in his own hands, but the town abrogated the arrangement in 1852. When Governor Seward of New York in 1840 proposed state aid to denominational schools, Bishop Hughes strongly endorsed the move by requesting subsidies for Catholic schools. But by 1842 this project had foundered in a deluge of bigotry. For Catholics, therefore, there seemed no other alternative than the costly course enjoined by the First Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852 that, "schools be established in connection with all the churches." By 1840 there were about two hundred parochial schools, but in 1866 the Second Plenary Council, deploring the "indifferentism" of some public schools, decreed once again the "erection of parochial schools." Before 1870, however, parochial education remained on a small scale and most of the teachers were lay.

(5) Intellectual Currents

Transcendentalism appeared about 1820 as an American phase of the Romantic Movement. Once Puritan orthodoxy had been broken down by Unitarianism and Universalism, the rugged Yankee was open to new ideas, good or bad. Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803–82) gave secular America a slogan of rugged self-reliance: "Let man stand erect, go alone, and possess the universe." Henry Thoreau (1817–62) extolled the pioneer, Herman Melville (1819–91) the explorer, and Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804–64) made New England articulate in literature. These and others of the group had their center at Boston and Concord was their inspiration.

"The Concord Movement," then, is a possible name for the trickle of converts from Transcendentalism to the Catholic Church, almost simultaneously with the Oxford Movement in England. These converts and their associates did something to dispel the idea that the Catholic religion was a fetish of low-caste immigrants, but was belief able to satisfy the "native Americans" and even the hardheaded Yankee. Among these converts, Orestes Brownson (1803–76) became a militant Catholic lay publicist after his conversion in 1845, the year of Ward and Newman.

[14] Ellwood Cubberly, *Introduction to the Study of Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925), p. 17.

His friend, Isaac Hecker (1819–88), in 1858 founded along with four fellow converts, the Paulists, whose convert-making techniques soon became renowned in America. Hawthorne's daughter, Rose Hawthorne Lathrop (1851–1926), became a Catholic, and after her husband's death, a Dominican nun. Cornelia Peacock of Philadelphia was converted with her husband, Pierce Connelly, an Episcopalian minister. They separated to enter the religious life. Despite his relapse, she persevered to found the Sisterhood of the Holy Child Jesus for the education of children.

(6) Missionary Work

European aid. Missionary organization in Europe continued to be an indispensable support of the Church in the United States. The leading institutes that helped the American mission were Pauline Jaricot's Society for the Propagation of the Faith, which contributed $6,000,000 between its foundation in 1822 and its transfer to Rome a century later; Kaiser Franz's Leopoldinen-Stiftung, established in Vienna in 1828, which sent missionaries and $700,000; and the Bavarian Ludwig-Mission-Verein (1838), that besides missionaries and church supplies, contributed $900,000 between 1844 and 1917. It is perhaps not idle to remark that the real value of these sums is not to be computed in contemporary monetary figures. Missionary interest was promoted in the United States by Bishop Charles Forbin-Janson, associated with the Lyons Propagation of the Faith Society and the Holy Childhood, whom the pope sent on a tour of American missions (1839–41). Since much of this foreign aid went to immigrants, nativists like Morse saw in the agents of foreign societies emissaries infiltrating American institutions. The fact that many American prelates had to go to Europe on begging tours was also taken as evidence of the subjection of the hierarchy to alien domination.

Domestic missions. In 1818 Venerable Felix de Andreis (1778–1820) led the first contingent of the Congregation of the Mission to Missouri, and he was closely followed by Blessed Philippine Duchesne (1769–1852), who introduced the Religious of the Sacred Heart to St. Louis. Father de Andreis and his successor Rosati, presently first bishop of St. Louis, founded a seminary at Perryville which furnished priests for both the secular and regular clergy laboring throughout the West and on Negro and Indian missions. The Indian missions were the special care of Father Pierre De Smet, S.J. (1801–72) from 1838 forward. He had arrived at Florissant, Missouri, in 1823 with other Jesuits, who opened St. Louis University in 1829. In Iowa, Matthias Loras, first bishop of Dubuque, and Father Samuel Mazzuchelli, O.P., were famous missionaries, while in the area of the Great Lakes, Frederick Baraga (1797–1868), subsequently bishop, displayed outstanding zeal. The Texan mission was reopened during the 1840's by Vincentian missionaries, of whom the future bishops, Timon and Odin, were prominent.

Foreign missions. Even at this early date Americans sought to open a foreign missionary field. When Liberia was established in West Africa as a haven for emancipated slaves, the American hierarchy sought volunteers to undertake their care. Pioneer American missionaries included Edward Barron, who became episcopal vicar apostolic of Guinea (1842– 46), Father John Kelly of New York, and Denis Pindar, lay catechist. The latter died in Africa in 1844; the priests were eventually forced to return by the oppressive climate and as yet unsurmounted tropical diseases.

(7) HIERARCHICAL DEVELOPMENT

Metropolitan reorganization. The stupendous growth of Catholic population was barely paralleled by the increase of sees from 6 in 1815 to 43 in 1860, and of priests from 150 to 2,235. Until 1846–53, all these sees were part of the original province of Baltimore. In 1846 Propaganda somewhat hastily erected the archbishopric of Oregon City, later Portland, on the glowing report of the Canadian, Bishop François Blanchet. When later in the same year an Anglo-American pact incorporated the area within the United States, the American hierarchy was displeased. The incident prompted a general reorganization of metropolitan provinces in the United States. St. Louis was made an archbishopric in 1847, Cincinnati, New Orleans, and New York followed in 1850, and San Francisco in 1853. These six new provinces, with Baltimore, provided for an American domain enlarged by the Mexican cession and the Gadsden Purchase. The arrangement endured until the next general metropolitan reorganization in 1875, Baltimore being accorded an honorary precedence in 1858.

The First Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852 terminates this period with an assembly of a large part of the new hierarchy. The Council was chiefly concerned with confirmation and codification for national use of the legislation of the previous seven provincial councils of Baltimore, and the second canon extended these provincial decrees to the new ecclesiastical provinces. The resolutions of the Sixth and Seventh Councils adopting the feast of the Immaculate Conception as the patronal feast for the Church in the United States, and petitioning definition of the dogma were soon to be heeded. Rosati's *Baltimore Ceremonial* was made obligatory. Parochial schools and seminaries were again earnestly demanded. Waning Trusteeism was castigated, but the Council under the presidency of Archbishop Francis Kenrick was silent on the question of slavery, as indeed might be expected from that prelate's 1841 edition of his widely normative *Theologia Moralis* which, while deploring Negro slavery, still advised obedience to existing laws and docility. On these matters, Catholics were men of their times.

X

Consummation of Nationalism

80. NATIONALISM AND IMPERIALISM

A. Nationalism

(1) NATURE

Nominal derivation. "The word 'Nationalism' was born in the course of the past century, soon after the birth of three 'isms': 'Liberalism,' 'Socialism,' and 'Communism.' All four words have highly respectable origins . . . 'nation,' 'liberty,' 'society,' and 'community.' . . . The 'ism' was accepted to mean either a theory founded upon these principles or qualities, or an organized activity which, adopting some special interpretation of the principle, built up a theoretico-practical system; or, finally, a collective sentiment favoring in any way the tendency represented by the 'ism' in question. . . . From the very beginning, the 'ism' connoted an excess, a supervaluation of what the original substantives—liberty, society, and community—signified. . . . Nationalism, too, must be classed along with the other already mentioned 'isms' which during the nineteenth century usurped the place rightfully belonging to the concepts from which they originated. Thanks to nationalism, the nation's character as the community of a people organized on the basis of its traditions, history, language, and culture has come to be perverted; for nationalism is interpreted as being the principal efficient and final cause of the community. Nationalism, too, takes on a broad variety of colors ranging from the most extravagant to the quite moderate, and all the way from the philosophic to the sentimental." [1]

[1] Don Luigi Sturzo, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (New York: Roy Publishers, 1946), pp. 1–5.

Excesses. This nationalism ought not to be confused with legitimate patriotism. Nevertheless, the fact is that people have often confounded the terms, and this is doubtless why Pope Pius XI, in condemning the abuses of the theory, was careful to direct his strictures against "excessive nationalism." By a strict use of terms this would be redundant, for nationalism as defined above is by nature excessive, but a too academic insistence on this meaning would easily expose Catholics to accusations of lack of patriotism or advocacy of a pale cosmopolitanism. The nationalism here considered, especially during its romantic honeymoon of the nineteenth century, was a perversion or exaggeration of this legitimate patriotism; sometimes it concealed itself "behind the cloak of a love of fatherland." Carlton Hayes has listed certain abuses or excesses attendant upon nationalism: "The spirit of exclusiveness and narrowness. . . . Secondly, nationalism places a premium on uniformity. . . . Thirdly, nationalism increases the docility of the masses. . . . Fourthly, nationalism . . . focusses popular attention on war and preparedness for war. . . . As the fifth, sixth, and seventh outstanding evils of nationalism, respectively, Jingoism, imperialism, intolerance. . . ." [2]

The "nationalistic generation"—one might almost designate that which lived and acted between 1848 and 1871. Italy and Germany achieved national unification; the United States preserved its own. Hungary and the Balkans won national autonomy; Poles, Czechs, and Irish strove vainly to obtain theirs. Japan awoke to Jingoistic music, and the ancient Habsburg monarchy, antithesis of nationalism, began its last waltz; and the final fruit of nationalism was imperialism.

(2) EVOLUTION OF MODERN NATIONALISM

Popular nationalism. The Middle Ages had not been entirely without experience of nationalism, but the rise of national literature during the Renaissance and of national monarchies against the condominium of papacy and empire have been rather generally taken as the transition to modern times. This modern nationalism, however, as has been previously indicated, remained largely a dynastic affair. True popular enlistment in the nationalistic movement may be dated from Danton's *levée en masse*, the total mobilization of the French people during the Revolution for repulse of foreign invaders. In the course of the French Revolution a new loyalty was born: whereas the king thought it not unpatriotic to negotiate secretly with brother monarchs to extricate himself from his position of subservience, the new concept of the French nation branded this as treason, indeed, a crime deserving the death penalty. Governments of the future must remember that they were the

[2] Carlton Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926), pp. 258-60.

nation's servants; even a monarch must be a "King of the French," and not of France. In their sacred trilogy—*liberté, égalité, fraternité*—the men of the Revolution came to include nationalism under the last term.

Philosophic nationalism. This emotional French nationalism, when imperialistically imposed on other European peoples by Napoleon Bonaparte, provoked popular national movements in Italy, Spain, Germany, and elsewhere. In Germany, an effort was made by Fichte, Hegel, and others to give the concept a philosophic basis and expression. Fichte's *Letters to the German Nation* were an omen of an entity as yet unborn in what had been for so long termed "The Germanies." Romanticism contributed its share: it proceeded to invest death for one's national idea with glory reminiscent of the legendary Valhalla, soon to be reincarnated by Richard Wagner. To be sure, all Germans were by no means intoxicated with Wagner nor crazed by Nietzsche, but the aristocracy of what proved to be the dynamic German state was influenced greatly by Hegel's apotheosis of Prussian military bureaucracy. For Hegel, "the state is the march of God through the world"; if so, the way of this divine juggernaut is strewn with wreckage of human dignity and Christian culture. The Bismarckian Second Reich (1871–1918) became the proximate expression of this type of nationalism, before a more hideous caricature appeared in the Nazi Third Reich (1933–45).

Ethnic nationalism. As the nineteenth century progressed, nationalistic sentiment grew in many subject peoples of Europe. It was compounded of the foregoing in varying degrees, but also recognized special new ingredients. Earnest, even fanatical groups strove to revive submerged nationalities; in some cases, it may be feared, artificially created them. Mazzini thus created "Young Italy" to forge a new Italian nation out of the medieval principalities, and in its image many other nationalistic "youngsters" came forward: in Ireland, Poland, Norway, and the Balkans. For nationalist agitators, freethinkers as they often were, it became almost a sacred dogma that no ethnic group might legitimately continue under the political rule of another nation or state. Languages were revived or purged of alien expressions; historical sagas of the past retold and appealed to; songs, customs, costumes took on almost religious significance; and finally the demon of nationalism—not to imply that all nationalism was diabolical—utilized religion to his purpose. A chorus of protest against ultranational regimes began which reached its crescendo only in the supposed vindication of Versailles-Trianon (1919).

(3) POLITICAL SURVEY: 1848–71

Revolutions of 1848–49, while generally Liberal in aspiration, also manifested many nationalistic strivings. The Irish insurrection in Tip-

perary met with little success (July, 1848), and Norwegian "Young
Norway" agitation was chiefly literary. But in Central Europe it was
another story. A brief civil war in Switzerland replaced the loose con-
federation of cantons with a new federal constitution. Italian unification
under papal presidency was seriously proposed, and initial Sardinian
successes against tottering Austria seemed to promise replacement of
foreign by native rule. Throughout Germany crowns toppled, and at
Frankfurt a National Assembly planned a constitution for a united Ger-
many. All this could not have taken place had not the Habsburg mon-
archy been momentarily shaken and Metternich forced to flee. Hungary
declared its independence and Bohemia demanded a separate adminis-
tration. Because, however, these revolutionary groups were disunited,
while the Austrian aristocrats and generals rallied together under
Schwarzenberg, a disciple of Metternich, the revolutionaries were de-
feated or cowed—with some assistance from Russia. In Central Europe
—Austria, Hungary, Germany, Italy—the pieces were put back much
as they had been previously.

Nationalist striving did not cease, though there was a tendency for
votaries to desert liberal and romantic slogans for realism and what
Bismarck later bluntly termed "Blood and Iron." Hence, "the first half
of the nineteenth century was an age of philosophy; the second half of
the century was an age of science. . . . The revolutions of 1848 had
seemed to prove, not only that certain theorists were wrong, but that all
theories were unimportant. . . . The international system of the Euro-
pean states took on during these decades those characteristics that came
to be called the 'Armed Peace,' which paralleled the development and
spread of the centralized national states as a standard political form." [3]

Nationalist achievement under these new auspices seemed to justify
a new series of "isms": realism, materialism, militarism. With superior
military assistance from France, Italians had little difficulty in winning
national unification during 1859–61 at the expense of Austria, and cold-
blooded seizure of opponents' weak moments enabled the new kingdom
of Italy to annex Venetia (1866) and absorb the last of the Papal States
(1870). Bismarck's Prussia meanwhile forced Denmark to cede "Ger-
man" Schleswig-Holstein (1864) and expelled multinational Habsburg
Austria from Germany (1866). Then Bismarck stampeded the south
German states into a new German Reich after a successful war against
France (1871). Defeated Austria had to capitulate to Hungarian na-
tionalism by according equal status in the Austro-Hungarian dual mon-
archy (1867), but many submerged nationalities still clamored for
redress within the revamped state. But they were not so strong as the

[3] Robert Binkley, *Realism and Nationalism* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1953),
p. 1.

Hungarians and failed to achieve national status. The Poles revolted unsuccessfully once more (1863), and Irish Fenian agitation produced no immediate result. It was only with British backing that Greece could continue to maintain her independence against Turkey; and Servian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian graduation from autonomous principalities to complete independence awaited the nod of Russian Pan-Slavism. But on the whole, in Europe national boundaries were more tightly drawn and national unities more closely cemented. Yet this national order was presently to make for international disorder, even anarchy.

B. Imperialism

(1) THE IMPERIALIST PHENOMENON

Nationalism during the third quarter of the nineteenth cetury contributed strongly to an amazing imperialistic expansion during the last quarter. "Synchronizing with the revival of protective tariffs and the extension of socializing legislation toward the close of the 1870's was a tremendous outburst of imperialistic interest and activity. The outburst was common to all the great powers of Europe, except Austria-Hungary; and it was so potent that during the next three decades greater progress was made toward subjecting the world to European domination than had been made during three centuries previous." [4]

(2) INDUSTRIAL FACTORS

Nationalism and industrialism often went hand in hand because pride of nationality demanded an industrial system inferior to none and kindred economic interests cemented existing national states. "Advancing industrialization . . . nicely synchronized with a marked access of nationalism. . . . In the circumstances, it was but natural that this spirit of rivalry should find expression in the economic and industrial field as well as in the strictly cultural and political domains." [5]

Industrial progress tended to increase production, specialize labor, and develop natural resources. Acquisition of further advantages than one's neighbor tempted a nation on to political imperialism in the interest of developing international trade. To some degree—though Hayes warns against the Marxist overstress of this theory—the search for additional consumers for increased production could lead industrialists beyond national boundaries. Here they might encounter competition from fellow industrialists who, if keenly alive to the situation, would refuse to allow their national markets to be taken from them. If they were of the same stage of industrial development as their competitors, they usually

---

[4] Carlton Hayes, *Generation of Materialism* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1941), p. 216.
[5] *Loc. cit.*

were able to hold their own, at least with the assistance of a protective tariff. European merchants, therefore, would entertain favorably sale to countries on a lower level of material civilization or less industrially advanced. Such markets could be found in the unappropriated regions of Africa, among the politically impotent nations of Asia, and in the economically dependent countries of Latin America. Here a foreign trader might encounter his erstwhile competitor from another European country. Here again competition could arise, but the field was so vast and inviting and the changes and chances of fortune so varied that all, even tiny Belgium, felt that they could enter the race with fair prospect of success. When a competitor did secure a footing in an undeveloped area he would strive to monopolize his advantage. In Africa this could be achieved by outright annexation of colonies or assumption of protectorates over weaker native states. In Asia, rival spheres of influence were set up in the existing, but backward civilizations of China, India, Persia, Afghanistan, Turkey, Arabia, and Siam. In Latin America, the powers worked more cautiously for fear of the Monroe Doctrine, but concessions of mines, oil wells, etc., were obtained, loans made to governments and revolutionary juntas, and public works contracted for. By this ceaseless activity the period witnessed a transformation of the world. But the industrial and commercial shares were not equal. Perhaps agreement might have been reached had the differences been exclusively commercial—for businessmen as such usually feared war—but they were more than that.

(3) DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL IMPERIALISM

"The sequence of imperialism after 1870 appears to have been, first, pleas for colonies on the ground of national prestige; second, getting them; third, disarming critics by economic argument; and fourth, carrying this into effect and relating the results to the neo-mercantilism of tariff protection and social legislation at home. . . . But in the last analysis it was the nationalistic masses who made it possible and who most vociferously applauded and most constantly backed it. . . . Into the imperial-mindedness of the masses . . . neatly fitted the preaching of Darwinian sociology that human progress depends upon struggle between races and nations and survival of the fittest." [6]

In Europe, long-standing national hatreds existed. Imperialism seemed to the chauvinist merely nationalism grown to maturity, and "our empire" became the dream of politicians, a dream with which they sought to indoctrinate the masses. To safeguard their national and colonial domain, each country embarked on a military career. Each sought protecting alliances. For years, Europe knowingly and willingly played with

___
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 223.

fire. Russians posed as the liberators of all the Slavs, a pointed hint to Austria to relinquish her provinces of Bohemia, Moravia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slavonia. Austria, incensed at unruly Slavic subjects and Russian and Serbian sympathy for them, threatened reprisals and warned Russia to keep her distance in the Balkans. Italians spoke of *Italia Irredenta*—lands not yet freed from Austrian or French rule. French diplomats tried to avert German national unification, failed, and next clamored for "revenge" for the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. Germans then retorted that they were but recovering stolen property, gloated over their comeback as a great power, and demanded a "place in the sun" in the international field, presumably at the expense of that British empire "on which the sun never set." Great Britain preached brotherly love, democracy, and the "white man's burden" over the backs of millions of subjects. Spain clutched desperately at the last remnants of her old dominions in the New World until American "dollar diplomacy" demanded their surrender. France, Spain, Italy sought "compensation" in Africa. Still small voices came from Ireland and Poland demanding independence, but the Great Powers usually said, "Hush."

Politicians looked war straight in the eye; in Bismarck's phrase: "They watch each other, and then one of them puts his hand in his pocket, his neighbor readies his own gun in order to be able to fire the first shot." Officially, at least, they did not flinch. Each country's leaders told their citizens that they were on the defensive and were in large part believed. Peace advocates toiled frantically for disarmament and usually were made laughingstocks. Only the popes knew what was wrong: the nationalism that had raised its hand against Boniface VIII at Anagni was about to commit suicide. The tongues of those nationalistic towers of babel raised during the sixteenth century against the theocracy were to be confounded. Peoples half-fearfully, half-excitedly continued to await war. Politicians, civil or military, tinkered with their alliances and military machines. Some cynically speculated on the time best suited for the next war; others coolly. It came, and, it seems, was the beginning of the end of "modern" civilization.

81. THE PAPACY AND ITALIAN NATIONALISM

A. *Pius IX and Liberalism* (*1846–50*)

(1) "Papal Liberalism"

Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti (1792–1878) was chosen to succeed Pope Gregory XVI on June 16, 1846, by a reputed thirty-four of forty-nine votes. The conclave had been comparatively free, inasmuch as Austrian and French pressures nullified one another. Cardinal Mastai was a handsome, affable, conciliatory cleric, who was believed to be well disposed toward new ideas. As a member of a pontifical embassy to Chile in 1823,

he was the first pope to visit the New World. He had been noted for his charity as bishop of Imola and Spoleto, and this had not excluded conversation with Liberal leaders. His protection of refugees after the failure of the Bologna uprising of 1832 was remembered, and the progressive leader (Rossi) assured everybody that "in the house of Mastai-Ferretti everybody is Liberal down to the family cat." It is not surprising, therefore, that Cardinal Lambruschini, connected with the late repressive regime, would be passed over for this genial *Politique*. But though acclaimed as *"Il Papa Liberale,"* Pio Nono had few illusions; on the day of his election he is said to have exclaimed: "Today the persecution begins."

Early concessions. The new pontiff was nonetheless resolved to do everything in his power to reconcile the Liberal movement to the Church. He named the conciliatory Cardinal Gizzi as secretary of state, and appointed a commission of cardinals to reform administration and the civil code. An amnesty was granted to all political prisoners arrested by his predecessor; unfortunately these when liberated only swelled the ranks of agitators urging the pope on to yet more "progress." The amnesty was criticized by Chancellor Metternich, and the pope's concession of a civil guard led to the resignation of Cardinal Gizzi in July, 1847. Pius IX went on to mitigate restrictions on the press, but this concession was soon abused by masonic publications with "between-the-lines" communications for Liberal conspirators. The pope was, indeed, cheered in the Roman streets by Italian Liberals; Adolphe Thiers, supporter of Louis Philippe, hailed the program in the French Chamber of Deputies; Viscount Palmerston sent Lord Minto to Rome to help manipulate the Liberal enthusiasm. Mazzini poured in instructions for his "Young Italian" lieutenants.

Liberal zenith. To the horror of Metternich and his associates the pope still went forward. In March, 1847, he had mitigated censorship; in June he created a council of ministers; this was followed by a group of lay notables to represent the communes and advise on civil administration. The new council of state met for the first time in October, 1847, under the presidency of Giacomo Antonelli (1808–76), lay cardinal since 1846, and the pope's chief political advisor during most of his pontificate. Though Metternich had occupied Ferrara in July, 1847, as a sign of his august displeasure, the pope protested but went on his Liberal course. In December, 1847, he agreed to ministerial responsibility: civil officials would depend for continuance in office upon a parliamentary majority. Early in 1848 the rulers of the Two Sicilies, Sardinia and Tuscany, conceded constitutions in order to allay discontent of the Liberals, and on February 8 an uprising in Rome demanded a similar grant. On March 14, 1848—the day that an "elderly Englishman," Metternich in

disguise, stole out of Vienna—*Pio Nono* granted a constitution: the "Fundamental Statute for Temporal Administration of the Papal States." There were to be two houses: a high council of life members named by the pope, and a council of deputies elected by the people. All legislation, however, was subject to review by a supreme court: the college of cardinals, and ecclesiastical and foreign affairs were excluded from the legislature's competence. Cardinal Antonelli took office as the first premier on March 16, 1848. All of Italy seemed to have become Liberal except for the Austrian-dominated territories, and there groups shouted "down with the barbarians." Some Roman troops marched to the northern frontier with Pius's blessing; when, however, newspapers interpreted this as a papal declaration of war, the pope explained that they were merely guards. Early in April, the pope sent a prelate to discuss Italian confederation with the king of Sardinia. The papacy, far from obstructing Italian Liberal nationalism, seemed a beacon.

(2) LIBERAL EXCESSES

Liberal excesses. Revolts had been engineered in Habsburg-held territories, but expulsion of Austrian regular troops was beyond the powers of a militia. Hence patriots demanded an Italian crusade to expel the foreigners from Italy, and Liberals would fain have Pius IX repeat Julius II's slogan: *"Fuori i barbari."* But in response to suggestions that he declare war on Austria, the pope asserted in an allocution of April 28, 1848, that although he did not approve of Austrian oppression, yet "we have deemed it our duty to protest formally and loudly in this solemn assembly against a design which is so foreign to our thoughts, seeing that we, although unworthy, hold on earth the place of him who is the Author of peace, the Friend of charity, and considering that, faithful to the divine obligations of our supreme apostolate, we embrace all countries and all nations in the same sentiments of paternal love." At the same time the pope extinguished the hopes of the Clerical Federalists: "We cannot avoid repelling, before all the nations of the earth, formation of a new Republic, to be constituted out of all the states of Italy." This was the crisis of "papal Liberalism." By this pronouncement *Pio Nono* forfeited the support of intemperate Italian nationalists and Liberals, but at the same time he opened the way to new papal prestige among all men of good will as an unbiased arbiter and impartial champion of international peace and justice.

Roman Republic. Roman Radicals denounced the allocution and on May 3 replaced Antonelli as premier with Count Mamiani who announced that henceforth the pope would merely "pray, bless, and pardon." *Pio Nono* retorted that he would retain "full liberty of action," and search for a moderate premier began. The pope felt that he had

found one in Pellegrino Rossi, but the latter was stabbed to death as he opened parliament on November 15. The Civic Guard sided with the assassins and a Radical ministry was forced upon the pope. Presently the most infamous decrees appeared under the papal name. Pius informed the diplomatic corps: "Gentlemen, I am a prisoner." During the night of November 24, the Bavarian ambassador, Graf Spaur, assisted the pope, "disguised as a priest," to escape to Gaeta in the Two Sicilies, where King Ferdinand II, who had subdued his own Liberals, gave him asylum. Meanwhile a Radical Liberalism triumphed at Rome. The papal commission delegated to rule in the pope's absence was disregarded, and Mazzini arrived to head a junta which announced a plebiscite for December. Since the pope threatened all taking part with excommunication, the Radicals carried the day and on February 9, 1849, declared Pius IX deposed in favor of a "Roman Republic." On February 18 all ecclesiastical property was secularized and other Italian states invited to imitate this "Young Italian" regime at Rome. On March 29 Mazzini became one of the triumvirs and on occasion occupied the papal throne in St. Peter's; Armellini set up placards: "Down with Christ; long live Barabbas"—a sample of the lunatic fringe of Freemasonry.

(3) CONSERVATIVE REACTION

Papal restoration. At Gaeta, Pope Pius had named Cardinal Antonelli secretary of state, a post which the latter held until his death in 1876. During April, 1849, Antonelli summoned all Catholic sovereigns to assist in restoring the Roman pontiff to his dominions. By this time the reactionary Schwarzenberg ruled in Vienna, and the Second French Republic had taken a conservative turn with its "prince-president," Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. In May, 1849, Austrian troops, having restored the archdukes in Lombardy, pressed into the Papal States. In April Bonaparte despatched French troops, though their first attack was repulsed by Garibaldi. In June Spanish troops arrived to help the pope. These three powers, with the Neapolitans, entered Rome on July 3, 1849, and overthrew the Republic. Restoration of pontifical authority was delayed when Bonaparte, in order to save the Liberal side of his face at home, proposed certain reforms as conditions of papal restoration. Supported by Francis Joseph of Austria, Pius IX refused and Bonaparte yielded. The pope then set up a reform commission on his own initiative, but did not himself return to Rome until April 12, 1850.

Papal intransigence. Pius IX was now free from his officious liberators, although a French garrison remained in Rome until 1866. The pope and Cardinal Antonelli had returned to Rome disillusioned about Liberalism. Everything compatible with the divine monarchical constitution of the papacy had been done to conciliate the Liberals without

appeasing their importunate demands. Henceforth there would be no
more experiments, and strict conservatism would be the rule. Though by
no means vindictive—an amnesty was granted—Pius IX henceforth
imposed stern restraint upon Liberals and Radicals. Progress and reform
would be achieved by benevolent despotism. In this policy the adroit
Cardinal Antonelli perhaps achieved as much success as was possible in
the face of European opinion now largely convinced that papal tem-
poral sovereignty was an anachronism, a relic of medievalism. The old
system of legatine government was restored, and education committed
to Jesuit supervision. The Jesuit review, *Civilta Cattolica,* became the
organ of an uncompromising and sometimes extreme Ultramontanism.
Reforms in administration, agriculture and commerce were introduced
by Antonelli. His administration, although neither democratic nor pro-
gressive, was tolerably just and prosperous, so that the average citizens
of the Papal States, much to the disgust of expatriate or foreign agita-
tors, were disposed to leave things well enough alone. But this could
scarcely endure, since the Papal State still lay athwart any prospective
united Italy. How could Italy be unified so long as Rome cut it in two?
The Lateran solution of 1929 was still far in the future, the idea of
papal presidency of an Italian federation had been repudiated by the
Holy See. Just as Austria could never countenance German unification
at the expense of her multinational monarchy, the Papal State could
scarcely approve of Italian unification without renouncing its independ-
ence and its international position. Just as Bismarck's Prussia resolved
to realize German unity without Austria, so Cavour's Sardinia began to
dream of a "Kingdom of Italy," papal opposition notwithstanding. Since
to all proposals of cession of papal territory or temporal prerogatives,
Pio Nono and Cardinal Antonelli opposed an unwavering *"non pos-
sumus,"* an irresistible material force began to move toward an immov-
able spiritual object.

B. *Papal Spiritual Internationalism*

(1) CURIAL ACTIVITY

The Roman Curia under Pius IX was after 1850 more exclusively
preoccupied with spiritual affairs, and temporal concerns were left to
Cardinal Antonelli. If the moral tone of the curia became better, its
ability and learning were rated lower by critics. The trend to specializa-
tion continued and the cardinals were now seldom consulted as a body.
Organizational activity during the long pontificate was unparalleled: by
1869 Pius IX had named all of the 739 Catholic bishops except 81. He
erected 29 archbishoprics, 33 vicariates, 15 prefectures, and restored the
English, Dutch, and Palestinian hierarchies. With his encouragement,

Rome witnessed the foundation of new Latin American, North American, and Polish colleges, and the reorganization of the Irish and English.

Diplomatic activity was intense. Repeatedly the Holy See clashed with the Russian government for violation of the pact of 1847, and in 1866 issued a documented exposition of Russian infractions of religious agreements regarding the Polish and Ruthenian Uniates. The pope, however, did not endorse the Polish uprising of 1863. He repeatedly denounced the *Kulturkampf* in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. The French, English, and Portuguese hierarchies came in for chiding on occasion for either weakness or internal disputes. But if the pope was strongly authoritarian, his winning personality repeatedly disarmed his opponents: bishops summoned to Rome for reprimands often returned strong Ultramontanes. *Pio Nono's* nervous and variable temperament, however, made his policies frequently seem inconsistent or improvised.

The Oriental Church, as will be noted elsewhere more in detail, was an object of the pope's solicitude, though he was accused of favoring Latinization and extinction of patriarchal autonomy. The bull *Reversurus* (1867), fusing two Armenian primatial sees, provoked a temporary schism, which was repeated soon afterwards when the norms of that document regarding prelatial jurisdiction were applied to the Chaldean Rite. Other Catholic Rites evaded the regulations or observed them under protest. Happily the disputes led eventually to better understanding on both sides and more conciliatory treatment by the Roman Curia.

(2) Doctrinal Exposition

Indifferentism was denounced again by the watchful pontiff. Thus *Qui Pluribus* (1846) set forth relations of Faith and reason; *Singulari Quadam* (1854) condemned Rationalism; *Eximiam* rejected Guenther's errors and *Gravissimas* those of Froschammer. The encyclical *Quanto Conficiamur Moerore* deplored indifferentism in Italy (1863) and *Tuas Libenter* (1863) warned against latitudinarian trends at German theological conventions; Liberal Secularism was indicted in the allocution *Acerbissimum* against civil marriage (1852). The encyclicals *Etsi Multa* and *Quod Numquam* (1875) rejected false notions of Church-state relations, and the royal *placet* was repudiated in an allocution during 1877.

The Immaculate Conception. In 1830 the Blessed Virgin had herself suggested definition of her unique prerogative by thrice appearing to the Daughter of Charity, St. Catherine Labouré, during July, November, and December at the mother house in Paris. St. Catherine was directed to promote wearing of a medal with the invocation: "O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee." Such medals

began to appear in 1832 with the authorization of Hyachinthe de Quelen, archbishop of Paris. Father Jean Etienne, superior-general of the Vincentians and of the Daughters of Charity, formed a confraternity. Authenticated benefits, such as the conversion of the Jew, Alphonse Ratisbonne, soon spread the fame of this Miraculous Medal. While in exile at Gaeta during 1849 Pope Pius sent a circular letter to the Catholic hierarchy requesting their views regarding a definition of Mary's Immaculate Conception. Replies were overwhelmingly favorable, and on December 8, 1854, the pope formally defined that "the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary was, by the singular favor and privilege of Almighty God in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the human race, preserved free from all stain of original sin from the first instant of her conception, is a doctrine revealed by God and therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful." This declaration, *Ineffabilis Deus* (Denzinger 1641), is cited by many theologians as a clear example of an ex-cathedra papal dogmatic definition independently of a general council. At Lourdes, France, four years later, the Blessed Mother graciously acknowledged the tribute of the universal Church by introducing herself to St. Bernadette Soubirous as "The Immaculate Conception." There too she opened to mankind a fountain of healing waters bringing to many health of soul and body—though occasioning not a few Rationalist headaches.

The Syllabus of Errors, issued on the tenth anniversary of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, 1864, was the chief object of Liberal scandal, pharisaic or otherwise. This was a compendium of censures of modern errors accompanying the encyclical *Quanta Cura*. This denounced Pantheism, Naturalism, Rationalism, Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism, Socialism, Communism, and Liberalism, together with pseudo-Bible societies, secret organizations, and "clerical-liberal" ententes. The Syllabus was a summary of modern errors briefly stated. Unfortunately Cardinal Antonelli's editing of the document was somewhat at fault, so that some of the propositions, when thus read out of the context of the original documents, were a little startling, such as: "The Roman pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to and compromise with progress, with Liberalism, and with modern civilization." Bismarck, Gladstone, and Bonaparte were dismayed by this reprobation. Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans undertook to explain that whereas the abstract errors noted had already been often condemned in the past, the Church would always be disposed to be merciful to human wanderers in good faith, and to take into consideration special circumstances requiring toleration of what could, however, never be proclaimed as an ideal. But however explained, nineteenth-century European Liberals found the *Syllabus* ab-

surd—though some twentieth-century thinkers are beginning to have doubts about the vaunted merits of "modern civilization."

C. Italian Unification (1850–70)

(1) FORMATION OF THE ITALIAN KINGDOM

Diplomatic preparation. Recent events had discredited the "Young Italians" and the "Clerical Federalists"; now it was the turn of the Liberal Monarchists. In 1850 Count Cavour became a member of the Sardinian cabinet, and two years later King Victor Emmanuel (1849–78) named him premier, a post that he filled almost uninterruptedly until his death in 1861. Though proclaiming a "free Church in a free state," Cavour abolished canonical jurisdiction and right of sanctuary, suppressed a number of abbeys, expelled the Jesuits, and interfered with holy days of obligation. His bill for civil marriage, however, had to be postponed in the wake of *Pio Nono's* denunciation (1852). Abroad, Cavour declared war on Russia in 1855, not so much because of any Sardinian grievance, as to win the good will of Russia's foes, Great Britain and France. At the Paris peace conference in 1856 Cavour had an opportunity to denounce Austrian rule in Italy to the Concert of Europe and to begin to exert that pressure on Bonaparte, now Napoleon III, which finally extorted from the latter a pledge of intervention on behalf of Italian liberation. Bonaparte's predicament lay in this: Liberals urged this ex-rebel to befriend Italian patriots; Catholics demanded that he protect the temporal power of the papacy. Bonaparte tried to temporize until 1858 when Orsini's near miss with a bomb jogged his memory.

Military consummation. Assured of Bonaparte's backing and of Palmerston's benevolence, Cavour provoked war with Austria in April, 1859. This short contest ended in July with severe defeats for Austria, which encouraged liberals in the duchies and the Romagna to revolt and invite Sardinian annexation. As soon as Bonaparte perceived that destruction of papal sovereignty was in prospect, he made a separate peace with Austria whereby the latter ceded Lombardy to Sardinia, but retained Venetia. The Sardinians were incensed, but had to acquiesce in the lead of their powerful ally, and even to cede to him his previously stipulated price for help: cession of Nice and Savoy to France. While Bonaparte then tried to persuade the pope through ghostwritten pamphlets to cede all papal territories outside of Rome, his secret attitude was virtually that of an alleged remark to Cavour: "Get the thing over with quickly": face the pontiff with an accomplished fact. The papal reply was "*non possumus*": we cannot yield what is ours. Cavour sent agents into the duchies and the Papal States to engineer plebiscites which in March,

1860, declared for annexation to Piedmont-Sardinia. With Cavour's secret knowledge, Garibaldi sailed from Genoa in May to seize Sicily. In August with some connivance of the British navy he crossed to the mainland, and captured Naples on September 7. On September 18 Garibaldi's forces overwhelmed the few papal troops at Castelfidardo. The survivors retreated to Ancona where they were forced to surrender on September 29. Several months were needed for "mopping up," but in March, 1861, Victor Emmanuel of Sardinia was proclaimed king of Italy and named Cavour his first premier. Pope Pius, whose territory had been reduced to Rome and vicinity, where a French garrison prevented further annexation, refused to recognize the new kingdom officially—although privately he is said to have admitted a patriotic Italian pride in the exploits of Cavour and Garibaldi against whom he held no personal animosity.

(2) Fall of the Temporal Power

Legal aftermath. Cavour died in June, 1861, and his successor, Baron Ricasoli, offered to reach accord by promising the pope sovereign status and permanent endowment—terms which *Pio Nono* consistently rejected. The Jesuit review *Civilta Cattolica* continued to reflect the intransigent curial viewpoint, while compromising journals, such as *Il Conciliatore* of Milan and *Il Mediatore* of Turin, were discouraged in their search for accord between curia and royal court. Large-scale confiscation of ecclesiastical property in the legations had followed on the proclamation of the new Italy, and yet royal edicts of 1863 and 1864 invoked the *exequatur* and *placet* in true regalist fashion. Civil marriage was authorized by the new regime in 1865. During 1866 in order to curb a supposed "Austro-Bourbon-Clerical" conspiracy, the "Law of Suspects" jailed 6,825 members of a non-political "Association for Defense of Catholicity." In 1867 the increasing financial difficulties of the kingdom were relieved by confiscation of more church property, with a promise to pay salaries to a reduced number of clergy. St. John Bosco, personal friend of both pope and king, alone succeeded in negotiating a modus vivendi (1867), whereby suppression of twenty-six sees was authorized, and provision made for confirmation of episcopal nominations. Yet in 1868 the papal decree, *Non Expedit,* forbade local Catholics to take an oath to the Italian constitution.

Precarious protection. Though Bonaparte had recognized the kingdom of Italy, he had done so on the express condition that Rome would not become its capital. The storm of Catholic protest raised by Bishop Dupanloup convinced him that he must maintain the remnant of the Papal States. In summer, 1862, Garibaldi called his bluff. Organizing two thousand volunteers, he marched on Rome with the cry: "Rome or death." He got neither, for the Italian government, frightened by

French threats, arrested him—though soon allowing him to "escape." By a Convention of 1864, Victor Emmanuel undertook to protect Rome from seizure so that the French troops might be withdrawn within two years. The pope enlisted volunteer defenders from all nations under the Swiss General Kanzler. As soon as French troops departed, Garibaldi made another attempt to capture Rome in October, 1867, but returning French forces reinforced the papal troops to repel the Italians at Mentana. Garibaldi was captured and sent to Caprera. Failing to have the "Roman Question" settled by international pact, Bonaparte was obliged to continue a token French garrison at Rome for the protection of the pope. This force deterred the Italian government from a move which would involve France.

Rome's fall was inevitable as soon as the Italian kingdom had obtained certain information of French reverses during the Franco-Prussian War (1870). The Roman garrison was recalled on July 26, 1870, and the capture of Napoleon III on September 2 relieved the Italian government from any further anxiety on the part of France. On September 8 King Victor Emmanuel informed the pope that Rome was about to be seized, but promised to guarantee his safety. *Pio Nono* retorted: "They speak of guarantees. Who will guarantee these guarantees? Your king cannot guarantee them. Your king is no longer king; he is dependent on his parliament, and that parliament depends on the secret societies." The United States Minister King and Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox offered the pope American naval vessels for flight, but *Pio Nono* pointed to a crucifix on his table and remarked: "This is all my artillery." On September 11, General Cadorna crossed the frontier with sixty thousand troops. Although effective papal resistance was impossible, Pius IX ordered his forces to defend the Roman city walls until a breach was made, in order to demonstrate that he yielded only to force. At nine o'clock on September 20, 1870, the Italian troops broke through the *Porta Pia* and the papal forces surrendered. The Papal State, founded in 755 by donation of Pepin of Frankland, came to an end with General Kanzler's capitulation.

(3) Epilogue: "Vatican Captivity" (1870–78)

Papal-royal relations. After a managed plebiscite on October 2, the king announced that "Rome and the Roman provinces form an integral part of the kingdom of Italy." The pope retorted on November 1 with a formal protest and excommunication for all "invaders, be their dignity what it may." With the king usurping the papal palace of the Quirinal, the pope immured himself as the "prisoner of the Vatican": neither he nor his successors set foot on Italian soil from September, 1870 to 1929. True, the Italian government in May, 1871, voted the "Law of Guaran-

tees" assuring the pope of personal inviolability, freedom of communication with the outside world "in spiritual matters," use of the Vatican and Lateran palaces with Castel Gandolfo, and an annual subsidy of 3,225,000 lire. Pius IX rejected this unilateral governmental fiat which would make of him a national chaplain. While the government proceeded to new confiscations, the pope retained the *Non Expedit* decree: no loyal Catholic ought to vote or take office under the king. The pope survived the king by one month, dying on February 8, 1878, after the longest pontificate since St. Peter. During his funeral procession, delayed to 1881, Freemasons attempted to throw the coffin into the Tiber. Though they were restrained, papal prestige seemed to have reached a new nadir.

82. FIRST VATICAN COUNCIL

A. *Conciliar Preparations*

(1) OFFICIAL PRELIMINARIES

Papal preparation. Pope Pius IX consulted the curial cardinals during December, 1864, on the expediency of holding an ecumenical council. When the majority pronounced in favor of the proposal, a secret circular letter during 1865 ascertained that informed and distinguished prelates through the world also for the most part favored convocation. The German civil war somewhat delayed preparations, but by 1867 the pope was ready to commit himself publicly. Despite Cardinal Antonelli's forebodings, Pius IX told some five hundred bishops assembled at Rome to celebrate the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of Sts. Peter and Paul, June, 1867, that he would call a general council "in order to bring necessary and salutary remedies to the many evils whereby the Church is oppressed." A year later he fixed the opening date for December 8, 1869.

Preparatory commissions. From March, 1865, a commission of cardinals had been named to consider the organization of the proposed council. From questionnaires sent to various bishops, a summary of the doctrinal and disciplinary points needing treatment was made. The cardinals decided to name five subsidiary commissions to work under their direction in drawing up the agenda for these questions, and leading theologians, canonists, and historians were assigned to elaborate the schemata, according to a mode of procedure devised by Karl Hefele, the historian of the councils, and subsequently bishop of Rothenburg. Among the hundred consultors were the Jesuit theologians, Franzelin and Shrader, and the historians Alzog, Hergenroether, Hettinger, and Haneburg. Newman and Doellinger were invited to participate, but declined.

Personnel. The Catholic prelates who comprised the Council in-

cluded over 200 Italians, 70 Frenchmen, 40 Austro-Hungarians, 36 Spaniards, 19 Irishmen, 18 Germans, 12 Englishmen, and 19 from smaller European countries. There were 40 from the United States, 9 from Canada, and 36 from Latin America, while 120 came from the British Commonwealth as a whole. There were prelates from the Catholic Oriental Rites; only Czar Alexander II of Russia hindered his bishops from coming. Papal invitations had also been issued to important Dissident and Protestant leaders. Although the Dissident patriarchs ignored the papal appeal, some of their bishops displayed interest and might have responded had they been permitted by their religious or secular superiors. Papal invitations to the Protestants were greeted by angry demonstrations before Luther's new monument at Worms. But the French Huguenot, François Guizot, made a courteous reply.

(2) Unofficial Alignments

Ultramontane majority. Since it was well known that the question of papal infallibility was likely to come up at the Council, parties began to form among the hierarchy regarding the opportuneness of its definition. With negligible exceptions, the great majority of the bishops endorsed the doctrine itself; the division was chiefly based on the expediency of definition at this particular time. The leader of the majority favoring immediate definition was the able theologian and conciliatory prelate, Archbishop Des Champs of Malines, Belgian primate in law and fact. The majority "whip" or floor leader was the inflexible, uncompromising Archbishop Manning of Westminster. In general, bishops from strongly Catholic lands, such as the Italians and Spaniards, tended to belong to the majority. Among these was Cardinal Bilio, head of the Commission on Faith, and as such almost the Council's "prime minister." Prominent majority spokesmen were Bishops Gasser of Brixen, Martin of Paderborn, Pie of Poitiers, Cullen of Dublin, and Spalding of Baltimore. The clerical majority was vehemently, if not always prudently, backed by Catholic editors of the *Civilta Cattolica*, and the militant laymen, W. G. Ward of the *Dublin Review* and Louis Veuillot of the *Univers*.

Inopportunist minority. A considerable minority of the prelates, comprising many from predominantly Protestant or secularistic countries, deemed immediate definition of papal infallibility inopportune. They were led by Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, and their most active agent was Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans. Other prominent spokesmen were Cardinal Schwarzenberg of Prague, Archbishop Melchers of Cologne, Archbishop Darboy of Paris, and Bishops Haynald of Kalocza, Strossmayer of Bosnia, Clifford of Cifton, and Moriarty of Kerry. Subsequently when overborne on the opportuneness of the definition, this

group strove to qualify the definition by restrictive clauses. Newman inclined to this group, along with the lay leaders, Lord Acton and the comte de Montalembert.

Foes of papal infallibility itself were few: chiefly Hefele, Maret, a surviving Gallican, and Kenrick of St. Louis. All eventually submitted, unlike their outside supporter, Doellinger, who went far beyond them in opposition.

(3) SECULAR REACTIONS

Governmental attitudes. Premier Hohenlohe of Bavaria tried to excite concerted opposition to the Council by a circular to chancelleries in April, 1869, but met with slight response. Bismarck of Prussia and Beust of Austria contented themselves with warning the Council to remain in the spiritual sphere. France's foreign minister Daru threatened interference, but was overruled by Premier Ollivier, a tolerant liberal. Prime Minister Gladstone of Great Britain became anxious, but was persuaded by Foreign Minister Lord Clarendon and Archbishop Manning that Victoria's crown was safe from papal aggression. Only the Russian czar banned attendance.

Masonic manifesto. As a gesture of defiance against the Council, some seven hundred Freemasons assembled at Naples, December 8, 1869, to proclaim: "The undersigned delegates of the various nations of the civilized world, assembled in Naples as members of the Anti-Council, issue the following principles: They proclaim the liberty of reason against religious authority, the independence of man against the despotism of Church and state, free education against teaching by the clergy; and they acknowledge no other foundation for human belief than science. They proclaim that man is free and they insist on the abolition of all official Churches. . . . Freethinkers regard the idea of God as the source and support of every despotism and of every iniquity . . . they regard all the Catholic dogmas as the very negation of society. . . ." But before they could air more blasphemies, the police dispersed the agitators lest they be harmed by popular violence. But even with many pinches of salt, this bombast contained many secularist objectives subsequently realized.

B. Conciliar Deliberations

(1) CONCILIAR PROCEDURE

Conciliar commissions. The Vatican Council, like any numerous assembly, had to do much of its work through committees. The assigned commissions were: (1) Faith and Dogma; (2) Ecclesiastical Discipline and Canon Law; (3) Religious Orders and Regulars; (4) Oriental

Churches and Foreign Missions; (5) Ecclesiastical-Political Affairs. As it turned out, only the material prepared by the first two commissions was ever discussed in the Council, and but part of the agenda of the first of these was voted on. Archbishop Manning seems to have effected a *coup* in the selection of members of the majority for the key commission on Faith and Dogma. Though his tactless stroke displeased the minority, it did not involve coercion, for there was full opportunity for episcopal discussion during the general conciliar meetings.

Rules of procedure. The pope reserved the right to propose questions for consideration through the presidents: Cardinals Reisach, De Luca, Bizzarri, Bilio, Capalti, and De Angelis. The bishops might also submit subjects for discussion to the commissions, and these would deliberate on proposals to recommend to the pope for introduction. Bishop Fessler acted as secretary of the Council. The theologians' printed schemata were to be distributed before any matter was discussed in a general congregation, so that anyone desiring to speak might notify one of the presidents beforehand. In case that difficulties arose or amendments were proposed, these would be referred to the commissions which would deliberate on the matter and make recommendations to the general congregations. When discussion had concluded on any point, the bishops voted: *placet, non-placet,* or *placet juxta modum* to signify respectively approval, disapproval, or approbation on condition of amendment. Once a congregation, a virtual committee of the whole, had settled a point, this might then be formally voted in a public conciliar session.

In **practice**, the bishops tore to pieces the theologians' lengthy and academic schemata, and the real formulation of the definitions thus reverted largely to the Commission on Faith. This meant that the proposed formula would represent the wishes of the opportunist majority. Nevertheless the minority had ample chance to exhaust their objections in lengthy speeches; had their arguments been better, they would—*salva praesentia Spiritus Sancti*—have won over the majority in that time. Premier Ollivier, a master of parliamentary procedure, thought the Vatican method of discussion fair and just; his chief criticism lay in that too much latitude was given the minority for the good of efficient business. This view of a French Liberal may balance accusations by Doellinger and Friedrich in their *Letters From Rome* under the pseudonym of "Quirinus." These future "Old Catholics" claimed that the majority ran roughshod over the minority by arranging for larger Italian than German representation, packing the Council with dependent titular bishops, and bribing leaders with offers of red hats. These gratuitous assertions were in large part based on the assumption that the Council was supposed to do business according to parliamentary theories of propor-

tional representation. Actually titular bishops numbered only 36 out of 750, voting was not by nations but by individuals, and insinuations of coercion or bribery by the pope are utterly groundless.

(2) Survey of External History

First session. The first public session of the Vatican Council was opened by Pope Pius IX in St. Peter's Basilica on December 8, 1869. Over 600 bishops were present, and during the course of the Council the number rose to 774. The Mass of the Holy Spirit and inaugural formalities occupied the first session.

Second session. Since the congregations had no decrees ready for voting, the second session of January 6, 1870, confined itself to recitation of the Profession of Faith by members of the Council.

Third session: Dei Filius. The third session convened on April 24, 1870, to adopt the dogmatic constitution, *Dei Filius*, by a vote of 667 *placet*. This constitution was divided into four positive chapters, with corresponding negative canons:

1) "De Deo Creatore" anathematized theories of the production of the world other than by creation of all things from nothing by God, freely and for his own glory; denials of spiritual existence; and pantheistic identification of God with the universe.

2) "De Revelatione" defined that God can be known by human reason *per ea quae facta sunt*, and that man can be instructed by Revelation through the canonical Scriptures, to be accepted as decreed by the Council of Trent.

3) "De Fide" pronounced anathema on those who would say that divine revelation contained contradictions, so that God cannot exact faith in Revelation, nor make Revelation credible through external signs sufficient to induce a free and certain assent.

4) "De Fide et Ratione" declared that divine revelation contained mysteries incomprehensible to human reason, and yet by no means contradictory to the science of today or the future.

Fourth session: Pastor Aeternus. On July 18, 1870, the dogmatic constitution on the Church, entitled *Pastor Aeternus,* was adopted by a vote of 533 to 2. This defined that: (1) St. Peter had received a true primacy of jurisdiction from Christ; (2) the Roman pontiffs had succeeded to St. Peter in this office by divine right; (3) the pope enjoyed full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, over each particular church, and each one of the faithful; and finally (4), "we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedra,* that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians and by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals

to be held by the Universal Church, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema."

Conclusion. The dogma on infallibility was at once proclaimed by Pius IX amid the thunder and lightning of Sinai as a summer storm surged about St. Peter's. The next day the Franco-Prussian War forced postponement. Though reduced numbers continued informal discussion during the summer, the Council was prorogued on October 20. That this adjournment has become definitive may be deduced from Pope John XXIII's announcement of a Second Vatican Council.

(3) Summary of Internal History

Debates on Faith. Cardinal Rauscher opened the public debate on December 28, 1869, by criticizing the proposed schema, "De Fide," as too long, vague, and academic. Archbishop Kenrick made a similar observation and was supported by others. The schema was sent back to committee, "mangled and pulled to pieces" in Bishop Ullathorne's view. A revision, in large part prepared by Bishop Martin of Paderborn, was resubmitted on March 1, 1870. This was eventually accepted without any noteworthy changes of expression save two. First the attribution of all modern errors—Rationalism, Pantheism, Materialism, Atheism, etc.—to Protestant origins was strenuously criticized as unfair by Bishops Strossmayer of Bosnia and Meignan of Chalons. Some murmured at Strossmayer's defense of heretics, and the cardinal-president felt it necessary to remind Strossmayer of the distinction between Protestants as individuals and Protestantism as a religion. After some disagreement, provoked by Strossmayer's stubborn and arbitrary presentation, the passage was toned down. Second, Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham, Newman's ordinary, proposed and carried the alteration of the proposed designation, "Roman Catholic Church," to "Catholic and Roman Church," in order to avoid giving even verbal countenance to the Anglican Branch Theory. Thus amended, the schema was adopted in general session.

Discussion on discipline. While the Commission on Faith was revising the original schema, the Council's members proceeded to discuss disciplinary matters. Although these considerations never came to a vote, they reveal some clerical opinions. Many bishops complained that too much was said in the agenda about episcopal duties and not enough about their rights. Others objected to excessive disciplinary centralization at the Roman Curia. German bishops staunchly defended their

catechism of St. Peter Canisius against proposed obligatory and general use of the one by St. Robert Bellarmine. Bishop Verot of Savannah, who repeatedly leavened proceedings by saving humor, inveighed against apocryphal hagiography and incongruous homilies. Bishop Martin thought there might be some merit in clerical beards. The only serious disagreement arose when the Chaldean patriarch, Joseph VI Audo, protested against what he characterized as a Roman tendency to Latinize the Orientals. Later he defied an order of Cardinal Barnabo, prefect of Propaganda, and went into virtual schism. He was subsequently reconciled to Pope Leo XIII, and a more generous curial policy adopted.

Primacy debate. The Council was proceeding slowly, so slowly that it seemed unlikely that discussion of papal primacy could begin during 1870. Accordingly Pope Pius advanced the question so that debate opened on May 13. As far as papal primacy, exclusive of infallibility, was concerned, discussion centered on its nature, for its institution and perpetuity were unanimously ratified at once. The chief concern of the minority was about the seeming omission of the hierarchy, a fear that bishops might be reduced to mere papal deputies. Cardinal Rauscher accordingly proposed that papal power in dioceses be termed extraordinary rather than ordinary, but his amendment was defeated. Bishop Freppel of Angers concluded the debate by explaining certain terms and pointing out several fallacies, and with a last-minute addition, the chapter on the primacy was accepted by July 13. Bishop Strossmayer, an ardent Croatian nationalist, often increased the tension by his blunt language. But both during and after the Council he accepted the doctrine of papal primacy; the speech against this said to have been delivered by Strossmayer on June 2, 1870, is a forgery, still being exploited by the *Converted Catholic*, etc.

Infallibility debate. Excitement naturally reached its zenith during the discussion of papal infallibility. The theologians' schema having been set aside for one prepared by Cardinal Bilio, first Cardinal Guidi of Bologna secured the alteration of its title from "the infallibility of the pope," to the more accurate, "infallible magisterium of the pope." Cardinal Rauscher spoke for the minority in proposing as an amendment the formula of St. Antonine: "The successor of St. Peter, using the counsel and seeking for the help of the universal Church, cannot err." But the majority objected that this savored too much of the Gallican theory that papal decrees do not become valid save with the consent of the Church. Archbishop Landriot of Rheims favored the distinction employed by Bossuet and Fénelon: that between the infallibility of the see and its occupant, *sedis et sedentis*. This, too, was set aside. Many other verbal changes were proposed, among them some by Bishop Amat of Los Angeles. Finally, Bishop Gasser of Brixen made a long address

discounting the fears of those who saw in the definition an infallibility separate from that of the Church. He pointed out that to prescribe conditions for the exercise of papal infallibility was unnecessary and impractical. Archbishop Manning had already argued that definition of papal infallibility would appeal to wavering conservative Protestants, and supported his thesis by an account of his own conversion and up-to-date citations. At the conclusion of these debates, the minority had dwindled from an estimated 136 in January to 88 in July—the Americans had apparently been the national group most impressed, for their original 24 *non placet* had declined to 9. Of the 88 hold-out opponents, only two actually repeated their vote in the public session, the others absenting themselves. But all of the minority subsequently subscribed to the dogmatic definition.

C. Conciliar Sequel

(1) CONCILIAR ACCEPTANCE

Episcopal Unanimity. All of the opposition bishops of the Vatican Council, then, without exception submitted. Formal professions from Central Europe were, indeed, slow in coming, but not so much from episcopal reluctance to subscribe, as from fear of governmental reaction. Bishop Hefele, a long waverer, promulgated the decrees on April 10, 1871. Bishop Maret of the Sorbonne, who had published a book against papal infallibility in 1869, loyally retracted any adverse statements. Bishop Strossmayer, despite importunity from schismatics, remained faithful.

Faithful majority. In France, but thirty to forty clerics were tempted into some phase of the German Old Catholic movement, but they included no prominent individuals save Abbé Michaud, vicar at the Madeleine in Paris, and Père Hyacinth, Carmelite preacher of the Notre Dame Conferences. Though fears were entertained for them, Père Gratry, John Henry Newman, and Lord Acton joined the vast majority of the clergy and faithful in ready acceptance of the Vatican definitions, and the few dissenters became just other bits of driftwood from St. Peter's bark.

(2) THE "OLD CATHOLIC" MOVEMENT

Origins. Dr. Johann Ignaz Doellinger (1799–1890) had distinguished himself prior to the Vatican Council as a brilliant, if none too sound or submissive, scholar. His exasperation with the vigorous Ultramontanism of the *Civilta Cattolica* school had led him to an ardent ecclesiastical nationalism suspicious of the Roman Curia. Before and during the Council, Doellinger criticized papal leadership in a series of articles signed "Janus" or "Quirinus." About the Vatican Council he obtained informa-

tion, highly inaccurate and exaggerated, from his friends, Lord Acton and Dr. Friedrich, consulting theologian of the Febronian Cardinal Hohenlohe.

Schism. After the Council, Archbishop Scherr of Munich in reporting the conciliar decrees to the university faculty and its dean, Doellinger, remarked: "Now we are going to work anew for Holy Church." Doellinger, however, retorted, "Yes, for the old Church; they have made a new one." This incident of July 21, 1870, foreshadowed and furnished a name to the "Old Catholic" movement in Germany and Switzerland. During August, 1870, Doellinger conferred at Nuremburg with other professors of Central European universities, including Friedrich, Schulte, Reusch, Langen, and Reinkens. They decided not to acknowledge the Vatican Council as ecumenical and consequently rejected its definition of papal infallibility. When they appealed for a new council outside of Italy, the German bishops on August 30 published their own adhesion to the conciliar decrees, and requested prayers for the hesitant. Though Archbishop Scherr and other members of the hierarchy accorded the disaffected ample time for reflection, on March 28, 1871, the dissidents sanctioned an article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in which they compared the Vatican Council to the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus. Excommunicated on April 23, Doellinger united kindred spirits on May 28 to plan a congress which met the following September under Schulte's presidency. When the majority moved from protest to organizing a sect, however, Doellinger separated from the movement to live in excommunicated isolation until his death.

Sectarianism. During 1873 an assembly of twenty-two priests and fifty-five Old Catholic laymen at Cologne elected Joseph Reinkens bishop of the new sect, and he received consecration from the Jansenist prelate of Deventer, August 11. Though excommunicated by Pope Pius IX on November 11, 1873, during the same year Reinkens was recognized as "Catholic bishop" by the governments of Prussia, Bavaria, and Hesse-Darmstadt. During 1874 the Bonn congress of the Old Catholics adopted an ecclesiastical constitution worked out by Schulte. Each national church was declared independent, and government was shared with lay delegates. A loose union was effected with the Utrecht Jansenists in 1889, but even with considerable secular backing, the combined sectaries never exceeded 150,000. After the *Kulturkampf*, they not only declined in numbers, but began to discard Catholic teachings and practices, such as clerical celibacy, auricular confession, and fasting and abstinence. They eventually reached some understanding with the Anglicans, and intercommunion was sanctioned between Anglicans and Old Catholics n 1931.

83. FRENCH NEO-BONAPARTISM

A. *The Second Republic: 1848*

(1) REVOLUTIONS OF 1848

Orléanist collapse. By February, 1848, the Orléans monarchy had for one reason or another alienated the majority of Frenchmen. Liberal reformers organized "banquets" to promote a movement for extension of the suffrage. When Premier Guizot banned these political rallies, the agitation got out of hand and the Socialists mounted the barricades. Riots ensued during which royal troops fired on the mob. A cry arose: "Louis Philippe massacres us as did Charles X; let him go join Charles X." The "King of the French" could take a hint; as "Mr. Smith" he followed his royal predecessor into English exile, February 24, 1848.

Provisional government. The successful rebels proclaimed a Second Republic, but the provisional government reflected the heterogeneous nature of the new regime. The Revolution had not been directed against the Church, and "Catholic liberals" were popular for a time. Lamennais was elected along with Lacordaire to the legislature, and the poet Alphonse Lamartine became premier. He was, however, checked by the Republican leader Ledru-Rollin, and Louis Blanc, pre-Marxian Socialist. The latter devised a system of "national workshops," a sort of badly managed W.P.A. for the Parisian workers, and induced the provisional government to guarantee "the right to work": public insurance of work relief.

Bourgeois reaction. But Blanc's attacks on private property alarmed the middle class and the peasantry. The April elections based on manhood suffrage gave these groups a majority in the new assembly. But when they decreed abolition of the "national workshops," the proletariat rebelled in June. Sanguinary street fighting followed, during which Archbishop Denis Affre of Paris lost his life in attempting to mediate. At length General Louis Cavaignac was given temporary dictatorial powers and suppressed the insurrection firmly.

(2) COMING OF THE "PRINCE-PRESIDENT"

Presidential elections next occupied the center of the stage. Since the Socialists were discredited, and the "Catholic Liberals" too few, the contest lay between General Cavaignac and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte (1808–73), nephew of the famous Napoleon. Cavaignac was a resolute and honest soldier, but had incurred unpopularity by his stern repression of the June riots. Bonaparte, an adventurer, had the advantage of not being implicated in any of the party contests of the foregoing administration. He was profuse in references to "my great uncle," whom he re-

sembled chiefly in his campaign promises: patriots would learn the glories of a new militarism; industrialists might be certain that private property would be safe; the commoners need not fear the loss of universal suffrage won by the Second Republic. Bonaparte courted Catholics in particular, by assuring them of revision of the prevailing secularized education and support for Pius IX in his troubles with the Roman Republic. Elected deputy in September, Bonaparte successfully continued his campaign in the Chamber until the elections of December, 1848. When the votes were counted, he had 5,500,000 to Cavaignac's 1,500,000, Ledru-Rollin's 370,000, and Lamartine's 17,000.

B. Bonapartist Conservatism (1848–59)

(1) THE PRESIDENCY (1848–52)

The "Prince-President" took the oath of office December 20, 1848. Though he pledged himself to maintain the Republic, his whole previous career had been devoted to restoration of his dynasty, and he continued to exploit the Napoleonic legend. Shrewdly he worked to conciliate as many groups as possible, paying at least one dividend on each of his campaign promises. Clericals were pleased by the papal relief expedition and religious instruction in the schools. Laborers heard of an old age pension. Citizens were assured that the president would defend universal manhood suffrage against any bourgeois attempts to restrict it. It was in fact on the pretext of protecting democracy against a reaction to privilege that Bonaparte assumed dictatorial powers on December 2, 1851— though not without bloodshed. Thereafter his campaign for a crown was obvious: his term of office was lengthened; military reviews in uniform were frequent; "spontaneous" outbursts of "vive l'empereur" were condoned. At length a managed plebiscite, November 21, 1852, restored the Bonapartist empire, and the following December 2, anniversary of his "great uncle's" coronation, Louis Bonaparte proclaimed himself Napoleon III, though without explicit papal sanction.

(2) CONSERVATIVE IMPERIALISM (1852–59)

Domestic policies. Guedalla has caustically termed Bonaparte's reign as the "tragedy of an *arriviste* who arrived." [7] Once in power, Napoleon III displayed few basic policies. At first he strove to give the real benefits to the Conservatives while beguiling Liberals with promises. Liberty for education and freedom of communication with the Holy See conciliated believers. The Liberal *bourgeoisie* were assured that the Socialist threat to property would not return, and that the government would take full cognizance of the Industrial Revolution and of laissez-faire economic

[7] Philip Guedala, *The Second Empire* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923), p. 242.

theory. Republicans were cajoled by lip service to universal suffrage and frequent plebiscites—as free as any Nazi election. Workingmen were encouraged by subsidies and democratic fraternization from the sovereign, while the socially talented Empress Eugénie (1826–1920) fascinated the old aristocracy. Behind this façade, Bonaparte ruled by muzzling the legislature and censoring the press.

Foreign affairs. The Napoleonic legend demanded glory and conquest, even if Napoleon III had promised, "the empire means peace." In his efforts to fill his uncle's far larger military boots, Napoleon III made most of his worst mistakes. At first, it is true, he seemed successful. African colonial expansion harmed no European power, and the Crimean War (1854–56) was a crusade against barbarism, autocracy, or schism— whatever each party at home might choose to call it. But the Italian question proved a two-edged sword. Napoleon wished to dominate Italy and yet please Liberals by assisting in Italian liberation; he would unite Italians without destroying the Papal State. He made halfhearted efforts to realize now one, now the other of such incompatible objectives. Though he was eventually induced to intervene, an "inspired" writer Dela Gueronniere suggested in *Napoleon III et l'Italie* and *Le Pape et le Congrès* a temporal power restricted to Rome. All these shifty maneuvers raised a storm of criticism from the right. To conciliate criticism itself, Napoleon III embarked on a "Liberal" course.

(3) CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

Clerical influence in the state was comparatively strong during this conservative period. Napoleon III allowed his uncle's "Organic Articles" to lie dormant; provincial councils and episcopal communication with Rome were unhampered. Cardinals were given seats in the French senate; certain clerical stipends were increased; and chaplains were named for the armed forces. Religious orders were unrestricted, Sunday observance was enforced and sacrilege suppressed, and the police confiscated antireligious books. Empress Eugénie, a practicing Catholic, contributed to the foundation of many new churches. Clericalism, then, was influential, but was also accused of being officious and avaricious. If the aristocracy and *bourgeoisie* gave an impression of piety, these circles were satirized as "more clerical than believing."

Religious instruction. Bonaparte rewarded Catholics for their support in the presidential election by naming Frederic, vicomte de Falloux (1811–85), minister of education. This ardent Catholic sponsored a bill which permitted erection of primary and secondary schools under direction of duly qualified religious or lay teachers. "Study certificates" and state examinations for diplomas were abolished, and the baccalaureate opened to pupils in seminaries and religious schools. Though Falloux

went out of office in 1849, his successor Pariou put through what was to be known as the "Falloux Law," March 15, 1850. This measure was deemed acceptable, if not perfect, by Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans and the comte de Montalembert, though denounced by Veuillot for what it withheld. The monopoly on education hitherto possessed by the Rationalist university was broken, some hierarchical influence on higher education was conceded, and private religious schools were authorized. Though the university still conferred degrees, Napoleon III prevented it from using this prerogative to the serious detriment of Catholics during the conservative period. It would seem by Catholic standards that the Falloux Law did much good. Within two years 257 Catholic schools had been set up, and 52 secular institutions closed for want of attendance. Councils of instruction, composed of both clerics and laymen, supervised these schools.

(4) CLERICAL CONTROVERSIES

Parties unfortunately existed within the ranks of the practicing Catholics, who were divided on issues of papal and secular government. In the Ultramontane camp, Louis Veuillot (1813–83), lay editor of the *Univers*, was as uncompromising and extreme in his zeal as W. G. Ward of the *Dublin Review*, and he sometimes confused papal infallibility with inspiration. Unlike the legitimism of Louis Pie (1815–80), bishop of Poitiers, Veuillot, however, declared that there were no more truly Catholic princes and urged the Church to throw in its lot with the people and a democratic form of secular government. The leader of the moderates, Bishop Dupanloup, was not a Gallican, though an opportunist. Staunchly loyal to the Holy See, he endeavored yet to explain and soften intransigent papal pronouncements, and to persuade the government to cease sponsoring Italian unification.

Controversies were all too numerous. In 1850 the Gallican Archbishop Sibour of Paris promulgated conciliar decrees against meddling lay editors, with special animus against Veuillot. The latter, however, appealed to Rome and was defended by the nuncio, Monsignor Fornari, a provocative Ultramontane who placed all progressive works on the Index. Disputes resumed in 1851 when Abbé Gaume denounced the pagan classics as a menace to Catholic education, with Veuillot's support. This time Bishop Dupanloup and others took the opposite view and gained many episcopal signatures on behalf of the indicted works. Meanwhile Archbishop Sibour and fifteen bishops issued a manifesto defending "legitimate Gallican customs," and the archbishop condemned the *Univers* in 1853. Under pressure from Rome and other members of the hierarchy, Sibour withdrew his ban. In 1853 the pope approved the use of the pagan classics and gently and indirectly, but firmly, rejected all

Gallicanism, including that of the episcopal manifesto. Assassination of Archbishop Sibour in 1857 by a disgruntled cleric and the attack on the Papal State (1859) served to unite clerical factions.

C. Bonapartist Liberalism (1859–70)

(1) LIBERAL POLITICS

Domestic Policies. About 1860, therefore, Napoleon III proclaimed that he was "liberalizing" his government and permitting criticism of his ministers by the legislature. Limited freedom of debate and of the press was conceded. At the same time Napoleon assured Catholics that he would never desert Pius IX—and did maintain a garrison at Rome until July, 1870. But some of the spirit of the Organic Articles now returned. Despite this show of Liberalism, Napoleon III was still able to have his own way in domestic affairs until 1869 when the government won its re-election by less than a million votes. Then Napoleon went the whole way toward Liberalism by conceding ministerial responsibility. With the Liberal Ollivier as his Mirabeau, he seemed to have found the right formula again, for in May, 1870, a plebiscite returned him 7,000,000 ayes to 1,500,000 nays.

Foreign affairs once again proved Napoleon's undoing. He tried to distract French attention abroad, but now he was trying to create situations in which he might recoup his waning prestige. The Polish Revolt of 1863 afforded him a good chance to appease both Catholics and Liberals, but he hesitated too long and confined himself to protest. In Mexico he proposed collecting capitalists' debts while installing a Catholic monarch—a double-headed venture such as always tempted him. When the anticlerical President Juárez imperiled the project, French troops had to be used to occupy Mexico. But after the Civil War the United States bluntly reminded Napoleon of the Monroe Doctrine, and the French ruler beat an ignominious retreat, leaving Maximilian to his fate. Thereafter the ailing monarch was clearly fumbling at the diplomatic controls. He turned attention to Germany where Bismarck's Prussia loomed too large after defeating Austria in 1866. Would not Bismarck in compensation permit France to annex Belgium, or Luxemburg, or a south German state in exchange for giving Prussia a free hand in reorganizing Germany? The wily Iron Chancellor played his imperial fish until Prussia was secure, and then refused.

Imperial collapse. Against his better judgment Napoleon III took the last plunge. Yielding to Ollivier's assurance that a firm stand was needed against Hohenzollern candidacy for the Spanish throne, he furnished provocation for Bismarck's garbled "Ems Despatch" in such wise as to inflame public opinion in Germany and France. Urged on by Eugénie to save the dynasty, Napoleon sought to rally all Frenchmen to a war

against Prussia. But they marched out on Bastile Day, 1870, only to surrender at Sedan in September. This was a signal for proclamation of the Third Republic, and a third French monarch sought asylum in England. Few Catholics regretted his departure, but the demagogue, Léon Gambetta, who led Paris in overthrowing Neo-Bonapartism, would presently give the new regime its war cry: "Clericalism: there is the enemy."

(2) THE CHURCH AND LIBERAL IMPERIALISM

The temporal power. When Napoleon III in *Le Pape et Le Congrès,* December, 1859, had suggested that papal sovereignty might conveniently be confined to Rome, Pius IX rejected this advice in *Nullis Certe,* January, 1860. Publication of this encyclical by the *Univers* resulted in suppression of that review until 1867. Bonaparte tried to apologize, but Bishop Pie retorted scornfully: "Wash thy hands, O Pilate; posterity spurns thy justification."

Local restrictions multiplied. In 1863 the secularist Duruy was made minister of education and began to attenuate the Falloux Law's enforcement, while Persigny as minister of the interior imposed regulations on the St. Vincent de Paul Society and dissolved it. While the government's favor to the Church wore thin, and religious were often criticized, Ernest Renan (1828–92) produced in 1863 a rationalist *Life of Jesus* which shocked France.

The Syllabus of Errors, therefore, exploded in 1864 within a tense atmosphere. Napoleon forbade its publication within France, and the Gallican Rouland indicted Ultramontanism in the French senate. To this Cardinal Bonnechose replied by deploring the placing of Gallican interests before those of the Roman pontiff, and Bishop Pie and Veuillot upheld the most extreme interpretations of the papal document. Bishop Dupanloup made a prudent distinction between "thesis and hypothesis": the *Syllabus* set forth an ideal Catholic society, but adaptation to existing conditions was left to the prudent conscience of the faithful. Archbishop Darboy of Paris urged "wisdom and conciliation." The controversy gradually died down in the public prints, though it still smoldered under the surface. Thus the last decade of the Bonapartist regime proved a transition to the open anticlericalism of the Third Republic.

Catholic life. The prelates and curés seemed by now to lack close contact with their people. Though generally zealous, they were prone to combat past errors and to resist change. Religious orders indeed increased in personnel. Yet despite many charitable works and many contemporary saints,—St. Jean Vianney and St. Sophie Barat among them —the breakdown of the Christian tradition in France seems to date from the middle of the nineteenth century. The country people tended to lose their pious traditions with their provincial dress, and parochial

missions did not entirely halt this process. Though baptism, First Communion, ecclesiastical marriage and burial, remained conventional, Sunday observance and even Easter Duties began to be neglected by many. The anticlerical press weakened the Church's influence among the people, and at Paris and Lyons bitter anti-anticlericalism was in evolution.

84. GERMAN UNIFICATION

A. *Nationalism and the State (1848–71)*

(1) LIBERAL NATIONALISM (1848–62)

Liberal uprisings (1848–49) finally ended the surface tranquility of the Metternich System. Since 1845 there had been petitions for national autonomy in the Austrian monarchy, and demands for a constitution forced Metternich into exile. The Hungarian masonic leader, Louis Kossuth (1802–91), seized this opportunity to proclaim a Hungarian Republic, while a Pan-Slavic conference met at Prague in Bohemia. In Germany, princes were forced by other revolts either to abdicate or concede liberal constitutions. By May, 1848, Liberals and nationalists were meeting at Frankfurt to design a new German federal government. Before the end of the year this body had drawn up the "Fundamental Rights of the German Nation," a variation of the French Revolution's "Rights of Man and the Citizen." During April, 1849, the Frankfurt assembly produced a constitution for a federated parliamentary monarchy, and offered the crown to Frederick William IV of Prussia, who had been one of the first rulers to concede a constitution.

Conservative reaction (1848–50), however, had set in by this time. Revolt began to lose ground where it had begun—Vienna. Here the Liberals proved to be divided among themselves regarding details of a constitution, and various subject nationalities of the Habsburg monarchy were contending for primacy. When radical leaders came to the fore, the conservative military class used the consequent disorder as a reason for counterrevolution. In June, 1848, General Windischgrätz subjugated Bohemia, dispersing the Pan-Slav Congress. In October the military aristocrat Schwarzenberg seized Vienna and made himself chancellor. After securing Ferdinand's abdication, Schwarzenberg installed the monarch's nephew, Francis III Joseph (1848–1916). Claiming that Ferdinand's concessions had been voided by the change of regime, the chancellor proceeded to restore much of the old system of government. Kossuth's Hungarian Republic was suppressed with Russian military assistance in August, 1849, and Austrian power was restored in northern Italy. Meanwhile in Prussia the Junker, Count Brandenburg, had become chancellor and had induced the king to spurn the Frankfurt offer as a "crown from the gutter." Frankfurt Liberals then made desperate

efforts to set up a German Republic, but were speedily suppressed. Schwarzenberg by 1850 felt strong enough to demand restoration of the old Germanic Confederation under Austrian presidency, and the vacillating Frederick William IV feared to assert Prussian claims to leadership at the expense of civil war in Germany. Thus, Metternich's system was in large measure restored under Schwarzenberg's new management. Though a number of paper constitutions survived, the only real gain was the abolition of serfdom. German Liberalism had failed, and would not have another opportunity until 1918. For about a decade after these mid-century revolts, Germany remained comparatively peaceful. German princes excluded known Liberals from political life, and, indeed, nationalistic patriots were now inclined to regard Liberal aims and means as visionary. Vowed to achieve unification of Germans at all costs, they were particularly susceptible to the successful methods of Otto von Bismarck (1815–98), who became Prussian premier in 1862, proposing to act "not by parliamentary speeches but by blood and iron."

(2) AUTOCRATIC NATIONALISM (1862–71)

Austro-Prussian duel. Bismarck was determined to unite Germany under Prussian hegemony to the exclusion of the multinational Austrian Monarchy. He approached his objective by devious ways. In 1863 King Christian IX of Denmark promulgated a common constitution for Denmark and the German state of Schleswig-Holstein which he ruled as duke. Bismarck branded this as alien aggression and summoned German patriots to repel it. Francis Joseph of Austria, the majority of whose subjects were non-German, perceived that the charge might be used against himself as well. Hence he sought to prove his German nationalism by joining Prussia in a war against Denmark. The Teutonic giants easily overwhelmed their tiny Danish neighbor and appropriated the disputed duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Bismarck proposed joint Austro-Prussian occupation of the area, apparently in the expectation that friction would develop between the leading German powers and give an excuse for war. He proceeded to isolate Austria diplomatically: Russia was pleased at Bismarck's offer of assistance in suppressing the Polish Revolt of 1863; Italy was promised Venice still in Austrian possession; Napoleon III was given vague hints of "compensations" in exchange for neutrality; Queen Victoria of Great Britain was reminded of her German ancestry and sympathies. When ready, June, 1866, Bismarck engineered intrigues against Austrian occupation of Schleswig-Holstein. When Austria complained to the Germanic Confederation Diet, Bismarck declared that Prussia seceded from the Confederation, and accused the Diet of virtual attack upon Prussia by sustaining Austria in a resolution. Prussian forces then launched their first modern

blitzkrieg against Austria, and within six weeks had routed the incompetent Austrian generals. Francis Joseph hastened to conclude the Treaty of Prague, August 23, 1866, whereby he ceded Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia, Venetia to Italy, and withdrew from the Germanic Confederation, which thereupon virtually came to an end. It was the termination of four centuries of Habsburg primacy in Germany; for the first time in her history Germany was to have a non-Catholic sovereign.

Prussian leadership within the remainder of the German states was a natural corollary of its population, size and power. In punishment for supporting Austria during the recent war, Hanover—since 1837 separated from the British crown—was annexed to Prussia, and Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Frankfurt were also appropriated. The remaining states north of the river Main were dragooned into the new North German Federation with Prussia at its head. In the new federation the Prussian monarch as president managed foreign and military affairs, and Prussian deputies in the Reichstag could outvote the other states combined. This left outside the new Prussian-dominated federation only the southern states of Baden, Bavaria, Hesse-Darmstadt, and Würtemberg. These Bismarck preferred to persuade than conquer. He bided his time until Napoleon III claimed his "compensations." When the latter secretly suggested that he be allowed to annex a part of southern Germany, Bismarck had only to inform the South German states of French designs in order to induce them to conclude hasty defensive alliances with the North German Federation. After carefully prepared diplomatic isolation of his intended French victim, Bismarck utilized the Spanish offer of a crown to a Hohenzollern prince to provoke war. He published a truncated version of diplomatic correspondence which made it appear that mutual royal insults had been exchanged between William I of Prussia and Napoleon III. The French were stampeded into declaring war on Bastile Day, 1870, but North and South Germans easily and quickly defeated the French armies, captured Napoleon and encircled Paris. During these common military successes, Bismarck had little difficulty in securing the adherence of the South German states to an enlarged Federation. On January 18, 1871, in the occupied Versailles palace, German leaders transformed the North German Federation into the "German Empire": the second or Hohenzollern Reich (1871–1918). King William of Prussia (1861–88) became Kaiser William, and Bismarck was his prophet.

B. *Nationalism and the Church*

(1) CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

Ecclesiastical unity in Germany had already been demonstrated during the Prussian Mixed Marriage Controversy which had crossed state

lines, and progress toward German political unification reacted upon the Church as well. Although limited state autonomy continued even under the Second Reich, so that the status of the Church varied somewhat with different constitutions and concordats with Rome, henceforth Catholic questions became chiefly national in scope. As before, no more than a survey of the developments in the leading Catholic and Protestant states can be attempted.

Austrian Concordat. With the Liberals discredited by the failure of the 1848 uprising, Francis Joseph was able to assert his personal wishes. The Revolution had swept away some Josephinist barnacles and these were not replaced. In 1850 Francis Joseph also renounced the *placet* by royal edict, and recognized episcopal right to inflict censures and to license theology professors in the University of Vienna. During 1851 Bishop Joseph Rauscher (1797–1875) of Seckau was instrumental in securing governmental recognition of canonical matrimonial regulations. Promoted to the archdiocese of Vienna in 1852, Rauscher was named plenipotentiary to arrange a concordat with the Holy See. This pact was concluded on August 18, 1855, and earned for Rauscher a cardinal's hat. In general, the Concordat guaranteed the Catholic Church all of her canonical rights and privileges as the state religion. Bishops were to be nominated by the monarch after consultation with the hierarchy, and subject to papal confirmation. Possession of and free administration of church property were assured. Seminaries were placed under exclusive episcopal supervision, while the teaching of the Catholic religion became obligatory in all state schools. Religious orders were granted their freedom, the Church remained free to regulate marriage, and all contrary civil laws were declared null. Until threatened by the Austro-Hungarian *Ausgleich* of 1867 this Concordat regulated Church-state relations. There was a resurgence of Catholic life. The hierarchy, if learned and conscientious, tended to be quite conservative, and not overly critical of the secular regime.

Prussian toleration. Catholic freedom was the rule during the greater part of the reign of Frederick William IV (1840–61). The 1848 constitution conceded Catholics liberty of worship, of discipline, of religious instruction, and of communication with Rome. This benign state of affairs continued for a decade. In 1858 when Prince William became regent for the ailing king, the new prime minister Anton von Hohenzollern (1858–62) was anti-Catholic in spirit and prone to denounce Catholics as unpatriotic. But when Bismarck succeeded as premier (1862–90), he at first refrained from such hostile expressions. He had been previously and was yet again to prove anti-Catholic, but for the moment the Iron Chancellor wished Catholic support for his schemes of German unification. Hence he blocked anti-Catholic legislation and even

restrained liberals from sectarian conflict. In 1869 Bismarck ignored a petition from German journalists, demanding suppression of the monasteries. Some Catholics were probably lulled into sleep by this toleration, but events soon demonstrated that Bismarck was but delaying his Kulturkampf until all the southern German states, largely Catholic, were safely in the Second Reich.

Bavarian Febronianism revived after the deposition of Prince Louis in 1848. Prime Minister Chlodwig Hohenlohe (1866-70), whose brother the cardinal was almost disloyal to the Vatican, gave the Church much to suffer. But when he threatened religious instruction in the primary schools, the laity formed the Bavarian People's Party which overthrew the Hohenlohe ministry in 1870.

(2) Theological Schools and Controversies

Philosophical trends. In Germany, use of modern philosophy as a basis for theological speculation had not been extinguished with Hermes, condemned by Gregory XVI in 1835 for Rationalism. In place of a rejected Scholasticism, there appeared tendencies toward Kantian subjectivism or Hegelian historicism which would eventually lead to Modernism. The Tübingen School founded by Johann Möhler maintained high standards of historical scholarship and patristic theology. Its chief representatives during the century were Johann Kuhn (1806-87) and Karl von Hefele (1809-93). The former, a dogmatic theologian, was professor from 1839 to 1882, and the latter was historian of the Church councils and later bishop of Rothenburg. Though the school remained orthodox during the nineteenth century, there were already some tendencies in the direction of Modernism. At Munich, the great historian was Ignaz Doellinger (1799-1890), an outstanding luminary from 1826. But despite his immense learning, he was an egotistical and opinionated controversialist. If his trenchant criticism demolished many legends, it often degenerated into invective and hyper-criticism—all of which but enhanced his reputation in certain circles. One pattern is clear in his "thesis writing": he is nearly always anti-Jesuit, anticurial, against the papal temporal power. His sarcastic and utterly one-sided exposé of Luther infuriated Protestants. Doellinger was piqued by the staunch and sometimes excessive Ultramontanism of the German Mainz School. Yet the school had intelligent moderates in the theologian Matthew Scheeben (1835-88), the historians Joseph Hergenroether (1824-90) and Johannes Janssen (1829-91), whose disciple was Ludwig von Pastor (1854-1928).

Würzburg Discussions. For the first time since the Ems Congress of 1786, the German hierarchy met at Würzburg in 1848. Even in southern Germany, Febronianism had begun to pass out of fashion, and Bishop

Richarz of Augsburg was deemed reactionary in airing Febronian views. On the other hand, the bishops paid scant attention to Doellinger, who pleaded for a national church in his opposition to secularism. Archbishop Geissel of Cologne provided moderate and intelligent leadership in opposing the *placet* and the patronage system. He led the bishops in a circular to the governments which complained of secular interference in clerical training, lay education, clerical administration and bestowal of benefices. This was the first indication of a united hierarchy, capable of joining in firm and moderate demands.

Social movements. While Father Wilhelm Ketteler's pioneer indictment of Marxism—treated separately—attracted attention at Frankfurt in 1848, at the same time Canon Adam Lenning of Mainz organized the Pius-Verein in defense of Catholic interests. During October, 1848, delegates from all over Germany held the first of periodical general meetings. In 1849 the Bonifatius-Verein was founded on Doellinger's initiative to assist scattered Catholics in the Protestant districts of Germany; from 1850 to 1875 it received the active direction of Bishop Martin of Paderborn. The Munich Catholic Congress of 1863, however, witnessed Doellinger's daring and ill-advised plea for the "rights of theology" and complete "liberty of movement." Theologians from Mainz and Würzburg protested, and the meeting closed, amiably enough, but with an ambiguous compromise formula which revealed profound differences between the so-called "German" and "Roman" theological schools, i.e., Doellinger's group and the Ultramontanes.

(3) German Catholic Social Action

Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler (1811–77) proved to be the outstanding Catholic social leader of the period. At first a dueling Prussian bureaucrat, he had resigned from the civil service in 1837 in protest over the arrest of Archbishop Droste-Vischering. This was his first step toward a more fervent Catholic life. In 1843 he was ordained to the priesthood and devoted himself to the poor in country parishes. Elected to the Frankfurt Assembly in 1848, he won national attention by his defense of ecclesiastical liberty. He was perhaps the first critic of Marx's *Communist Manifesto* in the very year of its publication (1848). He resigned from the parliament in January, 1849, and became provost of St. Hedwig's in Berlin where he organized the first Corpus Christi procession since the Lutheran Revolt. In March, 1850, he was named bishop of Mainz and continued to occupy St. Boniface's see until his death. He now flayed princely absolutism and anticlerical Liberalism alike. He excoriated the Freemasons for their secrecy and Naturalism. Socialism was rejected, but he had a positive program of social reform to put in its place—as will be analyzed later. To this end he introduced

the Daughters of Charity and the St. Vincent de Paul Society, championed co-operatives, state relief, higher wages, shorter workingmen's hours, abolition of child labor, and mitigation of the hardships of women workers. These ideas which he disseminated in sermons and pamphlets were to be given wider application by Pope Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum* (1891).

Adolf Kolping (1813–65), like St. John Bosco, was a workman before his ordination to the priesthood. As a priest he devoted much of his time to helping laborers. One part of his program included the provision of community dwellings—"Kolping Houses"—for young journeyman artisans. Here the workers could receive religious, vocational, and recreational helps under the supervision of a chaplain. Founded in Elberfeld in 1845, the organization opened national headquarters in Cologne by 1851, and presently followed German emigrants to the United States.

Ludwig Windhorst (1812–91) was an outstanding Catholic lay leader. He began his career of social service as chairman of the Catholic school board in Hanover, and from 1848 to 1865 he was almost continuously in office as minister or legislator. After the Prussian annexation of Hanover in 1866, Windhorst entered the Federal Reichstag. Here in 1868 he formed a coalition of minority groups wronged by Prussia and entered into alliance with the Bavarian People's Party. Minor successes proved the utility of the venture, and in 1870 all these groups, largely but not exclusively Catholic, fused into the German Center Party with the professed aims of the defense of religion, democracy, and social justice. The *Kulturkampf* was to prove its strength and bring its membership up to one hundred deputies. With this strong minority bloc the Centrists safeguarded Catholic interests and co-operated in many beneficial national projects until their dissolution by Hitler in 1933.

85. IBERIAN ANTICLERICALISM

A. Spain: 1808–74

(1) Revolution and Reaction (1808–19)

Bonapartist Revolution. After interning the Spanish Bourbon royal house at Bayonne in France during 1808, Napoleon Bonaparte had commissioned his brother Joseph to remodel the Spanish monarchy on the French state. Social and administrative changes in keeping with the ideas of the French Revolution were announced, and King Joseph suppressed the Inquisition and decreed confiscation of religious houses. While these changes were welcomed by a few Spanish Jacobins, foreign rule was something which no Spaniard would tolerate, so that Joseph had scarcely a peaceful day during his nominal reign (1808–13).

Liberal resistance. From the *Dos de Mayo* uprising in 1808, Spanish guerillas conducted a war of liberation against the French. With British assistance they wore down and cut off French armies, and by 1813 expelled them from Spanish territory. Meanwhile a provisional junta had been set up. A Cortes met near Cadiz during September, 1810. Though opened by Mass, this assembly was dominated by Liberals from the Catalonian provinces in the absence of delegates from French-occupied Castile. Using the French Constitution of 1791 as a model, the Liberals in 1812 issued a similar document. Though Catholicity was recognized as the sole legal religion, clerical privileges were curtailed and smaller religious houses suppressed. When protests were made by the hierarchy, the papal nuncio was expelled and some bishops exiled. Subsequent electoral success by Conservatives restrained the Liberals from further measures.

Legitimist reaction. Liberal excesses had alienated many Spaniards, and former Crown Prince Ferdinand was able to regain his throne (1813–33). Though he temporized with facile promises, he was unalterably opposed to any deviation from absolutism. By 1814 he utilized a conservative reaction to abolish the constitution and arrest Liberal chiefs. Prerevolutionary conditions returned: confiscated church property was restored, the Jesuits recalled, and the Inquisition re-established. But the king displayed little prudence in government and even Conservatives dared not defend his personal morality. He set himself against any recognition of the Industrial Revolution, or any departure from mercantilist policy toward the American colonies. These colonies, left to themselves during the French occupation of Spain, were ill-disposed toward subjection, much less to absolutism.

(2) LIBERAL REPRESSION (1819–33)

Liberal triennium (1820–23). Late in 1819 the king concentrated troops at Cadiz for the suppression of revolutions in Latin America. Liberal agitators demoralized the soldiers and in January, 1820, Colonel Riego led a successful insurrection which held the king virtually a prisoner until 1823. During the next three years Spanish history paralleled that of France between 1789 and 1792: the monarch was a figurehead, secretly intriguing for foreign intervention, while a bourgeois assembly effected a revolution. The order to proclaim the Constitution of 1812 provoked violence, and the bishop of Vich and other clerics were murdered. Liberal ministries confiscated church goods to allay financial stress, abolished the clerical tithes and banished the Jesuits. Feudal rights and distinctions were done away with. As in the French Revolution, the Radicals rapidly forged ahead and it was the latter group who ruled by 1822 through assassination and violence.

Autocratic reversal. Such excesses strengthened Metternich's hand and he deputized the duc d'Angoulême, nephew of Louis XVIII of France, to lead an expedition into Spain in the name of the Quadruple Alliance. The antagonism of the Spanish nobility to the Liberal program and the loyalty of the peasants to the clergy made the invasion a comparatively easy task. After the Battle of Trocadero, August 31, 1823, had routed the Liberals, the king restored the Old Regime once more— though this time the Inquisition stayed abolished. Ferdinand VII spent the rest of his reign in taking a terrible vengeance on Liberal partisans. But the uprising enabled most of the Latin American colonies to establish their independence. Yet the king would not recognize their loss nor permit invasion of the *real patronado* over the sees of the revolted lands. When the Holy See reorganized the Latin American hierarchy notwithstanding, the king refused to receive the papal nuncio. Pope Leo XII warned the monarch: "Because we place bishops where you have not exercised authority for twelve years, should you threaten your loyal estates of Spain with a controversy with the Holy See? Our duties are from above." Eventually the king acquiesced.

(3) LIBERAL ASCENDANCY (1833–43)

Disputed succession to Ferdinand's throne undid the Conservative victory. The Bourbons had introduced the Salic Law into Spain, which had previously permitted rule by women. According to the Bourbon custom, Ferdinand's heir was his brother Don Carlos, like the French Charles d'Artois a reactionary champion of union of "Throne and Altar." But masonic propaganda and the scheming of Ferdinand's fourth wife, Christina of Naples, induced the doting monarch to alter the succession in favor of his daughter Isabella (1830–1904). Accordingly when Ferdinand VII died in September, 1833, Christina assumed the regency for Queen Isabella II who nominally held the throne until her deposition in 1868.

The Carlist War (1833–40) followed when Don Carlos challenged this arrangement. To his standard rallied Conservatives, together with most of the clergy. This forced Doña Christina to turn to the Liberals, whose support she consolidated by conceding a constitution in 1837. The Liberals responded eagerly under the leadership of General Baldomero Espartero (1792–1879). Anticlerical riots broke out in Madrid and other cities in 1834–35. Some nine hundred religious houses were suppressed by Premier Mendizabal in an "emergency measure." The 1837 Constitution confirmed "nationalization" of clerical property and the abolition of the tithes and annates. All religious orders save the Escolapians and Hospitalers were dissolved. Bishops who protested were expelled until, by 1843, half of the Spanish sees were vacant.

Though Don Carlos enjoyed the support of Metternich, the advent of the Orléans monarchy in France prevented any repetition of 1823. Don Carlos tried to win the provinces by promising provincial autonomy against the Liberals' centralizing trend. The Basques did declare for him, but in the long run sectionalist rivalry became a plague for Spain. The Liberals, on the other hand, enjoyed the powerful support of Louis Philippe of France and the British minister Palmerston. Nevertheless the struggle proved severe. No quarter was given at times and well-nigh indelible hatreds engendered. The Carlist forces broke up in dissension in 1839. Don Carlos fled to pretend abroad, and in 1840 General Cabrera surrendered the last armed forces. Don Carlos's descendants kept up pretensions to the Spanish throne until the extinction of their line in 1936; diehard legitimists still find pretenders.

Radical Liberalism became the rule when General Espartero deposed Queen Christina and assumed the regency for himself (1840–43). Wholesale arrest and exile of bishops and priests followed to make way for pastors enjoying the government's confidence. By 1841 only six sees had canonical incumbents. Pope Gregory XVI denounced the government's tactics in March, 1841, and during 1842 asked public prayers for a change in Spain.

(4) Predominantly Conservative Era (1843–68)

Conservative reaction. Spaniards themselves heeded the papal request in the summer of 1843 when a coalition of Conservatives and Moderate Liberals overthrew Espartero and proclaimed Isabella II of age. Clerical exiles were permitted to return, and relations resumed with the Holy See in 1845. Protracted negotiations culminated in 1851 in a concordat with the Holy See. By its terms the Church renounced confiscated properties—estimated at nearly $200,000,000 at 1938 rates—in exchange for government subsidies for public worship and payment of clerical salaries. Canonical institution was now conceded to governmental nominations to bishoprics, and special provision was made for seminaries. Officially the 1851 Concordat remained in force until 1931, but there were numerous suspensions during Liberal relapses, and subsidies were meager and often in arrears, stationary amid rising prices.

Liberal relapse (1854–56). When the Conservatives announced their intention of revising the Liberal constitution, the coalition dissolved. A "progressive" biennium followed, again directed by Espartero. The latter at once passed some anticlerical legislation, but when he proposed sale of all church property and discontinuance of governmental subsidies entirely, the Moderates disagreed and dismissed him.

Moderate regimes (1856–68). Succeeding governments were dominated either by the Moderate Liberal leader, General O'Donnell (1809–

67) or the Conservative, Ramón Narváez (1800–1868). The former, premier in 1856 and from 1857 to 1863, proposed less drastic appropriation of church property and sponsored Liberalism at home and abroad. But he had repealed Espartero's legislation and in 1860 reached a supplementary agreement with the Holy See regarding some violations of the Concordat. Premier Narváez arrested Liberals and sponsored political reaction. But his death and that of O'Donnell deprived Spain of experienced administrators, and the incompetent ministry of Bravo permitted another Radical revolt that overthrew the monarchy. Queen Isabella fled to France, involving in her merited discredit her long-suffering and dragooned spiritual advisor, St. Antonio Claret.

(5) LIBERAL CRISES (1868–74)

Anticlerical monarchy. After Isabella's deposition, a regency was installed while Spain advertised for a Liberal constitutional monarch. The Cortes of 1869 proclaimed a neutral regime based on popular sovereignty, with freedom of cult, education, and press. Civil marriage was authorized, but "freedom of association" did not apply to religious orders, which were restricted. Indeed, debates on the new constitution revealed some fanatical atheism such as the plea of Suner y Capdevila: "Would that Spaniards had no religion. I intend to devote myself to the dissemination of this great teaching: War on God!" Riots, church-burnings and confiscations occurred in Madrid and elsewhere. In 1870 the vacant throne was accepted by Amadeo, younger son of Victor Emmanuel II of Italy, destroyer of the Papal States. Though endeared to Liberals by such an environment, King Amadeo (1870–73) spent himself in vain trying to reconcile Carlists, Alfonsists, Liberals, Republicans, Radicals, Clericals. Spanish patriotism had been outraged by choice of a foreign king, and in February, 1873, Amadeo abdicated in disgust and returned to Italy.

The First Republic (1873–74) was immediately proclaimed by the Radical majority in the Cortes. The Republicans, however, were divided on the degree of centralization to give the administration, and four presidents passed in rapid succession. All of the leaders of the Republic united in opposition to the Church, however, and riots and arson resumed. One of the presidents, Pi y Margall, asserted that Catholicity was outmoded both for humanity and the Spanish people. This Spaniards recognized as nonsense and Carlists took the field along with partisans of Don Alfonso, son of the deposed Queen Isabella II. For about a year a three-cornered civil war went on until the leading generals, disgusted with the anarchy, overthrew the Republic late in December, 1874.

Alfonsist restoration followed upon the handsome young prince's magic phrase that he would be a "Good Spaniard, good Catholic, and

good Liberal." Proclaimed Alfonso XII (1874–85), the new king restored the 1851 Concordat with slight modifications, paid the arrears of clerical stipends, and inaugurated a moderate regime which for the most part kept on outwardly polite terms with the Church until overthrown by the Second Republic in 1931. The 1876 Constitution, in operation until 1923, proclaimed religious liberty and parliamentary government, though the latter proved more nominal than real. Liberals and Conservatives, more or less anticlerical, would rotate in power until the next major Spanish explosion in the twentieth century.

B. Portugal: 1809–1910

(1) Portuguese Analogies to Spain (1809–34)

Revolutionary conditions. Portuguese history during the early part of the nineteenth century presented many resemblances to that of Spain. Like Spain, Portugal felt the force of French invasion, though her royal family escaped to the American colony of Brazil. During the royal absence (1807–22), Portugal became a battlefield. Bishop de Castro of Porto formed a junta to resist the French and invoked English aid. An expeditionary force was sent under Lord Beresford who exercised martial law from 1809 to 1820. British occupation authorities did not seriously interfere with the Catholic Church, but Liberals were naturally in favor.

Royal restoration. Continuance of martial law after the war incensed Portuguese patriots who expelled the English during Beresford's absence. In 1820 a Portuguese assembly adopted a constitution similar to the Spanish charter of 1812: feudal privileges were abolished; clerical prerogatives curtailed; church property "nationalized"; and some religious orders disbanded. After freedom of the press and popular sovereignty had been proclaimed, the king was invited to return to enjoy a merely suspensive veto over a unicameral Cortes. John VI, regent since 1792 and king since 1816, returned to Portugal in 1822 after appointing Crown Prince Pedro regent of Brazil. John perforce accepted the Liberal Constitution, but his younger son, Dom Miguel, denounced the document and built up a reactionary party. Miguel succeeded in dissolving the constituent Cortes, but the king was preparing a compromise when he died.

Dynastic dispute. John's middle-of-the-road policies had pleased neither his Liberal son Pedro nor his reactionary son Miguel. Dom Pedro had been proclaimed "Emperor of Brazil" in 1822 to avert complete separation of that colony from the Braganza dynasty, and Brazilians objected to reunion of the royal authority in one person. Dom Pedro accordingly returned to Portugal merely to abdicate the Portuguese crown in favor of his infant daughter, Maria da Gloria. After

betrothing her to her uncle, Dom Miguel, Pedro left the regency in the latter's hands, but exacted a promise to support the Liberal Constitution. Then Pedro returned to Brazil.

Miguelist Civil War. In 1828, however, Dom Miguel abolished the constitution and proclaimed himself "autocratic king." Liberals were repressed and clerical support courted. There followed a protracted civil contest during which Dom Pedro was assisted by the British navy to return to Portugal from Brazil where he had left his infant son Pedro II in nominal possession of the throne. By May, 1834, the prevailing sentiment for Miguel had been overcome by force of arms, largely supplied from without. Dom Miguel went into exile on a pension, though his partisans, like those of Don Carlos in Spain, long kept up pretensions to the throne. Dom Pedro then restored the Liberal regime. Prelates favorable to Miguel were replaced by his own nominees. Clerical tithes were abolished without compensation, and religious orders declared suppressed and their properties confiscated. All secular benefices were subjected to governmental appointment. Relations were broken off with the Vatican, but Pedro's death in September, 1834, put a halt to further attacks on the Church, a month after Gregory XVI had denounced the regime.

(2) LIBERAL ALIENATION (1834–83)

Queen Maria II (1826–53), though personally well disposed to the Church, had great difficulty in modifying the Liberal regime bequeathed to her by her father. By 1840, however, she succeeded in replacing some of Pedro's fanatical accomplices with more moderate Liberals, so that negotiations could be reopened with the Vatican. Even then a concordat proved impossible, and the best that could be achieved in 1841 was a limited understanding which permitted reopening of some seminaries under governmental supervision. Confiscated property was renounced by the Holy See, and canonical institution given to governmental nominees to bishoprics. But the government continued to dispose of lesser benefices, and even the administration of the sacraments failed to escape its meddling. The Church was deprived of nearly all voice in education, except that the catechism might be taught in the state primary schools. Private schools were allowed, but did not attain the success achieved in contemporary France. Finally, the whole educational system continued to be dominated by the rationalistic University of Coimbra.

Clerical conformity to Liberalism was the worst feature of the Portuguese scene during the nineteenth century. Many clerics who had been educated in government-controlled seminaries or colleges were passive or even favorable to the most flagrant manifestations of Liberalism.

Some prelates even co-operated in masonic functions, while ecclesiastical sodalities sometimes became virtual subsidiaries of the masonic lodges. During 1862 Pope Pius IX saw fit to protest to the patriarch of Lisbon regarding the entire Portuguese hierarchy: "No public testimony has come to prove that you have displayed in the fulfillment of your episcopal charge the vigilance and energy which are necessary. . . . Difficulties could doubtless hinder you from coming to us, but it is not less evident that nothing could hinder you from sending letters." Yet despite this rebuke, only two bishops from Portugal were present at the Vatican Council in 1870.

Maria's sons, Pedro (1853–61) and Luis (1861–89), effected no substantial change in this situation. They were children of Maria and Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and thus the male line of the Braganza dynasty ceased to rule in Portugal, though continuing in Brazil until the revolution of 1889. The advocates of Dom Miguel and his descendants accordingly renewed their agitation, and like the Spanish Carlists struck a discordant note in politics. Religious apathy continued. Introduction of the Daughters of Charity was followed by a masonic campaign of abuse until the king was obliged to demand their recall. When Luis in 1872 attempted to give legal recognition to some religious orders, Liberals, and Masons—who often displayed their lodge insignia openly in parliament—forced him to desist. Some religious continued to work in Portugal and her colonies without legal sanction, but the Goa schism in Portuguese India revealed considerable insubordination to the Holy See even among the missionaries, while the crown refused to surrender its patronage claims.

(3) Partial Amelioration (1878–1903)

Pope Leo XIII (1878–1903), however, witnessed some improvement in the condition of the Church in Portugal. During 1883 a new modus vivendi was reached regarding seminaries, henceforth subjected to episcopal supervision. Dioceses were rearranged, some of them combined, and revenues of prelates reduced, thus removing a temptation to worldly noblemen. In 1886 the crown ceded some of its excessive patronage claims, and permitted the Holy See to reorganize the missionary hierarchy. As in France and Spain, Pope Leo urged Catholics to avoid mixing religion with politics, and to unite in defense of ecclesiastical interests. During 1895 a Catholic congress at Lisbon explored projects for social reform, though it must be admitted with slight results. In 1901 there was some renewed persecution of religious, eliciting a papal rebuke in 1902. Portuguese Catholics would have done well to heed the pope's renewed exhortation to unity, for the anticlerical Republic was at hand.

86. LIBERALISM AND CATHOLIC MINORITIES
A. *The Netherlands*

(1) THE UNITED NETHERLANDS (1815–30)

Retrospect. The Netherlands, comprising modern Belgium and Holland, had remained formally a part of the Holy Roman Empire until the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Since 1465, however, the various feudal states had been united under the Burgundian dynasty into a confederation with a common parliament. The Habsburgs succeeded to the Burgundian possessions in 1477, and the Netherlands were the birthplace of Emperor Charles V. Then they passed to his son, King Philip II of Spain, against whom the Dutch revolted in 1581. This resulted in a division of the Netherlands into predominantly Calvinist Holland, an independent aristocratic republic, and largely Catholic Belgium, a dependency of Spain until 1713, and of Austria to 1795. During the Revolution, both lands came under French domination from 1795 to 1814, and Catholics had shared in the persecution of the Jacobins and the limited blessings of the Napoleonic Concordat— against the latter a schism broke out which endured until 1957: the "Stevenists."

Reorganization. The Congress of Vienna, in the hope of forming a strong bulwark against renewed French aggression, had united Belgium with Holland in the kingdom of the Netherlands under the Protestant house of Orange which had hitherto enjoyed almost an hereditary presidency in Holland. This disregard of three centuries of hostility created resentment among the three million Belgian Catholics. To make matters worse, King William I (1815–40) was a religious bigot and a reactionary autocrat. He conceded a constitution, to be sure, but retained all real power. This constitution gerrymandered parliamentary representation in favor of the Dutch and ignored Belgian political traditions. It disestablished the Catholic Church in Belgium and annulled clerical privileges. Though equal protection was promised to all religions, King William appointed Dutch officials who consistently violated Belgian Catholic customs. Despite its rejection by Belgian "notables" and a "doctrinal decision" of the Catholic hierarchy that an oath of allegiance to it was illicit, the constitution was put in force during 1815 by royal fiat. Belgian resentment now united on one ground or another, Catholics, Liberals, patriots.

Allegiance controversy. The king promptly nominated Bishop De Mean of Liége, the only dissenter to the "doctrinal decision," to be archbishop of Malines. Pope Pius VII refused to confirm this appointment until the nominee should make a declaration that he took the oath of allegiance only insofar as it did not contradict Catholic doctrine, and

in particular should interpret the constitutional "protection" of all religions as merely civil. The king replied in 1816 by declaring the Organic Articles in force, and indicted the Catholic leader, Bishop De Broglie of Ghent, for communication with the Holy See and promulgation of papal documents without the governmental *placet* and *exequatur*. During 1817 the Court of Assizes sentenced Bishop De Broglie to exile, but the pope and the cathedral chapter resisted the king's efforts to install a successor. When De Broglie died in Paris in 1821, the king terminated this controversy by conceding that the oath of allegiance entailed assent to the merely political provisions of the royal constitution.

Education dispute. The king, however, sought to dominate education. The constitution had placed colleges under secular administration, and now a series of decrees (1821–25) subjected other schools to state control. In 1825 the king established the Philosophical College at Louvain and decreed that all seminarians must spend two years in attendance prior to their theological training. This measure evoked a protest even from the conciliatory Archbishop De Mean. The Belgian deputies in parliament voiced the popular indignation by remonstrances, and finally backed these up by a refusal to vote taxes. This opposition became so menacing that during 1827–28 King William negotiated a concordat with the Holy See which proposed to introduce the Napoleonic system of episcopal nominations and rescinded the decree regarding the Philosophical College. Calvinist opposition, however, induced the king to delay the actual suppression of the institution until 1830. Then the concession came too late to placate the Belgians, for Catholics and Liberals had formed a "Patriotic Union" against the common enemy. This Union rapidly gained strength and seized the example of the French July Revolution (1830) to issue a declaration of independence. Fighting began in September when Prince Frederick occupied Brussels. But the Belgians, supported by Louis Philippe and Palmerston, soon drove the Dutch from Belgium, and in 1832 the Great Powers recognized Belgian independence, although William did not acknowledge the accomplished fact until 1839.

(2) The Belgian Monarchy (1830–70)

Catholic-Liberal coalition (1830–46). The patriotic union elected the Protestant Leopold of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha to preside over a constitutional monarchy. A bicameral parliament was set up, chosen by the restricted suffrage so dear to bourgeois Liberals. Virtual separation of Church and state was decreed. While the government renounced appointments to ecclesiastical offices, it granted financial subsidies for maintenance of cult, exempted the clergy from military service, and guaranteed Catholic supervision of their schools and cemeteries. The

Catholic University of Louvain dates from 1835. Common fear of Holland and general satisfaction with the secular government preserved a truce between Catholics and Liberals during the early years of independence. Disputes about education were generally settled by compromise. Thus when in 1842 a law made Catholic religious instruction obligatory in the state schools, dissenters were conceded the right to erect their own private schools.

Liberal regime (1847–55). But masonic propaganda had been urging the Liberals to sponsor a program of secular education. In 1846 the Liberal Party Congress renounced the coalition and named their own candidates on a vague platform of "religious and political reform." The Catholics were negligent in forming their own organization so that the Liberals won a majority in the 1847 elections and installed their own ministry. Charles Rogier, leader of the Moderate Liberal majority, became premier (1847–53), though Walther Frère-Orban headed a Radical anti-Catholic minority. The Moderate Liberals professed to be merely neutral, but consistently worked for complete secularization. In 1849 charitable institutions were subjected to state control, and in 1850 a bill proposed secularization of schools. But in the Convention of Antwerp (1850) the Catholic hierarchy secured amendments permitting religious instruction belonging to the religion of the majority of the pupils, according to books approved by the hierarchy. Safeguards were also appended to prevent antireligious propaganda in other courses. This compromise brought temporary peace.

Clerical reaction (1855–57). The Catholic or Clerical Party won the 1854 elections on their budget program and Pierre Decker became premier from 1855 to 1857. In the latter year he proposed amendments to the Charitable Institutions Act of 1849 in the direction of subsidies to Catholic religious orders. Decker was an inept politician, and the Liberals defeated him with the slogan that he proposed endowing convents. Riots, probably engineered, forced Decker's resignation.

Liberal return (1857–70). Charles Rogier and the Liberals returned to office which they held until 1870. Although still stopping short of radical measures, they continued secularization. More charitable institutes were secularized in 1859; in 1862 they repealed the guarantee of religious control of cemeteries, and scholarships for Catholic education were confiscated in 1864. The Protestant King Leopold I (1831–65) was now succeeded by his Catholic son, Leopold II (1865–1909). Though not a stalwart Catholic, he urged moderation upon the Liberal ministers. When these, nevertheless, imposed military service on seminarians and novices, the Catholics were aroused. In 1870 they won the elections and themselves took over the ministry. They were yet to learn that Catholic vitality would provoke more radical opposition.

(3) THE DUTCH MONARCHY (1830–70)

Calvinist domination (1830–48). In Holland the Catholics were only about a third of the population, but were more alert and energetic than the Belgian majority. William I had granted religious toleration in the 1815 constitution, but he remained bitterly hostile to Catholicity. He surrounded himself with Calvinist bigots whose only regret was that the prerevolutionary Calvinist Establishment had not been fully restored. The Concordat of 1827–28 applied to Holland as well, but Calvinist opposition delayed its operation.

Catholic-Liberal coalition (1848–57). Hence, the Catholics allied themselves with the Liberals who were opposed to the regime on political grounds. Accession of the religiously indifferent William II (1840–49) paved the way for concessions. The revolutionary fever of 1848 induced the monarch to grant a new constitution, wherein the *placet* was abandoned and Catholics granted freedom of association and legal property rights. Pope Pius IX took this occasion to restore the Catholic hierarchy. In the brief *Ex Qua Die,* March, 1853, he created the archbishopric of Utrecht with four suffragan sees. Jan Zwijser became the first metropolitan (1853–68). The Calvinists at once stirred up a furore similar to that in England during 1850. Vast blanket petitions made the government hesitate, but it was at length placated by the papal concession that the bishops would be permitted to take an oath of civil allegiance to the new King William III (1849–90). A law authorizing governmental supervision of religious societies was passed, but this probable face-saving measure was eventually relaxed. Catholics and Liberals continued their fruitful political alliance against the die-hard Calvinist Conservatives.

Catholic-Conservative coalition (1857–70). During 1857, however, the Dutch Liberals reverted to the universal type by proposing a neutral school system. This led to a dramatic realignment of political parties. The orthodox Calvinists were equally opposed to secularist education, and some of their anti-Catholic bigotry had by now evaporated. Hence, a Liberal-sponsored law of 1857 which imposed strictly nonreligious primary schools induced the Calvinists to make common cause with the Catholics in opposition. Together they organized their own private school systems and also co-operated in using their influence in the appointment of public school teachers favorable to their interests wherever local autonomy permitted. During 1868 the Catholic hierarchy forbade the faithful to send their children to neutral schools wherever a Catholic school was available. Yet the Liberals persisted in their secularizing designs, and the suppression of diplomatic relations with the Holy See in 1870 may be taken to mark the opening of a more vigorous attack.

B. Switzerland

(1) THE REVIVED CONFEDERATION (1815–48)

Retrospect. The Zwinglian War had resulted in division of Switzerland into Catholic and Calvinist cantons. Since there was no central government, these retired communities went their separate and comparatively peaceful ways until the French Revolution. In 1798, however, Switzerland was organized into the French-dominated "Helvetic Republic" with a constitution patterned on the French. This opened questions of Centralism versus Localism, and of Secularism against Catholicity. During 1803 Napoleon Bonaparte conceded more local autonomy, but at the price of drafting Swiss soldiers into his continental armies. After Bonaparte's downfall, Switzerland reverted to cantonal separatism.

Conservatism (1815–32). The constitution of 1815 was in accord with the reactionary ideas of the Congress of Vienna. Certain changes, however, had to be conceded. In the old Confederation, there had been thirteen cantons, together with subject districts. The new Confederation was composed of twenty-two equal cantons. This modification destroyed the ancient balance between Catholic and Protestant cantons, and accordingly in the Diet a compromise was secured by granting nine and one-half votes each to the Catholic and Calvinist cantons. The remaining three votes were exercised by the mixed cantons of St. Gall, Aargau, and Glarus. Catholic monasteries were everywhere safeguarded. But this conservative arrangement was increasingly challenged by Liberals, including many political refugees from other lands.

Liberal challenge (1832–41). In March, 1832, representatives from seven liberalized cantons agitated for a closer federal union and a secularized constitution. They were supported by the insubordinate priest, Fuchs, who in January, 1834, proposed restraint of the Catholic Church by means of the *exequatur* and *placet*, secular supervision of seminaries, clerical appointments, matrimonial courts, and exaction of an oath of allegiance from the clergy. These "Articles" were condemned by Pope Gregory XVI, May 17, 1835. Since 1832 the Catholics had formed the League of Sarnen to resist constitutional change, and cantonal contests centered largely on the control of education. Despite temporary Liberal victories in several cantons, by 1841 the Catholics had regained their ground and had brought in the Jesuits to supervise Catholic religious instruction. Gregory XVI took this occasion (1841) to reorganize the Swiss dioceses, but the fact that Ticino remained subject to an Italian bishop proved a target for Liberals.

Civil conflict (1841–48). A decisive act proved to be the suppression of the Aargau monasteries (1841) in violation of the constitutional

guarantee. The Diet, after protesting ineffectually, acquiesced. Thereupon Catholic representatives concluded a defensive league upon which the Liberals—playing up the "Jesuit menace"—made an unsuccessful armed attack during December, 1844. The Catholic cantons strengthened their *Sonderbund* into a military alliance during 1845. This amounted to secession from the Swiss Confederation, and the Liberals called upon the Diet to suppress the *Sonderbund*. Two years of armed truce passed until the Radicals overcame Conservative opposition in the Diet. After the Radicals had secured control, in July, 1847, the Diet decreed dissolution of the *Sonderbund*, revision of the constitution, and expulsion of the Jesuits. General Guillaume Dufour, a former Bonapartist officer, was named commander-in-chief of the Liberal forces, and by December, 1847, he had conquered the *Sonderbund* with a minimum of bloodshed. Any interference from Metternich, who protested in January, 1848, was nullified by the Liberal revolutions of the next few months throughout the European Continent.

(2) Swiss Federation (1848–70)

The Federal Constitution of September, 1848, was devised by the Radicals under the lead of Jonas Furrer, first president of Switzerland and leading statesman for a generation. The executive was committed to a seven-man council. The American system of representation was followed in a bicameral legislature, responsible both to the cantons and the people. Religious liberty was guaranteed throughout the Federation, thereby abrogating cantonal exclusiveness. In virtue of so-called supervisory rights, the Jesuits were expelled and monasteries suppressed. Political success eventually attended the constitution, but religious peace was long in coming.

Religious strife was almost continuous. The Catholic champion, Bishop Marilley of Lausanne, was exiled. Catholics, worsted in war, turned to political action in which they sometimes received support of conservative Protestants against Liberalism. Many Catholics moved to former Protestant cantons where they took advantage of federal toleration to erect churches, form organizations, and edit newspapers. This provoked reprisals, and Catholic institutions and property were targets for cantonal attacks.

C. Scandinavia

(1) Denmark

Retrospect. The Catholic Church in Denmark had been completely crushed by the Protestant Revolt of the sixteenth century, and severe laws were directed against any possible missionary efforts of the Counter Revolution. Until 1849 the French embassy in Copenhagen possessed

the only legal Catholic chapel in Denmark, and the vast majority of the Danes had been lost to the ancient Faith.

Liberal concessions. In Scandinavia, Liberalism worked in favor of Catholics inasmuch as the Liberals clamored as usual for religious liberty against an established Lutheran religion. Warned by the revolutions of 1848, King Frederick VII conceded a Liberal constitution in 1849. This allowed dissenters, including Catholics, freedom of cult and freed them from payment of tithes to the Established Church. At the same time all citizens were guaranteed their civil rights. In 1852, moreover, the Lutheran Establishment was replaced by the privileged and subsidized status of a majority religion, for Danish Protestantism was honeycombed with indifferentism to an unusual degree.

Catholic progress followed the arrival of missionary priests and nuns, at first chiefly from Germany. They discovered that a few native Danish families had preserved the Faith during penal days. The Catholics began the Church of St. Ansgar in Copenhagen, and here in 1853 was preached the first public Catholic sermon in Danish since the Revolt. Catholics founded their own schools, hospitals, and orphanages, and these institutions, served by devoted religious, acquired a high reputation among non-Catholics. Protestants made use of their services and in this way converts were made with surprising rapidity in proportion to the Catholic numbers. In 1869 Hermann Grüder was named prefect apostolic, and in 1892 the prefecture was raised to an episcopal vicariate. By the end of the century there were some forty priests and nine thousand Catholics in Denmark. Iceland, still a Danish dependency, received its first two resident priests in 1896.

(2) SWEDEN

Retrospect. Sweden's monarchs had dallied with the notion of reunion with the Holy See until 1599 when Protestantism was definitively established. Severe penal legislation had imposed exile on all missionaries and converts to Catholicity, and had deprived Catholics of all religious and civic rights. Queen Christina's conversion during the seventeenth century had not affected the status of her Catholic subjects, for she had been forced to abdicate.

Toleration was granted in 1780 to "Christians of other faiths" who might wish to emigrate to Sweden for the sake of promoting the country's economic development. In 1783 Pope Pius VI named Father Oster prefect apostolic, but he and his immediate successors could make little progress among native Swedes, because the penalty of exile for converts to Catholicity remained. As late as 1858 five converts were exiled and their goods confiscated. The intervention of Princess Josephine (1807–70), Catholic daughter of Eugene de Beauharnais and wife of

the well-disposed King Oscar I (1844–59), considerably changed the position of Catholics. The prudent vicar-apostolic, Monsignor Studach (1833–73), could erect Ste. Eugenie's Church in 1837, and other Catholic edifices followed. In 1860 the penalty for adult conversions was removed. Dissenters were allowed private exercise of their religion, but public preaching and proselytizing remained under ban. Dissenters were also made eligible for most civil offices in 1870. During 1872–73 remaining restrictions were removed with these exceptions: minors under eighteen might not leave the Established Church; royal permission was required to hold property and organize parishes; all religious except the Sisters of Charity were excluded from Sweden. Catholics remained few in number, probably no more than one or two thousand.

(3) Norway

Toleration. Norway was subject to the Swedish crown from 1814 to 1905, but Norwegians were more progressive and cosmopolitan and dissent from the Lutheran Establishment became common. When the dissenters in 1839 forced the king to grant them freedom of religious assembly, and in 1845 the right to have public churches, Catholics shared in these gains. A church was erected in Oslo in 1872 and Catholic growth was so rapid that a prefecture was established in 1887 and raised to a vicariate in 1892. During 1891 dissenters were granted full religious liberty, subject to a few restrictions, and in 1894 civil rights were conceded as well. Distinguished converts were made, including Dr. Tonning, a Lutheran minister, and the novelist, Sigrid Undset (1882–1949). By 1900, the Catholic population was estimated at two thousand.

87. NORTH AMERICAN NATIONAL CRISIS

A. *Political Crisis (1853–65)*

(1) Elements of the Crisis

Issues. The slavery dispute, far from having been settled by the Compromise of 1850, soon became acute. The ostensible issue remained economic: the firm conviction of the South that slaves were essential to her prosperity, so that no fancied moral question dare be raised. It is true that some Northern abolitionists were more solicitous for Negro slaves that they did not own, than about fair wages for their own factory workers. Yet even Southerners like Lee—who freed his slaves—agreed that slavery, if seldom deliberately cruel in practice, was far from compatible with human dignity and American democratic theory. A social issue was also involved, for if one may be permitted sweeping generalizations, the South was aristocratic, the North bourgeois, and the West democratic in collective outlook. Yet in the end, it was the national issue that proved basic. Southerners, as a defensive minority, insisted on "state sovereignty," a decentralized, sectionalist view of government.

But the North and West regarded a strong federal government as most in accord with their industrial and financial concerns that knew no state lines, or most likely to finance expansion to the Pacific. As Lincoln put it in 1860: "Physically we cannot separate." This view was sentimentally confirmed by numerous immigrants who gravitated toward the North and were more familiar with Old World centralization. Ultimately, the North and West had a majority of about twenty-one million against the South's nine million including three million slaves. Railroads were rapidly linking their lands and their horizons extended to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; indeed, Yankee clippers were seeking Japan and the Indies.

Political parties, despite efforts to compromise, were at last obliged to lean toward one view or the other. Democrats, while retaining a minority of Conservative and pacifist adherents in the North, had become largely identified with Southern statesmanship by the 1850's. The Whigs, who tried to evade taking sides, were rejected by both sections, and groups like the Know-Nothings who proposed new issues did not endure. A new party, the Republican, was born in 1854 and quickly captured favor in the North by its firm opposition to slavery extension. The fugitive slave clause of the 1850 Compromise proved a continual goad to Northerners who abetted the "underground railroad," and not even its approbation by Chief Justice Taney in the Dred Scott Case (1857) could make them accept it. Stephen A. Douglas essayed a new compromise with his doctrine of "popular sovereignty," but it became "squatter rule" in practice, and a bloody practice at that. Douglas might defeat the shrewd and moderate Lincoln in debate (1858), but he could not control Southern "fire-eaters": those who demanded a repeal of the ban on slavetrading. Defeated by John Quincy Adams in their effort to impose a "gag-rule" on Congress during the 1840's, these myopic defenders of sectional interest demanded in the 1850's that free speech cease on slavery, even in the North. An older school of statesmen like Webster and Clay had soothed these courtly egotists, but now blunter men like Senator Seward of New York declared that "there was a higher law than the Constitution" on the slavery question, and that between free and slave societies there existed "an irrepressible conflict." Lincoln, indeed, hoped to avoid armed strife if possible, but even he warned that the "Union . . . will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other." Four years of bitter war decided that America would be all free.

(2) IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT (1853–65)

President Pierce (1853–57), a pliant Northern Democrat, tried to abide by the Compromise of 1850, but Stowe's influential if not entirely accurate *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) aroused high feelings. Senator

Douglas and War Secretary Jefferson Davis then proposed to repeal the Missouri Compromise by the Kansas-Nebraska Bill (1854), but feuding pro- and anti-slavery settlers in what became known as "bleeding Kansas" took the issue out of these politicians' hands. Senator Sumner's intemperate denunciation of the "Crime against Kansas" got him a caning on the floor of the Senate, while the new Republican Party's flaunting of the issue of "bleeding Kansas" frightened enough conservatives to prefer the Democratic candidate in 1856: Buchanan was another Northerner willing to appease the South.

Chief Justice Taney (1857) stole the inaugural headlines, March 6, 1857, by his decision that not merely did the free soil of Illinois fail to free the Missouri slave Dred Scott, but that the Missouri Compromise had been unconstitutional: slavery might not be outlawed from any territory. It seems that this upright Catholic judge allowed himself to be swayed by his Southern prejudices. Wrongly, but understandably, Northerners branded the court's decision a conspiracy with the new administration and invoked a "higher law than the Constitution."

President Buchanan (1857–61) proved almost a caretaker administrator, and in his last months was but a grieving bystander. John Brown's attack on Harpers Ferry (1859) in a desperate attempt to free slaves got him a hanging, but "John Brown's Body" soon became an abolitionist war cry. The South lost its best chance to continue compromise by walking out on the conciliatory Democratic nominee, Stephen A. Douglas, and nominating Vice-President Breckinridge who, unlike Douglas, had endorsed a congressional slave code for the territories. When Southerners asserted that they would not accept the Republican candidate Lincoln even if elected, conservatives put up yet a fourth nominee, Senator Bell. On electoral votes the choice was never in doubt: Lincoln won by 180. An analysis of the popular vote shows forty per cent for Lincoln, forty-two per cent for Douglas and Bell, and eighteen per cent for Breckinridge. Though the upholders of the Union thus constituted a clear majority, South Carolina seceded in December, 1860, and by February, 1861, six other states had joined her in forming the "Confederate States of America."

President Lincoln (1861–65) at his inaugural addressed the South: "In your hands and not in mine is the momentous issue of the civil war. The government will not assail you . . . but no state on its own mere action can lawfully get out of the Union. . . . I shall take care . . . that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States." When Lincoln undertook to relieve Fort Sumter in Southern territory, Confederate President Jefferson Davis permitted and General Beauregard precipitated war by firing upon the Federal position, April 12, 1861. Secession would, then, mean war. The conflict was prolonged by

the fact that the South had a larger proportion of experienced officers and that her soldiers fought on their own territory with the advantage of interior lines of communication. Convinced that "cotton was king," Southern planters hoped to do business as usual with Europe, but despite a general European disposition to favor the South, an efficient Northern blockade presently stifled Southern economy. The North had the greater population, area, resources, and industrial technique, and must, if it persevered, inevitably outlast the South. If the Confederate States had an experienced and intelligent leader in Jefferson Davis, he lacked the unusual common sense and loftiness of character that made Lincoln pursue victory with patient tenacity against most discouraging setbacks. Lincoln lived to witness Lee's surrender at Appomattox, April 9, 1865, though his assassination five days later was the crowning tragedy of a "Tragic Era." His Emancipation Proclamation of January 1, 1863, however, was legalized by the Thirteenth Amendment, December 18, 1865. Slavery was done and the Union was one.

B. Catholic Ordeal (1852–66)

(1) High Tide of Nativism

Echoes of 1848. The European Revolutions of 1848 that overthrew the Metternich System were followed by an authoritarian reaction that sent revolutionaries to refuge in the United States. Louis Kossuth, president of the brief Hungarian Republic, was received here as a "symbol of Protestantism as well as liberty," for the Metternich Old Order was supposedly Catholic and Kossuth's masonic connections had excited no enthusiasm for his revolt in American Catholic circles. Kossuth's tour (1851–52) was at first triumphal, and he responded by a strongly anti-Catholic speech. Later, however, when he asked for funds and American intervention, his popularity waned. But he had served to revive nativist bigotry. When during 1852 Pope Pius IX donated a marble block to the Washington Monument under construction, the nativist press reached a frenzy of alarm at the "schemes of that designing, crafty, subtle, far-seeing, and far-reaching power." Bigots did not rest content until 1854 when a mob broke into the storage shed and cast the papal block into the Potomac.

A **papal nuncio,** Archbishop Bedini, could not have arrived at a less propitious time when during 1853 he called on President Pierce en route to his Brazilian post. Unfortunately he had been papal representative at Bologna while Austria was assisting the Vatican in suppressing the Young Italian Revolution. This gave an apostate Italian priest, Gavazzi, an opportunity to denounce him as the "Bloody Butcher of Bologna," typical agent of the Vatican Inquisition. Audiences were regaled with pictures of the Inquisition buildings at Rome in which, supposedly, rich

apartments for the inquisitors contrasted with the dungeons and torture chambers of the victims. It is little wonder that mass demonstrations were provoked: at Baltimore Bedini was fired upon and burned in effigy; at Pittsburgh he was pushed about by rowdies who broke through a Gaelic bodyguard; Cincinnati Germans prepared to lynch him, and one man was killed and sixteen wounded in clashes with the police. Despite Bedini's courageous attitude, it was deemed expedient to smuggle him out of New York in a tug, for a mob had congregated at the dock. The Bedini tour stirred up emotions and the years that followed were too often marred by violence. The Federal Government, however, was not responsible. Its envoy, Lewis Cass, presented apologies to Cardinal Antonelli during 1853, and during the perils of the papal temporal government the pope was offered American naval vessels as means of escape to a haven in the United States. It is not difficult to understand why Pius IX preferred to remain in Rome.

(2) KNOW-NOTHINGISM

Local origins. Nativist fears were capitalized upon by a new political party. In 1849 Charles Allen founded the Order of the Star Spangled Banner at New York. Reorganized as the Order of United Americans by James Barker in 1852, its members observed a masonic secrecy which they guarded with such fidelity as to be nicknamed "Know-Nothings." During 1852 the movement began to attain phenomenal success in local politics. It elected municipal officials and prepared to capture state governments. The party was pledged "to resist the insidious policy of the Church of Rome and all other foreign influence against our republican institutions in all lawful ways; to place in all offices of trust, honor or profit in the gift of the people or by appointment, none but native American Protestant citizens." Members were obliged to swear that they would never vote for a Catholic or a foreign-born citizen. Despite their profession of being law-abiding, Know-Nothing officials often condoned mob activity, and "plug-uglies," armed with awls, threatened to harm voters who refused to give the Know-Nothing password on the way to the polls. Catholics were kept from voting by violence, as on "Bloody Monday," August 5, 1855, at Louisville, Kentucky. By fair means or foul, the Know-Nothings carried nine states between 1854 and 1856, and held the balance of power in others. They elected governors in New York, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. During 1855 the first steps were taken in New York State toward confiscation of church property, while anti-Catholic legislation was passed or attempted in Michigan and elsewhere. Once again Bishop Hughes proved a shrewd and belligerent opponent who marshaled Catholic legal and political defenses. Churches else-

where were burned or looted, and convent inspection regulations occasioned good nuns trouble and insults.

National failure. By 1855 the Know-Nothings claimed seventy-five members of Congress and were confidently eying the 1856 presidential elections. They nominated ex-President Fillmore and Jackson's nephew, Andrew Donelson. But Fillmore repudiated most of the anti-Catholic program. The party did receive eight hundred thousand votes but many of these were those of Fillmore's former Whig partisans. The most respected political leaders, Douglas and Lincoln, repudiated Know-Nothingism. The latter remarked: "I am not a Know-Nothing; that is certain. . . . Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We are now practically reading it: 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read: 'all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretence of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure and without the base alloy of hypocrisy." But defeat in the national election and an attempt to ignore the burning North-South conflict, diverted American attention from the Know-Nothings. With the coming of the Civil War, the whole nativist movement paled into temporary oblivion.

(3) CATHOLICS AND SLAVERY

Clerical attitudes. In the South, the Catholic hierarchy was in a difficult position. Pope Gregory XVI's pronouncement in 1839 condemning the slave trade provoked adverse comment among slaveholders, and Secretary of State John Forsyth of the Van Buren administration had tried to identify the Catholic position with Northern abolitionism. In a series of open letters in his journal, the *Catholic Miscellany,* Bishop England of Charleston, whose private letters reveal him personally opposed to slavery, undertook to explain the papal document: "Slavery, then, Sir, is regarded by that Church of which the pope is the presiding officer, not to be incompatible with the natural law; . . . but not so the 'slave trade,' or the reducing into slavery of the African or the Indian." Archbishop Kenrick in his widely used *Theologia Moralis* (I, v, 38), while deploring the institution of slavery, urged obedience to the laws lest the lot of the Negro be made worse. His pastoral instruction of May, 1858, was in keeping with such norms: "Our clergy have wisely abstained from all interference with the judgment of the faithful, which should be free on all questions of polity and social order within the limits of the doctrine and law of Christ. . . . The peaceful and conservative character of our principles has been tested . . . on the subject of

domestic slavery. . . . Among us there has been no agitation." But the archbishop's passive policy was no more successful in allaying feeling in regard to slavery than it had been in appeasing nativism at Philadelphia. When secession took place, Confederate sympathizers among the Maryland clergy refused to read Bishop Carroll's "Prayer for Civil Authorities," and when the archbishop himself read it, some of the laity walked out. But even in the North, Archbishop Hughes of New York branded abolitionism as incitement to robbery, and he even disapproved of the Emancipation Proclamation as an invasion of property rights. Some of the clergy were less conservative: at New Orleans, Father Napoleon Perché so attacked Yankee occupation as to be put under house arrest, while Father Edward Purcell of Cincinnati branded all opposed to emancipation as "jailors of their fellowmen."

Lay opinion. The leading Catholic lay publicist, Orestes Brownson, changed from toleration of slavery to abolitionism during the prewar excitement, but he also indicted the evils of wage-slavery in Northern factories. Patrick Donohue of the *Boston Pilot* and most Northern Catholic newspapermen were staunchly Federalist, but Courtney Jenkins of the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore remained a Southern sympathizer, with the disapproval but toleration of Archbishop Kenrick. The judicial verdict on slavery was handed down by a Catholic, Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case. Holding to a strict construction of constitutional opinion, Taney held that Negroes "had for more than a century been regarded as beings of an inferior order." Yet in his private capacity, Taney "did not believe in slavery and had not only manumitted those slaves whom he had inherited at the death of his father, but pensioned his freedmen." [8] Personally humble, he used to take his turn after Negroes in the line of penitents before the confessional. Yet he believed that he must uphold the law as Chief Justice until slavery had gradually been eliminated. But popular Northern opinion, with less prudence but more heart than Taney, bypassed such "law" for equity and insisted that the evil was intolerable. Certainly voluntary emancipation with some public compensation would have been the ideal solution, but since the Bourbons would not take that course, they reaped the "grapes of wrath" and the "terrible swift sword."

(4) CATHOLICS AND CIVIL WAR

The Confederacy provoked the fratricidal conflict by order of a Catholic, General Beauregard, who fired on Fort Sumter. Catholics were comparatively few in the South, yet most of the bishops, clergy, and faithful believed themselves justified in transferring their allegiance to

[8] Theodore Maynard, *Story of American Catholicism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942), p. 349.

the Confederate States. Bishop Lynch of Charleston accepted a diplomatic mission to Europe for Jefferson Davis, and regained his see only after a pardon from President Johnson. Bishop Elder of Natchez was expelled from his cathedral by General Brayman in 1864 for refusing to order prayers for President Lincoln; on the other hand, Bishop Whalan of Nashville so alienated his flock by fraternizing with Federal officers that he resigned in 1863. There were instances of occupation forces abusing their power to damage church property. In the critical border states of Kentucky and Missouri, test oaths were imposed on the clergy for performance of their functions. Such acts, such as the "Drake Constitution" of 1865, were later declared null by the Supreme Court. Father Francis Leray, later bishop of New Orleans, was one of some thirty Confederate priest chaplains. Abram Ryan, the poet priest, by his "Conquered Banner" and "Sword of Robert E. Lee," put a romantic haze about the Southern cause, for which the Catholic leaders, General Beauregard and Longstreet, and Captain Raphael Semmes of the raider *Alabama,* served.

The Federal Union, not abolition of slavery, Archbishop Hughes told Secretary Cameron in 1861, was the object of Northern Catholics' loyalty: "Catholics, so far as I know, whether of native or foreign birth, are willing to fight to the death for the support of the Constitution, the Government and the laws of the country." The archbishop himself, a friend of President Lincoln, accepted a diplomatic mission to Ireland, France, and Italy in a successful effort to avert foreign recognition of the Confederacy. Bishop Domenech exercised like influence in Spain, and Bishop FitzPatrick of Boston in Belgium on behalf of the Union. When many Irish Catholics, too poor to buy exemption from military service at $300, participated in the 1863 draft riots, the dying Archbishop Hughes appeared in public to urge them to disperse; in this he was sustained by other members of the hierarchy. The Catholics, Sheridan and Rosecrans, were Federal generals. Regular chaplains were often assigned by regimental vote, which seldom favored a Catholic. Hence auxiliary nonmilitary chaplains took care of most Catholic needs, though there is record of about forty regular army priest chaplains. Notre Dame University sent seven chaplains, and their Father William Corby was the only Catholic chaplain at Gettysburg. The future bishops, James Gibbons, John Ireland, and Lawrence McMahon, served as chaplains. Mother Seton's Sisters of Charity and nuns of other communities to the number of six hundred almost monopolized the nursing service and won universal acclaim from men of good will; a monument in Washington pays tribute to their work. "All these sisters must be remembered for their heroic service in the cause of charity. And they must be still more remembered on account of their service to a better understanding of the

Church and all it stands for; no one who experienced their unselfish charity could long remain a bigot." [9]

(5) CATHOLIC LIFE IN TROUBLED TIMES

Clerical education continued a pressing problem. St. Mary's Seminary at Baltimore had ordained 52 priests by 1829, of whom 21 were natives. About 1840 there were eleven seminaries in the United States with 148 students. In 1857 an American house for clerical students was affiliated with Louvain University in Belgium, and the following year the American College at Rome was provided by Pope Pius IX, and promoted in this country by Archbishops Hughes of New York and Kenrick of St. Louis.

Religious communities coming to the United States from Europe also helped provide priests, brothers, and sisters for the American mission. Redemptorists came to Cincinnati during the early 1830's, and toward the close of that decade Bishop Forbin-Janson's Fathers of Mercy began to work in the South. Foreign sisterhoods arrived in increasing numbers: during 1833, Carmelites went to New Orleans, Sisters of St. Joseph to Carondolet, and the Dublin Sisters of Charity to Philadelphia. During the 1840's Holy Cross Fathers, Brothers, and Sisters began to settle in Indiana, where Notre Dame University would germinate. During the same decade, Benedictine Monks came to the United States, and the Trappists returned, establishing themselves at Gethsemane, Kentucky. At the same time the Sacred Heart Brothers (1847), the Christian Brothers (1848), and the Marianist Brothers (1849) arrived. The Sisters of Providence, the Precious Blood Sisters, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, the Sisters of Mercy, and the Notre Dame Sisters all opened establishments. The Oblates came in 1851 and the Passionists in 1852. Finally the poor and sick drew the Brothers of Charity, the Alexian Brothers, and the Little Sisters of the Poor toward the close of the Civil War.

Missionary work continued, with Bishop Lamy of Santa Fe (1850–85) sketching an epic of zeal before "death came for the archbishop" in 1888. Other prelates were concerned about the Negroes. Bishop England had opened a school for free Negroes at Charleston in 1835, but was forced to abandon it in the face of antiabolitionist panic. In 1844 Bishop Peter Kenrick of St. Louis opened a school for both free and slave children, but it failed for much the same reason within two years. Bishop Elder of Natchez in 1858 deplored that though half of Mississippi's six hundred thousand people were Negroes, he could not provide enough priests to visit and instruct the Catholic slaves. The American bishops of

---

[9] Theodore Roemer, *Catholic Church in the United States* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), p. 254.

the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866) after the Civil War declared that though they would have desired that "a more gradual system of emancipation could have been adopted," they now urged on clergy and laity alike "charity and zeal" for the emancipated Negroes. Catholics ought "to extend to them that Christian education and moral restraint which they so much stand in need of." If segregation was tolerated in secular contacts where expedient, it was not to be the rule in religion: Catholics were directed to admit Negroes to their existing churches without discrimination. Execution of these decrees was left to the bishops' discretion, but "let the ordinaries see to it that this is done in such wise that later the Church will not be subject to complaint or pretext of complaint. . . . If through neglect this is not done, anyone who, unmindful of his duty, shall fail to provide the means of salvation to all seeking them, be they black or not, will merit the strongest condemnation." The slavery issue was settled; the Negro problem remained.

(6) PAPAL-AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS (1848–67)

Civil War relations. Pius IX personally approved of Archbishop Hughes's mission on behalf of the Union, and though he also received Davis's envoy, Bishop Lynch, it was only in his prelatial capacity. Officially the pope pleaded only for peace in public letters to Archbishops Hughes of New York and Odin of New Orleans. He never extended diplomatic recognition to the Confederacy, although his information was not always the most complete: he remarked to the British envoy: "I have written a letter to Mr. Davis, president of the South, and I have also written to the other Mister who is president of the North." If the pope was cautious, Cardinal Antonelli was strongly pro-Union. And the American seminarian Robert Seton's boycott of a papal reception for Maximilian of Mexico got him into no trouble with the Vatican, once he had explained that he had merely intended to express American disapproval of the Bonapartist puppet regime.

Lincoln's assassination may have strained papal-American relations. The assassin Booth was not a Catholic, certain bigots' suspicions that he was a Jesuit notwithstanding. But the conspirators met in the house of a Catholic, Mrs. Surratt. She was hanged during the vindictive aftermath, but doubt of the reliability of the circumstantial evidence has since been expressed. Her son John escaped to the Papal States where he enlisted in the Zouaves as "Watson." When he was traced, Minister King asked extradition from Cardinal Antonelli. Though the secretary of state agreed to detain Surratt pending instructions from Washington, he was embarrassed by the escape of the elusive fugitive to Alexandria, Egypt. Recaptured and tried, Surratt had his case dismissed by reason of disagreement among the jury.

Close of the American Embassy came when Congress, dominated by a vindictive "Black Republican" oligarchy, discontinued appropriations for its support. The real cause seems to have been bigotry, though the pretext adduced in Congress was that American Protestants had been denied liberty of worship in Rome and ordered outside its walls. In reality, as Minister King reported, the Protestants held their services in the American legation building with the permission of the papal government, so that discontinuance of the legation would have precisely the effect alleged as cause for its suppression. The Holy See was never directly notified of the suppression, but diplomatic relations actually ceased in December, 1867.

88. LATIN AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

A. *Generic Latin American Problems*

(1) THE CLERGY AND THE REVOLUTION

Clerical divisions. "Speaking generally and allowing for individual exceptions on both sides, the bishops opposed the movement for independence, while the lower clergy strongly favored them. A similar situation existed among the religious orders: the superiors were for Spain, the rank and file were largely, though not entirely, for separation. This is not difficult to understand. The bishops were nearly all Spaniards and all were appointees of the crown; the lower clergy were either *creoles*—persons of pure Spanish descent born in America—or *mestizos*—a mixture of Spanish blood with Indian or Negro or both. Hence there was much class and racial jealousy. Separation from Spain could mean to the bishops only difficulties for themselves or even possibly deprivation, while to the rest of the clergy it held out hope of advancement from which under the Spanish regime they were cut off. In addition, the mass of the priests considered the subjection of the Church to the civil power detrimental to spiritual interests—little better, in fact, than slavery. While they continued to advocate union of Church and state, they wished that union to safeguard the rights and the dignity of both parties, a condition which they felt was not realized under a system whereby the Church was practically a department of the civil government. . . . One can safely say that both among those who worked for separation and those who remained loyal to Spain, the majority were actuated also by motives conscientious and lofty. This needs to be insisted upon especially in regard to the former, who have been attacked unjustly." [10]

Clerical participation. The revolutionary movements against the Spanish crown, then, were not per se anticlerical. In fact, many clerics

[10] Edwin Ryan, *The Church in the South American Republics* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1943), p. 43.

took a prominent part in the revolts, either as publicists for Latin American interests, chaplains in the rebel forces, or advisors to the constitutional conventions of the new states. Outstanding in the latter role was the Dominican friar, Santa Maria de Oro. As a participant in the Argentine Congress of Tucuman in 1816, he not only declared unequivocally for independence, but defeated a proposal for a monarchy on the ground that the delegates to the convention would not thereby execute the wishes of the people who had elected them. The democratic precedent thus set by the largest of the Spanish-American states probably did much to influence the setting up of republics in Latin America. That monarchy was the preference is indicated in the Mexican and Brazilian experiments. Clerical patriotism, therefore, did much to preserve Catholic influence in the new countries irrespective of political animosities: at first each of the republics declared Catholicity the state religion. Although many of the revolutionary chieftains were sincere Catholics, such as O'Higgins of Chile, others had been influenced by the Rationalism of the French Revolution. Clerics participating in the movement for independence were consequently brought into contact with the Liberals of the future. Such association was not always felicitous: some clerics, like Camilo Enriquez in Chile, became apostates, while the career of Hidalgo in Mexico is ambiguous to say the least. On the other hand, some clerics, alarmed at these latitudinarian ideas, were repelled into a reactionary conservatism in politics. But on the whole, lack of patriotism during the independence movement is not a charge that can be laid against the Latin American clergy.

(2) HIERARCHICAL REORGANIZATION

Recognition crisis. On the one hand, the sympathy of the Latin American hierarchy with the mother country of Spain prejudiced the revolutionary leaders against these bishops and made it practically impossible for them to continue to reside in their sees. By 1822 the six archbishoprics and thirty-two bishoprics of South America were without resident titulars, while in Mexico only four bishops remained—and by 1829 there were none. In their place, as well as in that of religious ordinaries, the new governments were prone to install sacerdotal vicars whom many people refused to acknowledge. On the other hand, the Spanish crown declined to recognize the independence of its revolted colonies, even long after military operations had ceased. This created a problem of providing a new hierarchy, inasmuch as the *real patronado* had virtually made the king of Spain papal vicar-general in the choice of prelates. During the early days of the insurrections, Pius VII had been under Bonapartist surveillance (1809–14), and doubtless remained ill informed about Latin American affairs. On his release, he urged the

bishops to win over their subjects to obedience to Ferdinand VII, restored to the Spanish throne since 1813. From 1814 to 1820 the Roman Curia continued to confirm royal nominations to Latin American sees, but the recommendations of the Holy See fell on deaf ears in the New World.

Hierarchical restoration. Latin American governments then sought to change the papal attitude, while claiming patronage privileges for themselves. In 1822 Chile sent a delegation headed by Padre José Cienfuegos, which Cardinal Consalvi received over Spanish protests. A cardinalatial commission was then set up to study the proposals, and the pope sent back an apostolic delegate extraordinary to examine the Latin American situation. Monsignor Muzi, the legate, was accompanied by Canon Mastai, the future Pius IX. This mission visited Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, while corresponding with Bolívar in Peru. Muzi's refusal to recognize a *patronado nacional* made his mission, terminated in 1825, a failure. Meanwhile Mexican envoys at Rome, Canons Marchena and Vasquez, were unsuccessful in making the same demands. During 1825, recognition of Brazilian independence by Portugal made possible a settlement of jurisdictional difficulties in that former colony. But Ferdinand VII of Spain still refused to yield, even after all hostilities had ceased in 1826. Finally in a consistory of May 27, 1827, Pope Leo XII resumed the privileges of patronage conceded to the Spanish crown, and himself named six bishops for sees in Greater Colombia, following recommendations by Bolívar. The next year he made other appointments in Chile and Argentina. King Ferdinand then dismissed the papal nuncio, Monsignor Tiberi, but the pope stood his ground. Pius VIII tried in vain to placate the Spanish monarchy, but continued his predecessor's course. Pope Gregory XVI in 1831 named six bishops for Mexico, and in 1832 further sees in Argentina and Chile were filled. The papal bull, *Sollicitudo Ecclesiarum* (1831) enabled him to extend *de facto* recognition to the new governments without committing himself as to their legitimacy. The death of Ferdinand VII in 1833 removed a great obstacle to peace, and in 1835 the pope conceded complete diplomatic recognition to Colombia, a procedure presently imitated in regard to other Latin American states.

(3) ECCLESIASTICAL-SECULAR PROBLEMS

Patronage disputes. It was with regret that the Holy See learned that outworn patronage rights had been terminated in the Old World only to be reasserted in the New. For most of the newly founded states jealously clung to the *patronado* which they claimed had been inherited by their governments from the crown of Spain. Dictators, like Francia in Paraguay (1814–40) and Rosas in Argentina (1835–52), were no im-

provement on the despotic Bourbons of the eighteenth century. Thus, transition from Spanish absolutism, difficult at best, became a problem requiring unusual tact. The solutions, expressed in concordats or other pacts, with *caudillos* or Liberal regimes, varied with the individuals concerned. If any generalization may be ventured, conservative views of close union of Church and state tended to prevail down to 1870, while thereafter Liberal insistence on broad toleration or even separation of Church and state came to the fore. Unique was the thoroughly clerical regime of President Gabriel Garcia Moreno of Ecuador (1860–75), but the reaction that followed his assassination was severe. At the other extreme was the ferocious dictatorship of Antonio Guzman Blanco in Venezuela (1870–77) which included wholesale exile of clerics and attacks comparable to the contemporary German *Kulturkampf*. Brazil, like Portugal, tended to have a great problem with Freemasonry, which insinuated itself even into clerical circles. "The Church was thus severely hampered in her endeavor to accommodate herself to the new order. On the one hand were inimical governments, and on the other, ecclesiastics powerless to effect an arrangement, too strongly attached to outworn customs and traditions, or perhaps not sufficiently mindful of the duties of their state." [11]

Papal relations. Pius IX (1846–78), mindful of his South American visit, displayed special interest in Latin American problems. In 1855 he named Monsignor Nunguia his representative to promote clerical reform in Mexico, but the latter was encountering resistance from the beneficiaries when his mission was cut short by the accession of the anticlericals to power. French intervention in Mexico raised new difficulties, which were met with intransigence by nuncio Meglia and Archbishop Labastida. But by this time the pontiff had lost his earlier prestige with the Liberals, and most disputes were approached with insuperable prejudice. By his foundation of the Latin American College in Rome (1858), Pius IX tried to develop a devoted and learned clergy outside this oppressive secular climate.

"In the last quarter of the century, Leo XIII (1878–1903) felt that a more conciliatory policy might be safely adopted and in several accidental matters saw fit to diverge from the rigid policies of Pius IX. The concordat between the Holy See and Colombia, made in 1887, is a good example of the arrangement of a modus vivendi between the Vatican and a modern state. Certain old privileges were yielded in return for guarantees of a substantial nature by government in return." [12] The pope also assembled at Rome during 1899 a plenary council of Latin

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[12] John Bannon and Peter Dunne, *Latin America* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1950), p. 456.

American prelates. The 54 members of this council enacted 998 decrees, among which can be singled out the proclamation of Our Lady of Guadalupe as the universal patroness of Latin America, and the unanimous condemnation of Freemasonry as *"peste nefaria."* [13] From this distinguished meeting a distinct revival of Catholic life in Latin America can be traced.

Missionary survival. "In Latin South and Central America, the missions, like the ecclesiastical situation in general, were gravely impaired by the abolition of the reductions and by the revolutionary disturbances which in the wars for independence usually brought anticlerical governments into power." [14] It has been estimated that possibly three million Indians relapsed into a state of paganism during this period. But the Franciscans had taken over some of the Jesuit missions and had maintained many of their own, for the Gran Chaco Indians in northern Argentina had preserved their Christian faith for years without priestly ministrations. In 1832 the Friars received their first re-enforcement from abroad, and in succeeding years could resume their apostolic work, aided by the returning Jesuits and many other religious communities. The new Salesian Congregation of St. John Bosco under the future Cardinal Caglieri were particularly active from 1880. In Mexico and Central America, if missionary work was slowed by the political transition, few of the Indians abandoned the Faith entirely, although there were some superstitious interpolations.

B. Mexican Independence

Introduction. Since a summary such as this cannot treat in detail each of the Latin American countries, some of the general trends will be illustrated in the history of that Mexican state which, besides exhibiting unusual problems for the Catholic Church, has also had the most intimate relations with the United States.

(1) WINNING OF INDEPENDENCE (1810–24)

Revolution was first proclaimed by Miguel Hidalgo (1753–1811), eccentric pastor of Dolores, whose previous moral lapses were notorious and whose views were Liberal. He had defied the mercantilist regulations and agitated against Spanish domination, though the Inquisition which prosecuted him may have been largely political in aim. On September 16, 1810, he raised his *"Grito de Dolores,"* a war cry of: "Long live Our Lady of Guadalupe and death to the Spaniards." Though the

[13] Mariano Cuevas, *Historia de Iglesia en Mexico* (El Paso: Revista Catolica, 1928), V, 419.

[14] Joseph Schmidlin, *Catholic Mission History,* trans. Matthias Braun (Techny, Ill.: S.V.D. Mission Press, 1933), p. 675.

latter scarcely numbered 40,000 in a population of 1,000,000 creoles, 1,500,000 mestizos, and 3,500,000 Indians, the disorderly mobs of Hidalgo were dispersed after initial successes. Hidalgo was shot at Chihuahua in 1811, but another clerical patriot, Don José Morelos (1765–1815), continued guerilla warfare until suffering Hidalgo's fate. The viceroy of the restored Ferdinand VII, Don Ruiz de Apodaca, won over all of the remaining insurgents save Vicente Guerrero in the south. But when he sent the Creole general, Augustín Iturbide (1783–1824), against Guerrero, the two joined forces at Iguala. Following the Liberal revolt in Spain, the viceroy had proclaimed the Spanish Constitution of 1812. This, however, was not acceptable to the conservative Iturbide, who on February 24, 1821, announced his "Plan of Iguala" with its "Three Guarantees": (1) exclusive supremacy of Catholicity; (2) immediate independence; (3) equal treatment for Spaniards and creoles. Without forces to meet the ever-growing army of Iturbide, the royal representative, Don Juan O'Donoju, endorsed the "Plan" on August 24, pending choice of a Bourbon prince as sovereign of Mexico.

Organization. The Spanish Cortes repudiated O'Donoju's pact, but Spain had no means to effect reconquest and Iturbide occupied Mexico City on September 27, 1821, and formally proclaimed Mexican independence. Failing to obtain a Bourbon prince, Iturbide had himself proclaimed monarch on May 18, 1822, and he was anointed by Bishop Ruiz of Guadalajara and crowned by President Cantarines of Congress the following July 21. Though Iturbide's regime, Catholic, conservative, agrarian, and nativist, probably enjoyed popular support, it alienated a masonic and militarist clique. Provoked into arbitrary acts by the difficulties of his position, Iturbide gave the generals an excuse to revolt. Under the lead of Antonio López de Santa Anna (1795–1876) they forced Iturbide to resign on March 19, 1823. He departed for Italy with the promise not to return; when he broke this in July, 1824, he was shot by the ruling junta. Archbishop Fonte of Mexico City, who had held aloof from the movement as much as he could, now departed for Europe where he remained until his death in 1839. By 1822 only four bishops remained in Mexico, and with the death of Bishop Perez of Puebla during 1829, the land was without a resident hierarchy.

(2) MASONIC MILITARISM (1823–62)

Political parties. During the early days of the Republic, proclaimed after Iturbide's fall, Mexico was torn by the rivalries of two masonic societies. The *Yorkistas* were more republican and plebeian, encouraged by Joel Poinsett, the first American envoy. The *Scotistas* were more aristocratic, but even more hostile toward the Church. Masonry of one brand or another has ever since dominated the ruling class throughout

most of Mexican history; even Maximilian was a member of the society. But these feuds of factions were complicated by endless personal rivalries. For the first decade after Iturbide's deposition, a federal republic was nominally in operation, but generals, largely inexperienced in statesmanship, alternated in office, often anticipating the legal term of office by revolts. No strong man arose until 1833 when Santa Anna seized the government which he dominated intermittently for a generation (1833–55).

Hierarchical re-establishment. During this time Roman Catholicity remained the state religion, and the government, whether more or less anticlerical, insisted on claiming the *real patronado*. The Holy See was not pleased with the importunate demands of Mexican envoys on this point, and delayed in restoring the hierarchy. At length in 1831 Gregory XVI named six bishops, implicitly recognizing the *patronado* to the extent of accepting the nominations of President Bustamente (1829–32).

Farias attack. Santa Anna, though not hostile to the Church, was a sort of Robin Hood not above profiting from clerical wealth, or letting others do so. He frequently delegated his presidential powers to others, and thus during 1833–34 acting vice-president Farias was enabled to persecute the Church. The latter secularized mission properties, discontinued the tithe, decreed suppression of monastic vows and clerical participation in education. When the hierarchy protested, four bishops were exiled. But in September, 1834, Santa Anna, sensing popular displeasure, came out of retirement, recalled the bishops and mitigated the anticlerical measures. The Conservatives remained in control of Congress until 1855. Farias fled to New Orleans where he formed a secret society pledged to an anticlerical program in the future.

War with the United States induced Santa Anna to reconcile himself with Farias, though the latter, again acting vice-president in 1847, devoted more attention to annoying the Church than to supplying Santa Anna on the military front. Santa Anna gained little glory in the war and his prestige was seriously weakened. The Liberals, led by Benito Juárez (1806–72), announced in 1854 the "Plan of Ayutla" which called for the secularization of Church property in exchange for governmental subsidies, in accord with projects concocted at New Orleans in 1835. After trying to put down the spreading revolt, Santa Anna recognized that he could no longer maintain his dictatorship. He resigned in August, 1855, and his departure from Vera Cruz on the S.S. *Iturbide* marked the end of an era, for though he twice attempted a comeback, he could never regain power. He died reconciled with the Church.

Ayutla regime. The clique of Liberals now in power were long dominated by Benito Juárez (1806–72) and Sebastian Lerdo (1825–89), both subsequently presidents. The *Ley Juarez* (1855) ended the im-

munity of the ecclesiastical courts and expelled the Jesuits. The *Ley Lerdo* (1856) decreed that existing Church properties were to be sold and the Church forbidden in future to own land. The *Ley Iglesias* denied state support in collecting tithes and regulated clerical fees. In 1857 a new constitution, destined to remain in force until 1917, embodied these and similar provisions.

Conservative reaction took the form of revolts, but in the ensuing "War of Reform" (1857–61) the Liberals were ultimately successful. As a war measure Juárez promulgated in July, 1859, his law "nationalizing clerical property," which thereafter paralyzed the social welfare work of the Church, while failing to achieve its announced aim of state aid to the underprivileged. During 1861, moreover, Juárez strove to set up a schismatic church, but the sudden death of the bishop-designate led to abandonment of the attempt.

(3) Foreign Intervention (1862–77)

Bonapartist scheme. For some time Spain, Great Britain, and France had held various claims against Mexico for personal or financial injuries. While the United States was involved in the Civil War, the claimant nations sent troops to Vera Cruz, January, 1862, but Spain and Britain withdrew when it became clear that the French Government of Napoleon III had more in mind than collection of debts. Conservative Mexicans, defeated by Juárez, were not averse to foreign assistance, and the expatriates, Estrada and Hidalgo, had sold the scheme of a clerical monarchy to Empress Eugénie, though Bishop Labastida of Puebla, later of Mexico City, disapproved of the plan. Napoleon III took up the venture and enlisted the candidacy of Maximilian of Habsburg, younger brother of Francis Joseph of Austria. On June 7, 1863, General Bazaine at the head of French troops occupied Mexico City, Juárez retiring to the north of the country where he maintained himself in opposition.

Maximilian, proclaimed "Emperor of Mexico" by an "Assembly of Notables," protected by French troops, arrived in Mexico in May, 1864. He found that he had been committed in advance by Napoleon to a policy of condoning the seizures of the Liberals, and followed this lead on December 27, 1864, by issuing a decree confirming the confiscations made by Juárez. This course was suicidal for his regime: as a foreigner and a monarch, Maximilian had driven many Mexican conservatives into the Juárez camp; now his anticlerical measures forfeited the support of the clergy and aristocrats. Yet Maximilian not only claimed the *patronado real*, but on January 7, 1865, issued a decree asserting the *exequatur* as a right. Monsignor Meglia, the papal nuncio, was now recalled and left Mexico City on April 14, 1865. On the same day Presi-

dent Lincoln, who had asserted that he would not go to war with Maximilian, was assassinated. President Johnson was less war-weary and the victorious Federal Government reasserted the Monroe Doctrine. On May 17, 1865, the president ordered General Sheridan to the Rio Grande to give aid to the Juarists, while Secretary of State Seward sent threatening notes to Napoleon III. The French ruler complied. He withdrew all French troops by February, 1867, leaving Maximilian to his fate. While the latter resolved on a gallant but hopeless stand, his wife Charlotte toured European courts seeking aid until her mind gave way during an audience with the sympathetic but helpless Pius IX. Back in Mexico, Maximilian was the victim of Mexican wrath against the rapacity and arrogance of the French occupation. On May 14 he was forced to surrender. Despite pleas even from the United States Government, the implacable Juárez insisted on Maximilian's execution by a firing squad at Querétaro, June 19, 1867. With him perished the Conservative Mexican generals, Miramón and Mejía.

Anticlerical relapse followed the overthrow of the French and their puppet. Though the Liberal leaders again claimed to be helping the poor, it would seem that more of the loot went into the pockets of politicians and generals than ever reached the poor. A class of "new rich" was thus created with a vested interest in the perpetuation of the Liberal-masonic regime. The clergy were excluded from control of education, though in virtue of the separation of Church and state now proclaimed, the naming of bishops and the training of the clergy escaped governmental control. But a respite was at hand: in 1876 Porfirio Díaz, a rival of Tejada, successor of Juárez, overthrew his regime, and himself entered into thirty-five years of power, during which he was content to relax, not so much the anticlerical legislation, but its enforcement.

Section II

MATERIALIST AGNOSTICISM

1870-

XI

Individualistic Heyday

89. INDIVIDUALISTIC MATERIALISM

A. *The Materialistic Environment*

(1) NATURE OF MATERIALISM

Generic definition. Though Materialism was not a new phenomenon in history, both Carlton Hayes and Father Corrigan would stress it as characteristic of the period after 1870. Father Corrigan endeavors to define Materialism, terming it a "perennial pseudo-philosophy, which teaches that we know nothing but matter, and that there is no ground for supposing thought and the human mind to be anything beyond a function of organized material substance. Materialism is latent in most of the 'isms' of the century. In a less philosophical sense, but scarcely less important, Materialism stands for an immersion in material things, in money-making, pleasure, comfort, and power: living as if there were no soul, no God, no future life." [1]

Philosophic exponents. In the strict sense of a philosophic theory, Materialism is foreshadowed in Ludwig Feuerbach (1804–72). This disciple of Hegel converted his master's Idealism into a thoroughgoing Materialism, while retaining his method. Étienne Gilson has characterized Feuerbach as "instead of a theologian, an anthropologian," and has analyzed his revolutionary "religion" as follows: "God has not created man in His own image, but man has created God in his own image and likeness; the worship of man under the name of God is the very essence of religion. The doctrine of Feuerbach aimed at the destruction of all

[1] Raymond Corrigan, *The Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1938), p. 306.

[590

supernaturalism, and was expressly contrived to achieve it. . . . As Feuerbach himself says, 'He who no longer has any supernatural wishes has no longer any supernatural beings either.' The new religion was, therefore, not a worship of society like the sociolatry of Comte; it was a worship of human nature, an 'anthropolatry.' " [2] Feuerbach was the intellectual progenitor of Marx's "Dialectical Materialism," but the liberal world was itself treated to a sweeping denial of the spiritual by Thomas Huxley (1825–95). This coiner of the word "agnosticism" drew antireligious conclusions from Darwin's questionable and ambiguous hypotheses; as the latter's "bulldog" he barked at theologians: "That this Christianity is doomed to fall is, to my mind, beyond a doubt." And the nineteenth century ended with Ernst Haeckel (1834–1920) stating dogmatically in his *Riddle of the Universe* (1899) that matter is all; spirit is nothing.

Popular attitudes, however, usually eschewed metaphysics for a more pragmatic cult of matter. "In this broad sense, many persons may be accounted 'materialist' who were not at all philosophically minded and who ignored, rather than denied, the traditional dualism of 'spirit' and 'matter'—persons who were absorbed in 'practical matters' of making money, directing banks, organizing industrial corporations, devising machinery, or otherwise 'applying' science. Such persons had little time or inclination to think about the ultimates of human life and destiny. Some of them might profess from habit a belief in the supernatural, but most of them were influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the Materialism of the 'philosophical' science accompanying the experimental or applied science which they immensely—if somewhat vaguely —respected. Among them and amongst most 'scientific' philosophers too, it was not so much a question of dogmatically rejecting the spiritual as of exalting the physical and the material and confessing a complete agnosticism about the supernatural." [3]

(2) MANIFESTATION OF MATERIALISM

Militarism. "Not by speeches and majority resolutions are the great questions of the time decided . . . but by blood and iron." Thus Bismarck, Prussia's "Iron Chancellor," had announced his program bluntly in 1862. Within a decade he had seemingly proved that "might makes right" by installing the Hohenzollern Second Reich as the leading state of the European Continent. Until 1890 Bismarck himself was the diplomatic arbiter with a prestige that rivaled that of Metternich during

[2] Étienne Gilson, *Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), pp. 281–82.

[3] Carlton Hayes, *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932–36), II, 356.

the first half of the century. Great Britain, still mistress of the seas, at first regarded with complacence the new German land hegemony as vindication of an Anglo-Teutonic racial superiority. It was an Englishman, Walter Bagehot, who smugly assured readers of the *Fortnightly Review* that, "those nations which are strongest tend to be the best." Other proofs of the "survival of the fittest" in a military "struggle for existence" were the triumph of the North over the South in the American Union, Italian appropriation of Rome from a "medieval papacy," and the ease with which European "powers" exploited the resources of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In 1888 this *machtpolitik* emerged baldly from diplomatic circumlocutions when Kaiser Wilhelm II—and last—opened his reign with the manifesto: "We belong to each other— I and the Army—we were born for each other and will cleave indissolubly to each other." Until 1914 the world would hear a succession of militant speeches. Militarism seemed in the saddle, the ancient conflict between the "two swords" resolved in favor of the material one. But the realm of the spiritual enjoyed less publicity; for instance, it was also in 1888 that Thérèse Martin entered Carmel at Lisieux.

"Realism." If militarism was a social consequence of materialistic philosophy in the strict sense, "Realism," which now dethroned Romanticism in the literary field, was a barometer of the materialistic attitude in the broader sense. "It was defined by its champions as the basing of art, as well as of human activity and practical 'progress' not on ancient models or 'reason' as 'classicists' had done; not on 'emotion' and an idyllic state of nature or an idealized Middle Age, as Romantics had tried to do, but on a veritably photographic representation of observable facts of the contemporary world. There should be in it no idealization of man, of his past, of his mind or 'soul,' or his aspirations or philosophizings. Indeed, it would tend in an opposite direction toward emphasizing the very gradualness of man's ascent from his savage animal origins, and the atavistic, pathological, and irrational features of his present existence. In the name of reality, it would utilize the ugly as the raw stuff of art." [4]

Typical realists were Henrik Ibsen (1828–1906), Émile Zola (1840–1902), and Anatole France (1844–1924), and many of the same symptoms can be found in Blasco Ibáñez (1867–1928), Thomas Hardy (1840–1928), Anton Chekov (1860–1904), Maxim Gorky (1868–1936), and Sinclair Lewis (1885–1951) and Ernest Hemingway. Corresponding to materialist philosophy, then, there emerged what Sorokin has termed a "sensate culture," or at least the traditional Christian civilization became afflicted with various sensate maladies. Among these were the degradation of social values to sensual enjoyment, an endeavor to

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 383.

portray the sensual, even the sexual, "frankly"; the nervous quest for sensationalism and novelty to the extent of entering the realm of the pathological and fantastic; the tendency to make means an end; a depressing standardization of mass production, carried over into the artistic and literary fields by catering to popular animal tastes. A true realism which would face the fact of original sin—as opposed to Victorian prudishness—might have been salutary, but scarcely a pseudo-realism which rashly plumbed the depths of human evil while ignoring supernatural remedies. Such imprudent probing threatened moral disaster, perhaps what Chesterton would call "breaking the spring."

(3) POLITICAL SURVEY (1870–1914)

Teutonic ascendancy on the European Continent was seemingly established by Bismarck's rout of Bonapartist France and his consolidation of the Hohenzollern Second Reich (1871–1918). With Francis Joseph of Austria-Hungary he cemented a Dual Alliance straddling Central Europe, a pact formally ratified in 1879. Simultaneously Bismarck maintained good relations with Russian Czardom through an understanding often labeled the *Drei-Kaiser-Bund*. His successors, however, proved incapable of composing the rival ambitions of Austria and Russia in regard to the Balkans, and Germany was eventually obliged to back the former at the expense of alienating the latter. Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and several diplomatic reverses of the Russians in the Balkans through international intervention seemed to warrant this choice. Yet the subject Slavs came to regard the Austrians and Hungarians as oppressors, and to look to the Russians as potential liberators. Austria-Hungary, moreover, proved quite incapable of controlling the antinational hodgepodge ruled by the Habsburgs from Vienna and Budapest. Italy also came into the Teutonic orbit in 1882, thus expanding the Dual into a Triple Alliance, but her adherence proved lukewarm. Italy's alliance was self-interested and labored against strong anti-German historical prejudices. Hence, it easily dissolved at the first sound of actual hostilities. But though the Teutonic position thus worsened diplomatically, the German military might seemed to grow with the years.

Anglo-French entente, at first improbable by reason of colonial rivalries, nonetheless became a reality in 1904 after a series of developments. While Great Britain and France composed their colonial differences by marking out separate spheres of influence in Africa and elsewhere, German aspirations to become a naval power aroused British fears. The Kaiser's open sympathy for the revolting Boers in South Africa during 1898 boded ill for the continuance of the British Empire, and a naval race commenced. German-Austrian alienation of Russia also drove

the latter into Anglo-French hands, especially after Russian defeat by Japan convinced the Czarist government of the need of finding allies. Then, two rival leagues faced one another in Europe, while lesser states curried favor with either group, or desperately proclaimed neutrality. The colonial domains of these two leagues involved all the continents and promised that a conflict, if it should occur, would be world-wide.

Balkan nationalism also came of age during this period in the wake of periodic risings against Turkish oppression. Greece was joined in her independent status by Serbia, Montenegro, and Rumania (1878), and later by Bulgaria (1909) and Albania (1913). This was all at the expense of the fast fading Ottoman dominions, which lost Tripoli to Italy in 1911 and retained but nominal suzerainty outside of the Anatolian peninsula, where, indeed, a saving nationalism was brewing in the "Young Turk" movement.

Peace efforts through the Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907 were the only hopeful omens in this charged atmosphere. Certain regulations for hostilities were adopted and provisions were made for voluntary arbitration of disputes. But on the crucial points of sanctions for international justice and compulsory arbitration, no agreement was possible amid the fixation of "national sovereignty" which deemed every state its own ultimate judge of its own interests. What remained of Metternich's "Concert of Europe" was fast dissolving into "International Anarchy."

B. The Individualistic Accent

(1) ASPECTS OF INDIVIDUALISM

Contractualism. If Materialism may be assigned as a common denominator for both the bourgeois Liberal culture and the proletarian Socialism which now became its rival, it is the former that remained in the ascendant prior to World War I. Sorokin discovers in the voluntary contract the pattern for this classic age of triumphant Liberalism, this "Gilded Age" of Individualism, flaunting its wealth in America at the century's turn. "If we were to characterize modern Western society in a single word, one such word would unquestionably be contractualism. . . . Its dominant capitalist system of economy was a contractual system of economic relationship between the parties involved. . . . Contractual government is a more precise definition of so-called democratic political systems—of government of the people, by the people and for the people. . . . Liberty of religion meant a transformation of religious organizations into contractual bodies: one was free to become, or not to become a member of any religious organization. A similar transformation occurred within the family. Marriage was declared a

purely civil contract between free parties, in contradistinction to a compulsory marriage. . . . Marriage was also made more contractual in its continuity and dissolution. . . . Not only in the relation of husband and wife, but also in those of the parents and children, the family tended to become an increasingly contractual institution. With individualism, the period became the century of triumphant sensate liberty, in contradistinction to ideational liberty. . . . Ideational liberty is inner liberty rooted in the restraint and control of our desires, wishes, and lusts. . . . Sensate liberty strives to expand endlessly both wishes and the means of their satisfaction." [5]

Cult of progress. This ceaseless quest—for a beatitude to be found in God alone—found its expression in the "cult of progress," a sort of universal application of Darwinian biological postulates. The magic key to knowledge became evolution. Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859) was presently followed in 1867 by Marx's "evolutionary materialism" that applied the hypothesis to the economic sphere; in 1871 Edward Tylor revolutionized anthropology on an evolutionary basis; in 1872 D. F. Strauss abandoned "spiritual philosophy" for "the materialism of modern science" in the name of evolution: philosophy, ceasing to be metaphysics, would become a synthesis of physical science. Wilhelm Wundt during 1874 used the evolutionary hypothesis for his "New Psychology," and by 1875 sociology saw Gumplowicz employing evolution in his analysis of civilization as the "struggle for existence between races"—remotely sowing seeds of Nazism. William James and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., hailed an "evolutionary law." Nowhere was the application of the evolutionary presupposition more exposed to abuse than in religion. Yet not only did contemporary Protestants for the most part surrender to doctrinal Latitudinarianism, but—as will be noted more in detail later—the Catholic Church faced the insidious threat of "Modernism." It is true that all Protestants did not yield to the *Zeitgeist*, but many who had rejected the lures of "agnosticism," "creedless morality," "religion of humanity," "national faith," etc., did so only by blind insistence upon Genesis literally interpreted according to outworn scientific principles, as was lamentably demonstrated at the Scopes trial in 1925. While docility to authoritative interpretation preserved Catholics from like folly, stubborn fundamentalists not merely cut themselves off from contemporary intellectual movements, but brought traditional religion into contempt among the younger generations by narrow-minded, if sincere, attitudes. Many of today's Radicals are reactionaries against a blind and arid Fundamentalism.

[5] Pitirim Sorokin, *Crisis of Our Age* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1942), pp. 110 ff.

(2) SOCIAL CONCOMITANTS

Parliamentary omnicompetence. Politically, the period witnessed the general victory in the Western World, if not precisely of Democracy, yet of parliamentarianism. The English system of "constitutional monarchy" or ministerial responsibility became the model for Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Italy, Greece, Austria, and Hungary. France differed from this system only in its "republican" nomenclature, and Germany's Reichstag, if it could not unseat Chancellor Bismarck, could at least prevent him from always having his own way. American Democracy was presidential in form, but toward the end of the period even the United States seemed susceptible of conversion under Woodrow Wilson who as professor had defended the British system and as president professed to regard himself as prime minister. Following the Second Reform Act of 1868, the English Victorian Compromise came to an end and the suffrage was more widely extended, though the ruling parties continued to avoid universal manhood suffrage and to smile tolerantly at feminine suffragists. While it had been established that the chief of state and his ministers were responsible to parliament, it was not considered prudent to make them fully dependent on the popular will. Parties might rotate in office, but collectively the charmed circle of parliamentarians still felt that they knew best.

Laicization or secularization of the state went on incessantly, reaching an explicit avowal in the French separation of Church and state in 1906. If other Latin countries did not go so far in theory, they approached this in practice. In Protestant countries, the established religion was either disestablished or practically disregarded by the majority of the inhabitants. By gaining control of education, both in nominally Catholic and in Protestant countries, the state generally imprinted the idea of the unquestioned supremacy of secularism on the rising generations. This universal secularization was an ultimate consequence of Luther's distinction between private and social morality: the subjectivist principle that religion is a private affair was crashing on the rocks of sterile Fundamentalism, amorphous Latitudinarianism, and a secularized "Church" could afford no relief. Lutheran dualism was not yet sufficiently countered by Catholic Action, and the masses were enticed from religious to secular influences. Hence, Pius XI is reported to have remarked to Canon Cardijn: "The great scandal of the nineteenth century was the neglect of the worker."

90. SOCIALIST CHALLENGE

A. *The Capitalist Citadel*

(1) AGE OF THE ECONOMIC BARONS

"All the industrial developments of the period from 1830 to 1870 continued and spread throughout the period from 1870 to 1910 in an exaggerated degree and with more and more far-reaching effects. . . . Opportunities for 'self-made men' as well as for professional bankers (and corporation lawyers) were now golden. And such opportunities were not neglected. . . . The new type of business corporation dispersed nominal ownership and centralized actual control. It enabled a few directors and officials to enrich themselves on other peoples' money and to become irresponsible 'captains of industry,' tsars of paper-credit empires. At the same time it imparted to a mass of investors a blissful ignorance of sordid details and a heavenly manna of bond interest and stock dividends. It also promoted monopoly. For the corporation was big and rich compared with most individual and family enterprises, and the big fellow might buy up the little fellow, or still more simply, might crush him in free and open competition. By the 1880's industrial and financial combination was striding over the industrial world." [6, 7] International concerns limited competition and obtained privileges; varying with the countries involved, there were now "trusts" or "holding-companies," joint-stock concerns, cartels. Everywhere in the Western World arose industrial and financial titans to flourish in a classic age of economic feudalism. Henceforth the "first families" in wealth and power were not those of kings and nobles, but the economic barons, more often than not newly rich. Nobel in Sweden, Krupp in Germany, Creusot in France, J. & P. Coats in England, Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Morgan in the United States, and the Rothschilds nearly everywhere were but a few of these dynasties.

(2) LAISSEZ-FAIRE PATERNALISM

It would be unjust to characterize all of these business leaders as ruthless exploiters of the poor. Frequently men like Nobel and Carnegie would turn philanthropists in their old age and contribute hugely to public welfare. Yet their patronage of the underprivileged was at best humanitarian condescension, not social justice. These "barons" might throw largesse after the manner of a medieval lord, but they consoled themselves that their success was but another verification of Darwinian "survival of the fittest." At least so they were assured by

---

[6] Hayes, *op. cit.*, pp. 285, 304.

[7] Carlton Hayes, *Generation of Materialism* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1941), pp. 100–101.

Herbert Spencer: "The poverty of the incapable, the distresses that come upon the imprudent, the starvation of the idle . . . when regarded not separately, but in connection with the interests of universal humanity, these harsh fatalities are seen to be full of the highest beneficence—the same beneficence which brings to early graves the children of diseased parents, and singles out the low-spirited, the intemperate, and the debilitated as the victims of an epidemic. . . . That rigorous necessity which when allowed to act on them, becomes so sharp a spur to the lazy and so strong a bridle to the random, these paupers' friends would repeal because of the wailings it here and there produces." When ministers of religion, educators, sociologists either approved of or did not contradict this new "gospel of wealth," it is possible to understand, if not to justify, Marxian condemnation of "bourgeois morality" and "capitalist religion." This very smugness of capitalists drove socialists to fury.

B. Socialist Onslaught

(1) SOCIALIST ORIGINS

Utopian Socialism ushered in the nineteenth century with the schemes of Saint-Simon (1760–1825) and Charles Fourier (1772–1837) in France, and Robert Owen (1771–1858) in England, Scotland, and the United States. The general aim of these reformers was to correct the abuses of private property by the voluntary example of model communities. But if the Scots for a time publicized New Lanark in Scotland, "New Harmony" in Indiana proved a dismal failure. Briefly, voluntary communal living, difficult in religious orders for supernatural motives, proved too much to expect of unregenerate human selfishness.

Syndicalism—derived from the French *syndicat*, a trade union—was foreshadowed in the short-lived "national workshops" of Louis Blanc (1813–82), and came into prominence with Proudhon (1809–65) and Sorel (1847–1922). At first an anarchist, Proudhon after 1852 admitted economic society under proletarian leaders. Holding that "property is theft," the syndicalist did not scruple to sabotage capitalist industry: literally, putting a sabot or wooden shoe into the machinery. Another tactic was the strike, preparatory to the "general strike" in which all the workmen of the land would be able to take over the means of production. Syndicalism, represented in the United States by the I.W.W., proved too radical for the majority of workers, and the famed British General Strike of 1926 turned out to be a failure.

Marxian Socialism was born when Karl Marx (1818–83) and his patron and inseparable collaborator, Friedrich Engels (1829–95), adapted some of Proudhon's economic materialism to Hegelian dialectic. Marx had been born in the Rhineland, a region stirred by the French

Revolution and chafing under the reactionary Prussian yoke. Of his ancestral Judaism, Marx seems to have retained nothing save perhaps a despiritualized Messianism to be fulfilled in a Communist millennium. Any Christianity he imbibed from the family's outward acceptance was lost under teachers of the prevailing Hegelian Pantheism and Feuerbach's "anthropolatry." From Hegel's *Philosophy of History,* Marx derived a determinist theory which at Proudhon's suggestion, he transposed from its idealist setting to a remorseless march of materialist economics. Barred from teaching by his rebellion against the official Hegelianism and successively exiled from Germany and France for journalistic agitation against the established order, Marx spent his later life in England composing that "Dialectical Materialism" which would become concrete in Russian Communism. Assuming an autodynamic, wholly material universe, Marx made man subject chiefly, if not entirely, to economic motives. Existing society is but an expression and defense of the proprietary avarice of the dominant capitalists. In pursuing his exclusive interests, the capitalist usurps the "surplus value" of workmen's labor, for the product is sold for more than the wage paid—an economically unsound postulate. Inevitably, Marx argued, capitalistic exploitation would reach intolerable dimensions and provoke the proletariat into revolt; whereupon the "expropriators are expropriated." Then a transitional "dictatorship of the proletariat" would enforce proper remuneration for each through collective ownership of the means of production. Eventually, when all classes have been dissolved into a classless society, the state will "wither away" and there will emerge a world-society without coercion in which "man, at last master of his own form of social organization, becomes at the same time lord over nature, his own master—free."

(2) SOCIALIST PROGRESS (1848-1914)

First International. In 1848 Marx and Engels gave this doctrine to the world in rudimentary form in their *Communist Manifesto.* From the first, Marxism sought an international audience: "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite!" The rebels of 1848, however, were chiefly interested in political and national grievances, and the *Manifesto* escaped general notice—though not that of Father Ketteler. From his English exile, Marx in 1864 organized the "International Workingmen's Association," popularly called the "Internationale." The intellectuals who tried to spread Socialist doctrines among the workers were furnished in 1867 with a Marxian bible, the first volume of *Das Kapital.* International congresses were held and in 1871 the first approximation of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" appeared in the "Commune of

Paris" where Socialists and Anarchists revolted against the inchoate Third Republic. Only after copious bloodshed was their attempt overthrown, and the episode frightened away disciples from Marxism. Marx himself was led to dissolve his alliance with the Anarchist, Mikhail Bakunin. The remnants of the First International dispersed at the Philadelphia World's Fair in 1876.

State Socialism appeared as a reaction to Marxism in Germany. Karl Rodbertus (1805–75) and Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–64), while not formally repudiating Marxian orthodoxy, stressed practical short-term objectives. Lassalle organized a political party, the Social Democrats, to work for government legislation on behalf of the worker and to form workers' co-operatives. Gradual extension of these and other means, it was felt, would achieve the downfall of capitalism by peaceful, democratic methods. Presently Jules Guesde (1845–1922) formed a similar party in France, and analogous movements appeared in most countries. In England, the "Fabian Socialists," organized in 1883 by Shaw, Webb, Cole, and MacDonald, advised a gradual transformation of society through education and propaganda; many of its members reappeared in the British Labor Party. These Socialist parties were successful in forcing capitalist governments, beginning with that of Bismarck, into conceding limited reforms which mitigated the lot of the worker. Such partial successes irritated the "all or nothing" doctrinaires, and prepared the way for a schism into a political and moderate "Socialism," and a more violent "Communism."

The Second International, founded at Paris on the centenary of Bastille Day, July 14, 1889, signalized the re-emergence of Marxism into favor. After some disputes, leaders avoided the pitfall of the First International by repudiating Anarchism for Marxian orthodoxy. The dead Marx henceforth became a revered and infallible guide, although live leaders continued to dispute about various interpretations of his teaching. Membership in this Second International grew rapidly at successive congresses where a standard program was prepared and party discipline enforced. But as membership grew, so did the numbers of moderates, workingmen, and reformers, interested more in social betterment than in "Dialectical Materialism." Hence the movement became increasingly "political," to the disgust of Lenin's faction. It remained to be seen whether it was truly international. When in 1914 the Socialists for the most part rallied to their respective national states, the Second International practically dissolved—though a "Fourth International" founded in 1946 mustered 22 national units for its 1951 Frankfurt congress. But meanwhile Lenin and Trotsky had organized a more famous and influential "Third International": Communism.

C. The Catholic Answer

(1) Bishop Ketteler's Corporate Revival

Wilhelm von Ketteler (1811–77), bishop of Mainz, has already been briefly mentioned as a leader of German Catholic social organization. As early as November, 1848, he began to prepare a Catholic alternative to unrestricted capitalism and materialistic Socialism. Elected to the Frankfurt parliament in 1848, he commenced during October of that year a series of addresses and sermons on the "Social Question," taking note of the *Communist Manifesto* in the very year of its publication. In 1862 appeared the first of the many able pamphlets on social problems, and during 1869 he led the German hierarchy in making pronouncements on social topics at Fulda.

Revived Thomistic teaching, applied to modern conditions, was the essence of Bishop Ketteler's solution for the social question. Pointing out that God has eminent domain over property and that man merely the usufruct, the bishop asserted that, "the Catholic teaching of private property has nothing in common with the concept current in the world, according to which man regards himself as unrestricted master of his possessions." Rather, "man should never look on these fruits as his exclusive property, but as the common property of all, and should therefore be ready to share them with others in their need." Under existing conditions, however, the bishop deemed the organization of labor unions to assist in this work "not only justified but necessary." Indeed, "it would be great folly on our part if we kept aloof from this movement merely because at the present time it happens to be promoted chiefly by men who are hostile to Christianity." The Catholic Church ought to replace the vanished guilds with "workingmen's associations." With prudent foresight, moreover, Ketteler warned: "Lassalle wishes to carry out this project with the help of capital advanced by the state. This expedient, at least if carried out on a large scale, appears to us . . . unjustifiable encroachment on the rights of private property." Admonishing labor against excessive wage increase demands, he said: "The object of the labor movement is not to be war between the workman and the employer, but peace on equitable terms between both." Among such fair terms, however, the bishop would recognize the justice of workers' claims for shorter hours, days of rest, prohibition of child labor and of female work in the factories. To secure these and other demands, he admitted that the "working classes have a right to demand from the state that it give back to them what it deprived them of, namely, a labor constitution, regulated labor. . . . In the second place, the working-man has a right to demand from the state protection for himself, his

family, his work and health, against the superior force with which capital endows its owner. . . . By wise legislation the state can bring about peaceful organization of the working-classes, and it certainly has no right to leave this result to be accomplished by a long-drawn-out struggle between capital and labor." During the *Kulturkampf*, Bishop Ketteler continued to lead Catholics on social issues, completing his fund of ninety-two sermons or pamphlets. It was a just as well as a graceful tribute to Bishop Ketteler for Pope Leo XIII to refer to him as "my great predecessor": that is, in the preparation of the papal social teaching eventually appearing in *Rerum Novarum*.

(2) CATHOLIC SOCIAL PIONEERS

Realist School. Bishop Ketteler's immediate disciples, who might be termed the Realist School of Social Christianity, had as their spokesman Father Franz Hitze, for a time Center Party deputy in the Reichstag. Building on Father Kolping's Youth Group of 1849, Father Hitze organized the *Arbeiterwohl* during 1879. He and his associates sought state intervention for limiting hours of labor, ensuring Sunday rest, old age and accident insurance, and workers' social education. The German Center Party was its instrument for the realization of its program of defense of the worker. Other German leaders were Alfred Hüffer and Father Joseph Schlimps, who organized a federation of Catholic social groups in 1868, and adopted a complete program in 1870. A minority adhered to these methods in Austria-Hungary as well.

Corporative School. On the other hand, a so-called "Corporative School" was largely predominant among the Austrian and French groups. In Austria this movement was led by Baron Karl von Vogelsang (1818–90), and in France it was headed by Count Albert de Mun (1841–1914) and Marquis Tour du Pin. As might be suspected from the titles of these aristocrats, the movement tended to be paternalistic, and somewhat idealized the Middle Ages. Some proposed an ideal organization of the whole state under a "grand council of corporations" which would advise on social questions. But Count de Mun also formed a Catholic association, including a youth movement, and advocated state relief legislation. During 1880 Father Cerutti formed near Venice the first farm co-operative, and this organization was imitated in most of the other countries by 1914.

Education was the medium chiefly employed by Giuseppe Toniolo (1845–1918), professor and writer at the University of Pisa. He outlined the program of "Christian Democracy," a Catholic social and political movement founded in 1903, which evolved into Don Luigi Sturzo's *Partito Popolare*. Organizations for families were begun by Abbé Viollet in France in 1887, and in Switzerland, Cardinal Gaspard

Mermillod (1824–92), bishop of Lausanne, sponsored social journals and the Catholic Union for Social Studies. In 1925 Abbé Cardijn founded the Jocists—Young Christian Workers—in Belgium, and they spread to France in 1926.

In **Anglo-Saxon lands,** Cardinal Manning, archbishop of Westminster, took the lead in the Catholic labor movement in England, and intervened with outstanding success in the London dock strike of 1889. In the United States, Cardinal Gibbons, archbishop of Baltimore, averted papal condemnation of the first nation-wide labor organization, the Knights of Labor, and softened possible censure on Father McGlynn for participation in Henry George's ill-advised but popular "Single Tax" scheme.

These pioneers, all intelligent, zealous, and courageous workers, even if not always successful at first, in the long run launched movements which achieved great results. Christian democracy, or the banding together for social action of Catholics and conservative non-Catholics, was to be a bulwark against Communism in Western Europe after World War II. Unfortunately much precious time had by then been consumed in overcoming prejudices and fixed ideas, and in working out effective lay support.

91. LEO XIII AND CATHOLIC REVIVAL

A. *General Pontifical History (1878–1903)*

(1) POPE LEO THE CONCILIATOR

Gioacchino Vincenzo Pecci (1810–1903) was born at Carpineto, then in the Papal States, of an aristocratic family. In his early years he seems to have shared his relatives' ambitions for a brilliant ecclesiastical career: on one occasion he assured his brother that he sought "to rise in the hierarchical ranks of prelacy, and so augment the due respect our family enjoys in the country." Educated at the Roman Academia dei Nobili and the Gregorian University, he was ordained to the priesthood in 1837 and entered upon the temporal administration of the Papal States, first as governor of Benevento, and then as delegate for Umbria. In 1843 he was named nuncio to Belgium and consecrated titular archbishop. But as a diplomat he seems to have proved somewhat inexperienced; at least he was recalled in 1845 and "rusticated" as archbishop of Perugia. Out of favor with Cardinal Antonelli, the papal secretary of state, Pecci reminded himself of St. Ignatius Loyola's axiom that everyone ought to be resigned to being but an instrument of Divine Providence, and applied himself to the work of his diocese. Pecci's pastoral skill attracted the pope's attention. He was named cardinal in 1854, consulted on many ecclesiastical projects, and after Antonelli's death, also made camerlengo. As such he presided over the conclave of Feb-

ruary 18, 1878, which on the third ballot of the third day, February 20, chose him as Pope Leo XIII.

Character. "His well-known portraits reveal a tall, thin, diaphanous, distinguished-looking nobleman of exquisite poise and dignity; a man of delicate constitution, but of iron will and tireless energy; a likable, witty, winsome individual who was at the same time conscious of the greatness of his office." [8] Called to the papacy at what seemed the end of his life, he lived to celebrate his silver jubilee. On being congratulated on his age with the wish: "May Your Holiness live to be a hundred," he could retort: "Why put limits to Providence?" Signora Rattazzi felt that he gave an austere impression, though softened by benevolence, especially toward children. On the other hand, the German, Von Bülow, deemed him very friendly and approachable. Finally John Henry Newman, whom Leo at length vindicated, probably carried away the English impression that the pope was the personification of a Christian gentleman.

Role. This holy urbanity enabled Leo XIII to conciliate many of those who had been alienated by Pius IX's intransigence. Without abating any of the Church's claims, the new pope nevertheless found a way of presenting them without needlessly antagonizing Liberals. Perhaps he came to regard them less as traitors to the Church than as deluded wanderers in a generation which no longer appreciated religious authority. At least such was the respect which Leo won for the papacy that from his pontificate may be dated much of the esteem for the office in moderate non-Catholic circles. The Leonine tact induced many to cease to regard the Holy See as the Beast of the Apocalypse; some now deemed it a venerable, benevolent, if somewhat impractical force for peace.

(2) Pontifical Program

Inscrutabili, issued shortly after Pope Leo's accession in 1878, provided a sort of sketch of the papal program. The pope traced the evils of modern society to a repudiation of the Church's guidance in social life. Instead of crippling ecclesiastical activity by anticlerical secularization and indifference, society, once civilized by the Church, ought again to hear her voice, for she has been appointed by God the teacher of mankind. And the pope's valedictory, *Graves de Communi* (1902), continued to plead for the world's recognition that moderns are "not animals but men; not heathens, but Christians."

Doctrinal errors condemned by Leo XIII included Rosmini's Ontologism (Denzinger 1881) and the so-called "Americanism" of natural virtue (Denzinger 1967), treated elsewhere. Dueling, cremation, and

[8] Corrigan, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

abortion were reprobated by the Holy Office, and Anglican orders held invalid.

Devotional practices recommended by the pope included those to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin. The vernacular prayers after low Mass and the "October Devotions" are of Leonine institution.

Pacification of the *Kulturkampf* in Germany and Switzerland, the reaching of an understanding on the Belgian dispute about education, a modus vivendi with Russia, termination of the Goa schism and the Chaldean estrangement, settlement of the Philippine Friary question, and arbitration of the Caroline Island dispute between Germany and Spain—this list of diplomatic successes discussed more at length elsewhere, reveals Leo's conciliatory attitude.

(3) THE ROMAN QUESTION (1870–1903)

Regime of Guarantees. Pope Leo's relations with the Italian kingdom, however, had been largely predetermined by his predecessor's policies. After the annexation of Rome, the Italian parliament had enacted a "Law of Guarantees" which unilaterally regulated relations between Italy and the Holy See. These assured the Roman pontiff of personal inviolability equal to that of the Italian monarch; allowed him complete freedom of communication "in spiritual matters" with the Catholic world; permitted him to retain the Vatican and Lateran palaces, with Castel Gandolfo, and assigned him an annual subsidy of 3,225,000 lire— about $640,000 at pre-1914 rates. Pope Pius IX had rejected this law as a mere governmental fiat which ignored his sovereignty and threatened to reduce him to the status of a national chaplain. To avoid any appearance of recognizing the de facto situation, he had inaugurated the famous "Vatican Captivity" of the papacy during which no pope set foot on Italian soil in order to avoid even an implicit recognition of the kingdom of Italy. But the Italian government could display its resentment as well. Protestant churches began to appear in Rome without disguise in 1871; in 1873 houses of religious orders in Rome were declared secularized, and during 1876 Premier Depretis, a cousin of St. Francesca Cabrini, banned all religious processions outside of churches. During 1874 Pope Pius IX had applied an earlier decree, *Non Expedit*, to regulate the conduct of loyal Italian Catholics: none who manifested his allegiance to the Holy See ought to vote or hold office under the usurping government of Savoyard Italy, and Roman aristocracy divided into pro-Vatican or pro-Quirinal factions.

Papal-royal estrangement. When Leo XIII succeeded Pius IX in February, 1878, it was generally expected that a reconciliation would be reached with the new King, Humbert I (1878–1900), who had mounted

the throne the preceding month. And the new pontiff, without abating papal claims, did show himself not unfriendly. On his own account he made no overt move until the obsequies of the late pontiff—delayed until July 13, 1881—provoked public insults and an attempt to throw the body into the Tiber as it was borne from St. Peter's to San Lorenzo. Pope Leo denounced this violence in an allocution of August 4, and the Freemasons countered with a demonstration on August 7 during which they denounced the Law of Guarantees as too generous toward the papacy. Open conflict followed, sometimes reaching fanatical proportions, e.g., Carducci presented his "Hymn to Satan" at La Scala Opera House in 1882. The regime of Premier Depretis (1876; 1878–79; 1881–87) renewed legal attacks upon the Church. One of the most reprehensible of these was seizure of the property of Propaganda, devoted to the service of Catholic missions throughout the world. No fancied principles of national interest could justify this grievous act of injustice, and Catholic bishops endorsed the protest of Cardinal Guibert of Paris (1884). The Italian government, moreover, violated its own Law of Guarantees in 1882 by assuming jurisdiction over Vatican territory in the case of Martinucci, a dismissed Vatican employee. The French anticlerical Gambetta was eulogized, and a royal representative presided at the erection of a statue at Brescia in honor of the medieval "Communist" agitator, Arnold of Brescia. Papal protests, however repeated, seemed to fall on deaf ears.

Impasse. Some claim that the Italian government during 1887 meditated restoration of a small strip of territory to the Holy See, and that proposals in this direction were actually made in 1894, but quashed by French governmental interference. However this may be, relations between the Holy See and Italy even worsened when Depretis was succeeded by the more radical Francesco Crispi (1887–91; 1893–96). His associate minister, Giuseppe Zanardelli, in 1888 enacted a penal code which threatened with fine or prison clerics or laymen violating the anticlerical laws or speaking against them. In the same year new decrees forbade religious instruction in the state schools. During June, 1889, erection of a statue to the renaissance rebel, Giordano Bruno, provoked antipapal demonstrations at Rome, so that even Leo XIII is reported to have long considered leaving the city. New governmental decrees subjected works of charity to state control. While not essentially modifying the papal directive of *Non Expedit* or *Non Licet,* Leo XIII did approve of the formation of nonpolitical organizations of Catholics to work for local social reforms. Yet in 1898 the otherwise moderate Rudini ministry suppressed four thousand of such groups. But disasters to Italian arms in the invasion of Ethiopia, and bread riots—falsely blamed on Milanese priests—contributed to Rudini's fall. His succcessor

as premier, General Pelloux, permitted re-establishment of the Catholic social groups. The pontificate of Leo XIII closed, however, without any essential modification of the Vatican-Quirinal impasse. Perhaps Pecci had been too closely associated with papal temporal government in his youth to propose the radical solution of 1929, but it is questionable if Italian statesmen were yet disposed to be fair.

B. Papal Doctrinal Guidance

(1) INTELLECTUAL REVIVAL

Papal guidance in intellectual matters had been minimized and hampered by Gallicanism and Febronianism, but the definition of papal infallibility at the Vatican Council had marked the definitive triumph of Ultramontanism. With Leo XIII, instruction of the Catholic world through papal encyclicals became a normal procedure. But few of these Leonine pronouncements can be touched upon here. Basic, however, were the instructions which contemplated a revival of sound ecclesiastical studies and thus prepared the way for a Catholic intellectual revival.

Aeterni Patris (1879) directed Catholic theologians and philosophers to return to St. Thomas Aquinas and Scholastic principles. Catholic educators were to seek in these sources perennial principles for refuting modern pseudo-science, pseudo-rationalism, and pseudo-historicism. Since "false conclusions concerning divine and human things, which originated in the schools of philosophy, have crept into all the orders of the state and have been accepted by the common consent of the masses," the pope insisted that the truth be sought again from the Fathers and Scholastics and reapplied to present-day conditions. From the pope's initiative dates the Neo-Scholastic movement, carried on by Zigliara, Cornoldi, and Satolli at Rome, and soon pushed forward by Mercier at Louvain. This movement, besides systematizing clerical instruction, has produced lay philosophical experts and even interested some non-Catholic scholars, although not to a degree to offset the prevailing anti-metaphysical bias of secular philosophers. The next pontificate would indicate that the Leonine revival of the *philosophia perennis* had come in the nick of time to avert a widespread infiltration of the clergy by Kantian subjectivism.

Saepenumero (1883) is Pope Leo's instruction on history. The pope reminded relativist cynics about the validity of any objective history, that still the "first law of history is that it presume to say nothing false." This was no mere aphorism, for the pontiff opened the Vatican archives to the research of Ludwig von Pastor on papal history, remarking that the truth could never damage the Catholic Church. Rather, "all history shouts out" that God is the supreme governor of mortal events. The

historian, then, ought to go beyond the mere narration of facts to their interpretation; indeed, every Catholic philosophy of history tends to become somewhat of a "theology of history." And for a mentor in this quest for meaning in history, the Pope bade Catholics turn to St. Augustine, author of *De Civitate Dei*.

Providentissimus Deus (1893) completed the Leonine study program by urging the careful cultivation of Biblical sciences. While firmly laying down principles of divine inspiration and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures, Leo XIII bade Catholic scholars devote human learning to the exposition of the sacred text. When a tendency toward Modernism appeared, the pope took the first steps to combat it in 1902 by setting up the Pontifical Biblical Commission to serve as an official, reliable, although not necessarily infallible, guide to biblical studies.

Officiorum ac Munerum (1897) undertook the first thorough revision of the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* since the sixteenth century. The revised lists and modernized norms still preserved a salutary restraint upon inordinate human curiosity.

(2) POLITICAL GUIDANCE

Diuturnum Illud (1881) defended Democracy as a legitimate form of government. It eased many consciences and allayed some hard feelings to hear the Holy See declare authoritatively: "There is here no question of the forms of government, for there is no reason why the government, whether by one or by many, should not meet with the approval of the Church, provided that it be just and for the common good. Therefore, provided that justice be fulfilled, peoples are not forbidden to procure that form of government which is most in agreement with their national temperament and the institutions and customs of their ancestors." By this document Leo XIII did not antagonize the spirit of the age, but if most Catholics heard him gladly, French diehard monarchists, even when specially urged by *Au Milieu des Solicitudes* (1892), refused to "rally" to the Third Republic.

Immortale Dei (1885) clarified Catholic teaching on relations between Church and state. The *Syllabus* had been misinterpreted by many. Between secularists and anticlericals who would subject the Church to the state or entirely separate the institutions, and fanatical medievalists and curialists who would, against all reasonable hope, cling to their own inaccurate versions of theocracy, the pope steered a middle course that recalled the Gelasian dyarchy. Basing his teaching upon Christ's response regarding the rights of God and Caesar, Leo XIII asserted: "The Almighty has appointed the charge of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine, the other over human things. Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed

limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the province of each, so that there is, we may say, an orbit traced out within which the action of each is brought into play by its own native right." Neither disestablishment nor inquisition need be the consequences, for "the Church, indeed, deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not on that account condemn those rulers who, for the sake of securing some great good or hindering some great evil, allow patiently custom or usage to be a kind of sanction for each kind of religion having its place in the state."

Libertas (1888) admitted a legitimate political Liberalism, but distinguished between true liberty and license: "Men have a right freely and prudently to propagate throughout the state what things are true and honorable, so that as many as possible may possess them; but lying opinions, than which no mental plague is greater, and vices which corrupt the heart and moral life, should be diligently repressed by public authority, lest they insidiously work the ruin of the state. . . . Every man in the state may follow the will of God and from a consciousness of duty and free from every obstacle, obey his commands. This is true liberty."

Sapientiae Christianae (1890) commended legitimate love of country, without envy of the Church: "Church and state alike both possess individual sovereignty; hence in the conduct of public affairs neither is subject to the other within the limits to which each is restricted by its constitution." And Americans were reminded by *Longinqua Oceani* (1895) that "it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for Church and state to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced."

(3) Social Renewal

Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae (1880) was devoted by Leo XIII to the subject of Christian marriage, stressing anew its sacramental and indissoluble character. To the latter point the pope returned in the decree of the Holy Office (1886) against civil divorce and formal cooperation with it. Pertinent to the same domestic social unit was the prohibition by the Holy Office in 1889 of direct craniotomy and abortion.

Rerum Novarum (1891) is proof that Pope Leo did not share the blindness or indifference of the arch-Liberal, León Gambetta, who had made in 1872 the too-sweeping statement that "there is no remedy for social ills for the simple reason that there is no social question." The pope refused to allow Christian justice and charity to be fettered by "remorseless economic laws," even though the average Liberal statesman

was not yet willing to admit with Franklin Roosevelt that these "economic laws are not made by nature; they are made by human beings." Lest clerics remain tied to this economic Old Regime, the pope stoutly defended not only private property against Socialism, but the poor man's title to property, his wage, against Capitalism. Since this title was personal as well as physical, the workman ought to have a wage that is "sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife, and his children in reasonable comfort." The state was therefore urged to abandon its discrimination among persons euphoniously termed "laissez-faire" Individualism, and come to the assistance of the poor, though not to the extent of absorbing all private initiative and enterprise. This initiative could best be exerted in the formation of trade associations, defensive unions of workingmen if necessary, but preferably leagues of mutual co-operation between employers and employees. It would be this last directive that would prove most difficult of execution. Indeed, it was impossible save by the means indicated at the close of the encyclical: "Charity is patient, is kind . . . seeketh not her own."

92. ST. PIUS X AND CATHOLIC ACTION

A. *Restoration in Christ*

(1) St. Pius X (1903–14)

Giuseppe Sarto (1835–1914) was born in the village of Riese, near Vicenza, then under Austrian rule. He was early acquainted with manual labor on the small plot of his peasant parents. After his father's death in 1852, only his pious mother's self-denial and help from clerical sponsors enabled him to acquire a formal education and later a scholarship to a seminary. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1858 by Bishop Farini of Treviso and at once began a long parochial apprenticeship, as curate of Tombolo (1858–67) and pastor of Salzano (1867–75). Zealous preaching and devoted solicitude for the poor impressed his superiors, and between 1875 and 1884 he served at one time or another as canon, seminary director, synodal examiner, canonical judge, chancellor, vicar-general, and vicar-capitular.

Episcopate. In 1884 Leo XIII named Sarto to the see of Mantua, where Masonry and Jewry had been strong. Undismayed, the new bishop in his first pastoral pledged "hope—not in man, but in Christ." Even then he set out to fulfill his subsequent papal motto: *"restaurare omnia in Christo."* He pointed out that, "God is driven from politics by separation of Church and state; from science by teaching doubt as a system; from art, lowered through Realism; from the laws, modelled according to notions of flesh and blood; from schools, by the abolition of the catechism; from the family, by the attempt to secularize it in its

origin and deprive it of sacramental grace." After first reforming his clergy and seminary, Bishop Sarto next provided spiritual and civic leadership. Named cardinal and patriarch of Venice in 1893, his installation was held up until 1895 by a governmental *exequatur*. Then the king, after a reserved but friendly interview, yielded. Sarto's denunciation of the king's assassination in 1900 improved unofficial clerical relations with the House of Savoy. At Venice, the cardinal merely expanded his Mantuan activities among clergy and laity, and it is here that he first designated lay participation in the Christian apostolate as "Catholic Action." Music and liturgy were also stressed in his pastoral vigilance.

Papal election. At Pope Leo's death, this "poor country cardinal" met the unforeseen emergency by borrowing money for a round trip to Rome. Assured by Cardinal Mathieu of Paris that he was not *papabile* because he could not speak French, Sarto entered the conclave of August at ease. The early favorite was Cardinal Rampolla, Leo's secretary of state, but Cardinal Puzyna of Cracow announced a veto by the Austrian monarch. In spite of general protest at this anachronistic revival of Caesaro-papism, the cardinals reconsidered and on the seventh ballot, August 4, cast fifty votes for Sarto. He gave every indication of a refusal until, it is said, Cardinal Gibbons pressed acceptance on him through Monsignor Merry del Val, secretary of the conclave and presently secretary of state. The latter reminisced that "truly deep and unaffected humility was, I consider, the prominent characteristic of the Holy Father." This humility, it is now confirmed, was that of sanctity, not of weakness. On January 20, 1904, by *Commissum Nobis* Pius X repudiated the Austrian claim to a veto. For the new pope, "temporal dreams were out of date," and the Habsburgs were reminded of this again in 1914 when the dying pontiff exclaimed: "I bless peace, not war."

(2) Spiritual Leadership

Liturgical reform was the object of papal directives beginning with *Tra Le Sollicitudine* (1903) stressing Gregorian Chant, and *Divino Afflatu* (1911) revising the Breviary. Truly historic were the pope's regulations on the Holy Eucharist, the object of all liturgical devotion. Early and frequent reception of Holy Communion was urged in the decrees, *De Quotidiana* (1906), *Romana et Aliarum* (1906), and *Quam Singulari* (1911). In a letter to the Benedictine abbot primate, April, 1907, the pope also ordered a revision of the Vulgate to the original text of St. Jerome.

Canonical codification was set in progress by St. Pius's initiative expressed in *Arduum Sane* (1904). A commission under Cardinal Pietro Gasparri attacked this gigantic task with vigor, so that it was actually

completed with the issuance of the New Code during the succeeding pontificate. Already in 1908 *Ne Temere* had anticipated the Code in the regulation of marriage.

Curial reorganization was effected by *Sapienti Consilio*, June, 1908. This, the first complete overhauling of the curial machinery since the Sistine decree of 1587, set up the modern sacred congregations, prescribing for Roman congregations, tribunals, and offices, their titles, rights, and duties. By this apostolic constitution the Congregation of Propaganda was confined to strictly missionary jurisdiction, and England, Ireland, Holland, Canada, and the United States, where the hierarchy had been by then regularly established, were removed from its direction.

Catechetical instruction was deemed of prime importance by St. Pius. In 1905 the encyclical *Acerbo Nimis* reinforced Tridentine decrees on the conscientious teaching of the catechism by the clergy, and also ordered erection of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in each parish to secure "lay helpers in the teaching of the catechism." Major points in the papal directive were: 1) "On every Sunday and holy day, with no exception throughout the year, all parish priests and in general all those having the care of souls, shall instruct boys and girls for the space of an hour from the text of the Catechism on those things they must believe and do in order to attain salvation." 2) "They shall at certain times throughout the year, prepare boys and girls to receive properly the sacraments of penance and confirmation by a continued instruction over a period of days." 3) "They shall with a very special zeal on every day in Lent, and if necessary on the days following Easter, instruct the youth of both sexes to receive Holy Communion in a holy manner with the use of apt illustrations and exhortations." 4) In each and every parish the society known as the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine is to be canonically established. Through this Confraternity the pastors . . . will have lay helpers in the teaching of the Catechism. 5) "In the larger cities and especially where universities, colleges, and secondary schools are located, let classes in religion be organized to instruct in the truths of faith and in the practice of Christian life the youths who attend the public schools from which all religious teaching is banned." [9]

Seminary instruction was regulated by Pius X who followed up Pope Leo's stress on Thomistic principles and care for biblical studies, himself founding the Biblical Institute in 1909. Some three hundred Italian seminaries, some with but one or two professors, were consolidated into

[9] Joseph Collins, "Diffusion of Christian Teaching," *Symposium on the Life and Works of Pope Pius X* (Washington: Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, 1946), pp. 106–13.

regional institutions for which a thorough program was laid down in 1908.

(3) CATHOLIC ACTION

"Catholic Action will not please certain timid souls who though good-living, are so attached to the habitual quiet and so afraid of every inno-vation that they believe it is quite sufficient to pray." [10] But let these "rabbits," these "pessimists," know that one must join prayer to action. At any rate, it should be enough to remind these "wearied and dispirited souls" that this enterprise had been commanded by the Holy See. These words of Cardinal Sarto were now to be urged more widely and strongly by Pope Pius X. "Although Pius X did not coin the title 'Catholic Action,' yet he is certainly the first pope to make frequent use of this term to designate the laity's share in the apostolic mission of the Church. . . . Since his pontificate, Catholic Action has remained a technical term both in papal documents and in other writings that adhere accurately to the terminology of the Popes. . . ." [11] In his first encyclical, *E Supremi Apostolatus* (1903), in which he had announced his goal to "restore all things in Christ," St. Pius had declared that the clergy must not fail to enlist the assistance of the laity in the work of the apostolate, but always under the direction of the hierarchy. And the pope is reported to have expressed the conviction that the Church's greatest need of the moment was the formation of such a group of apostolic lay workers in each parish.

The lay social apostolate, nevertheless, presented its own problems, chiefly those of insubordination of single-minded zealots toward hier-archical direction. As early as July, 1904, the pope was obliged to dis-solve the rebellious Catholic groups, Opera dei Congressi. Publications of the Societa Editrice Romana were also banned for insubordination to hierarchical jurisdiction. On March 1, 1905, the pope, as will be seen, condemned the Italian Catholic "autonomous movement" of Padre Murri; the latter's Lega Democratica Nacionale was repudiated in 1906, and clerics were forbidden to join under pain of suspension. The Pente-costal encyclical of 1905, *Il Fermo Proposito*, reiterated the need of subjection of Catholic Action to ecclesiastical authority. *Notre Charge* (1910) suppressed Sangnier's French review, *Le Sillon*, as productive of a "democracy neither Jewish, nor Protestant, nor Catholic, a religion more universal than the Catholic Church." The Sillonists submitted, but in 1912 the pope had to warn against a similar tendency among Catholic workers' unions. In *Singulari Quadam* (1912), the pope opposed forma-

---

[10] Joseph Sommers, S.J., "Catholic Action," *ibid.*, p. 125.
[11] *Loc. cit.*

tion of interconfessional labor unions with a design of escaping ecclesiastical direction. In 1914 the Centrist Dr. Wacker's book, *Center Party and Ecclesiastical Authority,* was placed on the Index. The pope continued to prefer purely Catholic labor organizations, although tolerating in addition "federations formed by Catholics with non-Catholics for the purpose of promoting material welfare . . . under certain definite conditions."

(4) PAPAL POLITICAL RELATIONS

Papal diplomacy. St. Pius X's conduct of diplomatic affairs was definitely in the tradition of the *Zelanti,* and so he was advised and sustained by his secretary of state, Cardinal Merry del Val. This uncompromising policy was criticized by many, especially in regard to Modernism, but the papal attitude was respected. Thus St. Pius X refused to compromise with the French government in regard to separation of Church and state: *Vehementer Nos* (1906). This independence toward secular government was coupled with his repudiation of Austrian dictation, already noted. And his condemnation of *Action Française*—never published until 1927—reveals his willingness to rebuke as well the "sovereign people" for any exaggerated nationalism.

Italian "Christian Democracy," already taught by Toniolo, was implemented by Don Luigi Sturzo's "Popular Union." When Father Sturzo was elected mayor of Caltagirone in 1905, Pius X, instead of excommunicating him as some demanded, accorded him audience and embraced him. But the Vatican refused to endorse any official Catholic political party, and Don Sturzo's activities were merely tolerated as private efforts. During 1909, however, a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary allowed local ordinaries to relax *Non Expedit* at their discretion—by 1914 most of them had done so for local questions. On March 1, 1905, the pope in rejecting Padre Murri's "autonomous movement," denied the view that ecclesiastical authority did not extend to civic matters.

"The Roman Question" remained unsolved, although there may have been some improvement in papal-royal relations during the pontificate. In 1908 the ban on religious instruction in state schools was relaxed to allow parents to provide it at their own expense. After 1909 some Catholics took part in politics and in that year twenty-four Catholic deputies were elected. From 1906 to 1914 Ernesto Nathan, a violent Jewish anticlerical, made himself particularly obnoxious as mayor of Rome. His tactless address of September 20, 1910, elicited an open letter of protest from the pope. Finally in 1914 the Catholics were able to replace Nathan with Prince Colonna. The pope's influence also prevailed sufficiently with 228 deputies to block a divorce bill, and in 1914 the Freemason, Finocchiaro-Apule, was prevented from imposing a civil

marriage ceremony prior to the religious rite. The new Catholic deputies made no difficulty about recognizing Rome as the Italian capital, and it is possible that the Holy See inspired the "feelers" in *Osservatore Romano* suggesting a safeguarding of papal independence "otherwise than by means of territorial sovereignty, as for instance, by an international guarantee." But for this or any other settlement the Liberal Italian statesmen were not yet ready.

B. Modernism in Kant

(1) Evolution of Modernism

Origin and nature. Modernism was the attempt of certain Catholic scholars—their eyes captivated by contemporary philosophy and science —to renovate or "modernize" the Catholic Church, not only in discipline, but even in dogma, by applying to it principles of Kantian subjectivism. Though the external fabric of ecclesiastical organization and the dogmatic terminology were to remain, behind this façade the innovators hoped to "reinterpret" Catholicity in the light of "modern needs." Thus, Modernism became a form of subjective Nominalism whereby the meaning underlying dogmatic expressions would be expounded according to the personal views of theologians and thereby the more easily harmonized with contemporary non-Catholic thought. "Revelation," Modernists said, "is not an affirmation but an experience." This could only signify that subconscious individual experience alone would serve as the source of enlightenment about the meaning of dogmas. The latter, indeed, were to be esteemed as nothing more than external stimuli, adaptable changing guides. Truth, then, was merely an intrinsic phenomenon varying with individuals and times, which bore merely an accidental relation to external phenomena or reality. Since, according to Modernists, present-day experience must be unduly strained to conform to antiquated dogmatic formulas, such as the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, such formulas, though remaining verbally the same, might be reinterpreted in a new sense. For in Loisy's view, "these formulas are not immutable, they are perfectible. All have responded to a need of the Christian conscience, and consequently contain a moral sense which we must extract when the symbol itself has become outmoded." In their place new religious impulses will be substituted, emerging from the subconscious as a "vital phenomenon."

Expression of modernist ideas can already be found in the Protestant Sabatier's *Esquisse d'une Philosophie de la Religion* (1879). Blondel's *L'Action* (1893) presented a novel theme, while Modernism was detected in La Berthonnierre's *Essais de Philosophie Religieuse* (1903) and *Le Realisme Chretien et L'Idealisme Grec* (1904). At the same time Abbé Alfred Loisy applied Modernism to biblical criticism in *L'Evan-*

gile et L'Eglise (1902) and *Autour d'un Petit Livre* (1903). Therein distinction was drawn between a "Christ of history" and a "Christ of Faith": the former had no intention of founding a Church, which is the product of the evolution of Christian consciousness. French Modernism culminated in a notorious article, "What is dogma?", written by Edouard Le Roy for the April, 1905, number of *La Quinzaine.* Official formulas, it would seem, were issued merely to stimulate internal religious inquiry. Meanwhile in England the Jesuit, George Tyrrell, was developing Modernist theology. He had indeed studied St. Thomas superficially, but the teaching of his *Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi* and *Between Scylla and Charybdis* (1903–7) was no brand of Scholasticism. For Tyrrell, theology was normative only insofar as it "formulates and justifies the devotion of the best Catholics, and as far as it is true to the life of faith and charity as actually lived." It Italy, Foggazaro tried to sketch in popular fashion how Modernism should be lived in his novel, *Il Santo* (1905). Here he predicted that the moment was at hand when the Church would undergo revival under Modernist auspices. At the same time Padre Murri sought applications of Modernism in the social field. Most of these leaders belonged to a reputed intelligentsia, but one uninfluenced by the budding Neo-Scholasticism—which they derided as the dusting off of outworn weapons.

(2) Condemnation of Modernism

Preliminary censures. Pope Leo's *Providentissimus Deus* had been a rebuke to biblical Modernism, and when Loisy failed to heed its norms he was deprived of his professorship at the Institut Catholique at Paris. In 1903 five of Loisy's books, together with others by Le Roy, Le Berthonniere, and Houtin, were placed on the Index by a decree of the Holy Office. Finally on July 4, 1907, the Holy Office in the decree *Lamentabili* proscribed sixty-five propositions, drawn chiefly from Loisy, Le Roy, and Tyrrell, although these authors were not superficially named. These propositions were all "reprobated and proscribed" with papal approval.

Pascendi Dominici Gregis (1907). Modernist subtleties did not appeal to St. Pius X, simple with the simplicity of Christ. As successor of him to whom the "historical Christ" had said, "Feed my sheep," he issued on September 8, 1907, an encyclical providing solid doctrinal food for the flock. *Pascendi* branded Modernism as a "synthesis of all heresies," embracing Agnosticism, Immanentism, and Evolutionism. Its chief cause lay in ignorance of Scholasticism by men deluded by the "false glamour" of modern philosophies. Curious to know more than it behooves to know, inflated by the pride of modern science, these persons were pushed on to novelties, "lest they appear as other men," saying the traditional

things. Whence their erroneous conclusions: Faith arises from a need of the divine, a need perceived by a religious sense resident in the subconscious, unaffected by dogmas. Tradition, therefore, they would term but communication of the collective religious sense, successively "transfigured and disfigured" during the course of centuries. Thereafter everything, Church, sacraments, Scriptures, history, is warped to fit their varying subconscious religious sense, their emotional "need of the divine." Dogmas vanish into mere symbols; censures are disregarded as antiquated. All is "theological symbolism."

Repression. The pope then laid down practical remedies to check Modernism: (1) study of scholastic as well as positive theology; (2) exclusion from seminaries and colleges of directors and professors in any way imbued with Modernism; (3) episcopal vigilance committees to supervise publications and clergy conferences, and to report to the bishop who in turn must periodically inform the Holy See. These measures proved so effective that as early as 1909 Loisy admitted that Modernism was "doomed and would not be difficult to crush." The leaders left the Church: Loisy, excommunicated by name in 1908, held tenaciously to his views until his death in 1940. Tyrrell died in the Petrie home in 1909, dubiously reconciled by Abbé Bremond. Padre Murri was excommunicated in 1909 but returned to the Church during the 1940's. Floods of modernist pamphlets appeared and there were reports of clandestine agitation. Pius X, who believed in taking no chances, issued on September 1, 1910, the motu proprio, *Sacrorum Antistitum*, which imposed an "Oath Against Modernism," upon prelates, educators, and candidates for the subdiaconate. Criticism has been heard in certain quarters that this provision is now obsolete, but Pius XII in *Humani Generis*, August 12, 1950, still found it necessary to castigate "some false opinions which threaten to undermine the foundations of Catholic doctrine." At the time of Modernism, however, some suspicions were excessive, even if it may not be true that Pope Benedict XV discovered in his predecessor's desk a denunciation of himself, then archbishop of Bologna, as suspected of Modernism.

93. BENEDICT XV AND WORLD WAR I

A. *Papal Peace*

(1) POPE BENEDICT XV (1914–22)

Giacomo della Chiesa (1854–1922) was born at Genoa of a noble family. His elementary education was received in the Genoese public schools and he at first pursued studies in civil law at the University of Genoa from 1871 to 1875. During these years, however, he was a member of a confraternity which served in hospitals, so that his decision to embrace the clerical life was not wholly unexpected. After he had

received his doctorate in civil law in 1875, his father permitted him to enroll in the Capranica College where he obtained his theological degree in 1878. Ordained to the priesthood in the same year, he attended the Academia dei Nobili where he secured a doctorate in canon law in 1880. During 1881 he became secretary to Cardinal Rampolla, serving under him first at the Spanish nunciature (1883–87), and then in the Roman secretariat of state. Monsignor della Chiesa remained deputy secretary of state until 1907 when he was named archbishop of Bologna and consecrated by Pope Pius X himself. He was zealous in visiting the parishes of his diocese, especially during Forty Hours, and conducted a pilgrimage to Lourdes in 1913. He was created cardinal on May 25, 1914, and—following the death of Pius X on August 20—was elected to the papacy on September 3, 1914.

Character. The new pope had several physical handicaps: he was short and somewhat lame, and his voice was not particularly good. He had, however, a well-trained mind, great powers of concentration and administration, and a good sense of humor. To an English lady, at a loss during a papal audience, he gave a complete guide of what to see in Rome, complete with the times of opening and closing of the museums. If Benedict XV seems a less attractive personality than St. Pius X, it was from no absolute deficiency, but merely from the competition with sanctity. In learning and diplomatic skill he undoubtedly surpassed his predecessor, and Providence gave him to the Church at the critical period of World War I when his talents were needed.

Curial activity. It was providential also that the new Code of Canon Law, begun by St. Pius X, could be guided to completion by a pope versed in both the laws. Its appearance was clearly the most memorable event of the pontiff's ecclesiastical administration: promulgated at Pentecost, 1917, it went into effect on May 19, 1918. During 1915 the pope ordered the addition of the invocation, *Regina Pacis,* to the Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and on August 10 of the same year the papal document, *Incruentum Altaris,* conceded trination privileges to all priests for All Souls' Day. Benedict XV assumed personal direction of a new Congregation for the Oriental Church, and his important encyclical, *Maximum Illud,* stressed the need for developing a native clergy and improving missionary methods.

(2) Papal War Problems

Diplomacy was the outstanding task of Benedict XV's pontificate. He was definitely *politique,* and a disciple of Leo XIII and the latter's secretary of state, Cardinal Rampolla. He was himself the guide to his own secretary of state, Cardinal Pietro Gasparri (1914–30), who in turn was the diplomatic mentor of Eugenio Pacelli. The pope strove con-

scientiously to maintain strict impartiality during the war, although the English Cardinal Gasquet deemed the Roman curia on the whole somewhat pro-Austrian. Passing over Benedict's wartime activities for the moment, it may be noted that his tact contributed to renewal of diplomatic relations with the Vatican by Great Britain, France, and Portugal— and on January 4, 1919, President Woodrow Wilson called briefly upon the pope. During the peace period Benedict XV relaxed some of the regulations for diplomatic etiquette for Catholic rulers' visits to the Holy See. Though the secular governments were not always conciliated, papal war relief work won Benedict XV widespread popular esteem and many non-Catholic soldiers testified their gratitude.

Strict impartiality was the pope's announced policy during the war, and the criticisms of his conduct by both sides may well represent an unconscious testimony to his fidelity in keeping his pledged word. Elected during the war, the pope took the first opportunity, November 1, 1914, to urge peace upon the belligerents. His request for a truce at Christmas was not heeded, but proposals during January, 1915, for mutual exchange of interned civilians and disabled prisoners of war were eventually put into partial effect through Swiss mediatorship. During January, 1915, the pope also deplored the "injustice" to Belgium, an injustice indeed admitted by the German chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg. On July 28, 1915, the pope issued a second peace plea, and the following September suggested five conditions: (1) preservation of French territorial integrity; (2) restoration of Belgian independence; (3) preservation of Austria-Hungary, although with some concessions to Italy; (4) re-establishment of Poland within generous limits; (5) freedom of the Dardanelles. In November, 1916, he condemned the bombing of the open city of Padua.

Papal peace note. During 1917 the pope made his major effort to terminate the war. In May he consecrated Eugenio Pacelli and sent him to the Kaiser with an urgent plea for peace on the terms of the general peace note of August 1, 1917. This urged participants that, "the moral force of right shall be substituted for the material force of arms; . . . a just agreement of all for the simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments; . . . institution of arbitration . . . subject to regulations to be agreed on and sanctions to be determined against a state which should refuse; . . . total evacuation of Belgium with a guarantee of her complete political, military, and economic independence; . . . similar evacuation of French territory; . . . similar restitution of German colonies; . . . as regards territorial questions, to examine them in a conciliatory spirit." Unfortunately, as the pope himself admitted privately later, this note was badly timed, for it followed American entrance into the conflict and the First Russian Revolution. The first event

heartened the Allies, the second the Central Powers, to seek the chance of total victory rather than compromise on a negotiated peace. But time proved that the real losers were all the belligerents concerned.

(3) PAPAL PEACE PROBLEMS

The Versailles Conference, and not the peace note, therefore, laid down terms after the "war to end war." Despite this general disregard of his proposals, Pope Benedict XV, unlike certain critical Catholics, did not wash his hands of the secular groping for peace. His encyclical, *Pacem Dei Munus,* in 1920 lauded a league of nations, without necessarily endorsing all of the features of the league set up at Geneva and the interwoven terms of the Versailles peace pact. Indeed, the pope urged that: "It is most desirable that all states, putting aside all their mutual suspicions, unite to form only one society, or even better, one family, for the defense of their respective liberties and the maintenance of the social order." At the same time, however, Benedict XV was not deceived by vague Liberal idealism and self-righteousness, indicted at the very peace conference by the German delegates. With some prescience these obviously partisan witnesses had protested against the dictated peace terms: "In the document before us a moribund conception of the world, imperialistic and capitalistic in tendency, celebrates its last horrible triumph." [12] With Christian realism and the objective impartiality of Rome, the pope perceived that nationalistic animosities would linger on. During 1920 he warned in words that proved prophetic in the light of World War II: "Remember that nations do not die; humbled and oppressed, they chafe under the yoke imposed upon them, preparing a renewal of the combat, and passing down from generation to generation a mournful heritage of revenge."

The Roman Question had been explicitly banned from discussion at Versailles by the fifteenth article of the secret Treaty of London. This document, signed in 1915, was given to the world from the Petrograd archives by the Communist revolutionaries. The portion pertaining to the Holy See pledged: "France, Great Britain, and Russia will support the opposition which Italy may make to any proposition, no matter what, having in view the introduction of a representative of the Holy See in the negotiations which have for their object the questions arising out of the present war." It was in vain, then, that Monsignor Kelley, later bishop of Oklahoma City, strove to have the Roman Question brought up at Versailles by the American delegation. Cardinal Gasparri, however, asserted that the Roman Question ought not to be settled "through foreign armies," and this also implied not through foreign

[12] Grove Haines and Ross J. Hoffman, *Origins of the Second World War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1943), p. 96.

governments. Cardinal Ehrle, the Vatican librarian, unofficially put forward a suggestion of restoration of papal temporal sovereignty limited to the Leonine City. But the Italian Government, which had seized the Palazzo Venetia in 1916, was unwilling to make any concessions whatsoever. Pope Benedict XV, however, by entirely revoking *Non Expedit* removed any obstacle to Catholic influence upon national politics. Don Sturzo organized his *Partito Popolare* on January 10, 1919, although the *Osservatore Romano* asserted on June 10, 1920: "The Holy See is and remains completely foreign to the direction and attitude of the *Partito Popolare Italiano,* as of all political parties." Thus Benedict XV was forced to leave a still unsolved Roman Question to his successor when he died after a short illness, January 22, 1922.

B. Secular Belligerency

(1) WORLD WAR I

The seeds of war, according to Hayes, lay in international anarchy. Blustering self-interest led to a race for the strong, and unlimited competition in domestic economics reacted upon national ambitions and was carried over into the international sphere. Areas of friction were created through myopic self-interest. No international organ existed to settle disputes save by extraordinary international conferences which uniformly failed to win general approval, in the face of rampant imperialism and nationalism.

More proximate causes, in Fay's view, were: 1) a system of secret alliances, which made a local conflict inevitably world-wide. Although these alliances, chiefly the German-Austrian-Italian Triple Alliance and the Anglo-French-Russian Entente, were defensive in aim, the security afforded by promised support of friends rendered an offensive possible and assured that it would be on an extensive scale. 2) Militarism involved huge armies and the presence of a military class prone to push, and even to rush diplomats into war by demanding general mobilization in any emergency. 3) Nationalism, especially when heated by war propaganda, evoked worship of the fatherland, and hatred for other nations: newspapers infuriated the populace, heckled the pacifiers, and precipitated issues. 4) Economic imperialism, though somewhat exaggerated, was also a contributing factor.

Occasion. After a series of international crises in 1905, 1908, 1911, 1912, and 1913 had produced diplomatic hypertension, Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, reputed advocate of a Triple Monarchy to alleviate Slav grievances within the Habsburg state, was slain by three Bosnian youths, promoters of a "Greater Serbia." Austrian foreign minister Berchtold hoped to chastise Serbia in a local war, but Russia announced support of the latter. Russian mobilization alarmed Austria's

German ally, who mobilized in turn and asked France her intentions. Receiving an evasive reply, Germany strove to skirt French defenses by passing through Belgium, which brought in Britain as guarantor of Belgian neutrality. Eventually the Entente blockade of Germany was countered by German submarine blockade of the British Isles, and the United States was drawn into the conflict.

Course. German blitzkrieg tactics called for a quick decision. Unexpected Russian speed in advance necessitated transfer of German forces from France to the eastern front. The latter was saved but at the expense of fatally impairing the Western offensive. Austrian military weakness prolonged this diversion until 1917 when czarist collapse was helped along by introduction of the Bolshevik germ. Meanwhile the British and French with difficulty sustained the western front in monotonous trench warfare. American assistance arrived in time to offset German successes in the east, and internal dissension on the German home front made armistice imperative. When the four-year ordeal was over, the Western World was exhausted more than by previous conflicts. For this had been a popular war involving the personal sacrifice and hardships of a majority of the people; it had been an unusually destructive war affecting the lives and property of millions; it had, finally, been a demoralizing conflict which shook Liberal confidence in the "cult of progress," and had left secular leaders disillusioned, cynical and desperate.

(2) VERSAILLES: GERM OF WORLD WAR II

Peace terms. Germany ceded Alsace-Lorraine, Eupen-Malmédy, Memel, Posen, Danzig, part of West Prussia, and after plebiscites, districts in Schleswig and Silesia. The Saar was internationalized for fifteen years, under French economic control. All overseas dominions went to Britain, France, Belgium, and Japan. The German army was held to one hundred thousand, its fleet to six battleships, six cruisers, and twelve torpedo boats. All Rhine fortifications and Baltic defenses were dismantled and Allied commissions placed in charge of German inland waterways. Germany was forced to acknowledge full responsibility for the war and promise to pay an undetermined sum in reparations—later set at 132,000,000,000 gold marks. The Centrist leader Erzberger was assigned the thankless task of signing this harsh treaty. Later the Treaties of St. Germain and Trianon reduced Austria and Hungary to small inland states, the former of which was forbidden to join Germany. Such was to be Hitler's initial talking point.

League of Nations. President Wilson had consented to terms not in conformity with his announced "Fourteen Points" in the hope that the

League of Nations would rectify any injustice. The resulting League was a free association of states for the realization of certain aims, but none yielded its sovereignty and each retained a veto. The League was to formulate plans and suggest solutions in a crisis, but it remained for the several states to take what steps they thought best to enforce decisions. The supreme organ was to be an assembly with one vote for each nation-member, but effective direction rested with the council composed of the Great Powers. Russia's ostracism and the abstention of the United States struck the League crippling blows at the start. It tended then to become an instrument of Britain and France to maintain the *status quo*. When these came to disagree on the *status quo*, it lost all political significance, although certain juridical and social agencies attached to the League continued to do useful work.

Catholic attitudes. Some Catholics regarded the League as set up by a Presbyterian President Wilson in the old Calvinist center of Geneva a direct antithesis to Benedict XV and the Roman See. They resented the exclusion of the pope from the peace conference and still smarted under the rebuffs accorded his peace proposals. But other Catholics, at least in time, came to prefer an imperfect League of Nations to none at all. In fact the non-political features of the League organization embraced many worthwhile humanitarian projects and various attached agencies performed useful social functions.

In any event, the new League of Nations was secularist, in fact, the triumph of secularism. Despite many naturally good principles, the League avoided any explicit invocation of God or any recognition of Christianity. Versailles and its League may be taken as marking the zenith of Liberalism, but this "parliament of man in the federation of the world" proved exceedingly short-lived at Geneva.

94. TEUTONIC KULTURKAMPF

A. *Political Background* (*1867–1918*)

(1) The Hohenzollern Second Reich (1871–1918)

Bismarck, first German chancellor (1871–90), dominated the reigns of William I (1871–88) and Frederick (1888). A conservative junker, he was nonetheless an intelligent and progressive statesman. Once he had united Germany and defeated France, he professed no further territorial ambitions. Germany was a "sated power" and would confine her efforts to maintaining the *status quo* by isolating France from a war of revenge. In this objective Bismarck was quite successful: while binding Austria and Italy to Germany by the Triple Alliance (1882), he yet preserved friendship with the Russian czar through the *Drei-Kaiser-Bund* (1881) and Reinsurance Treaty (1887–90). Meanwhile he kept

on good terms with Great Britain by moderating German colonial and naval expansion. For Bismarck, the strong German army would suffice to bring the Reich political primacy, and industrial development would ensure prosperity. German industrial growth, however, accentuated social problems and provoked active socialist agitation. Regarding Socialism as a greater menace than Romanism, Bismarck eventually made peace with the latter in order to oppose the former. His attitude, however, was not merely negative, for between 1883 and 1889 he took the lead in social insurance legislation which did much to allay discontent among the laboring classes.

William II (1888-1918) would not tolerate for long the dictation of this aged mentor of the Hohenzollern; in 1890 he "dropped the pilot" and essayed thereafter to act as his own prime minister. His labor policy was even more liberal than Bismarck's and his condescension to the proletariat, similar to that of Napoleon III, won for him for a time the title of the "Labor Emperor." But his foreign policy was unwise. Not only did this neurotic ruler alarm Europe by irresponsible, belligerent speeches, but his surrender to the naval building mania of Tirpitz brought Germany into rivalry with Great Britain which eventually sided with France and Russia against the Central Powers. During the World War, greater tactlessness—and inept propaganda—antagonized neutrals and the United States, setting in motion forces which brought about the downfall of the Hohenzollerns.

(2) AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN AUSGLEICH (1867-1918)

Francis Joseph (1848-1916) meanwhile was trying to preserve Habsburg rule over a multiracial realm. Evicted from Germany in 1866 and shorn of all control in Italy, Austria found her subject Slavic peoples eager to challenge her traditional pre-eminence. To avert dissolution of the monarchy into a host of petty national states—as actually happened in 1918—Austria formed a partnership with Hungary during 1867. The ensuing Dual Monarchy allowed each country domestic autonomy while preserving a common foreign and military policy. The federal parliament was continually rent by such diverse nationalist pressures, moreover, that Austrian leadership usually prevailed by default. Personal prestige and experience enabled Francis Joseph to manage a theoretically unworkable government, but his heir, Archduke Francis Ferdinand, is said to have contemplated a redress of Slavic grievances by some device of a "Triple Monarchy." His assassination stifled such hopes, and the aged monarch's successor was young Charles (1916-18) who spent his brief reign in trying to extricate the creaking Habsburg realm from the disasters of World War I. He failed, but terminated Habsburg tenure honorably and gracefully.

B. German Religious Contest

(1) ORIGINS OF THE KULTURKAMPF (1870–73)

Causes. Bismarck had dissembled his anti-Catholic prejudices pending German unification, but after 1871 he felt no need to do so longer. In 1870 the Vatican definition of papal infallibility had furnished new fuel for Protestant bigotry, and seemed a deliberate affront to the theory of the secular state. This is reflected in Bismarck's personal declaration of war, May 14, 1872: "After the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church which have been recently promulgated, it will not be possible for a secular government to conclude a concordat with the papacy, unless that government effaces itself to the last degree and in a way to which the German Reich at least will not consent. Do not fear. We will not go to Canossa, either in body or in spirit." The succeeding conflict was therefore visualized as a "war for civilization," a *Kulturkampf* according to a term first used by Rudolf Virchow in 1873. Presumably the aim of this contest was to supplant the ancient Habsburg, Roman and Catholic traditions of Germany's First Reich with a new outlook, a thoroughly German culture. It was expected that the Old Catholic movement might be utilized to launch a *los von Rom* movement within the Catholic Church itself, and the *Kulturkampf* was foreshadowed when Baden recognized the Old Catholic prelate, Reinkens, as bishop. Though the contest was primarily a Prussian thing, it had repercussions in other German states: Premiers Lutz of Bavaria and Jolly of Baden sympathized with Bismarck, and Baden and Hesse recognized the Old Catholic hierarchy. Bismarck's aim may also have been partly international, and echoes of the *Kulturkampf* reverberated as far as the Congress of the United States.

Inaugural. An occasion for the fight was afforded by discussion of the new imperial constitution. Since the Prussian constitution of 1848 had granted the Catholic Church considerable liberty in administration, religious instruction and communication with Rome, Bishop Ketteler urged that its provisions be extended to the whole new German federation. This became the program of the states' rights parties in Bavaria and Hanover, aided by national groups of Poles, Danes, and Alsatians. The Poles were particularly incensed at Bismarck's order that all Polish schools teach German and in German from Easter, 1873, contrary to a privilege dating from 1842. Most of these dissenters were Catholics, following the lead of Windhorst in forming the Center coalition during 1870. They won sixty-seven seats in the 1871 Reichstag election, increased their strength to ninety-four during the *Kulturkampf*, and until 1933 consistently held about one hundred seats in an assembly of three hundred to four hundred—a deciding factor since no one party polled a

clear majority between 1871 and 1933. But in 1871 Bismarck pushed through the imperial constitution with a significant modification of the Prussian religious articles. The Catholic participation in the ministry of cult was abolished, and Catholics subjected to Protestant secularism: "All public and private educational institutions are subject to supervision by officials appointed by the state." Criticism of this administration was banned under penalty of fine or prison. When Pope Pius IX intimated that the Febronian Cardinal von Hohenlohe, named ambassador to the Vatican, might not act in such a secular capacity, it was rumored that Ultramontane pressure had influenced the Vatican decision. Accordingly on July 4, 1872, Germany declared her independence of the most virulent type of Ultramontane, the Jesuits. Not only were they banished from the Reich, but in 1873 the Sacred Heart Sisters, Redemptorists, Holy Ghost Fathers, and Vincentians were exiled as "affiliated societies"—apparently on the theory that the Jesuit "Black Pope" directed all religious. The office of Catholic military bishop was suppressed when use of a Catholic chapel by the Old Catholics was protested.

(2) Zenith of the Kulturkampf: Falk Regime (1873–79)

May Laws. Having failed to divide Catholics by his first measures, Bismarck mounted his attack by naming Dr. Adalberg Falk, a Freemason, as minister of Cult. By successive enactments this tool of the chancellor constructed a code similar to the French Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The first of a series of "Falk Laws" was promulgated in May, 1873, decreeing: 1) *Regulation of clerical education:* henceforth no one might be given any ecclesiastical office in Germany unless he had completed a course in a secular high school, studied three years of theology at a German university, and had passed an examination prepared by state inspectors. If desired, theology might be taken in a seminary, provided that its discipline, curriculum, and examinations were regulated by the state inspectors. 2) *Ecclesiastical government:* All episcopal nominations to benefices must be notified to the civil authorities thirty days before going into effect under pain of nullity. All benefices must be held by Germans. Disciplinary trials of the clergy in the canonical courts were subject to the inspection, revision, and in some cases, veto of the secular courts. Civil judges might cite clerics before them and depose them from office, especially for imposing censures upon clerics obedient to the Falk Laws. The German hierarchy promptly forbade their clergy to obey these May Laws, and its stand was upheld by the pope. Meanwhile Archbishop Ledochowski of Gnesen also forbade religious schools in Poland to comply with the linguistic ban. While the Center Party remonstrated in the Reichstag, the Catholic press defied

the Government, and Catholic laymen organized mass meetings of protest.

Coercive measures were added to the original May Laws during March and May, 1874, and supplemented in March-June, 1875: 3) Catholic societies were dissolved and their press prosecuted. 4) Civil marriage was introduced into Prussia in 1874 and extended to Germany the next year. 5) Beneficiary vacancies, produced by the numerous arrests of bishops and priests for disregard of the May Laws, were to be filled by the cathedral chapters; in case of their refusal, the government would itself name administrators. But when the bishops, Melchers of Cologne, Eberhard of Trier, and Ledochowski of Gnesen, were arrested in 1874, the chapters refused to elect vicars. 6) Exile, therefore, was virtually imposed on the clergy, for in May, 1874, any priest who had been deposed by the government was forbidden to exercise his ministry or reside in his parish under penalty of loss of civil rights and exile from Germany. The few priests who sided with the government were excommunicated by the hierarchy and shunned by the laity. The bishop of Paderborn was exiled and the bishops of Breslau and Münster were arrested during 1875. 7) Clerical subsidies were discontinued for recalcitrant pastors. 8) Any religious orders, save those tending the sick, were expelled from Germany. 9) Ecclesiastical property was taken from episcopal direction and placed under committees of laymen. Catholics, however, chose trustworthy men who safeguarded the property according to secret instructions from the bishops.

Catholic resistance was heroic and prolonged, for the Falk Code, once complete, was vigorously enforced in 1876 and 1877. By the latter year, nine sees were vacant by death, deposition, or exile. A thousand parishes lacked pastors, and over two thousand priests had been fined, imprisoned, or exiled. All seminaries had been closed and detective measures taken against secret training. The episcopal heroes were Archbishop Ledochowski, named cardinal in prison by Pius IX, and Bishop Ketteler who, like Cardinal Faulhaber a half century later, was too respected to be molested. Catholic lay officials continued to be dismissed until Falk resigned in 1879.

(3) SETTLEMENT OF THE KULTURKAMPF (1879–90)

Road to Canossa. Bismarck, who had survived an assassination attempt which he blamed on the Center, was exasperated. But his persecuting majority had been composed of a coalition of Conservatives, the agrarian Junkers' party, and the National Liberals, the burgher industrialists. As in every highly industrialized country, the German proletariat was seeking political recognition and was prone to give its al-

legiance to the new Marxist parties. Bismarck and the Conservatives began to realize that the Liberals' laissez-faire tenets were provoking this Socialist threat. Windhorst's Centrists were prepared to ally themselves, now with Socialists against Liberals in order to secure needed workingmen's assistance, now with Conservatives against Socialists to block radical Marxian demands. Finally in 1879 the agrarian interests of the Junkers clashed with the tariff protecting urban industries, and the Conservatives broke up the coalition with the National Liberals. Pius IX had died in 1878, and from the beginning of his pontificate Leo XIII had extended the olive branch to William I. Though some preliminary talks through Cardinal Mazella led to no immediate result, the way to Canossa was open.

Reconciliation. But Bismarck had to decide between fighting Catholics or Socialists. He chose to make peace with the former, and in 1880 took a cautious step backward by empowering his officials to use discretion in executing the May Laws—practically suspending them. Bishops and priests were for the most part permitted to return and provisional appointments to vacancies tolerated. Diplomatic relations with the Vatican, severed in 1874, were resumed in 1882. In 1885 the German government made a friendly gesture by inviting Pope Leo's arbitration in regard to German-Spanish claims to the Caroline Islands. In the same year Archbishops Ledochowski and Melchers agreed to sacrifice themselves to save Prussian face, as Droste-Vischering had done in the Mixed Marriage Controversy. Both resigned their sees; they were given papal curial posts later. For his part, the chancellor invited Bishop Kopp of Fulda to supervise revision of the May Laws. With the exception of the ban on Jesuits and "affiliates," and the requirement of notification of prospective appointments to ecclesiastical benefices, the Falk Code was abolished. In 1886 also the devout Prince Leopold became regent of Bavaria and anti-Catholic laws were rescinded in Hesse and Baden. In May, 1887, the pope could announce to the cardinals that for all practical purposes the *Kulturkampf* was at an end. After Bismarck's retirement, the Jesuit "affiliates" (1893) and in 1904 even the Jesuits themselves were allowed to return.

(4) CATHOLIC EQUILIBRIUM (1890–1918)

William II, by comparison with Bismarck, was friendly toward Catholics. Disregarding Protestant agitation, he freed the Catholic clergy from peacetime military service in 1890, and during 1891 restored the clerical subsidies withheld since 1875. The Kaiser visited Pope Leo in 1893, and in 1901 intervened on behalf of Catholics at Strassburg University.

The Center Party, founded in 1870 by Windhorst, Mallinckrodt, the

Reichenspergers and Savigny, preserved its strength after the *Kultur-kampf*. From 1895 it generally supported the imperial government, although from its conservative majority, a left wing, led by Matthias Erzberger, dissented in drawing closer to the progressive parties. In March, 1906, the party was stirred when one of its members, Julius Bachem, urged a broader social program: a desertion of preoccupation with exclusively Catholic issues. Controversy waxed warm between the nonconfessional viewpoint on social matters of the Cologne school, and the strictly Catholic program of the Berlin group. In 1912 Pius X in *Singulari Quadam* noted that only confessional labor associations might properly be termed Catholic Action, although interconfessional unions might be permitted for limited aims. In the same year the Center de-fined itself as a "politically non-confessional party." It rallied to the support of the monarchy during World War I, but showed no disposi-tion to restore it once it had fallen. The Centrist Erzberger was given the thankless task of concluding a humiliating but necessary peace. On his return he was assassinated, first victim of the Nazi *Kulturkampf* of the future, for despite exemplary Centrist patriotism, Catholics were accused of "stabbing in the back," along with other internationalists, Jews and Reds, supposedly undefeated German military forces.

Catholic social activity. The *Albertsverein* for Catholic university students and the *Caritasverband* of all Catholic welfare groups had both been organized in 1897, and annual Catholic congresses con-tinued to demonstrate Catholic unity. Other organizations took care of the needs of Catholic emigrants from Germany, especially to the United States, and the promotion of German Catholic missionary work. The *Volksverein* was a well-organized workers' guild of five hundred thousand persons, and professional men also possessed their associations. The *Borromeo-Verein* spread good literature, and many youth groups were founded.

C. Austrian Religious Alienation (1867–1918)

(1) AUSTRIAN KULTURKAMPF (1867–82)

Retreat from the Concordat. Austro-Hungarian dualism, begun by the *Ausgleich* of 1867, necessitated a new constitution which threatened the understanding reached with the Holy See in 1855. From the begin-ning the new Liberal regime tried to weaken the privileged position of the Catholic Church. Friedrich, Graf von Beust (1809–86), during his chancellorship (1867–71) passed incompatible legislation. In May, 1868, after vainly trying to obtain approval of the Holy See, his government virtually repudiated the Concordat by decreeing: (1) that marriage jurisdiction be given the civil courts in place of exclusive canonical supervision; (2) that all religions should enjoy equal rights before the

law; and (3) that secular direction of education in the public schools would be assumed, although private schools might be erected. The hierarchy was allowed to continue supervising religious instruction in the state schools, but all influence on education as a whole was denied them. To avoid worse, Cardinal Rauscher of Vienna accepted the accomplished fact.

A **Kulturkampf** nonetheless ensued. During the Vatican Council, Chancellor Beust had tried to intimidate the Holy See and at its close announced that the definition of papal infallibility had so modified Vatican status that the Concordat might be regarded as abrogated. The Liberals then prepared to follow German precedents. During May, 1874, a new Civil Code required governmental approbation for all episcopal appointments, claimed a veto over cult regulations "inconsistent with the public interest," and subjected ecclesiastical funds and publications to a secular ministry of worship. The Austro-Hungarian government also presumed to tax wealthier benefices and religious houses for the alleged purpose of giving the surplus to poorer clerics. The Austrian hierarchy, however, remained divided on the extent of resistance to be offered to these measures. In practice, the moderate view of Cardinal Rauscher who advocated watchful waiting was followed. The Austro-Hungarian *Kulturkampf* reached its peak in 1876 when the government proposed to legalize the status of the Old Catholics; this, however, failed of passage.

Mitigation and gradual abandonment of these antiecclesiastical laws followed. In 1879 the foundation for the Austrian *Kulturkampf* was destroyed in much the same fashion as in Germany: Liberals fell from power and the Conservatives halted further secularization. During 1882 the professedly neutral state school system was somewhat modified in the Catholic interest. The *Kulturkampf* measures had been somewhat less severe in Hungary, but the local administration in that country continued to maintain a paternalistic control over the clergy.

(2) Catholic Social Activity (1882–1918)

Anticlericalism was also rife. A Pan-German, *los von Rom* movement began in the Sudetenland in 1897 and alienated some Bohemian Germans from the Church, and this trend continued under Georg von Schonerer (d. 1921). Traditional Czech resentment of German domination played into the hands of nationalistic schismatics who were to set up an independent church during the twentieth century. Hungarian Catholics, moreover, were often divided on racial grounds, and many Austrians, especially the Viennese, were non-practicing.

Austrian Catholic political action was prone to sacrifice liberty to Catholic security. In defense of Catholic interests, Dr. Karl Lueger

formed the Christian Democrat party which often allied itself with the Socialists against the Liberals. During 1891 Dr. Lueger with the assistance of an anti-Semitic group won control of Vienna's city government from the Liberals, whom he labeled as Jewish anticlericals. As mayor of Vienna from 1896 to 1910, Lueger ran an efficient socialized administration. Though the Christian Democrats were delated to Rome for condemnation, the Holy See remained noncommittal on their political activity. The Christian Democrats remained in control of Austrian government from 1895 to 1938. Unfortunately they employed anti-Semitism as a scapegoat; the youthful Adolf Hitler used to sell the Christian Democrat *Volksblatt* in the streets of Vienna, and from it imbibed some of his first anti-Jewish notions.

Christian social leaders were not, however, lacking. Baron Karl von Vogelsang (1818–90) tried to organize new guilds which were to be independent of all state control. He was a strong foe of capitalism, but entertained an anachronistic and erroneous view on the immorality of interest which he identified with medieval usury. Leading exponents of the principles of *Rerum Novarum* were Prince Aloys von Lichtenstein (d. 1920) and Franz Schindler (d. 1922), whose policies survived in his disciple, Monsignor Ignaz Seipel, subsequently Austrian chancellor after the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary after World War I.

95. GALLIC REPUDIATION
A. *French Secularization* (*1870–99*)

(1) CLERICAL REPULSE

Conservative trend. Bonaparte had been overthrown by patriots and republicans, but the bloody Commune of Paris—March to May, 1871—had alarmed Frenchmen at the spectre of radicalism. Liberals, unsuccessful in frenzied appeals for continued war against Germany and unable to use their organization at the polls, were dismayed at what Brogan terms a "free election," return a Catholic and Conservative majority. Politically, however, Catholics were divided among the legitimists favoring the comte de Chambord, Orléanists supporting the comte de Paris, grandson of Louis Philippe, Bonapartists and Republicans. Although the first two groups together had a majority, they failed to agree among themselves. Pending an expected monarchical restoration, they designated Adolphe Thiers as provisional "Chief of the Executive Power."

Catholic disunity, however, proved fatal to the clerical cause. A proposal to erect the church of Sacre Coeur in Montmartre in reparation for civic bloodshed not merely antagonized anticlericals, but divided the uncompromising Veuillot group from politic followers of Bishop Dupanloup. The latter won out with a noncommittal assertion instead

of an explicit acknowledgement of reverence for the Sacred Heart demanded of the assembly. Anticlericals, having impotently aired blasphemies in the Chamber, now shrieked that France had been vowed to the Sacred Heart in a dangerous "clerical aggression." Meanwhile legitimist and Orléanist squabbles were such that in 1873 Thiers announced his conversion to Republicanism. Monarchists united long enough to replace him with a staunch clerical, Marshall MacMahon. But a promising monarchist accord broke down in 1875 when Chambord agreed to accept the Orléanist prince as his heir, but refused as prospective "Henry V" to abandon the absolutist symbol of the Bourbon fleur-de-lis. Catholics did succeed in breaking the monopoly of degrees possessed by the secularist National University (1875), and presently Monsignor D'Hulst was installed as first rector of the Institut Catholique de Paris.

Republican triumph. Though Monarchists retained a majority in the Senate after the 1875 elections, Republicans under Gambetta won a decisive victory in the Chamber of Deputies: 340 of 533. Thereafter the president and senators were placed in the odious position of resisting what appeared to be a popular demand for a republic. Even yet Catholics failed to unite. One of their premiers, Dufaure, "wore the frock-coat, eloquence, and the Gallicanism of 1830." [13] He refused admission to a papal document and castigated clerical finances. On the other extreme, militant Ultramontanes led by Bishop Pie of Poitiers introduced resolutions demanding French intervention to rescue Pius IX from Italian parliamentary persecution. The bishop of Nevers saluted MacMahon as a new Joan of Arc to liberate the "France of St. Louis" from the aftereffects of the French Revolution. Such clerical electioneering signally failed to overcome Gambetta's war-cry: "Clericalism, there is the enemy." In the 1879 elections the Republicans captured both houses and later in the year forced MacMahon to resign the presidency to Jules Grevy, moderate anticlerical. The Republic had definitely arrived.

(2) Anti-Clerical Ascendancy (1880–99)

Neutral state schools. The *Ligue de Enseignement*, founded by Freemasons to advocate neutral state schools, had been gaining support in France. Educational secularization became the object of the new minister of education, Jules Ferry. At once in 1879 he proposed a law which banned unauthorized religious, especially Jesuits, from teaching; denied Catholic colleges university status; and abolished accreditation by religious superiors. Though passed by the chamber, this bill was rejected

[13] Denis Brogan, *France Under the Republic* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1940), p. 61.

by the senate in 1880. Yet several "Ferry Laws" were enacted to the detriment of religious instruction. In virtue of Article 7, henceforth basic in this secularist program, "no one is to be allowed to teach in state or private schools nor direct a teaching establishment of any kind if he belongs to an unauthorized religious order." This was enforced against the Jesuits in June, 1880, but it proved impossible to replace at once some ten thousand brothers and forty thousand nuns. Transition to secular teachers was to take place only gradually, and even in 1914 religious survived as teachers in some local state schools. Next in 1882 primary education in the public schools for children between the ages of six to thirteen was declared, "free, obligatory, and neutral." Religious instruction was relegated to extracurricular periods. During 1886 the Ferry Laws were supplemented by the Goblet Law; this decreed that all teachers in the public schools be lay and must preserve absolute neutrality in teaching any question involving religion. Brothers or sisters still teaching in the public schools were to be replaced at death or resignation within a contemplated period of five years—a project not soon realized. The chief effect of these measures was financial. Catholics, obliged to support public schools by taxation, also had to erect private schools to provide religious instruction. This they did so loyally that during the next fifteen years most practicing Catholics patronized private schools, leaving the public institutions to indifferentist or Protestant groups.

Other secularist enactments nationalized charitable institutions (1879), abolished military chaplaincies (1880), laicized cemeteries (1880) and hospitals (1881). Sunday work was authorized and the church of Ste. Genevieve secularized as the Pantheon (1885). Divorce was legalized in 1884, and during 1889 military service was imposed on seminarians.

Republican survival. These measures infuriated the clericals, whose divisions yet prevented effective opposition. But a series of scandals seemed to bode the collapse of the Third Republic. From 1879 finances had been a problem and feeling was aroused in 1887 when the president's son-in-law was detected in graft. Grevy was obliged to resign, and monarchists lent countenance to General Boulanger who began to make progresses *à la* Louis Napoleon, calling for revenge on Germany. In 1889 he was elected to the chamber by huge majorities on a vague program of constitutional revision. But Boulanger was a talker, poser and libertine. He let the moment slip and when the government threatened retaliation, fled to Belgium where he committed suicide over the grave of his beloved (1891). Conservatives were chagrined, but in 1892 followed the Panama scandal: De Lesseps' corporation to build an American canal was found to have implicated in corruption many

members of the administration. Implication of the German Jew, Baron Reinach, provoked a wave of violent anti-Semitism abetted by some clericals. When (1894) Alfred Dreyfus, a French Jewish officer, was accused of selling military secrets to Germany, he was given short shrift and sent to Devil's Island. But the "Dreyfus Case" was far from over.

(3) CATHOLIC CONTROVERSIES

"Ralliement" versus legitimism. Neglect of religious duties among the urban populace and growing anticlericalism became more pronounced under the Third Republic. Religious life, however, seemed flourishing, and the majority may have been at first willing to acquiesce in monarchical restoration. Yet the singular ineptitude of aristocratic clerical politicians denied Catholic France any sustained leadership. What native Frenchmen failed to supply, Pope Leo XIII tried to inspire. In his letters, *Nobilissima Gallorum Gens* (1884) and *Au Milieu des Solicitudes* (1892), he urged French Catholics to "rally" to the Third Republic in order to change its unjust laws instead of engaging in dreams of an ideal monarchy. From 1885 Albert de Mun did attempt to organize a political program which would incorporate most of the Leonine social teaching, but for the most part monarchists were cool toward his proposed reforms. Cardinal Lavigerie did respond to papal suggestions dramatically, but his toast to the Republic before the French admiralty at Algiers, November 12, 1891, was snubbed by the largely monarchist military personnel. Père Naudet inspired the French Christian Democrats in the 1890's, but they died of some intemperate polemics.

B. French Alienation (1899–1919)

(1) RADICAL ANTICLERICALISM (1899–1906)

Dreyfusard Radical Bloc. The army, largely Rightist, seems to have railroaded the Jewish Captain Dreyfus to conviction for sale of military information in response to prejudices imbibed from propaganda like Drumont's anti-Semitic *Libre Parole.* Revision of Dreyfus's sentence was also opposed by the clerical paper *La Croix,* and the monarchist journal of Maurras, *Action Française.* But if many clerical monarchists hounded Dreyfus, it should be noted that Dreyfus's lawyer, Dumange, and his vindicator, Piquard, were Catholics. Yet Clemenceau, Zola, and other anticlericals gained most of the credit for bringing to light that the real culprit was a monarchist, Major Esterhazy, who virtually admitted guilt by flight in 1898. The Dreyfus Case became one of the main issues of the 1898 elections. Many Republicans felt that the Rightist army and clerical anti-Semites were victimizing Dreyfus in order to discredit the Third Republic. With the slogan, "the Republic is in danger," anti-

clericals subordinated their habitual internal differences to form a Drey-
fusard Radical Bloc that controlled French government from 1899 to
1906. Although the army convicted Dreyfus anew in 1899—while ad-
mitting extenuating circumstances—the Radicals utilized the pardoning
power of their creature, President Loubet (1899–1906), to prevent the
execution of the sentence. Alfred Dreyfus (1859–1935) was eventually
exonerated and reinstated in 1906.

Attack on religious associations. Under Premier Waldeck-Rousseau
(1899–1902), the Radical Bloc struck back at the discredited clericals.
In 1900 the *La Croix* press was raided and funds, allegedly collected for
conspiratorial aims, seized. The Assumptionist editors of the review
were fined, and Leo XIII advised them to hand over the paper to laymen.
But Assumptionist involvement served as a pretext for the premier's
Associations Act dissolving every religious association failing to obtain
governmental authorization to exist. Passed by a vote of 303 to 244 over
the opposition of the count de Mun and Ribot of the Moderate Repub-
licans, it was promulgated on July 2, 1901. The premier, however, applied
it only to the Jesuits, Benedictines, and Carmelites who had refused
to seek authorization, while the cause of other communities seeking
authorization was debated in the assembly. Though sustained in the
1902 elections, Waldeck-Rousseau was forced by ill health to yield his
office to the more violent anticlerical, Emile Combes. Combes inter-
preted the Associations Act in such wise as to destroy the Catholic
school system, and fortified it with new hostile decrees. Requisites for
authorization were so narrowly interpreted that but five communities
could qualify. Schools conducted by unauthorized communities became
illegal, and in 1902 Catholic institutions numbering 2,635 were closed.
Rejecting an episcopal protest, Combes went on in 1903 to dissolve
54 societies of men and 84 of women. Anyone lacking a degree from
the Rationalist university was debarred from teaching in secondary
schools. Such decrees were enforced despite protest resignations of
many magistrates and army officers and popular remonstrances. By
September, 1904, Combes could claim that he had rid the country of
13,904 of 16,904 Catholic schools. Though some Catholics found ways
to circumvent the program, most children were henceforth subject to
secularism.

(2) Separation of Church and State (1903–9)

Preliminaries. Despite his attack upon Catholic education, Premier
Combes continued to exercise the governmental privilege under the
Concordat of nominating bishops. When St. Pius X in 1903 rejected
several nominees, Combes announced that the sees would henceforth
be left vacant. During 1904 he took amiss demands by the Holy See for

the resignation of Bishops Geay of Laval and Nordez of Dijon, the latter a government supporter and possibly one of the last examples of clerical Freemasonry. During March, 1904, moreover, President Loubet ostentatiously visited King Victor Emmanuel of Italy. When the Holy See protested against this recognition of an usurper, Combes broke off diplomatic relations with the Vatican, May, 1904.

Separation Act (1905). Premier Combes then prepared a bill termed "Law of Separation of the Churches and the State," designed to revoke the Napoleonic Concordat of 1801. Although Combes himself was forced out of office early in 1905 on a side issue, espionage in the army, his bill was nonetheless carried through by his successor, Maurice Rouvier. As promulgated on December 9–11, 1905, the Act of Separation (1) guaranteed complete liberty of conscience and freedom of worship to all religions; (2) severed all connection between the French state and the Catholic Church, renouncing on the one hand privileges of nominating to benefices, while repudiating all clerical salaries and subsidies for worship—save for a few meager and temporary pensions; and (3) directed that all church property be taken over by lay *associations cultuelles*, formed for that purpose. The last provision was a page from Falk's *Kulturkampf,* and intended to tempt avaricious laymen to despoil the Church of her property. The Act of Separation discontinued the annual governmental budget for worship, amounting in 1905 to 42,324,933 francs—perhaps averaging $8,000,000 a year. Pope Pius X condemned this Act in *Vehementer Nos,* February, 1906, but the "Eldest Daughter of the Church" had repudiated her mother.

Legal application. After the hierarchy of France failed to reach a decision in May, 1906, the pope in *Gravissimo Officii,* August 10, 1906, condemned the "associations of cult" which the government had ordered formed. Catholics, at last loyal to Vatican policy and united on an issue, thereupon refused to form the associations and threatened to defend ecclesiastical property by force. When officials entered church precincts to make inventories, sacrilegious acts often provoked riots. Premier Clemenceau (1906–9), while suppressing the inventories, clamored loudly for new laws "to protect the Republic against the priests." Failing the associations, much of the property was handed over to central or local governmental agencies "to be and to remain the property of the state, département or town." When the state demanded that the clergy seek its permission to officiate in the nationalized church edifices, the priests, in obedience to papal instructions, refused to make application. Sometimes with the connivance of local officials they performed liturgical services without authorization; elsewhere they were denied admission. The Catholic laity raised a modest offering for

the support of the clergy in lieu of discontinued governmental subsidies.

(3) SEQUEL OF SEPARATION (1907–19)

Modus vivendi. While Clemenceau in face of widespread popular disregard of the governmental program demanded suppression of all Catholic worship, few even of the Radicals would go so far. The Radical Bloc was disintegrating as the "Clerical Menace" seemed to fade into the background in comparison with Socialism's threat to "sacred property" at home, and the shadow of German militarism abroad. In 1907 Aristide Briand, hitherto a Socialist, began his long career as peacemaker by coming over to the ranks of the Moderates. Alarmed at the radicalism of some Socialist proposals, he may have felt that the conservative force of Catholicity might still be valuable in French society. He negotiated a modus vivendi with the Catholics whereby the clergy were tolerated in the use of the churches, without either the authorization or prohibition of the government. After Clemenceau had been forced out in 1909 for intransigence to demands of the laboring classes, little further effort was made by the Third Republic to interfere with Catholic cult. Divine services continued by the clergy in church buildings over which they possessed no legal title, while the government pointed to the open churches in disclaiming any intent to persecute. Under these precarious conditions, the Church in France, impoverished but free, lived at the opening of World War I. The unforeseen result of clerical military service was the beginning of a better understanding between clergy and people. This was bound to affect relations between Church and state, so that during 1919 even Clemenceau would allude to the "legitimate rights of religious liberty."

96. TWILIGHT OF CZARDOM

A. *Return to Liberalism* (1855–81)

(1) RENEWED RUSSIAN WAVERING

Czar Alexander II (1855–81) who succeeded his father Nicholas I during the Crimean War, ended hostilities as soon as possible by making what some regarded as a humiliating peace. Liberal Westernizers seized on this military discomfiture to urge political and social reforms, and anarchistic "Nihilists" began to create serious unrest.

Social reform. Feeling his autocratic position unsafe, the czar decided to emulate his avuncular namesake by embarking on a liberal course capable of pacifying discontent. He inaugurated his program on March 3, 1861, with an edict abolishing serfdom. As a matter of fact, although the serfs were conceded personal liberty, they were in some

instances thereby deprived of their only livelihood in the village communal *mir*. Most of them became economically poorer, and some drifted to cities to form an exploited proletariat for Russia's belated industrialization. Those who remained on the land—and in 1917 about eighty per cent of the people were still peasants—were permitted, at least on paper, a minimum of local self-government by Alexander's "Zemstvo Law" (1864). Actually, control of local government was monopolized by the nobility and gentry, although legislation was not egregiously class-conscious. During 1862 the juridical system had been modernized on the pattern of the Code Napoleon. By reason of his efforts on behalf of the serfs, Alexander II came to sympathize with the Northern side during the American Civil War in the face of quite general European governmental favor toward the South. In recognition of this friendship in a time of need, State Secretary Seward obliged Alexander in 1867 by taking "that icebox," Alaska, off his hands. Along with his liberalizing trend and also for reasons originating in the stresses of the Crimean War, Alexander somewhat relaxed the Russian government's persecution of Catholics, but there was no essential change in czarist determination to dominate the Church.

Reaction. "By 1865 the reforming spirit of Alexander II was spent. He had never been at heart a Liberal. What reforms he had instituted were an impulsive response to the protest of Russian Westernizers against a regime which had suffered humiliating foreign reverses in 1854–56. By 1865 the Crimean War was a thing of the past, and a much more recent occurrence, the Polish Rebellion of 1863, was discrediting the Westernizers and throwing the tsar into the arms of the reactionary Russian Slavophiles." [14] Alexander II accordingly abandoned domestic affairs in large part for foreign diplomacy. In 1871 he denounced the neutralization of the Black Sea imposed on Russia at the end of the Crimean War. Having reorganized the army in 1874, he used it effectively during 1877 to free Serbia and Romania and regain Bessarabia. Yet at the Congress of Berlin (1878) his plans for dismembering Turkey were thwarted by the Western powers. Alexander, however, remained in a position to lead a Pan-Slavic alliance against both Turkey and Austria-Hungary. Meanwhile at home Westernizers had become more bold and on March 13, 1881, an anarchist emerged long enough from the underground to cast a bomb which ended Alexander's career.

(2) POLISH ADMINISTRATION (1855–81)

Hesitant concessions. In Poland, a national literary revival had begun with Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855), and unofficial national leagues were organized to preserve the religion, language, and customs of the

[14] Hayes, *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe, op. cit.,* II, 260.

Poles, who sought political rather than social reforms. Alexander did permit installation of Archbishop Anton Fijalkowski in the long vacant see of Warsaw, but in 1859 he prohibited Catholic priests from making converts under penalty of exile. Poland, however, was already seething with nationalistic fervor, stimulated in 1859 by the beginning of Italian unification. Liberals forged to the lead of this native movement, and in 1860 began to assemble crowds in the churches to chant outlawed patriotic songs. Despite clashes with the Russians, a still greater rally was staged in Warsaw on Kosciusko's anniversary, October 15, 1861. The police then forcibly ejected the demonstrators and arrested their leaders. When Archbishop Fijalkowski closed the churches in protest against these violent reprisals, he was deported to Siberia where he died the same year. Yet in 1862 the czar proclaimed the proximate restoration of the "Kingdom of Poland," and deputed his brother, Grand Duke Constantine, to act as his viceroy.

Polish rebellion. Polish Conservatives, led by Lord Alexander Wielpolski, accepted this offer, but these concessions came too late to conciliate the Radicals who now insisted upon Polish independence. The czar neglected the moderating influence of the hierarchy, for by banning Catholic May Devotions during 1862, the Russian administration aroused the defiance of the new Archbishop of Warsaw, Monsignor Felinski (1861–83). When the Russians in January, 1863, issued blanket search warrants that threatened the lairs of the Radical chiefs, the latter precipitated the Second Polish Revolt, January to May, 1863. But this uprising proved to be merely a poorly organized guerilla warfare which was quickly suppressed before foreign assistance could come.

Repressive measures. Polish autonomy was again abolished and severe reprisals taken. Russian administration was re-established and the Russian tongue made obligatory in Polish schools. Archbishop Felinski was deported to Siberia in June, 1863, but unlike his predecessor, refused to die until 1895, and continued to govern his diocese as best he could. Back in Poland, clerics were executed or imprisoned, and the rest placed on parole. Monasteries and private schools were suppressed and seminaries subjected to secular control. Religious instruction by priests in state schools might be given only in the presence of a Russian supervisor. When Pius IX protested against this Polish persecution, Alexander II severed diplomatic relations with the Vatican, January 1, 1866. In December of the same year he repudiated the understanding of 1847—not that this had ever meant much. All legal communication with Rome was cut off and the Polish bishops refused visas to attend the Vatican Council. In 1875 it was announced that all remaining Ruthenians had been incorporated into the Orthodox Church, but on the whole Polish Catholics of both rites remained faithful to the Holy See and

the memory of a free Poland. Leo XIII's condemnation of Nihilism, however, so pleased Alexander II that he was about to reopen negotiations with the Holy See when he was assassinated.

B. Failure of Autocracy (1881–1917)

(1) ALEXANDER III (1881–94)

Alexander Alexandreivich, succeeding a father blown up by bombs, was a straightforward, honest, brutal man who would not trifle with even a semblance of Liberalism. Rather, "the voice of God orders us to stand firm at the helm of government with faith in the strength and truth of the autocratic power." Conscientious but dull, he gave Russia a reactionary administration.

Secular policy. Throughout his reign Alexander III remained true to this program. His father's murderers were executed and underground movements mercilessly ferreted out. Repression became a full-time job and the secret police a regular arm of the government as every phase of Russian life was subjected to a suspicious scrutiny. The czar promoted Russia's rapid industrialization, though on mercantilist rather than laissez-faire principles. While he subsidized industrialists, however, he gave but inadequate protection to the proletariat and peasantry.

Marxian Socialism accordingly found a field ripe for the harvest. The nihilist "Land and Liberty" program, indeed, was waning; Alexander Ulianov's unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the czar (1887) was one of the last manifestations of nihilist terrorism. But Ulianov's prompt execution hardened in a revolutionary career a younger brother Vladimir, who as "Nikolai Lenin" would one day rule from the czarist palace of the Kremlin. In 1883 survivors of the "Land and Liberty" league under the leadership of Georg Plekhanov (1857–1918) formed the Marxist "Liberation of Labor" movement, forerunner of the Social Democratic Party founded in 1898. The latter divided in 1903 into Plekhanov's Mensheviks and Lenin's Bolsheviks. Underground or abroad, foes of autocracy worked incessantly.

Religious policies. Alexander III promptly pursued his father's preliminary overtures to the Holy See. By December, 1882, a new modus vivendi had been concluded between Leo XIII and the czar. This provided that vacant sees in Russia and Poland might be filled, the seminaries were restored to exclusive episcopal control, and Russian supervision of religious instruction in Polish state schools was withdrawn. In 1883 Archbishop Felinski of Warsaw was released. The prelate returned from exile only to resign and be succeeded by the able Vincent Popiel (1883–1912). But cases of governmental interference with Catholic life still occurred. In 1885 the bishop of Vilna was sent to Siberia for censuring his clergy without governmental approbation; the pope procured his

release only on the understanding that his resignation would follow. The mixed marriage difficulties continued and Ruthenians were still retained in their enforced subjection to the Orthodox Establishment, though by 1917 a third of Russian subjects were dissenters: Catholics, Protestants, or members of radical Russian sects. Vladimir Solovyev, the "Russian Newman," though converted to the Catholic Church in 1896 at Moscow, could be attended *in articulo mortis* (1910) only by the village Orthodox priest. In Poland, the policy of Russification in language and customs was pursued relentlessly against equally stubborn resistance. On the whole, however, Polish Catholics enjoyed a slight respite from the severe religious persecution of the previous years.

(2) Nicholas II, Last of the Czars (1894–1917)

Nicholas II (1894–1917) was, indeed, a poor symbol of autocracy. Weak but obstinate, his fatalistic and pseudo-mystical temperament was successively dominated by an hysterical wife, Alice, and a megalomaniac, the lay monk Grigori Rasputin (1873–1916). With less of the benevolence, moral courage, and divine faith of King Louis XVI, the last of the czars as surely took the road to ruin.

Religious policy. Because Russian ambitions to rule Catholic Slavs in the Balkans made good relations with the Holy See expedient, further concessions were announced for Catholics. In 1898 some Ruthenians were allowed to return to communion with Rome on condition of embracing the Latin Rite. The aim of this condition seems to have been to brand everything Catholic as Latin and alien in culture. Religious orders were permitted to resume work openly in Poland. In 1899 the czar allowed priests to visit Rome and authorized a Catholic church in Petrograd. When during 1905 other Ruthenian Uniates were permitted to profess their allegiance to the Holy See openly, whole villages availed themselves of the opportunity. Under pressure of the Duma, the October Manifesto of 1905 proclaimed freedom of conscience, but a reported five hundred thousand conversions to Catholicity induced Nicholas II to restrict this in 1907 by banning any further Ruthenian submission to Rome under pain of fine or imprisonment. Interference with Catholic worship took place spasmodically, but in spite of official disfavor, Catholics continued to increase in number.

Secular administration. Opposition to autocracy was now directed by definite parties. In 1901 Nihilism was reborn in the Social Revolutionary Party. The bourgeois Liberal Party was organized in 1903. In the same year the Social Democratic Party split on the interpretation of Marxism into Menshevik (Moderate Minority) and Bolshevik (Communist Majority) factions. Russian military disasters during the Japanese War (1904–5) led to a General Strike and Workers' Insurrection in

1905. The czar tried to placate dissent in an "October Manifesto" which promised a constitution. His convocation of a parliament or duma divided Liberals and Socialists. Though the First Duma, meeting in 1906, was vociferous in demands for reform of autocracy, the czar, his nerve restored by the secret police, dissolved dumas and manipulated elections until he had secured a relatively tame parliament. This remained little more than a debating society, although Liberals did not give up hope for gradual evolution through constitutional methods. Unfortunately for the czar, his "Mirabeau," the able reform Premier Peter Stolypin (1906–11), was assassinated, and was succeeded by a "Necker": Kokovtsev (1911–14), expert financier but not a great statesman. During 1914 Nicholas and his foreign minister Sazanov believed that the time had arrived to realize Pan-Slavic dreams in the Balkans. They provoked Serbia into defiance of Austria, and when the latter decided to end Serb provocations, widened the conflict by coming to Serbia's assistance, with full knowledge of Germany's engagements to the Austrian alliance. But the course of the war revealed Russian autocracy's utter inefficiency, and gave Liberals and Socialists new material for criticism. The aristocrats struck first by assassinating Rasputin, December 30, 1916, on the charge of hindering the war effort. Strikes and mutinies followed during the early months of 1917, disrupting what was left of the department of supply. The czar endeavored to force the war-weary troops to coerce the workers. But his peremptory edict of March 11, 1917, proved to be his last official act.

(3) RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONS (1917)

Liberal Revolution (March). The Duma at length was emboldened to withhold sanction of the royal ukase, the strikers refused to obey and the soldiers fraternized with the workers. The Duma requested a Liberal ministry, but disorder had by then spread too far for halfway measures: the March Revolution was largely spontaneous. On March 15 Nicholas II abdicated in favor of his brother Mikhail, who, however, dared not accept. Lord George Lvov, a Liberal aristocrat, had already formed a provisional government for the Russian Republic.

Provisional democracy. Lvov and associates were mostly aristocrats of Liberal leanings and bourgeois professional men, though Alexander Kerensky of the Mensheviks was included in the ministry to placate the workers. All the customary Liberal freedoms: of speech, of association, of the press, and of religion, were at once proclaimed. The Russian Orthodox elected their first patriarch in two centuries, Tikhon, and the Catholics were encouraged to secure an exarch. Poland and Finland were promised home rule. Universal manhood suffrage was announced. But these paper reforms could not be put into effect at the same time

with successful prosecution of the war. Lvov and his successor Kerensky worked frantically to refashion Russia into a democracy while carrying on the czarist war. But effective military organization was impossible on such short notice, and disastrous defeat and retreat continued. In May Kerensky succeeded Lvov and tried to establish a moderate socialist regime. But he could not overcome defeatism, sabotaged as he was by the Bolshevik capitalizing on the widespread demand for peace and quick delivery on reforms. The Bolsheviks did support Kerensky against a militarist counter-revolt under Kornilov in July, but thereafter asserted: "All power to the *soviets* (workers' councils); no support to the Provisional Government."

Communist Revolution (November). Unrestrained by patriotism or legality, the Communists mounted the barricades on November 6, 1917, and demanded a Marxist "dictatorship of the proletariat." The Petrograd troops deserted Kerensky on November 7, and the latter failed in an attempted comeback on November 14 and fled the land. Fighting lasted a week in Moscow; Kiev was not subdued until December, and civil war against one group or another continued within Russian territories until 1921. But none of these counter-revolutionary movements was inspired by devotion to czardom; during the night of July 17–18, 1918, Nicholas II and his whole family were shot to death at Ekaterinburg, Siberia. Theirs was a not wholly responsible expiation for an indefensible, an intolerable regime. But Russians were to discover that the strong Bolshevik panacea that they had so hastily swallowed would bring no cure for the soul.

97. BRITISH SOCIAL PROGRESS

A. Political Background (1865–1922)

(1) POLITICAL CHANGE (1865–1905)

The **Second Reform Act** (1867) dissolved the "Victorian Compromise." This measure gave the vote to urban workers irrespective of householding, though it conceded plural votes to businessmen with an office separate from their residence and to university graduates. Moderate property qualifications based on rentals were still required, but a step had been taken toward Democracy by enfranchising urban skilled workers. The act had been passed by the otherwise Conservative Disraeli in an effort to win favor by what he believed to be an inevitable concession. But his political trick failed to win the 1868 elections which returned his Liberal rival, William Gladstone, to office.

A **first Gladstone ministry** (1868–74) gave further substance to the liberalizing of the "Victorian Compromise." In 1870 the Forster Education Act provided for free, nonreligious schools, but offered subsidies to private schools which could meet government specifications. In the

same year a Civil Service Order assured a competent, well-trained, nonpartisan career bureaucracy. At the same time the commission purchase system was abolished in the army and conditions of enlistment improved. The Ballot Act (1870) introduced secret voting. In 1873 the Judicature Act placed many separate courts under a supreme tribunal.

Disraeli's ministry (1874–80) proved conservative in domestic affairs, but departed from the "Little England" policy of Gladstone's Liberals. Disraeli fostered British penetration into Egypt where the Suez Canal was acquired in 1875 and a virtual protectorate assumed. In 1876 Victoria was proclaimed "Empress of India"—a title which lapsed in 1947. Strong-arm methods at the Congress of Berlin (1878) kept Russia from Balkan domination. But continual imperialist wars in Afghanistan, South Africa, Egypt and elsewhere finally wearied "Little Englanders" of Disraeli and Toryism.

A second Gladstone ministry (1880–85) strove, not always with success, to avoid expansion—the premier's pacifist and hesitant policy in Egypt finally caused the fall of his ministry. At home, a start was made in 1880 in holding employers liable for workers' injuries; the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act regulated campaign expenditures; and the Third Reform Act (1884) enfranchised rural workers, thus according the suffrage to all save "peers, paupers, lunatics, and women."

Tory imperialism was dominant for the next twenty years, punctuated briefly by Gladstone's third (1886) and fourth (1892–94) ministries which collapsed in attempting to give Ireland home rule. Conservatives had united with many Liberal "Unionists" to oppose Irish autonomy and social legislation under ministries led by Lord Salisbury (1885; 1886–92; 1895–1902) and his son-in-law, Balfour (1902–5). Imperial expansion was pushed forward vigorously, especially in Africa, until momentarily shaken by reverses in the Boer War (1899–1902). Canada (1867), Australia (1901), and soon South Africa (1909) became self-governing dominions, but Joseph Chamberlain's project of imperial federation with close economic, political, and military ties failed to elicit wholehearted response. Thus the "Empire" remained largely a traditional and sentimental bond.

(2) Social Change (1905–22)

Welfare legislation. In 1905 the period of Conservative domination terminated, and was then followed by the three Liberal ministries of Campbell-Bannerman (1905–8), Asquith (1908–16), and Lloyd George (1916–22). From 1906 David Lloyd George as chancellor of the exchequer sponsored important social reforms. George was a poor Welsh boy who had experienced dire poverty and who believed that the Boer

War had revealed that a large portion of the English population was physically unfit. He hoped to prevent Marxian socialism by governmental welfare legislation similar to that initiated by Bismarck in Germany. George began in 1906 with a Workingmen's Compensation Act holding employers liable for accidents save in cases of "serious and willful misconduct." In 1909 he enacted the Old Age Pension Law for destitute persons over seventy. The National Insurance Act (1911) provided all workers with health insurance together with semisocialized clinics, and offered certain poorer laborers limited unemployment insurance: "the dole." A Minimum Wage Law (1912) for sweated industries completed the major social legislation, which also included heavy income and excise taxes and liquor control—though not prohibition.

Political democracy. The "People's Budget" (1909), imposing new and heavy taxes to finance the foregoing legislation, provoked a parliamentary crisis. Against custom, if not law, the House of Lords rejected the budget, invading the Commons' normal prerogative. The Lords continued to oppose until two general elections during 1910 sustained the Liberal majority in Commons. King George V then threatened to swamp Tory membership in Lords by creating new peers, and the upper house yielded. In 1911 the Parliament Act explicitly removed all financial control from the House of Lords and reduced its legislative function to a two-year suspensive veto. The popularly elected House of Commons, whose members were voted salaries for the first time in the same year, was henceforth for all practical purposes the sole British legislature, though the Lords still function as an appellate law court. In 1918, moreover, the suffrage was extended to all men over twenty-one and to women over thirty—feminine embarrassment was finally removed in 1928 when they were given the vote on the same terms as men. At the same time most plural voting privileges ceased. Disestablishment of Anglicanism in Wales (1914) left the English body the only refuge of privilege—and it was largely disregarded.

International crises, however, distracted Great Britain from social legislation after 1912. In that year an Irish Home Rule Bill was introduced. After two rejections in Lords, it was enacted in 1914, but the outbreak of World War I and the threatening opposition of Ulster led to postponement of its application until 1922, when it was put in force in altered form for two separate Irish governments. World War I, though it brought British imperial domain to a brief zenith, seriously sapped the nation's vitality and resources. Though Lloyd George proved an energetic war leader, he was neither a farsighted peacemaker nor a gifted economic analyst. During the war, Great Britain was at last overtaken in industrial development and commercial expansion. Post-

war economic distress and serious labor agitation alarmed the British populace and produced a conservative reaction which forced Lloyd George and the Liberals out of office in the 1922 elections.

B. *English Ecclesiastical History* (*1865–1922*)

(1) SOCIAL QUESTIONS

Cardinal Manning, archbishop of Westminster in succession to Cardinal Wiseman from 1865 to 1892, proved intransigent on the great question of infallibility, and as has been seen, was a prime factor in securing its definition in the Vatican Council. Newman's defense of the doctrine against Prime Minister Gladstone—*Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* (1875)—did much to allay the cardinal's suspicions of the soundness of view of his distinguished co-convert. He graciously received him as colleague in the college of cardinals in 1879, and preached at his funeral in 1890. If Cardinal Manning, however, seems to have lacked Newman's fine appreciation of doctrinal and intellectual subtleties, he did excel the latter in his grasp of the urgent social problems of the day.

Relief of the poor. Cardinal Manning, indeed, became primarily interested in the pressing problem of social betterment. He founded the League of the Cross for total abstinence, took the pledge himself, and marched in temperance parades through the London streets. From 1866 he constituted himself defender of the poor, especially those in public workhouses. There Catholic children were likely to lose their Faith under Protestant administration and harsh economic pressure. The cardinal succeeded in lessening discrimination, and in providing Catholic welfare organizations to care for the Catholic poor. He made a start toward founding schools and homes in the crowded cities, and these institutions were enlarged by his successors.

Labor disputes. In his lecture, "On the Rights and Dignity of Labor," Cardinal Manning had defended the lot of the laboring man, and had admitted moderate governmental intervention in order to safeguard for him proper working conditions, hours, and wages. As early as 1872 he had supported the farm workers in a meeting at Exeter Hall, and he continued to participate in public gatherings and discussions beyond Catholic circles. In 1887 he sustained Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore in the latter's defense of the Knights of Labor, and seconded the American prelate's petition to Rome. Cardinal Manning himself won nationwide attention during 1889 by personally intervening in the London dock-workers' strike. Though the Anglican prelate of London had dodged the complexities of this dispute, the Catholic cardinal archbishop patiently persevered in lengthy conferences with employers and employees. His mediation eventually proved successful in settling the

strike, and won him the respect of many non-Catholics. The ascetic-looking cardinal had at last come to be regarded as a great Englishman. He retained intellectual vigor to the end of his life, and his death on January 14, 1892, elicited expressions of regret from many non-Catholics.

Missionary agencies. During Cardinal Manning's episcopate, the Catholic Truth Society began its dissemination of Catholic apologetic and instructive literature, and the Mill Hill Fathers, founded by Father Herbert Vaughan—presently Manning's successor—furnished Catholic England with its own foreign missionary society.

(2) EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

Cardinal Manning, however, held conservative views in regard to Catholic education. After Oxford and Cambridge universities had abolished religious tests for reception of degrees (1854), Catholic opinion was divided on the liceity and expediency of Catholic attendance. For a time hopes were entertained of a thoroughly Catholic university under Newman at Dublin, but in 1858 financial and nationalistic difficulties obliged Newman to resign the rectorship. Newman next (1864) opened a preparatory school at Birmingham, but proposals for a "Newman Club" at Oxford University to provide for Catholic needs were decidedly discouraged by the Congregation of Propaganda on Manning's advice. Cardinal Manning himself tried to provide a Catholic college for Englishmen at Kensington (1874–78), but its rector, Monsignor Capel, was inexperienced, financial resources were inadequate, and the student body discouragingly small. At length the whole project had to be abandoned. Yet the cardinal remained adamant against Catholic participation at Oxford or Cambridge down to the end of his pontificate. He did, however, favor breaking down of Catholic isolation by joining the Athenaeum and the Metaphysical Society. He also postponed erection of a new cathedral in order to found Catholic primary schools.

Cardinal Vaughan (1892–1903), Manning's successor at Westminster, did build the new Catholic cathedral and was interred in it. On the question of Catholic attendance at Cambridge and Oxford, he proved more obliging than his predecessor. He recommended a change of ruling to Propaganda, and in 1895 Catholics were granted permission to attend these institutions under certain safeguards. These were enumerated as a solidly Catholic preparatory training, and compulsory attendance at lectures under Catholic auspices on religion, philosophy, and history. When this program was put into operation, however, these formal courses were generally modified in favor of Catholic guidance through special chaplains. Catholics were also divided on the prudence of accepting governmental subsidies offered under the Forster Act of

1870, for it was argued that this presaged state control of Catholic education. Cardinal Vaughan, however, supported the legislation when the Act was extended to cover secondary education in 1902. "The Act (1902) as finally passed put the Voluntary Schools 'on the rates.' Provided by the denominations as to sites and buildings and structural repairs, they were henceforth to be maintained financially by the new Local Education Authorities. Their teachers were to be appointed by the School Managers, subject to a veto on educational grounds by the L.E.A.; the secular education was to be controlled by the L.E.A.; the religious by the Managers, who were to comprise four denominational, and two L.E.A. representatives." [15]

Subsequent developments during the period of English history now under survey left this "Dual System" of public and private schools untouched, despite agitation from secularists against the procedure. Scottish Catholics concluded a quite satisfactory educational concordat with the British Government in 1918, but the English Catholics remained divided on the measures to be adopted and continued as before. Later educational legislation caused them to regret not having made the more favorable arrangement when they had an opportunity to do so.

(3) EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Anglican orders. The insistence by the Oxford Movement on tradition had raised the question of the validity of Anglican orders. Though Catholic practice, in accord with decisions of Julius III and Paul IV (1554-55), had assumed their invalidity, ardent workers for reunion felt that all hope had not been exhausted. From 1889 Abbé Fernand Portal, C.M. (1855-1926), and Lord Halifax encouraged conferences looking toward corporate reunion, and in 1895 the latter was received in audience by Leo XIII. During 1896 a papal commission, including Cardinal Mazella, Abbot Gasquet, Abbé Duchesne and Monsignor Merry del Val, examined the question. French predispositions in favor of validity were reversed by Gasquet and his archivist, Bishop, who discovered in the Vatican archives documents illustrative of the grounds on which the Holy See had repudiated Anglican orders during the sixteenth century. The fruit of these deliberations was the negative verdict of the papal brief, *Apostolicae Curae,* of September 15, 1896. This declared: "The words which up to the last generation were universally held by Anglicans to be the proper form of ordination to the priesthood, namely, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' are surely far from the precise signification of the order of the priesthood or of its grace and power. . . . With this deep-seated defect of form is joined a defect of

[15] Carlton Beales, *The English Catholics: 1850-1950* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1950), p. 384.

intention, which is equally necessary for the performance of a sacrament. . . . We pronounce and declare that ordinations performed according to the Anglican rite are utterly invalid and altogether void." The prelates of Canterbury and York denounced the decree, but Low Church and dissenting clergy chortled. When some French scholars hinted that the *Apostolicae Curae* was not final, the pope assured the archbishop of Paris that it was definitive in a letter of November 5, 1896.

Hierarchical reorganization. In 1903 Cardinal Vaughan was succeeded at Westminster by Francis Bourne, whose episcopate lasted until his death in 1935. In 1908 the English Church was removed from missionary status, and in 1911 the hierarchical organization which had prevailed since 1850 was changed by the elevation of Liverpool and Birmingham to metropolitan rank—which was also accorded in 1916 to Cardiff in Wales. During 1908 the Eucharistic Congress in London elicited a last flare-up of bigotry when Premier Asquith tried to invoke the antiprocession nuisance relics of Emancipation. Archbishop Bourne complied, but public opinion sided with the Catholics, and the obnoxious provisions were removed in 1927. By 1919 Catholics in England had reached two million and in 1918 the Catholic Evidence Guild began onthe-street exposition.

Diminution of discrimination. Edward VII had been well disposed to Catholics, but had been unable to change the "King's Protestant Declaration" required since 1689 of "every king and queen of this realm who at any time hereafter shall come to and succeed in the imperial crown of this kingdom." This declaration included the assertion that, "there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever." This enduring refutation of Anglo-Catholic pretensions to valid orders was repealed on August 3, 1910, prior to George V's coronation, though the 1701 Act of Settlement still bars a Catholic or anyone married to a Catholic from the throne.

Noted converts of this period included the Anglican monks of Caldey and the nuns of St. Bride (1913), and the writers, Baring, Benson, Chesterton, Dawson, Gill, Hollis, Knox, Leslie, Lunn, MacKenzie, Noyes, Watkin, and Windle.

C. Irish Reforms (1870–1922)

(1) AGRARIAN REFORM

After the Irish Famine population declined enormously through emigration. But the wealthy landlords, largely non-Catholic and often non-Irish, introduced mechanical improvements which put still more peasants out of work. Violent movements, such as "Young Ireland" and the Fenians, had failed to win redress and evictions continued. Yet all that

was done by the British government was to pass the Irish Land Act (1870) which compensated outgoing tenants for improvements and prohibited eviction if the rents were paid up—very small consolation for the poor and debt-ridden.

An Irish Land League was accordingly formed by Michael Davitt to demand three "f's": "Free sale, fair rents, fixity of tenure." Davitt fought for his objectives through boycott and no-rent campaigns, while Charles Parnell, a brilliant parliamentarian, aided him by filibusters at London. Although the Irish hierarchy generally looked askance at Davitt's semi-socialism, Bishops Walsh of Dublin and Croke of Cashel supported the League and Leo XIII refused to condemn it in 1882. During 1881 Gladstone passed another land measure, conceding the League's demands in principle. In 1882, however, the murder of Cavendish by the "Invincibles" renewed bitterness and endangered Parnell's political maneuvers for Home Rule and agrarian reform. His conviction for adultery in 1890 divided Irish politicians. The Conservatives for a time tried to "kill Home Rule with kindness": divert the Irish from politics by redressing their economic grievances. In 1891 the Irish Land Purchase Act compensated landowners so that Irish tenants might regain the national soil. These provisions were extended in 1896 and 1898, and in 1903 the Irish secretary, George Wyndham, completed the reform by giving a bonus to landlords who would sell, while allowing tenants to buy on easy terms with 68 years in which to repay.

(2) Political Autonomy

Home Rule was the objective of another league founded in 1870 by Isaac Butt (d. 1879). From 1875 Parnell led fifty-nine Irish members of the British parliament agitating for local Irish legislative control of all domestic matters. But the first two Home Rule Bills (1886; 1893) drove enough English Liberals into alliance with Conservatives to form a "Unionist" coalition which blocked Home Rule, though in 1898 native control of county administration was conceded. The Liberals in 1912–14 passed a Third Home Rule Bill, but it was suspended because of the war and Ulsterite opposition. Impatient Irish nationalists under De Valera staged an unsuccessful rebellion (1916) and long resisted pacification by guerilla tactics. Moderates under Griffith, founder of Sinn Fein ("We Ourselves"), a movement of cultural renewal and passive resistance, were content to negotiate for dominion status. When Orangemen insisted that "Home Rule means Rome Rule," the British in 1920 permitted six Ulster counties to form a separate administration. After a direct appeal for peace by the king, the Irish Assembly by a vote of sixty-four to fifty-seven accepted dominion status as the "Irish Free State" on January 7, 1922.

98. AMERICAN SOCIAL TENSIONS

A. *Domestic Industrialism* (1865–97)

(1) INDUSTRIAL IDEOLOGIES

Materialism. In the generation following the American Civil War, Materialism seemed to prevail over Idealism; at least its advocates were more vociferous and influential. The aristocratic slave interest, indeed, had been destroyed forever, and political-economic events would soon reveal that agrarian concerns had been subordinated to industrial. Yet by 1885 railroad capital alone exceeded the old slave interest. The new industrial baronage, moreover, proved more powerful than the planters in bending politicians to their will. Prewar moderate tariffs were modified by the Morrill Act (1861), and succeeding measures which rapidly raised rates in favor of manufacturers. The National Banking Acts (1863–64) virtually displaced the independent treasury system which retained government funds; instead, the interests of private finance were favored. In 1864 the Immigration Act by admitting contract labor paved the way for a new proletariat. With this new vogue of Materialism, much of the simplicity and rugged honesty of frontier days went West or vanished forever. Walt Whitman in 1873 viewed this trend with alarm: "Pride, competition, segregation, vicious wilfulness, and licence beyond example brood already upon us. Unwieldy and immense, who shall hold in behemoth? who bridle leviathan?"

National centralization. Centralization of more governmental functions in Washington now considerably altered earlier concepts of the Constitution. The primitive Federal Union had yielded largely to a new National Government, and "States' Rights" were subordinated in all major issues. In 1868 the Fourteenth Amendment provided the legal means of subjecting the states to the Federal, or rather, National Government. Its prohibition of a state's depriving persons of life, liberty, and property was to be interpreted later during the nineteenth century in such wise as to protect the capitalists from social legislation by state governments.

Moral decline. The Fifteenth Amendment (1870) in theory guaranteed universal manhood suffrage. Yet Republican designs of capturing grateful Negro votes were eventually countered in the South by rise of a Democratic one-party system which used various evasions to "keep the Negro in his place." Practically the Negro did not achieve either political or social or economic equality. Negroes who remained in the South continued as hired hands or semi-feudalized "share-croppers"; those who went North were usually given menial labor at inferior wages. Political and business morality revealed a decline in standards. Speculation in the phenomenal industrial boom assumed im-

mense proportions, but business leaders were often none too scrupulous in their methods and politicians quite willing to be swayed by graft. If rigorous letter-of-the law justice was not violated, equity and charity suffered some severe shocks. In corporation ethics and political partisanship there was often a distressing lack of devotion to the common good, and individual and class selfishness came to be taken by some almost as a virtue. There was too little sense of public and private responsibility, and there had arisen a new industrial-commercial-financial nobility that had not heard of *noblesse oblige*.

(2) RECONSTRUCTION THROES (1865–77)

Abolitionist vindictiveness was given free rein when Lincoln's assassination removed the author of a rational and generous policy toward the defeated South. President Lincoln had envisioned the rehabilitation of a seceded state as soon as a tenth of its citizens had taken an oath of allegiance. His successor, Andrew Johnson, strove to carry out these projects, but lacked the war president's prestige and finesse. Johnson was a "war Democrat" who ran on a coalition ticket during the Civil War to demonstrate Northern unity of purpose. Now that peace had returned, politics likewise resumed normal partisan rivalry. Johnson had begun to put Lincoln's mild program into effect during a Congressional recess, but by December, 1865, Congress was in session. It listened largely to Senator Charles Sumner and Representative Thaddeus Stevens, narrow-minded abolitionists embittered against the South. The "Black Republicans" or rabid abolitionists insisted on treating the late Confederate States as conquered provinces, rejected Southern representatives chosen on the presidential plan, and from March, 1867, imposed their own harsh views by martial law. Negro suffrage, as granted by the Fifteenth Amendment, proved to be premature. While the ablest of Southern leaders were temporarily disqualified, political power fell into the hands of ignorant freedmen or Northern immigrants. Imported Northern administrators, doctrinaire, unfamiliar with local conditions, and often simply dishonest, introduced arbitrary misrule with the backing of an army of occupation. President Johnson was politically paralyzed by his impeachment and near removal by a vengeful Congress, and replaced by Grant in the 1868 elections.

Tardy reconciliation. General Grant had captured the popular sentiment in 1868 with his slogan: "Let us have peace." He was not only re-elected in 1872, but was seriously considered for a third term in 1880. As president, Grant, though well-meaning and personally honest, showed himself incompetent or naïve in things beyond the military sphere. His years in office revealed him a pliant tool of the Republican

congressional oligarchy. With the Democratic Party discredited by its connection with the Confederacy, national politics for a score of years came dangerously close to a one-party system. The president did not rise above continuance of the existing martial law in the South, and this enabled "carpet-baggers" and "scalawags" to control state politics in many areas. But so reckless proved capitalist manipulation—in the North as well as the South—that the Democrats almost won the presidential election of 1876; in fact some still claim that Tilden actually did win but was counted out. The Republican victor, Rutherford Hayes (1877–81), coming to office with a colored title, felt the need of concessions in keeping with unofficial pledges made by his supporters before the decision. Hayes' withdrawal of troops from the South permitted white citizens to regain control of the politics in these states, quietly nullifying Negro suffrage by one pseudo-legal means or another. As industrialism invaded the South and bankers replaced planters in control of agriculture, a "New South" emerged, though the Civil War and reconstruction remained emotionally charged topics.

(3) INDUSTRIAL POLITICS (1869–77)

Industrial evolution. The new industrial order had been evolving in the United States since the War of 1812, and was fanned to fever heat by the Civil War. Heretofore confined to the Eastern and Midwestern area, it now invaded the South and the Far West. The bases for this growth were two: abundant resources long possessed and daily discovered which had either not yet been used, or employed for purposes now antiquated; e.g., oil; and men's inventive genius which found new values for things deemed worthless centuries before, or produced labor-saving machines. Once an invention had been introduced, its usefulness was multiplied by the countless improvements demanded by a competitive system.

President Ulysses Grant (1869–77) had been a successful and efficient, if not brilliant war commander. In the business of government he was the ordinary man of average intelligence, which might have been barely enough for less complex circumstances. But he assumed, as he often stated, that the Constitution and the law were what the majority of the people wanted them to be, and he displayed few inflexible principles. For economic affairs he was not at all qualified: he had failed repeatedly in business up to the eve of the Civil War, and he was to be the victim of another misfortune after his retirement from the White House. He readily accepted compromising gifts, assuming the donors to be unbiased. He was blindly and doggedly loyal to friends, and filled his administration with relatives, cronies, and army acquaintances. Provi-

dentially his secretary of state, Hamilton Fish—himself only a second choice—was an outstanding statesman who prevented mistakes abroad, and sometimes exercised some restraint on domestic issues.

Problems of corruption. The dominant congressional group, besides oppressing the South, also favored too indiscriminately the Northern industrialists for whom the Civil War and the postwar boom had created fantastic opportunities for money making. Southern squires might have been dethroned, but Northern industrial barons and financial czars were in the making. Lobbyists made their appearance urging protection of their respective interests. "Black Friday," September 24, 1869, occurred when financiers Gould and Fiske imposed upon the president and nearly cornered the gold market. Credit Mobilier, a finance company for the Union Pacific Railway, had been highly subsidized by the Federal Government, and seems to have rewarded its friends by special concessions. In the long run, this "mobile credit" paid 348 per cent interest! Investigations eventually implicated Vice-President Colfax, Treasury Secretary Richardson, and Congressmen Garfield and Blaine, among others. Less scandalous but more disastrous was the Jay Cooke failure in 1873 through withdrawal of foreign credit after the Franco-Prussian War. Finally, Grant's administration was involved in the Whiskey Ring and still other instances of bribery. In view of these disclosures, reform elements captured the Republican Convention during 1876, and its nominee Hayes promised the country higher political standards.

(4) Reformist Politics (1877–85)

The Parties. The Republican party long basked in the halo of Abraham Lincoln, and enjoyed the lifetime allegiance of abolitionists, Union veterans, and homesteaders, while quite generally satisfying the capitalists that they were the more conservative and respectable group. The Democrats carried the onus of the late rebellion, a disadvantage in the North, but a badge of favor in the South. Yet they enjoyed control of local strongholds represented at Washington, so that from 1875 to 1897, with but brief exceptions in 1881 and 1889, they controlled one of the branches of Congress. They were not, however, particularly "democratic" in favoring the common man until the Populists captured their organization in the 1896 campaign, and the Progressives inclined to their ranks at the beginning of the twentieth century. Hence those desirous of economic reform usually sought to back a third party, such as the Greenback inflationists, and the Populists. The latter group came close to becoming a major party in the 1890's but went down irretrievably in the debacle of 1896. Thereafter the chief social reformers went to the Progressive factions of the major parties, or joined the Socialists, founded

in 1897, and long led by Eugene Debs and his successor, Norman Thomas.

President Hayes (1877–81). The president was a conscientious and upright man in both public and private life, but lacked a reformer's singleness of purpose, and a leader's unquestioned prestige. Nonpartisanship became a cardinal policy of Hayes's administration. He named to his cabinet the Democrat Key and the Progressive Schurz. Civil service, promoted by Thomas Jenkes of Rhode Island, obtained the president's moral support and received some publicity, but politicians were not yet convinced of its necessity. The Bland-Allison Silver Purchase Act was passed over the president's veto as a sop to Western farmers. Having alienated party managers, Hayes was disregarded for Garfield in the 1880 nominations. Garfield won from Hancock in a colorless election; his popular majority was but ninety-five hundred out of a vote of nine million.

Garfield-Arthur Administration (1881–85). Garfield had been involved in Credit Mobilier, and Arthur had been dismissed by President Hayes from the New York collectorship. The old guard seemed in power and reform hopelessly lost, until Garfield's assassination by a disappointed office-seeker focused attention on the spoils system. And President Arthur proved quite different from Collector Arthur. Like Octavius, he sobered with power and responsibility. Appointing a new cabinet, he reversed the trend toward reform at the cost of his political future. After considerable discussion, and not a little help from the president, the Pendleton-Eaton Civil Service Act (1883) launched the civil service by placing about a tenth of Federal officials under this classification. The Republican "Stalwarts" repudiated Arthur to name James Blaine, another relic of Mobilier. This tarnished "Plumed Knight" was narrowly defeated by the Democratic reform candidate, Governor Grover Cleveland of New York. The campaign featured the public errors of the former and the private foibles of the latter, but properly returned the former to private life, and promoted the latter to public office.

(5) AGRARIAN-INDUSTRIAL POLITICS (1885–97)

First Cleveland Administration (1885–89). Cleveland, not a professional politician and somewhat aloof from his Democratic confreres, was a scrupulously conscientious administrator whose motto was "public office is a public trust." He became the first independent and aggressive chief executive since Lincoln, if one excepts Johnson's futile bluster. Cleveland resolutely defied the bosses in cabinet appointments and in maintaining the Pendleton Act. He added 7,000 to civil service status during his first administration, and 42,500 during his second, bringing

the percentage to nearly half. Cleveland also holds the record for vetoes: 475 bills in eight years—before 1945 no president vetoed more than 50 bills save Theodore Roosevelt (82 in 7) and F.D.R. (631 in 12). Many of these vetoes were used on extravagant measures and suspicious pension grants. The president approved the Interstate Commerce Act, although his economic views were on the whole conservative. Protectionism he made the chief issue of his message of 1887, favoring a moderate rather than a high tariff. When the Mills Bill embodying his ideas was blocked by the Republican Senate, Cleveland took the issue to the people in the 1888 election. Theoretically he won their endorsement by a 100,000 plurality over his Republican opponent in the popular vote; practically he lost out, 233 to 168, in the electoral college.

President Benjamin Harrison (1889-93), an undistinguished senator and a corporation lawyer, was a rather cold personality without zeal for reform. The spoils system seemed to have returned and government economy, so painfully stressed in Cleveland's meticulous vetoes, was brazenly ignored. Protectionism returned with the McKinley Act (1890). Though Sherman's Anti-Trust Act and Silver Purchase Act seemed concessions to the populace, the former was long inoperative and the second quickly withdrawn. Protectionism was once again the issue in 1892, when even more forcibly the popular majority was given to Cleveland, who this time captured the electoral majority as well.

Second Cleveland Administration (1893-97). Cleveland's second victory, however, proved delusive. Depression and panic induced this conservative statesman to repeal the Silver Purchase Act and call upon magnate J. P. Morgan for financial aid—to the indignation of workers and farmers. Cleveland's efforts to dislodge the McKinley Tariff failed and attempts to tax excess incomes of large corporations were abruptly halted by the Supreme Court. These events, added to Cleveland's unpopular intervention in the Pullman strike, caused widespread desertion of his leadership.

Populism had absorbed the old Greenbackers and strove to give relief to the grievances of laborers and farmers. In 1892 its candidate, General Weaver, won a million votes in the Populist appeal for "free silver," government control of credit, government ownership of utilities, and communications, a graduated income tax, an eight-hour day, a secret ballot, initiative and referendum, direct election of senators, and a ban on labor spies. In 1896 Populists fused with Silver Democrats to nominate William Jennings Bryan who had indicted big business: "You have made the definition of a business man too limited in its application. The man who is employed for wages is as much a business man as his employer; the attorney, the merchant at the crossroads store . . . farmer. We have petitioned and our petitions have been scorned. . . . We entreat no

more; we petition no more; we defy them. . . . You shall not press down on the brow of labor a crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind on a cross of gold." But Bryan's evangelical crusade failed to impress Mark Hanna and his protégé, William McKinley, who carried the East for the Republicans by 7,000,000 to 6,500,000 votes. Gold was sacred until 1933.

B. Catholicity Amid Social Tensions (1866–95)

(1) CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

"The Age of Gibbons." After Archbishop Carroll's pioneer episcopate, no period of American Church history was so nearly personified by one prelate as that between the Civil War and World War I by James Cardinal Gibbons (1834–1921). Gibbons had been a Civil War chaplain; successively he was missionary bishop (1868), member of the Vatican Council, primatial archbishop of Baltimore from 1877, president of the Third Plenary Council (1884), cardinal from 1886 and in this capacity participated in a conclave. Before his death he presided over the first annual bishops' meeting (1919). Zealous, alert, moderate, democratic, sociable, frank, the cardinal won widespread respect for Catholicity in the United States. He strove to allay bigotry by conspicuous patriotism, and certainly reflected average American Catholic opinion when he declared in 1916: "The separation of Church and state in this country seems to Catholics the natural, the inevitable, the best conceivable plan, the one that would work best among us, both for the good of religion and of the state."

Vatican relations. Until the establishment of an apostolic delegation at Washington (1893), the cardinal conducted the clerical and occasional secular relations of this country with the Vatican, and he retained great personal influence thereafter. On taking possession of his cardinalatial church in Rome, March 25, 1887, Cardinal Gibbons extolled the American system of government, and in the same year at his suggestion President Cleveland sent a copy of the American Constitution to Pope Leo XIII on the latter's golden jubilee. Together with Archbishop Ireland, the cardinal tried to avert the Spanish-American War, but once it had begun provided chaplains and visited hospitals. He helped negotiate the settlement in the new American colonies with the Vatican, and mediated between Rome and the Philippine hierarchy when members of the latter accused the American government of curbing the Church in the Islands. Vatican-Washington negotiations, amicably conducted by Mr. Taft, were generally cordial. But Vice-President Fairbanks, while in Rome, visited a bigoted Methodist mission that was conducting a crude campaign of abuse against the Holy See. When ex-President Roosevelt came to Rome in 1910, he was asked not to

repeat this visit if he desired to be received in papal audience. Scorning this "Tammany proposition," Teddy refused to give any such assurance and was denied his audience. Cardinal Gibbons did not share the same intimacy with President Wilson as with his predecessors, but he discouraged Catholic nagging of the administration on Mexican intervention until convinced of Carranza's guilt. Gibbons endorsed the League of Nations, but failed to obtain Wilson's approval of inclusion of the "Roman Question" on the Versailles agenda. He did prevail on the president, however, to make a courtesy call on the pope in 1919, and this formal visit at least restored the amenities. So long as Gibbons was at Baltimore, papal messages to the White House often passed through him.

Catholic statesmen during the period were headed by Edward White (1845–1921), chief justice from 1910; Joseph McKenna (1843–1926) was also a member of the Supreme Court, from 1898 to 1925. Catholic senators, James Shields of Illinois and John Kenna of West Virginia, earned inclusion in National Statuary Hall. Joseph McKenna was attorney general under President McKinley, and Charles Bonaparte and Robert Wynne held cabinet posts under Theodore Roosevelt. Maurice Francis Egan was a diplomat of some distinction, and the Bellamy Storers pretended to inside White House information.

(2) NEGRO MISSIONS

Emancipation problems. The greater number of Catholic Negroes before the Civil War were resident in Maryland and Louisiana. The former state was generally free from disturbance during the military operations, but in Louisiana many slaves were uprooted during the Federal occupation. About 1890, Archbishop Janssens of New Orleans was of the opinion that possibly twenty thousand Catholic Negroes had been lost to the Faith. Some migrants failed to keep up the practice of their religion in their new surroundings, often strange and unfriendly. In the South, moreover, there were not enough priests to care for White Catholics, while in the North the tide of immigration left the clergy little time for the difficult Negro apostolate. Hence Negroes often failed to receive adequate religious instruction.

Apostolate to the Negro. The prewar missionaries to the Negro, Jesuits in Maryland and Vincentians in Louisiana, continued their labors under these trying conditions. But there was need for a specialized apostolate. Providentially this developed from a mission begun in Baltimore in 1871 by the newly founded (1866) English Mill Hill Fathers. Father, later cardinal, Vaughan accepted Pius IX's suggestion to devote four missionaries to the salvation of the Negroes. Eventually it proved expedient for the American group to become a separate religious community, the Josephite Fathers, pledged to work among the Negroes. In

1872 they were joined by the Holy Ghost Fathers, and in 1906 the Society of the Divine Word began to take a special interest in the Negro missions, and the African Mission Fathers came in 1907. A native clergy was encouraged and between 1891 and 1941 some thirty Negroes were ordained to the priesthood. A former slave, August Tolton, ordained in 1888, later baptized his former master. James Healy, who had Negro blood, became bishop of Portland in Maine in 1875.

Negro education, if not merely nonexistent before the Civil War, was usually of an inferior quality to that accorded Whites. The New Orleans Ursulines and Mother Seton's Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg, however, had from the beginning made their schools available to Negroes, and other sisterhoods made contributions after the Civil War. In 1868 the Religious of the Sacred Heart opened a school for Negroes in St. Michael, Louisiana, but in 1889 the Sisters of Divine Providence still encountered opposition in starting a school at Clutierville, Louisiana. Particularly noteworthy was the work of Katherine Drexel (1858–1955) of Philadelphia. In 1891 at Pope Leo's suggestion she founded the Blessed Sacrament Sisters for work among Indians and Negroes. Between 1915 and 1933, she developed at New Orleans, Xavier School, College, and University, exclusively devoted to Negro education. After 1884, moreover, by decree of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, an annual collection for the Negro and Indian missions has contributed to the financing of educational facilities.

(3) DEFENSE OF CATHOLIC INDIANS

Sectarian menace. After the Civil War, Congress initiated a new policy in regard to surviving independent Indian tribes. They were no longer to be treated as theoretically independent nations, but were to be grouped on reservations as wards of the United States government. Though President Johnson had been personally friendly to Catholics, President Grant seems to have been, willingly or no, a masonic tool. In a message to Congress on December 5, 1870, the president announced his new "Indian Peace Policy." The tribes under government wardship were to be allocated for religious ministrations to such groups as "had heretofore established missionaries." But while the formal wording of the program was unobjectionable, its application proved to be different. The agents who supervised the appointment of missionaries were unfairly named. Thus, in the appointment of agents, Protestant pressure groups were favored so that Catholics received but eight of the thirty-eight agencies to which they were entitled on proportional representation. This inequality resulted in the distribution of about eighty thousand Catholic Indians among Protestant agencies.

Catholic Indian Bureau. To protect Catholic interests, both at Wash-

ington and on the reservations, James Roosevelt Bayley, archbishop of Baltimore, formed the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, January, 1874. This was presently recognized by the Federal Interior Department. General Charles Ewing, General Sherman's Catholic brother-in-law, became the Bureau's first commissioner (1874–83) and worked in co-operation with the clerical director, Father Brouillet (1874–84). Their efforts proved so successful that the objectionable features of the "Peace Policy" were altered in 1881, and practically abandoned in 1883. The second director, Monsignor Joseph Stephan (1884–1901), arranged for "contract schools" for Indian children whereby the government paid for educational maintenance, once buildings and teachers were assured. By 1890, Federal subsidies to sixty Catholic schools amounted to $300,000. It was subsequently contended, however, that such subsidies violated the "principle of separation between Church and state," and in 1900 Congress terminated the allocation. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Taft, however, upheld the contract school policy, and in 1908 the Supreme Court, in the case of Quick Bear vs. Leup, decided that sub-sidies to the Catholic Indian Bureau were lawful inasmuch as they were treaty payments and not tax appropriations. The next director, Mon-signor Ketcham (1901–21), promoted better relations between the Bureau and the government, and in 1912 was named a member of the Board of Indian Commissioners.

Indian missions. By 1955, about one-fourth of the Indians in the United States were Catholic. There were 112,000 with 408 churches served by 224 priests and 58 schools had 8,000 students. Perhaps another 100,000 Indians claimed Protestant membership, and some still remained pagan, for the survivors were prone to make a fetish of ancestral cus-toms. The chief missionaries were the Franciscans, Jesuits, Benedictines, and many communities of sisters.

(4) Masonic Secularism

Bigotry revived shortly after the Civil War, though there was no or-ganized movement until the rise of the A.P.A. in 1887. Charles Chiniquy, a renegade priest who had been excommunicated at Bourbonais, Illinois as early as 1857, foisted on the American public a bogus Lincoln proph-ecy which represented the late president as saying: "I see a very dark cloud on our horizon and that dark cloud is coming from Rome. It is filled with tears of blood." Though the saying was repudiated by Robert Lincoln, it was still being used in the 1928 presidential campaign. Long before that, masonic secularism had made great strides in its drive against religious education in the United States.

Educational threats. After the Civil War the trend to secular educa-tion was accentuated, and most states placed a ban on religious in-

struction in the public schools. In a message to Congress, moreover, President Grant recommended on December 7, 1875, "that a constitutional amendment be submitted to the legislatures of the several states to establish and effectively maintain free public schools adequate to the education of all children in the rudimentary branches within their respective limitations, irrespective of sex, color, birthplace, or religion, forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic or pagan tenets, and prohibiting the granting of any school funds . . . in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect. . . . I suggest the taxation of all property equally, whether church or corporation, exempting only the last resting place of the dead and possibly, with proper restrictions, church edifices." Though Blaine the following December 14 introduced an amendment in this sense, this possible bid for bigots' votes did not succeed.

Politics were not adjourned, however. During 1876 radical Republican propaganda used a pamphlet endorsing Bismarck's contemporary *Kulturkampf*, entitled, *Vaticanism in Germany and the United States.* Garfield in 1876 castigated the "combined power of rebellion, Catholicism, and whiskey," and in 1880, when accepting the Republican presidential nomination, said: "It would be unjust to our people and dangerous to our institutions to apply any portion of the revenues of the nation or of the states to the support of sectarian schools. The separation of the church and the state in everything relating to taxation should be absolute." Blaine may have lost New York and the presidency by permitting denunciation of the Democrats during 1884 as the party "whose antecedents have been rum, Romanism, and rebellion." In 1888, Dr. Dorchester, Protestant minister and Indian commissioner during the Harrison administration, denounced alleged Catholic political influence. One can understand Monsignor Stephan's private description of "the bigoted commissioner and not much less bigoted president" (Harrison), which embarrassingly leaked out.

(5) AMERICAN PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION

Origins. Even Cardinal Gibbons's era of good feeling witnessed its phase of organized anti-Catholic agitation, although it proved comparatively mild. Alarmed by discussions from 1885 forward of appointment of a papal representative at Washington, nativism revived. At Clinton, Iowa, during 1887, Henry Bowers founded the "American Protective Association"—the A.P.A.—to defend native institutions against foreign aggression. It used the old methods of denunciation and calumny, and the parading of ex-priests, real or bogus. Nast contributed a number of antipapal cartoons to *Harper's Weekly*. William Black charged that the White House had been connected by wire to the episcopal residence

at Baltimore so that Cardinal Gibbons might transmit the pope's wishes to the president. President Cleveland felt that the accusation called for a denial, branding the statement as silly and lauding the patriotism of Cardinal Gibbons.

"The Chicago Massacre." But in 1893 the Detroit organ of the A.P.A., *Patriotic American,* spread a rumor that Catholics would make use of the Columbian Exposition at Chicago to perpetrate a massacre of Protestants. To Leo XIII was ascribed the following encyclical: "We likewise declare that all subjects of every rank and condition in the United States and every individual who has taken any oath of loyalty to the United States in any way whatever may be absolved from said oath, as from all other duty, fidelity, or obedience on or about the fifth of September, 1893, when the Catholic Congress shall convene at Chicago, Illinois, as we shall exonerate them from all engagements and on or about the feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of our Lord 1893, it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics found within the jurisdiction of the United States of America." Elbert Hubbard claims that during 1893 he found terror in many villages, some were arming, others fleeing. The alarm excited was only partially allayed by the assertion of the Protestant ministers of Columbus, Ohio, attesting the falsity of the alleged encyclical. But the following November, Dr. Drury was still warning the Union Biblical Seminary Conference at Xenia, Ohio, that Irish Catholics in the United States were enlisted members of the papal troops.

Politics. A.P.A. political success seems to have been larger in boast than reality. In state contests, it claimed to have effected a political revolution in New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, California, and Oregon; actually, its only established triumph was the election of William Bradley as governor of Kentucky in 1893. Though the Association pretended to have twenty-five members of Congress in 1895, only one, William Linton of Saginaw, Michigan, is certain. The Democratic Party's alleged identification with "Romanism" drove A.P.A. politicians into Republican ranks. They endorsed Benjamin Harrison for the presidency in 1892, but Cleveland was elected. When McKinley repudiated the A.P.A. in 1896, the organization made strenuous efforts to prevent his nomination. Its complete lack of influence destroyed its prestige, and after 1900 the Association ceased as a national organization, although Bowers posed as its president until his death in 1911.

(6) EARLY LABOR PROBLEMS

Early labor unions. Industrialism came to the United States later than in Europe, and for a long time the frontier exercised a cushioning

influence. Though child labor and wage exploitation existed in early Eastern factories, conditions were not intolerable until after the Panic of 1837. Labor unions were at first mainly local, and tended to be secret societies resorting to violence. Thus the "Molly Maguires," an Irish terrorist group, operated among Pennsylvania miners. Repudiated by ecclesiastical authority, they were broken up by the Pinkertons by 1879.

The Knights of Labor were founded in 1869 at Philadelphia by Uriah Stevens as a national secret society to work on behalf of laborers. As a secret organization, the Knights at first incurred some of the odium of the Molly Maguires, but presently under the leadership of Terence Powderly (1849–1924), they abandoned secrecy. Powderly, then a Catholic but later an apostate, advocated such radical changes as an eight-hour day and abolition of child labor. Though the Knights reached a membership of 729,677 by 1886, their past associations were enough to induce the conservative Canadian hierarchy, led by Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec, to condemn them. On the other hand, ten of the twelve members of the United States archiepiscopal committee on secret societies had opposed condemnation. When at Rome in 1887 to receive the red hat, Cardinal Gibbons described condemnation as unjustified and inexpedient. His views were upheld by Cardinal Manning, and Pope Leo XIII reversed the Quebec censure. Powderly publicly expressed his gratitude, but the Knights lost public support by unfounded accusations of implication in the anarchistic Haymarket Riot at Chicago in 1886. When Powderly resigned in 1893, the Knights were discredited, and defense of the American laboring interests had passed to the conservative American Federation of Labor, founded in 1886 by the circumspect Samuel Gompers. Yet the intervention of Cardinal Gibbons had prevented the impression that the Church was officially opposed to labor unions and on the side of the capitalist.

Labor questions continued to arise for American clerics. Father Edward McGlynn, a New York City pastor, publicly defended the semi-socialistic "Single-Tax" theory of Henry George, and was excommunicated by Archbishop Corrigan of New York, with the support of Bishop McQuaid of Rochester. Cardinal Gibbons, however, averted Roman compliance with Corrigan's demand for condemnation of George's treatise, *Progress and Poverty.* In *Rerum Novarum* (1891), Leo XIII contented himself with criticizing the unsound theory obliquely. Through his legate, Monsignor Satolli, the pope secured McGlynn's reinstatement, though the latter was rusticated by the archbishop. Cardinal Gibbons remained a champion of labor, while ever urging conciliation with capital. In his *Christian Heritage* (1889), Gibbons upheld the right of a living wage and denounced child labor, and in 1907 defended the workers' right to organize in an article in *Putnam's*

Monthly, while a sermon during 1908 criticized sweatshop conditions. Archbishop Ireland endorsed President Cleveland's controversial intervention in the Pullman Strike (1893) as a step toward order. On the other hand, President Roosevelt named Bishop Spalding of Peoria to the Coal Anthracite Board during the 1902 Anthracite Strike, and this body's findings gave general satisfaction. In 1906 appeared Father John A. Ryan's *Living Wage,* the first detailed application of *Rerum Novarum* to American conditions. Father Peter Dietz was the first priest to attend an A.F.L. convention in 1909, and in the following year organized a study group, the Militia for Christ. In 1913 the Boston Labor School made its appearance.

(7) HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATION

New sees and provinces. Between the Second (1866) and Third (1884) Plenary Councils of Baltimore, nineteen new sees were erected. The second great metropolitan reorganization took place in 1875 when Boston, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, and Santa Fe were made ecclesiastical provinces, followed closely by Chicago in 1880. During 1875 Archbishop John McCloskey of New York became the first resident American cardinal.

Third Plenary Council (1884). In the absence of the aged Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop Gibbons of Baltimore presided as papal legate over the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, attended by fourteen archbishops and fifty-seven bishops. Legislation was arranged in these titles: 1) *Orthodox Faith:* special approval was given to the decrees of the Vatican Council, and the encyclicals of Leo XIII on socialism, civil government, and marriage. 2) *Ecclesiastical persons:* recommendations for episcopal sees diocesan consultors; clerical examiners; rural deans; clerical discipline. The Roman collar was made obligatory, and retreats and study were deemed preferable to theaters and horse races for the clergy. Precautions ought to be taken about begging by clerics and religious. 3) *Divine worship:* general extension of a Sunday bination faculty; the present six holy days of obligation fixed for the United States; Sunday observance urged upon immigrants; uniform fasting regulations were considered premature. 4) *Sacraments:* careful inquiry into the validity of non-Catholic baptism was enjoined; excommunication imposed on Catholics marrying before a minister; stress on exacting promises before mixed marriages. 5) *Clerical education:* a six-year course was prescribed for major seminaries with a curriculum on Thomistic principles; five-year junior clergy examinations; periodical clergy conferences. Establishment of a Catholic University was recommended. 6) *Lay schools:* stringent commands were laid on Catholics to send children to the parochial school, unless excused by the ordinary;

multiplication of high schools and colleges was urged. 7) *Christian doctrine:* preachers were warned to avoid political questions and undue iteration of money appeals. The Catholic press was commended and subversive literature condemned. The *Baltimore Catechism,* published the next year, was prepared. 8) *Zeal for souls:* port chaplains were urged to care for immigrants, and a commission, supported by an annual collection, set over Negro and Indian missions. Sodalities, especially for promotion of temperance, were commended, and the Propagation of the Faith Society made obligatory in each diocese. Secret societies were censured and an episcopal commission set up to determine uniform discipline. 9) *Church property:* pew money should not be collected at the door, and free seats must be provided for the poor. Fund-raising abuses ought to be eliminated, and the sacraments ought never be denied for failure to contribute. Advertisements of Masses in return for donations were denounced, but picnics, bazaars, banquets, when free of abuses, might be used to raise funds. 10) *Ecclesiastical trials:* technical regulations were made concerning judges, notaries, etc. 11) *Ecclesiastical burial:* proper care of Catholic cemeteries was enjoined and some relaxation made in previous prohibitions of burial of Catholics in non-Catholic cemeteries. 12) *Directions for promulgation.* Such was the legislation governing the Church throughout the United States until promulgation of the New Code of Canon Law in 1918.

(8) Educational Controversies

Catholic University. The recommendation of the Third Plenary Council gave urgency to efforts long made by Bishop Spalding of Peoria to erect a school of graduate studies, primarily for clerical training. Despite the foreign houses of studies at Rome and Louvain, and the sixteen hundred students in seminaries in the United States, full needs of scholarship were not yet being met. In 1887 Pope Leo XIII gave his approval for a Catholic University for both clerical and lay students, and in November, 1889, the university opened its doors in Washington, D.C., with Bishop Keane as first rector, and Mary Caldwell the first large-scale benefactor. Though its original faculty was concerned only with theology, the staff was augmented in 1895 to embrace schools of law, social science, philosophy, and arts. Bishop Keane recruited his original faculty among six foreign-born professors: Schroeder, Bouquillon, and Hogan, theology; Hyvernat, sculpture; Pohle, philosophy; Searle, physics; and enlisted two native converts, Stoddard and Hewit, to teach literature and history. Progress was retarded for a time by ideological and national tensions among the faculty, but its scholarship came of age with publication (1907–14) of the *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

Parochial schools. Even more necessary was the maintenance of the

parochial school system, also stressed by the Third Plenary Council. In their pastoral on this occasion the bishops had set forth this ideal: "No parish is complete until it has schools adequate to the needs of its children, and the pastor and people of such a parish should feel that they have not accomplished their entire duty until the want is supplied." In 1884 this goal had been realized in scarcely forty per cent of American parishes, but poorer dioceses and parishes were disturbed at the immense financial outlay required and were disposed to consider favorably some sort of state assistance. Mention has been made of the Lowell Plan (1831–52). Between 1873 and 1898, when the state superintendent decided that teachers in religious habits were unconstitutional, a Poughkeepsie, N.Y., parochial school was rented to the community and its teachers reimbursed by it. In 1890 Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul endorsed a modification of the Poughkeepsie Plan so enthusiastically that Archbishop Corrigan and others deemed it approbation of a neutral public school system. Actually, Archbishop Ireland's "Faribault Plan" allowed the public school board to rent parochial school buildings, hire nuns as teachers—of secular subjects in regular hours; of religion after hours—and administer the institution as an integral part of the public school system. Dr. Thomas Bouquillon of Catholic University backed the plan a little too enthusiastically in a booklet, *Education: To Whom Does It Belong?*, which magnified state control over Catholic education. He was answered by Father Holaind, S.J., in *The Parent First,* which asserted that the state might neither enforce attendance nor set teaching standards. Each view was supported by members of the hierarchy, with Cardinal Gibbons seeking to moderate the heated dispute. In 1892 the papal envoy, Monsignor Satolli, lauded the American public school system, but in ignorance of American conditions failed to indicate certain objectionable features. On April 21, 1892, Propaganda ruled that the Faribault Plan might be tolerated, but by that time local opposition had canceled the plan. On May 31, 1893, Leo XIII urged all prelates to harmony, strongly re-emphasized the Baltimore ideal, but urged the expediency of obtaining state aid wherever possible. The controversy subsided, but state subsidies remained a desideratum, for by 1933 the parochial school system had achieved but sixty per cent of its goal.

99. AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

A. *Imperialistic Industrialism* (1897–1921)

(1) IMPERIALISTIC IDEOLOGIES

Emergence of imperialism. Aside from the acquisition of Alaska by purchase from Russia in 1867, no new territory had been added to the public domain since the Civil War, and foreign relations until 1890 were largely confined to cases arising out of the Civil War. But coinciding

with the closing of the frontier on the Continent and the rapidly advancing industrialization of the United States, came a new imperialism atune with the international interest in colonization. As European powers carved out new colonial domains in Africa and extorted port concessions from Asiatic monarchies, the United States became aware once again of Latin America. The Pan-American Union began its conferences at Washington, D.C., in 1889 under Blaine's sponsorship, and the Monroe Doctrine was cited anew. Though looming conflict with Great Britain over a Venezuela boundary was eventually amicably settled in 1895, the incident gave occasion to a brash distortion of the Monroe Doctrine by State Secretary Olney: "Today the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat *is* law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition." Simultaneously the dollar, well-nigh almighty at home, now ventured abroad, and the resulting "dollar diplomacy" had no small say in Caribbean politics. Trade with Cuba played a part in McKinley's acquiescence in a seemingly needless war with Spain in 1898, which not merely freed Cuba, but involved the United States in Asiatic as well as American colonialism. American idealism was outraged by acceptance of the Filipinos as colonial subjects, but President McKinley at length decided that "there was nothing left for us to do but take them all, and to educate the Filipinos and uplift and Christianize them." Clearly the United States was to lift its share of the "white man's burden," but had never heard of three centuries of Catholic evangelization of the Islands.

Oceanic imperialism. Yet there had been portents of this new American role. In 1844 the United States through Caleb Cushing had made the first trade pact with China, and ten years later Commodore Matthew Perry forced Japan to reopen commercial relations. In 1868 the Burlingame Treaty with China concluded reciprocal trade and immigration agreements, but the latter clause was repudiated by the United States in 1879 when Chinese labor on the West Coast threatened native wage standards. In 1872 claims incurred by the Confederate cruiser *Alabama* on the high seas with British connivance won the United States a judgment for $15,500,000. The American navy obtained rights to use Pearl Harbor in 1875, and with them a virtual option to the Hawaiian Islands. In 1894 a Republic was set up under an American, Sanford Dole, and annexation followed in 1898. American interests in Samoa culminated in occupation of Pagopago. All this brought the United States into Pacific trade and politics, and in 1899 China was warned to keep the door open for American commerce, and patriotic "Boxers" were chastised in 1900 by American as well as European troops. This new two-ocean position of the United States necessitated better maritime communications. This was provided by the Panama Canal, for which

land was taken in rather cavalier fashion by President Theodore Roosevelt who added a "corollary" to the Monroe Doctrine.

(2) OCEANIC IMPERIALISM (1897–1901)

President William McKinley (1897–1901), elected and re-elected over William Jennings Bryan in 1896 and 1900, was personally an amiable and well-meaning man. But he lacked strength of character and in public life proved a routine politician who conformed to the desires of big business. Sponsored by a shrewd and wealthy "boss," Mark Hanna, McKinley nonetheless had a comparatively tranquil political career until he was assassinated by a demented anarchist in September, 1901. Previously, however, a foreign crisis had given some substance to Roosevelt's exclamation: "McKinley has no more backbone than a chocolate éclair."

The Spanish-American War. Both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans were involved in the Spanish-American contest, for though the spark was ignited in Cuba, the conflagration spread to the Philippines. Cuban restiveness under Spanish rule was an old story, for basically the colonial mercantilism had survived in Spain's diminished New World dominions. Of an annual revenue of $26,000,000, but one twenty-sixth was devoted to the benefit of Cubans; the remainder was used in Spain or her domain. Distance from the mother country, outmoded ideas of colonial government, and belief in the disreputable character of the insurgents led the Spanish government of the Conservative Premier Castillo into a series of errors. Cuban insurgents were herded into concentration camps where they excited American sympathy. After another uprising in 1895, American sugar interests importuned intervention by the United States, but President Cleveland resisted all such pressure. In 1897 Castillo's assassination confused Spanish administration, while the Spanish ambassador's indiscreet reference to President McKinley as a *politicastro* antagonized the new American administration. When American lives became endangered in Cuba, the U.S.S. *Maine* was sent there. This was blown up in February, 1898, with the loss of 260 lives. Yellow journalism stirred up war fever although the cause of this explosion has never been definitely established. McKinley's ultimatum of March was substantially complied with in Spain, and the queen asked for papal arbitration. Despite Archbishop Ireland's pleas, the president, fearful of bigots and warmongers, virtually asked for a declaration of war, which Congress formally declared on April 25. The contest revealed the Spanish dominions an empty hulk, and the Spanish forces lost all save honor. Though the American army was ill-prepared, the Navy was superb. Dewey promptly captured Manila and ten Spanish ships, committing the United States to Pacific occupation. In Cuba, American

Rough Riders distinguished themselves, a distinction that lost nothing in the telling.

Peace brought the cession by Spain to the United States of the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico, and placed Cuba under American supervision. After some hesitation, President McKinley decided to keep the Philippines which the Democrats tried to get off American hands. The United States renounced all intention of annexing Cuba, but ruled it by martial law from 1898 to 1902, and from 1906 to 1909. In 1901 the Platt-Root Amendment reserved to the American Government the right to intervene to protect life and property, and until its abrogation in 1934 this made of Cuba an American protectorate. In poverty-stricken Puerto Rico there was considerable unrest until home rule was conceded in 1946.

(3) HEMISPHERIC IMPERIALISM (1901–15)

President Theodore Roosevelt (1901–9), succeeding President Mc-Kinley in 1901, had had varied experiences and interests. Energetic and original, he naturally chose the broad interpretation of the presidential powers. A good dramatist and showman, he often exhibited more bark than bite. He had, however, an unhesitating self-righteousness in American dealings with her neighbors, which gave rise to the "Roosevelt Corollary" to the Monroe Doctrine, as enunciated in 1904: "Chronic wrong-doing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention." Let, then, Latin Americans beware.

Canal through Panama. The Spanish-American War had, however, excited hatred and fear of the United States south of the border. An inter-oceanic canal had long been contemplated, and the American government eventually acquired from the French De Lesseps firm its rights of construction through the Isthmus of Panama. When Colombia, which then controlled the Isthmus, made difficulties about leasing land, a revolution was engineered with the connivance of the American State Department in November, 1903. A new Republic of Panama was declared, promptly recognized, and graciously ceded the desired Canal Zone. Colombia was finally granted some compensation in 1921.

Mexican intervention. In 1912, the United States intervened in Nicaragua; in 1914 it was Haiti's turn. Hence it was understandable that the idealistic President Wilson came to conceive it as his duty to meddle in Mexican affairs in 1914. Huerta's complicity in the murder of President Madero (1913), induced the American President, ill-advised by his agent, John Lind, to refuse recognition of Huerta's provisional government and to prevent shipment of arms to him. At Tampico, April 9, 1914, American sailors were detained briefly by Huerta and the latter

refused to make amends by saluting the American flag. Wilson ordered seizure of the Vera Cruz customs office, and the operation resulted in the loss of 19 American and 193 Mexican lives. All Mexican leaders denounced this action, and Wilson took refuge in A.B.C. mediation. Though this settled nothing, in July, 1914, Huerta resigned, and Wilson recognized his opponent Carranza. Yet the latter's insubordinate lieutenant, Pancho Villa, raided Columbus, New Mexico, in 1916, to be vainly pursued into Mexico by General Pershing. After Carranza's assassination in 1920, the United States withheld recognition from Obregón until 1923. But the American government soon wearied of deciding which were the legitimate Latin American governments, and Presidents Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt abandoned intervention for the "Good Neighbor Policy" which blossomed in 1945 into Pan-American solidarity.

(4) THE PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT (1901–14)

Progressivism was a revival of American moral indignation against oppression. An America that had grown too fast—from five million to seventy-six million in a century—paused to note that in 1896 one per cent of the population owned half of the national wealth, and twelve per cent had almost nine-tenths of it. Against the "social sins" of corporation finance—impure foods and drugs, misleading advertising, improper inspection of mines, factories and banks, enslavement of women and children, purchase of votes and legislation—arose the Progressives: Hughes in New York, Wilson in New Jersey, La Follette in Wisconsin, Altgeld in Illinois, Hiram Johnson in California, and a host of other politicians and journalists.

President Theodore Roosevelt (1901–9), reformer by choice, publicized the Progressive crusade, at least by word and gesture, though his "big stick" waved at "trusts" often proved but a fairy wand that transformed them into "holding companies." But concrete gains were the Pure Food and Drug Act (1906), the strengthening of governmental regulatory powers over commerce, and stress on conservation and natural resources. "Malefactors of great wealth" had to walk more warily, and the common man regained faith in the possibility of a "square deal" in society.

President William Taft (1909–13), Roosevelt's designated heir, was by nature judicious, conservative, cautious. But in a less flamboyant way he carried on Roosevelt's antimonopoly campaign, and actually gained more convictions. While the Mann-Elkins Act (1909) further strengthened the Interstate Commerce Commission, a Corporation Tax (1909) and the Income Tax Amendment (1913) threatened private

hoards. Yet because the Payne-Aldrich Tariff of 1909 maintained protectionism, Taft began to lose Progressive support. Roosevelt was led to believe by personal squabbles that his successor had betrayed his cause, and that it could be retrieved only by his own candidacy in 1912. Though a patronage-dominated Republican Convention renominated Taft, Roosevelt's independent campaign divided Republican votes and gave the election to Democrats.

President Woodrow Wilson (1913–21), scholar and reform governor of New Jersey, was rigidly honest, courageously but stubbornly firm. He convinced rather than persuaded, though he knew well how to work with professional politicians. Whereas Roosevelt believed in regulating corporations in the public interest, Wilson championed restoration of as much competition as possible to American business life. This was to achieve the "New Freedom," his administration slogan. After the Pujo Investigation of Trusts (1913) had confirmed the existence of large monopolies, the president struck back with the Federal Trade Commission Act, providing a bipartisan board to investigate corporations which might escape other agencies; the Clayton Anti-Trust Act banned discrimination in competition, control of one corporation by purchase of stock in another, interlocking directorates—though exempting labor unions. The Rayburn Railway Bill, suspended by the outbreak of World War I, attacked stock watering and rebates. The Federal Reserve Act provided for twelve reserve banks owned by all national and some state and private member banks, but subject to a board named by the president, with powers to render credit elastic and secure. The Underwood Tariff scaled down protective rates. A separate Labor Department was set up, though the Keating-Owens Bill regulating child labor (1916) was declared unconstitutional. But Wilson's pursuit of the monopolist was halted in its career by the outbreak of war. The capitalists came into their own during the unusual need, and some of the rigor of enforcement lapsed. After the war, reaction against Wilson's foreign policies engulfed his domestic policy, and there was a resounding turn from "Progressivism" to Republican "Normalcy."

(5) WORLD WAR I (1914–20)

The compelling reason for American entry was German violation of American neutrality. In her effort to starve out Britain, Germany gambled on American isolation. Sharp notes from the president elicited apologies and a temporary cessation of incidents. During this lull, Wilson was re-elected (1916) with Governor Glynn's slogan, "he kept us out of war," playing its part. But even before Wilson's second inaugural, Germany reached, February 1, 1917, a fatal decision to resume

unrestricted submarine warfare. Three days later the United States severed diplomatic relations, while the Zimmermann Note published on March 1 revealed Germany inciting Mexico to war against the United States. After eight American ships had been lost, Wilson demanded a declaration of state of war, which Congress sanctioned on April 6, 1917.

American contribution was expected to be chiefly financial, and indeed Americans eventually loaned $10,500,000,000 to the Allies—of which they repaid $2,500,000,000 with the $2,475,000,000 Americans later loaned to Germany! But American aid extended to men and resources as well. Of 4,800,000 men mobilized, over 2,000,000 were transported to Europe in ships built more quickly than U-boats could sink them. The speed of mobilization enabled U.S. troops to participate in the stubborn resistance offered to the final German drive on Paris in June, 1918. American forces helped turn the tide at Belleau Wood and Château-Thierry, and further distinguished themselves in counterattacks at St. Mihiel, the Argonne, and the Meuse until Germany surrendered, November 11, 1918. America lost 115,000 in battle, 57,000 by disease, and 200,000 were wounded. More than that, it lost some of its faith in progress and secular leaders were prone to become disillusioned, cynical, and desperate.

The League of Nations, which President Wilson sponsored in the hope of rectifying inequities in the vengeful peace, was to consist of a council of nine powers, with the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan as permanent members, and an assembly of all member nations, each nation enjoying one vote. An International Court of Justice would arbitrate on cases submitted freely or by obligation. The League became the president's pet project, though it won the endorsement of Republicans Taft and Root and a slender majority of Democratic senators. But since the 1918 elections, Republicans possessed both a senatorial and congressional majority. Not only were senatorial leaders disgruntled at Wilson's failure to consult them, but Senators Borah, Johnson, and La Follette opposed the treaty on isolationist grounds. Senator Lodge, Republican leader, demanded certain reservations to guard against a commitment of the United States to the fighting of Europe's battles. Wilson took his case to the people in a strenuous speaking tour, but suffered a stroke at Pueblo in September, 1919, and never fully recovered his physical strength or his political influence. Since he refused all compromise, the treaty embodying the League was defeated in the Senate in March, 1920. In the 1920 elections, the Democratic candidates, James Cox and Franklin Roosevelt, undertook to campaign on the League as a platform, but were snowed under by the Republican nominees, Harding and Coolidge. Business returned to the center of the American stage, and the United States renounced international concerns.

B. *Catholicity and Imperialism* (*1895–1921*)

(1) Problems of Imperialism

Philippine difficulties. American occupation of the Philippine Islands created an urgent need for English-speaking Catholic missionaries to offset Protestant ministers who were deluding the natives into the belief that Protestantism was the official American religion. To remedy this, after a preliminary survey by Archbishop Chapelle of New Orleans, bishop, later cardinal, Daugherty led a group of American prelates and priests to ensure continuance of the Filipinos in the Catholic Faith which they had received from Spain. But if Spain had brought the natives Catholicity, she had been here as elsewhere in her colonies remiss in developing a native clergy, while royal patronage had blinded the faithful to the need of material support of the Church. The revolution had tended to associate the Church with the Spanish state; hence the priest Aglipay began a nativist schism during which some of the rebels confiscated landed property belonging to the Spanish friars. These lands were now desired for agrarian reforms with which the friars were not wholly in sympathy. Archbishop Ireland, whose diplomacy had failed to avert the Spanish-American War, was more successful in suggesting to State Secretary Root direct negotiations with the Vatican. For these President Roosevelt made an excellent selection in William Howard Taft, and during 1902 the latter reached an agreement with the Holy See. Lands seized by the Aglipayans were restored to the Catholic Church, while property that had passed into secular hands was divided up into small holdings, the American Government compensating the Holy See to the sum of $7,000,000. This, however, was not exactly what Cardinal Gibbons had in mind when he told President McKinley regarding Philippine annexation: "Mr. President, it would be a good thing for the Catholic Church, but, I fear, a bad one for the United States." The Cardinal had to mediate when Archbishop Harty of Manila (1904–16) accused the American government of deliberately curbing the Church in the Islands, and the archbishop was later transferred. Aglipay died in 1940 and his sect disintegrated into Liberal Protestantism.

American colonies or protectorates acquired in the Spanish-American War also called for ecclesiastical readjustments. The American Navy insisted that Guam be cleared of foreigners, but at length allowed Spanish priests to stay until American clergy were prepared to take over this mission. It was made a vicariate in 1911, and received an American bishop in 1945. Hawaii, annexed in 1898, had been a mission of the Belgian Picpus Fathers since 1827. Father Damien De Veuster (1840–88), the immortal Samaritan to the lepers, had an American

disciple, Brother Joseph Dutton. Here, too, Americans began to supple-
ment the work of European pioneers, and the vicariate established in
1844 became an American diocese in 1941. The place of the Spanish
missionaries in Puerto Rico was taken by American Redemptorists,
Capuchins, Benedictines, and Holy Ghost Fathers. For a long time
material conditions were deplorable, but improvement came at last and
the Puerto Rican Commonwealth inaugurated in 1952 allayed native
dissatisfaction. Though Cuba was proclaimed independent, Governor
Wood and Secretary of War Taft did much to check anticlerical legis-
lation by the Radicals under President Gomez (1906–9). Separation
of Church and state was written into the Constitution of Cuba, and
Spanish patronage replaced by nomination of bishops through apostolic
delegates, of whom Archbishop Chapelle was the first.

(2) AMERICAN MISSIONARY EFFORTS

American missions. The peaceful parallel to American imperialism
lay in Catholic missionary activity. For the greater part of a century
the Church in the United States had been the beneficiary of European
assistance. This era ended in 1908 when Pope Pius X removed the
United States from the missionary jurisdiction of the Congregation of
Propaganda and incorporated the American Church in the ordinary
administration of the universal Church. Since an apostolic delegation
had been set up at Washington from 1893, ecclesiastically the United
States had come of age. It was incumbent upon the American Church
to show her gratitude for assistance previously received from Europe by
contributing to missionary work in less fortunate areas. In 1908, Arch-
bishop Quigley of Chicago sponsored the first American Catholic Mis-
sionary Congress, and the following year the Society of the Divine
Word set up a missionary center at Techny, Illinois, which has trained
missionaries and disseminated literature.

The Extension Society had already been founded as an organization
to sustain the home missions. The idea was conceived by Father Francis
Kelley, pastor in Lapeer, Michigan, and later bishop of Oklahoma-
Tulsa. With the prompt support in 1905 of Archbishop Quigley and the
early assistance of Father William O'Brien, later auxiliary archbishop of
Chicago, the Society was organized to assist missionary districts in the
United States, especially in the South and West. It built chapels, devised
railway and mobile motor chapels, and enlisted the missionary zeal of
clergy and laity of more well-established dioceses. Subsequently the
Society was approved by St. Pius X.

Maryknoll was America's answer to the call for foreign missionaries.
In 1911 the Catholic Foreign Mission Society was set up in New York
by Fathers James Anthony Walsh and Thomas Price. The Maryknoll

Fathers constituted a "society of secular priests with the purpose of training Catholic missioners for the heathen lands, and of arousing American Catholics to a sense of their apostolic duty." [16] By 1918 Father Price was able to lead the first mission band to China. Though he died in 1919, the others long survived: James E. Walsh, later bishop and second superior-general; Francis Ford, martyr under Communism, and Bernard Meyer. During the administration of the cofounder and first superior-general, father, later bishop, James A. Walsh (d. 1936), the Society expanded rapidly and was joined by auxiliaries, the Foreign Mission Sisters of St. Dominic (Maryknoll Sisters) and the lay Brotherhood of St. Michael. By 1951 there were six hundred priests and one thousand nuns.

Other missionary activity continued or commenced during the same period. By the turn of the twentieth century, the Indian and Negro missions were better organized, though little help was forthcoming from the "Mexican Pious Fund" in spite of a judgment of the Hague tribunal in 1902 awarding the missions $1,420,682, for Mexico refused to pay. The Church, however, was heartened by the reunion in 1909 of the Episcopalian Society of the Atonement, founded by Paul Francis at Graymoor, New York, in 1899. After he brought his entire community into communion with the Holy See, he gave added impetus to his Church Unity Octave to pray for the return of separated believers in Christ. In 1918 the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade got under way at Techny, though later transferred to Cincinnati. About the same time an Academia for Mission Study for seminarians was founded by Monsignor McDonnell, director of the Propagation of the Faith Society. The great American Catholic missionary response was demonstrated at the International Eucharistic Congress held at Chicago in 1926.

(3) Intellectual Liberalism

Catholic University at first proved more of an intellectual storm center than a beacon of learning. Its very erection divided the hierarchy between "Progressives" such as Cardinal Gibbons, and Bishops Ireland, Spalding, and Keane, and "Conservatives" like Bishops Corrigan, McQuaid, and Katzer. The first rector, Bishop Keane (1889–96), was harassed by ideological and nationalistic factions among his largely alien faculty. Monsignor Schroeder accused Ireland and his party of Liberalism, while the dismissed canonist, Abbé Peries, wrote articles under pseudonyms, claiming that Keane had been removed in 1896 because Catholic University was the "fortress of American Liberalism." Bouquillon had been involved in the parochial school controversy, and

[16] Theodore Roemer, *Catholic Church in the United States* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), p. 347.

the treasurer, Waggaman, was later tried for speculation and negligence. Cardinal Gibbons rallied to the defense of the university, which regained its equilibrium under new rectors, Bishops Conaty (1897–1903), Denis O'Connell (1903–9), and Thomas Shahan (1909–28), all "Progressives." Bishop Shahan, along with Fathers John Wynne, S.J., and Edward Pace, and the laymen, Charles Herbermann and Condé Pallen, directed publication of the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* well termed "a monument to our first stage of maturity." [17]

Liberalism. National peculiarities naturally appeared in American Catholic life, and these were magnified by suspicions accompanying Modernism at the turn of the century. Though the otherwise conservative *American Ecclesiastical Review* under Herman Heuser's editorship printed articles by the future Modernists, Loisy and Tyrrell, there was probably little native theological Modernism. What chiefly aroused suspicion, especially in European circles, was the easy-going tolerance of American Catholics in civil relations with non-Catholics. Cardinal Gibbons was even criticized for endorsing the presidential Thanksgiving Day proclamation—which Pius XII was to laud in 1947. In April, 1890, Gibbons was indicted in the *Edinburgh Review* as presenting "a singular contrast to the orthodoxy of the Vatican." In 1893, the cardinal and other prelates participated in the Chicago Exposition's "Parliament of Religions" at which each creed expounded its tenets. The Cardinal's mild remark that, "though we differ in faith, . . . we stand united on the platform of charity and benevolence," was distorted by the *Review of Reviews* into exalting benevolence over Catholic Faith. Archbishop Ireland was less prudent in appearing as a partisan at the Republican Party rallies in New York. But when he was denounced from the pulpit for this by Bishop McQuaid—who boasted that he had never voted— the latter was rebuked by the Holy See. In 1894 Father Tablaerts denounced "Liberalism" at a Catholic German *Tag* at Louisville. On January 6, 1895, Pope Leo XIII issued his *Longinqua Oceani.* After lauding American institutions and conceding that the Catholic Church in the United States had prospered under them, the pope yet warned American Catholics not to defend their separation of Church and state as an ideal to be followed in all ages and places. Conservatives hailed this pronouncement as vindication, but the whole question of "Liberalism" was presently concentrated into the single issue of the alleged "Americanism" of Father Hecker and his disciples. This new controversy came to a head just at the time when the defeat of "Catholic Spain" by the United States alarmed some Europeans and antagonized certain Catholic circles against things American.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 333.

(4) AMERICANISM CRISIS

"Americanism" supposedly took its rise with Father Isaac Hecker (1819–88), convert founder of the Paulists, who had forcibly maintained that American Catholics ought to develop their own techniques for convert making, with New World rather than European environments in mind. According to Catholic bishops who knew him, Father Hecker was perfectly orthodox, though Archbishop Corrigan complained of the "liberalizing tendencies" of the Paulist *Catholic World.* Its editor, Father Walter Elliott, in 1890 published a *Life of Father Hecker,* with introductions by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, and even an imprimatur from Archbishop Corrigan. By its disproportionate choice of materials to stress an activist thesis, the biography may have been susceptible of a distorted impression, although it aroused little criticism, or even interest, in the United States.

"Europeanism." But in 1897 the *Life* was translated by Louise, comtesse de Ravilliax, and readapted, with a new "thesis" introduction by Abbé Felix Klein (d. 1953). In his enthusiasm, Abbé Klein stressed far more than the original the innovations of Father Hecker and held him up as a model for forward-looking French Catholics. But French and other European Conservatives were antagonized. In March, 1898, appeared a series of articles criticizing and ridiculing this novel "Americanism" under the name of Martel in *La Vérité.* Martel was later identified as Abbé Charles Magnien of the Brothers of St. Vincent—not to be confused with the Sulpician Alphonse Magnien of Baltimore. Magnien, a foe of De Mun and Leonine *Ralliement,* accused American Catholics of advocating a false Liberalism: absolute separation of Church and state, limitation of submission to lawful authority, criticism of older religious orders, and exaltation of active and natural virtues over passive and supernatural ones. In May, 1898, these articles, together with some additional material, appeared in Rome in book form: *Études sur l'Americanisme: Le Père Hecker, est-il un Saint?* The treatise bore the imprimatur of the papal theologian, Alberto Lepidi, and excited the ire of American prelates. Though Cardinal Gibbons protested that there was no such thing as "Americanism" a commission of cardinals recommended its condemnation.

Papal intervention. At least by October, 1898, Pope Leo had personally intervened in the dispute. While he softened considerably the indictment of the cardinalatial commission, Leo XIII in his *Testem Benevolentiae,* January 22, 1899, made no doubt that certain views, "called by some 'Americanism,'" deserved censure. The pope asserted that "if under the name of Americanism there should be designated the char-

acteristic qualities which reflected honor on the people of the United States, then there was no reason why these should be questioned or discarded." Yet the pope feared that there were "some among you who conceive and desire a Church in America different from that which is in the rest of the world." In particular, the pope pointed out, (1) authority and spiritual direction were more, not less, needed at the present; (2) natural virtues were not to be extolled over supernatural; (3) all virtue is active and suitable to all times; (4) religious life and vows give the noblest "Christian liberty"; and (5) traditional methods of evangelization are not to be abandoned. Although Cardinal Gibbons protested at "false conceptions of Americanism emanating from Europe," he and the Progressives joined the American hierarchy in acceptance. If Archbishops Corrigan and Katzer deemed "Americanism" prevalent, in retrospect it seems that while Americanism in the sense of Modernism did exist among a few in the United States, it was not peculiarly nor predominantly American.

(5) ALIEN ALARMS

German nationalism. In some national groups the language barrier tended to clannishness as a protective measure. As early as 1836 the Germans of Philadelphia had requested a national bishop, but the chief troubles arose in 1878 when Archbishop Henni of Milwaukee sought a coadjutor. Several of the Wisconsin clergy urged a breaking-up of the German monopoly of dignities and parishes. Though Gibbons recommended and Propaganda urged the succession of Bishop Spalding, Archbishop Henni desired and received Bishop Heiss who succeeded him in 1882. But appeals and counter-appeals from both bishops and priests to Propaganda multiplied. In 1884 some St. Louis clergy deplored dependence of German chapels upon English parishes, and in 1886 Father Abbelen of Milwaukee asked for national parishes. Over protests by Gibbons, Ireland, and Keane, Propaganda in 1887 sanctioned independent German parishes and favored other of their demands.

Cahenslyism. The most heated discussion, however, concerned the well-meaning proposals of Peter Cahensly (1838–1923). This exemplary Catholic lay secretary of the German *Raphaelsverein* for protecting Catholic emigrants feared that many German Catholics were losing their faith in the United States for want of priests of their own nationality. During 1891 he presented a proposal to the Holy See that every racial group in the United States be given its own hierarchy and parochial system. This at once brought Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, and other bishops to the defense of American homogeneity and unity of parish discipline. Cardinal Rampolla soon assured Cardinal Gibbons of the Vatican's substantial agreement with the views of the American

hierarchy. In 1896 Propaganda issued directives stressing that children born in the United States of foreign parents might not be obliged to frequent a national church after coming of age, and that even foreign-born Catholics who knew English were not to be excluded from American parishes or forced into national groups. Controversy cooled about 1900 when Ireland and Katzer reached an understanding which eased the tension.

Polish schism. Slavic protests, however, were not so easily quieted. On one occasion the Polish Father Barascz of Jersey City went so far as to demand of President Cleveland that he use influence at Rome to obtain a Slavic diocese. Cardinal Gibbons, to whom the president referred this demand, replied that Catholic policy in the United States frowned on national churches. But certain Polish elements remained dissatisfied. In 1897 there was set up the "Polish Catholic Church of Chicago" by Anton Kozlowski, who secured consecration from the Swiss "Old Catholics." This sect merged in 1907 with the "Polish National Catholic Church" which had been founded at Scranton in 1904 by 147 clerical and lay delegates from isolated Polish rebels. The convention elected Francis Hodur bishop, and he later received consecration from the Dutch Jansenists. Though this schism by no means received the support of the majority of Polish Catholics, by 1945 the sect numbered seventy thousand. It soon added heresy to schism as it rejected original sin, eternity of hell, and papal infallibility. Its liturgy honored as saints Peter Waldo, John Hus, and Savonarola.

St. Frances Cabrini was a happy antidote to these heated nationalistic disputes and partisan squabbles. While learned sociological studies were being made and discussion went on about the best methods of taking care of the immigrants, this little Italian nun quietly entered the United States (1889) with her Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart. With scant encouragement from Archbishop Corrigan of New York, she opened hospitals and engaged in social work among Italian immigrants. Her community, which by 1950 numbered four thousand professed sisters, extended its activities from New York to Los Angeles. Finally Mother Cabrini died at Columbus Hospital, Chicago, in 1917. Since she had become naturalized, her canonization by Pope Pius XII in 1946 made her the first citizen of the United States to be raised to the altars.

(6) CATHOLIC WAR ACTIVITIES

Organized direction. After the outbreak of World War I, the American hierarchy issued the following declaration, presented to President Wilson by Cardinal Gibbons on April 18, 1917: "Our people will rise as one man to serve the nation. We are all true Americans ready as our age, our ability, and our condition permit, to do whatever is in us to do

for the preservation, the progress, and the triumph of our beloved country." Father John J. Burke, Paulist editor of the *Catholic World* and founder of the Chaplain's Aid Association, soon recognized the need for a nationwide organization to assist Catholic men in the armed forces. He presented this idea to Cardinal Gibbons who, after discussing the matter with Cardinals Farley and O'Connell, gave the plan to the bishops of the United States. On August 11–12, 1917, clerical and lay representatives of sixty-eight dioceses and twenty-seven national Catholic associations met at Washington, D.C., in order to "devise a plan of organization throughout the United States to promote the spiritual and material welfare of the United States troops at home and abroad, and to study, co-ordinate, unify and put into operation all Catholic activities incidental to the war." From this preliminary meeting arose the National Catholic War Council (1917–19). This was composed of the American archbishops who named as their administrative board Bishops Muldoon of Rockford, Schrembs of Toledo, Russell of Charleston, and Patrick Hayes, military ordinary. Father Burke was made chairman of a Committee on Special War Activities. The War Council was recognized as the official co-ordinating agency for Catholic war activities.

Chaplaincies. At the declaration of War in April, 1917, there were but sixteen priests in the regular army and nine national guard chaplains. The government issued a call for chaplains of all denominations, and on the basis of enlistment statistics, raised the Catholic army quota from 24 per cent to 37.8 per cent until 1920, when it was reduced to 25 per cent. Catholics were allowed a 25 per cent quota in the Navy. By the date of the Armistice, there were 1,023 chaplains on active service, and 500 approved applicants from the Catholic clergy. To govern this large body, Pope Benedict XV in November, 1917, created the *diocesis castrensis,* naming Bishop Hayes as the first military ordinary. The bishop divided his diocese into five vicariates, and named a chancellor and secretary. This jurisdiction had temporary care of the more than eight hundred thousand Catholics who enlisted in the armed forces. This organization, like that of the N.C.W.C., proved so successful that it was retained in modified form in peace.

War activities. The Knights of Columbus and other male and female Catholic societies set up centers for service men at home and abroad, e.g., the Étoile Club at Paris. Parishes were used as units in fund-raising drives, and millions of dollars of government funds were distributed through the Catholic War Council. Cardinal Gibbons and other members of the American hierarchy and clergy assisted Herbert Hoover in Belgian relief, and in the postwar assistance to Germany and Austria. The cardinal set an example by upholding and explaining papal neutrality, while himself defending in the United States universal military

training. He attended rallies and promoted drives with such diligence that he won the respect of many non-Catholics. Admiral William Benson (1855–1932) was chief of naval operations from 1915 to 1919.

(7) HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATION (1884–1921)

Multiplication of sees. Between 1880 and 1910, the Catholic population increased from over six million to sixteen million; the number of priests from six thousand to sixteen thousand, the number of dioceses from sixty to ninety-five. New metropolitan provinces were those of St. Paul (1888) and Dubuque (1893).

End of an era. In 1911, Cardinal Gibbons was joined in the Sacred College by two new American members, Farley of New York and O'Connell of Boston. Whether Archbishop Ireland, denied a red hat by Storer lobbying, became such *in petto* will remain a conjecture. But Cardinal Gibbons remained dean of the American hierarchy and acknowledged spokesman for the Church in the eyes of non-Catholics. A new unity appeared in the American hierarchy at a meeting of seventy-seven bishops at Washington in February, 1919, to celebrate Cardinal Gibbons' jubilee, for it was then decided that the bishops should henceforth meet annually. Cardinal Gibbons, last survivor and president of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), thus presided over the first of these annual hierarchical meetings, September 24, 1919. Having lived just long enough to link the old with the new system of episcopal collaboration, Cardinal Gibbons died on March 24, 1921.

XII

Totalitarian Shadow

100. THE TOTALITARIAN MENACE

A. Generic Nature

(1) ORIGINS

"The word 'totalitarian' was coined by ~~Mussolini~~ and did not exist before in the Italian dictionary, in the famous words: 'Nothing outside or above the state, nothing against the state, everything within the state, everything for the state.'[1] In this new type of society, then, the governing body would permeate all and the citizen would be expected to give his all, even to the extent of worshipping the state by a *Statolatry* scarcely different from the ancient Roman imperial cult. This materialistic "Totalitarianism" threatened to wreck human dignity and Christian culture; its antidote lay in the spirit of the thoroughgoing Christianity of the motto of St. Francis of Assisi: "My God and my All."

Philosophic origins. Absolutism, of course, is no new phenomenon in history. Yet Totalitarianism is no mere Absolutism. It is not so much a *de facto* dictatorship as a system of government, an all-embracing view of humanity. Machiavelli doubtless contributed much to its genesis by his divorce of public and private morality, an attitude implicitly favored by the Lutheran revolt. Rousseau paradoxically opened a way to Totalitarianism as well as to Democracy by envisioning an omniscient interpreter of the "general will." Comte contributed much by his Positivism in which social development and organization were studied after exact biological norms. Thereby the individual human being was subordinated

[1] Don Luigi Sturzo, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (New York: Roy Publishers, 1946), p. 40.

[682

to the species, his liberty regarded as an obstacle to a centralized and standardizing social bureaucracy—tendencies appearing as well in Bentham. That dictatorial mandate which Comte bestowed on a vague "humanity" or "society," Hegel more specifically conferred on the state. For him, history is the march of the Absolute Idea through the world, and in Hegel's own era this had been incarnated in the Prussian state. Marx, it will be recalled, changed Hegelian Idealism into Communist materialism, and he had merely to adapt Hegelian "military class dictatorship" into "dictatorship of the proletariat." Thus "positivist democracy on the lines of Comte led to the omnipotent bourgeois state; Idealist nationalism on the lines of Hegel to the omnipotent state-nation; Socialism on the lines of Karl Marx to the omnipotent class-state. In all three there is the stuff of the totalitarian monistic state." [2]

Historical evolution. The first totalitarian state was set up in Russia during November, 1917, but early efforts to propagate its ideas outside Soviet borders failed, though Bavaria and Hungary teetered on the brink for a time. Mussolini installed his Fascist dictatorship in 1922, but took care to announce that Fascism was "not an article of export." In 1923 Rivera asserted a dictatorship in Spain which his son strove to revive as Falangism in the next decade—though Franco never completely identified himself with the latter. During January, 1933, Adolf Hitler founded the Nazi brand of totalitarian rule in Germany, and this in time created in its own image semi-totalitarian satellites before and during World War II—as Russia has been able to do since. Abortive totalitarian movements were those of English Mosleyites, Belgian Rexists, French *Croix de Feux,* and American Bundists, each paralleled by clever Communist branches. Totalitarianism, however, has everywhere been somewhat modified or restrained by the varying traditions of the national environment into which it has been introduced.

(2) Common Features

Administration. "To realize the totalitarian state, a complete administrative centralization is first of all required, with the transfer of the sum total of all powers to the government, the government itself becoming the blind executor of the will of a leader endowed—it does not matter how—on a dictatorial scale with all moral, juridical, and political powers. For the dictatorial machine to gain momentum, it is necessary to suppress all political and civil freedom, all the fundamental rights of human personality and of the family, of communities and of cities, of universities and of churches. . . . The chief instrument of such powers is force. But the public force of the police is not enough; reliance must

[2] Don Luigi Sturzo, *Church and State,* trans. Barbara Carter (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939), p. 452.

be placed on a secret police—which has assumed the well-known names of OGPU in Russia, OVRA in Italy, and Gestapo in Germany. Recourse can be also had to private armed bands, the armed gangs of the Blackshirts in Italy, and of the Brownshirts in Germany."

Religion. "As long as the Church could be useful toward bringing about or maintaining dictatorships, its help was sought and concordats were negotiated. But when the Church became an obstacle to the spirit of the totalitarian states, it was persecuted and even abolished. The Bolshevists tried to form a church of their own, then they suppressed it, proscribing its priests and closing its buildings, declaring freedom of worship, but imposing so many restrictions that this freedom became illusory. Hitler promised that the state would respect both Catholics and Protestants, attempted to make out of the Protestant church a Hitlerian church, stipulated a concordat with Rome. But he soon failed in his promises to both Catholics and Protestants by beginning a subtle persecution which aimed at the complete de-Christianization of Germany. Mussolini settled the Roman Question with the Vatican and accepted a concordat on Pius XI's terms. Generally speaking, he attempted to avoid open conflict with the Church, by favoring it up to the point where it did not threaten the development of Fascism. Here the chief conflict arose out of the question of education of the youth and of their Catholic societies. . . ."

Education. "The totalitarian state has monopolized the schools, the sport activities of the youth, the cinema, the radio, the press; special schools have even been created in order to shape the perfect citizen. Still another step: the effort is made to weaken or even to eliminate the influence of the family; hence the special Fascist, Nazi, and Communist institutions for youth. At the age of six, one became in Italy a member of the Sons of the She-Wolf, at the age of eight of the *Balillas*, then of the Young Italians, and so on for every age to the grave. In Germany children were conscripted into the Children's Group of the Hitler Youth at the age of six; . . . from ten to fourteen years boys and girls belong to the Young Folk and Young Maidens respectively; from fourteen to eighteen to the Hitler Youth proper and the *Bund* of German Girls, respectively. Before being admitted to the party itself or one of its organizations of adults, the adolescents had to go through the rigorous training of the Labor Service—both sexes—and of the army. The Russians had the 'voluntary' organization of the Young Pioneers, embracing the ages from eight to sixteen; younger children may be banded together in the Octobrist groups. From the age of seventeen a Russian boy or girl is eligible for the Communist Youth: *Comsomol*." [3]

Goals. Such states set millennial goals: Italy dreamed of a new Roman

[3] Sturzo, *Nationalism and Internationalism, op. cit.,* pp. 40–42.

Empire and *"mare nostrum";* Nazi Germany idealized a triumphant *"Herrenvolk";* Russia propagated the "Communist International." All this demanded complete regimentation, and fostered militarism and ideological imperialism.

(3) POLITICAL SURVEY (1918–39)

Peaceful trend (1919–29). Despite bickering over reparations between France and Germany leading to temporary occupation of the Rhineland by French troops, there were hopeful signs for peace as business revived and reconstruction got under way. When in 1924 France demanded a definition of the League's attitude toward aggressors, Great Britain, fearing continental involvement, demurred. Failing sanctions, resort was had to voluntary pledges. At Locarno (1925), Stresemann promised that Germany would respect her Western frontier as definitive, and Germany was admitted to the League and Cologne freed from occupation. The Dawes (1924) and Young (1929) Plans contemplated the economic rehabilitation of Germany, largely through loans from the United States. And in 1928 the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact garnered many facile promises to outlaw war from the national policies.

Rival alliances, however, were not slow in arising. The world depression again disrupted German economy and supplied fuel for Nazi agitation. Chancellor Bruening proposed to retrieve German prosperity and national prestige through a Customs Union with Austria (1931), but France vetoed the scheme and the Slavic lands were alarmed. Both Germany and Austria then resorted to dictatorship, and eventually played into the hands of the Nazis. Successful Japanese defiance of the League of Nations in Manchuria (1931) encouraged "have-not" or ambitious governments in the belief that strong-arm methods would succeed.

Nazi aggression, a clever compound of threats and bluff, began to make headway from 1933 against a divided Europe. Though an attempt to seize Austria in 1934 proved premature in that it aroused the suspicions of Fascist Italy, Hitler conciliated Mussolini by complacency toward the latter's invasion of Ethiopia (1935) at a time when Great Britain and France talked of applying economic sanctions against Italy through the League. A rift appeared between Britain and France on the nature of these sanctions, and Hitler seized this moment (March, 1936) to reoccupy the Rhineland with military forces. Shortly afterwards (October, 1936), Mussolini joined Hitler in proclaiming a "Rome-Berlin Axis," which pressed its military assistance upon the nationalist rebels in Spain. The Spanish Civil War was to some extent used as a rehearsal for future world conflict: Germany and Italy ostentatiously backing the Franco forces, while Russia and France aided the "Loyal-

ists." Nationalist successes in Spain alarmed the West, and France feared encirclement by totalitarian powers. While Britain and France hesitated over thorough rearmament, the Axis continually advertised its preparedness, especially in the air. Annexation of Austria by Germany early in 1938 proved easy, but Nazi pressure upon Czechoslovakia threatened British and French intervention in defense of the smaller country. But Anglo-French aversion for war and their military unpreparedness eventually led to acquiescence in Nazi encirclement of a reduced Czechoslovakia on the understanding that this would constitute a final liquidation of all German territorial demands arising from the defunct Versailles peace settlement. This Munich Appeasement Pact (September, 1938) was practically repudiated early in 1939 when the Nazis occupied the whole of Czechoslovakia as well as Memel, and the Fascists overran Albania. When, therefore, Hitler repeated his ultimatum tactics in the summer of 1939, with Danzig and Poland substituted for Memel and Czechoslovakia, even the more peacefully inclined Western statesmen agreed that appeasement had gone far enough. After reaching a pact of expediency with Soviet Russia regarding the disposal of Poland, Hitler, refused carte blanche on his sweeping and peremptory demands upon the West, resorted to World War II at dawn of September 1, 1939. This brought France and Great Britain into a European conflict which presently engulfed the United States and most of the countries of the globe.

B. *Totalitarian Ideologies*

(1) POLITICAL-LEGAL THEORIES

Fascism. "Conceiving the doctrine of Natural Law to be indissolubly wedded to liberalism-democracy-socialism, Fascism rejected the natural law as well. There are and can be no rights other than those the state accords. . . ." Criticising the "plutodemocracies," Rocco said: "For Fascism, society is the end, individuals the means, and its whole life consists in using individuals as instruments for its social ends. The state therefore guards and protects the welfare and development of individuals not for their exclusive interest, but because of the identity of the needs of individuals with those of society as a whole." Hence, in Mussolini's words, "The state is not only the present, but it is also the past, and above all the future. Transcending the individual's brief spell of life, the state stands for the immanent conscience of the nation." [4]

Nazism. "The 'blood and soil' principle was nothing more or less than the peculiar Nazi theory of racial superiority. To the Nazi all races were inferior to the Aryan, and among Aryans the Nordic was the highest,

[4] Francis P. Le Buffe and James V. Hayes, *American Philosophy of Law* (New York: Crusader Press, 1947), p. 127.

finest type. . . . The state was but the vital expression, the living will of the national conscience. But the will of the people and the state are united in the leader. Thus, law, in the form of a Hitler decree, could be called both the will of the people and the will of the leader. There was an irrefutable presumption that the will of the leader was the will of the people and for the best interests of the state—a sheer totalitarian principle. A corollary of the leadership principle was the notion of 'national conscience.' The national conscience was the sentiment of the people. It was arrived at, however, not by consulting the people, but by taking careful heed of party directions. . . . A major change in German criminal laws was the power extended to courts to convict of crime one who had performed an act not specifically declared to be criminal by statute, provided the act offended the 'national conscience.' . . ."[5]

Communism. "Law is now considered not merely a necessary evil, but a valued and important instrumentality of the socialist state. During the years since Lenin seized power, law has grown by leaps and bounds in Russia. So far have the jurists swung from their original intention to eliminate law entirely, that now they speak of it as the expression of the toiler's will. If in the earlier stages of the Marxian evolution law is a weapon in the hands of the dominant class, so in Russia law is a weapon in the hands of the ruling party, the Communist Party." Stalin commented on Marxian "withering away" of the state thus: "We are in favor of the state dying out and at the same time we stand for the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which represents the most powerful and mighty authority of all forms of state which have existed up to the present day. The highest possible development of the power of the state, with the object of preparing the conditions for the dying out of the state, that is the Marxist formula. Is it 'contradictory?' Yes, it is 'contradictory!' But this contradiction is a living thing, and completely reflects Marxist dialectics." This cavalier treatment of contradiction enables the 1936 Constitution to guarantee freedom of religion, of press, of speech, of assembly, etc., "in conformity with the interests of the toilers, and in order to strengthen the socialist system."[6] Article 135 even provides for universal suffrage; thus does Totalitarianism utilize the democratic terminology.

(2) Economic Theories

Fascism: "Over all conflicts of human and legitimate interests, there is the authority of the government; the government alone is in the right position to see things from the point of view of the general welfare. This government . . . is over everybody, because it takes to itself not only

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 131–33.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

the juridical conscience of the nation in the present, but also all that the nation represents for the future. . . . The citizen in the Fascist state is no longer a selfish individual who has the antisocial right of rebelling against any law of the collectivity. The Fascist state with its corporative conception puts men and their possibilities into productive work and interprets for them the duties they have to fulfill. . . . We have given rhythm, law and protection to work; we do not waste time in brawls and strikes . . ." (Mussolini).

Nazism: "The state's duty towards capital was comparatively simple and clear. It merely had to see that capital remained the servant of the state and did not contemplate obtaining control of the nation. In taking this attitude the state could confine itself to two objects: maintenance of efficient national and independent economy on the one hand, and the social rights of the workers on the other. . . . This will find expression in a wise grading of earnings such as shall make it possible for every honest worker to be certain of living an orderly, honorable life. . . . A nationalist socialist trades union . . . is not an instrument of class war, but one for defense and representation of the workers. . . . If we review all the causes of the German collapse, the final and decisive one is seen to be the failure to realize the racial problem, especially the Jewish menace . . ." (Hitler).

Communism: "There are three fundamental aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat: (a) Utilization of the power of the proletariat for the suppression of the exploiters, for the defense of the country, for the consolidation of the ties with the proletarians of other lands, and for the development and the victory of the revolution in all countries; (b) the utilization of the power of the proletariat in order to detach the toiling and exploited masses once and for all from the bourgeoisie, to consolidate the alliance of the proletariat with these masses, to enlist these masses in the work of socialist construction, and to assure the state leadership of these masses by the proletariat; (c) the utilization of the power of the proletariat for the organization of Socialism, for the abolition of classes, and for the transition to a society without classes, to a society without a state" (Stalin).

Totalitarian spirit, however, is perhaps better conveyed by this salute to a socialized humanity by the Soviet poet Bednyi: [7]

"Million-footed: a body. The pavement cracks.
A million mass: one heart, one will, one tread.
Keeping step, keeping step.
On they march. On they march.
Out of the factory quarters, smoke-wreathed,

[7] Cited by Edmund Walsh in *Last Stand* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1931), p. 171.

Out of black dungeons, filthy rat holes,
He came—his fingers bent like pincers,
Burst the thousand year old chains rattling about him,
Came now the new ruler onto the street. . . ."

101. PIUS XI AND CATHOLIC LIBERTY

A. *Papal Leadership* (1922–39)

(1) POPE PIUS XI

Achille Ratti (1857–1939) was born at Desio, near Milan, the son of bourgeois parents: his father was manager and part owner of the Gadda silk mill. He received his elementary education from Don Volontieri, a priest who for forty-three years maintained a practical and comparatively progressive school in his own house. It was he and Achille's uncle, the priest Don Damiano Ratti, who fostered the boy's education at San Carlo Seminary in Milan. Here he made a brilliant record in mathematics, philosophy, theology, and canon law, and was sent to complete his studies at the Lombard College at Rome. He was ordained to the priesthood at the age of twenty-two in the Lateran, December 20, 1879. He continued his studies three years longer at the Gregorianum, receiving doctorates in theology, philosophy, and canon law.

Scholarly career. Father Ratti returned to San Carlo Seminary as professor of theology and sacred eloquence (1882–88). Thereafter he spent many years in research, first in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (1888–1910), and then as vice-prefect of the Vatican Library at Rome (1910–18). Some of his research on Milanese history has been published in his *Historical Essays*. Until the age of sixty, however, Father Ratti lived a relatively retired life, broken only by incessant mountain-climbing on vacations, reception of library visitors, and occasional trips as manuscript scout or delegate to library conventions. Quiet, reserved—but as the future would prove, strong-willed—he was observant as he walked the city streets or rode on the top of London buses. During much of this time he was chaplain at the Cenacle Convent, and catechist for the Milanese chimney sweeps.

Diplomatic service. Yet such a man seemed destined to remain forever in obscurity, had not the Allies decided to resurrect a country. In 1918 even the Vatican diplomatic corps lacked an expert in Polish history going back to Monsignor Garampi's mission in 1763. But Ratti had published a monograph on the subject. He was summoned, and soon named nuncio to Poland and consecrated bishop. At Warsaw (1918–21) he provided bishops for the new and rearranged dioceses, negotiated a concordat with the Pilsudski government, and assisted in relief work. He stayed in the city during a critical communist siege of Warsaw, repulsed by Pilsudski and Weygand on August 15, 1920. The eminently

successful nuncio was recalled and made cardinal-archbishop of Milan in June, 1921. He had barely time to inaugurate the Catholic University at Milan on December 7, when he was summoned to Rome by the death of Benedict XV, January 22, 1922.

Papal election. If reporter Morgan's information be correct, the conclave elected Cardinal Lauri, who refused the tiara. Be that as it may, on the fourth day and fourteenth ballot a two-thirds majority was found in favor of Ratti, who accepted saying: "Pius is a name of peace. As I desire to devote my efforts to the peace of the world . . . I choose the name of Pius." The new pope's first effort in this direction was to resume a custom abandoned since 1870: he appeared on St. Peter's balcony to give his blessing *urbi et orbi.* In the crowd, it is said, was Deputy Mussolini who may have been impressed sufficiently by the popular enthusiasm for the Roman pontiff to modify somewhat an hitherto uncompromising anticlericalism.

(2) Papal Peace Crusade

"**Pax Christi in Regno Christi**" was Pius XI's motto, and to its realization he devoted his entire pontificate. This was the theme of his first encyclical, *Ubi Arcano:* "Because the world has determined to do without God, it is in chaos and peace has not yet come. After the terrors of the war, hate still remains, the presage of further wars between the nations. . . . There is but one remedy for these disasters: let us begin Christ's reign in the world, and the world will have peace" (December, 1922). In his letters regarding Red Cross work and the Washington Disarmament Conference (1922), Pius XI urged mercy and forbearance. To the theme of peace he returned during the 1925 Jubilee Year when he issued the encyclical *Quas Primas,* instituting the feast of Christ the King. Then he admonished: "He would gravely err who would withdraw from Christ as Man the rule of all civil affairs whatsoever, since He received from the Father such an absolute right over created things that all things are placed under His will. . . . Therefore, let not the rulers of nations refuse to render to the rule of Christ the public duty of reverence and obedience for themselves and for the people, if they desire that their authority remain secure."

Concordats were the pope's attempts to conclude peace with the various national governments. In this he was not averse to negotiating with forms of government of which he did not wholly approve, remarking that he was disposed to treat with the Devil himself, when the salvation of souls is concerned." Besides the epoch-making Lateran Pact with Fascist Italy, presently discussed in greater detail, Pius XI concluded agreements with Latvia (1922), Poland and Bavaria (1925), Lithuania (1927), Portugal (1928), Prussia and Rumania (1929), and Nazi Ger-

many (1933). Well aware of the dangers of prevailing selfish national-
ism, he warned: "Difficult, not to say impossible, is it for peace to endure
between states and peoples, if in place of true and genuine love of
country there reigns, or rages, a hard and egotistical nationalism; that is
to say, if envy and hatred supplant mutual desire for good; distrust and
suspicion replace fraternal confidence; strife and conflict take the place
of concord and co-operation; and ambition for primacy and pre-
dominance excludes respect and protection of the rights of all, even the
smallest and weakest."

Missionary effort the pope tried to raise above national and racial
considerations. The headquarters of the Society for the Propagation of
the Faith were transferred from Lyons and Paris to Rome in May, 1922.
The pope's personal consecration of six Chinese bishops at Rome stressed
his wish for a native clergy. An encyclical, *Rerum Ecclesiae* (1926),
directed foundation of schools for training native clerics, and during
1928 the encyclical *Rerum Orientalium* encouraged reunion work among
Eastern sects.

Requiescat in pace. During the Munich Crisis, Pius XI, though ailing,
labored strenuously for peace. Indeed, in his radio address of Septem-
ber 29, 1938, he offered his life for it: "With all our heart we offer for the
salvation and the peace of the world this life, which in virtue of those
prayers the Lord has spared and even renewed." Like another Moses,
the pope interposed himself to avert the divine wrath. It would seem
that the exchange was accepted: peace was preserved for 1938 against
expectations, and Pius XI died on February 10, 1939. His last words,
scarcely audible, were: "Peace, peace, O Jesus!"

(3) LATERAN SETTLEMENT (1929)

Preliminaries. Benito Mussolini (1886–1945), ex-Socialist, had or-
ganized the Fascists in 1919, fusing them with D'Annunzio's Nationalists
who had protested against the Liberals' "weak and pacific" politics.
Leaving for another topic the history of Fascist Italy, it is enough to
note here that the Fascists, after seizing power during October, 1922,
were brought into conflict with that Liberal-Masonic-Anticlerical clique
that had long blocked settlement of the "Roman Question." Though
Mussolini's ideas were totalitarian, he recognized that they could not at
once be put into full execution. Reconciliation with the Holy See, so
highly esteemed by most Italians, might consolidate support of a Fascist
dictatorship. During this early period Pius XI held aloof from politics,
save to praise the government for its removal (1925) of anticlerical
bans on Catholic education, and to remark wistfully on the absence of an
Italian representative among the diplomats accredited to the Vatican.

Lateran Treaty. Mussolini took up these hints in 1926 by opening

unofficial talks with the Vatican about the Roman Question. From 1926 to 1928 these were conducted by Francesco Pacelli, brother of the future pope, for the Vatican, and Domenico Barone for *Il Duce*. Both were conscientious lawyers, and when Barone died in 1928 such progress had been made that Mussolini and Grandi continued them officially with Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, whom Pius XI had retained as secretary of state from his predecessor's pontificate. At length a satisfactory accord was reached, and the principals signed what is known as the Lateran Treaty on February 11, 1929. This set up an independent Vatican city-state, guaranteed as sovereign, neutral, and inviolable territory in international law: "Italy recognizes the sovereignty of the Holy See in the international field as an inherent attribute of its nature, in conformity with its tradition and the exigencies of its mission in the world" (Article 2). On the other hand, "The Holy See . . . declares the 'Roman Question' definitively and irrevocably settled and therefore eliminated, and recognizes the kingdom of Italy under the dynasty of the house of Savoy, with Rome as the capital of the Italian state" (Article 26). A financial convention replaced the inoperative "Law of Guarantees." After the Holy See had made generous condonation of property to the state and private individuals, it accepted an indemnity of 750,000,000 lire in cash, and 1,000,000,000 lire in government bonds.

Consequences. After this treaty had been ratified on June 7, the pope emerged from his 108-acre state for the first time, July 25, 1929. Accompanying the Lateran Treaty, a Concordat opened a new alliance of Church and state: the Church was declared the religion of the state; religious teaching was made obligatory in state schools for Catholics; clerical and religious immunity were recognized; canonical matrimonial law given civil effects; and Catholic organizations legally authorized. It will be seen in the national history of Italy that Mussolini soon violated the spirit of this Concordat, thereby provoking a spirited contest between papal and secular jurisdictions. Nonetheless, despite threats from Fascists and occupation of Rome by both Germans and Americans, the Lateran Pact and its Vatican State creation seem to have stood the test of World War II. As part of international law, it is not bound up per se with the Concordat, nor does it lose its validity with a change of Italian government. Nevertheless the Italian Republic under Premier Di Gasperri took care to renew the Lateran Pact explicitly on February 11, 1949.

B. Papal Magisterium

(1) CONDEMNATION OF TOTALITARIANISM

Catholic liberty was championed by Pius XI against a prevailing trend to dictatorship. His appeal was intellectual and moral, though

the Mexican persecution evoked the warning that all physical self-defense was not denied Christians. In *Nos es Muy* (1927), the pope sustained the Mexican bishops in that: "You have also affirmed that if the case arose where the civil power should so trample on justice and truth as to destroy even the foundations of authority, there would appear no reason to condemn citizens for uniting to defend the nation and themselves by lawful and appropriate means against those who make use of the power of the state to drag the nation to ruin." Only Spaniards averted totalitarian persecution by these means; elsewhere Catholics could not or would not see the threat until it was too late.

Non Abbiamo Bisogno (1931) is the pope's classic, though by no means unique, condemnation of Fascism. In this encyclical Pius touched on the basic issue between the Church and totalitarian regimes. For the pope asserted: "We are happy and proud to wage the good fight for the liberty of conscience." And he struck back with the verve of a Hildebrand: "Tell us, therefore, tell the country, tell the world what documents there are . . . that treat of politics planned and directed by Catholic Action. . . . We find ourselves confronted by the resolve . . . to monopolize completely the young . . . for the exclusive advantage of a party and a regime based on an ideology which clearly resolves itself into a true, a real pagan worship of the state—the *Statolatry*—which is in no less contrast with the natural rights of the family, than it is in contradiction with the supernatural rights of the Church. . . . We have seen in action a species of religion which rebels . . . even to cry out: 'Down with the pope and death to him.'"

Mit Brennender Sorge (1937) gave the Nazi brand of totalitarianism a modern version of papal anathema: "None but superficial minds could stumble into concepts of a national god, or national religion, or attempt to lock within the frontiers of a single people, within the narrow limits of a single race, God, Creator of the universe, King and Legislator of all nations, before Whose immensity they are as a drop in a bucket. . . . Should any man dare in sacrilegious disregard of the essential differences between God and His creature, between the God-Man and the children of men, dare place a mortal, were he the greatest of all times, by the side of, or over against Christ, he would deserve to be called a prophet of nothingness to whom the terrifying words of Scripture would be applicable: 'He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh at them.' . . . The day will come when the *Te Deum* of liberation will succeed premature hymns of the enemies of Christ."

Divini Redemptoris (1937), finally, warned men not to fall into the utopian web of Communism: "The means of saving the world today from the lamentable ruin into which amoral Liberalism has plunged us are neither the class struggle, nor terror, nor yet the autocratic use of

state power, but rather the infusion of social justice and the sentiment of Christian love into the social-economic order. . . . We have indicated how a sound prosperity is to be restored according to the true principles of a corporative system which respects the proper hierarchic structure of society, and how all the occupational groups should be fused into an harmonious unity, inspired by the principle of the common good."

(2) SOCIAL REGENERATION

Domestic society was safeguarded by the encyclical *Casti Connubii* (1930) which included this definitive condemnation of contraception: "Any use whatever of matrimony, exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life, is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such acts are branded with the guilt of grave sin." Already in *Divini Illius Magistri* (1929) the pope had upheld the parents' rights to supervise the education of their children, along with the supernatural prerogatives of the Church in the educational field. In this document Pius XI cited with approval the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the Oregon School Case. Higher ecclesiastical studies were the subject of the papal directive, *Deus Scientiarum* (1931).

Economic society was recalled to the Leonine teaching of *Rerum Novarum* on its fortieth anniversary by Pius's *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931). In applying his predecessor's teaching to twentieth-century conditions, the pope distinguished the individual and social aspects of property, while suggesting a corporate economic system as a *via media* between Capitalism and Socialism. Speculation and credit manipulation, partial causes of the world depression of 1929, came in for sharp criticism: "In our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few, and that those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure. This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the lifeblood to the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will." The pope urged co-operation between employers and employees; they ought not place all their hopes in state intervention. This, if necessary, should moderate and arbitrate rather than participate; reasonable public ownership of certain natural resources, however, need not be deemed socialistic.

Catholic Action was called upon for the work of social regeneration

by Pius XI, who diffused ever more widely and strongly the movement initiated by St. Pius X. "We have called this movement so dear to our heart 'a particularly providential assistance' in the work of the Church in these troublous times. Catholic Action is in effect a social apostolate also, inasmuch as its object is to spread the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, not only among individuals, but also in families and in society. It must, therefore, make it a chief aim to train its members with special care and to prepare them to fight the battles of the Lord. The task of formation, now more urgent and indispensable than ever, which must always precede direct action in the field, will assuredly be served by study-circles, conferences, lecture-courses, and the various other activities undertaken with a view to making known the Christian solution of the social problem" (*Divini Redemptoris*).

102. PIUS XII AND TOTALITARIANISM

A. *Ecclesiastical Leadership* (*1939–58*)

(1) POPE PIUS XII

Eugenio Pacelli (1876–1958) belonged to a distinguished Roman family. His grandfather Marcantonio had been undersecretary of the Papal State and founder of *Osservatore Romano;* his father Filippo and elder brother Francesco were competent lawyers, the latter participating in the negotiations for the Lateran Pact. Eugenio himself was at first destined for the law, and for a time attended the state-controlled Liceo Visconti where he defied anticlerical professors, once substituting a denunciation of the Italian annexation of Rome for a prescribed theme to justify it. About 1894 he resolved to enter the clerical state and enrolled at Capranica College. His health broke down under his efforts, but he survived to be ordained on April 2, 1899. He continued postgraduate studies at the Apollinaris, earning doctorates in theology, philosophy, canon and civil law.

Diplomatic career. In 1901 Father Pacelli was assigned work under Monsignor Gasparri in the Congregation of Extraordinary Affairs where he remained until 1917, becoming its secretary in 1914. During 1901 he was bearer of a papal letter of condolence to Edward VII in London; here he returned in 1908 for the Eucharistic Congress and in 1911 for the coronation of George V. On May 13, 1917, he was consecrated bishop by Benedict XV and named nuncio to Bavaria. During July he met the Kaiser but proved unable to win his assent to the pope's peace plan. During the communist riots in the spring of 1919, mobsters invaded the Munich nunciature, but were faced down by Archbishop Pacelli; repeatedly his life was in peril on the streets. Named nuncio to Germany in 1920, he retained both German legations until 1929. He participated in arranging the Concordats with Bavaria (1925), Prussia

(1929), Baden (1932), Germany (1933), and Austria (1934). On his departure from Germany he received enthusiastic testimonials from all German groups save the Nazis whom he had often criticized. Named cardinal in December, 1929, Pacelli became papal secretary of state, February, 1930. In 1934 he toured South America and in 1936 the United States. He was legate to congresses at Lourdes (1935), Lisieux (1937), and Budapest (1938). His opposition to Totalitarianism was well known: he denounced it at Lourdes in 1935, and participated in the papal rebuke to Cardinal Innitzer of Vienna for his overly-warm welcome to Nazi *Anschluss.* Reputedly another excoriation of Totalitarianism was scheduled for February 11, 1939, but Pius XI died the preceding day.

Election to the papacy. As *camerlengo,* Cardinal Pacelli administered the Holy See during the ensuing *sede vacante* and made arrangements for a conclave which at long last included Cardinal O'Connell of Boston —for whom Pius XI had extended the Lyonnaise (1274) prescription from ten to eighteen days. On March 2, 1939, reputedly on the third ballot and almost unanimously, Cardinal Pacelli was elected to the supreme pontificate. His was the first papal election announced *orbi* by radio as well as *urbi,* and Cardinal Caccia-Dominioni discharged well this new extension of an ancient announcer's role. On the feast of St. Gregory the Great, March 12, 1939, Eugenio Pacelli was crowned as Pope Pius XII. Thus began a long, eventful, and progressive pontificate, conscientiously discharged until terminated by the pope's death at Castel Gandolfo, October 9, 1958.

(2) Doctrinal Guidance

Ecclesiology. In 1943 Pius XII in an encyclical, *Mystici Corporis,* expounded the true doctrine and warned against errors: Christian union with the Divine Head is not merely moral, nor does it constitute a single physical person, but is supernatural. Expressions alluding to the "soul" and "body" of the Church ought not to be used in such wise as to suggest a separation of a visible from an invisible Church; rather, non-Catholics in good faith are described as "related, even though unsuspectingly, to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution." Even so, "they still remain deprived of so many precious gifts and helps from heaven, which one can enjoy only in the Catholic Church." In 1950, in *Humani Generis,* the pope warned against vestiges of Modernism and the vagaries of Existentialism. Docility to papal instructions —which are not to be regarded merely as advice—was stressed in order to offset any theological relativism. *Ci Riesce* (1953) suggested modern norms for tolerance of non-Catholics.

Holy Scripture. During 1943 also the pope commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of *Providentissimus Deus* by issuing *Divino Afflante Spiritu.* The latter encyclical emphasized the new information afforded by archaeological discoveries in regard to the languages, literature, history, and customs of Biblical peoples. Nowadays Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, original tongues of the Scriptures, are essential to scholarly exposition. Accordingly, without prejudice to the Vulgate, versions directly from the original texts should be prepared and appropriately translated to the vernacular, subject to hierarchical sanction. In 1945 a papal motu proprio, *In Cotidianis Precibus,* but some of these norms into effect by permitting liturgical use of a new Psalter directly based on the Hebrew.

Canon Law. The apostolic constitution, *Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis* (1945), changed the required two-thirds majority for papal elections dating from 1179 to two-thirds plus one, and clarified procedure. In the same year an important *Allocution to the Rota* distinguished between ecclesiastical jurisdiction derived immediately from God independently of the people, and civil authority, deduced "as most Scholastics teach" mediately from God through the people. Between 1949 and 1957 the Holy Father issued a new *Oriental Code* for the Eastern Rites in communion with the Holy See.

Mariology. Pius XII, when dedicating the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary by establishing the feast in 1942, suggested prayers for the opportuneness of defining the doctrine of her Assumption. This definition he made on November 1, 1950, in the constitution, *Munificentissimus Deus:* "We pronounce, declare and define it to be a divinely revealed dogma that the Immaculate Mother of God, ever Virgin Mary, when the course of her earthly life was finished, was taken up body and soul into heavenly glory." The invocation, *"Regina assumpta in coelum,"* was added to the Litany. The centennial of the definition of the Immaculate Conception—1954—was proclaimed a "Marian Year," climaxed by the festive celebration of the "Queenship of Mary," henceforth assigned to May 31.

The Missions received attention from Pius XII who, adhering to the policy of his two predecessors, fostered a native clergy. He consecrated twelve missionary bishops October 29, 1939, erected a Chinese hierarchy in 1945, set up a missionary college for native students (1947), and admitted a Chinese and Indian to the Sacred College (1946; 1953). In 1939 more liberal norms were permitted for use of Confucianist ceremonies. During 1947 *Provida Mater Ecclesia* recognized the "secular institutes" as means of domestic asceticism; analogous and overlapping was the development of a lay missionary movement.

(3) Liturgical Discipline

General liturgy. Pius XII, besides legislating on six of the sacraments, issued an important encyclical, *Mediator Dei* (1947), on the liturgy. He there defined liturgy as "the integral public worship of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, of its Head and members." He warned against liturgical excesses and any changes introduced without papal sanction, such as revival of disused rubrics or unauthorized use of the vernacular. Besides new feasts, a new common of popes, a new Psalter, the pope introduced a considerable, but merely transitional simplification of the rubrics of the Mass and Office in 1955. A new Holy Week ritual, optional and partial in 1951, became obligatory and definitive in 1955. In 1958 four ways of promoting greater participation of the congregation in the Mass were recommended.

Baptism. Through the Congregation of Rites the pope sanctioned alteration of the saliva rubric (1944)—a change once denied to the Malabarese. In 1951 he provided for congregational renewal of baptismal vows at the revived Holy Saturday Vigil.

Confirmation. Pius XII conceded general faculties to pastors and their equivalents in the Latin Rite to administer this sacrament in case of danger of death and the absence of a bishop (1946).

Penance. During 1947 the provisions of canon 883 for faculties for confession on a sea voyage were extended to air travel.

Holy Eucharist. During World War II the pope allowed not only soldiers but war workers to have evening Mass, with corresponding modifications of the Eucharistic fast (1942), and permitted use of water only in ablutions where wine was not easily obtainable (1944). Regulations about the time of the Mass and the Eucharistic fast were standardized and fused with previous indults for the sick by *Christus Dominus* (1953), subject to a confessor's sanction. The latter restriction was removed in March, 1957, by a supplementary regulation requiring a three-hour fast from solids, a single hour from liquids—save intoxicants—for all, and permitting the sick true medicine whenever needed. Water was entirely excluded from the Eucharistic fast.

Holy Orders. By *Sacramentum Ordinis* (1947) the pope settled long-standing theological disputes about the matter and form of this sacrament by defining that "the matter of the sacred orders of deacon ,, priesthood and episcopacy is the imposition of hands alone; the form is the words determining the application of this matter by which the sacramental effects are univocally signified. . . ." These words are to be found in the Preface.

Matrimony. In 1940 the Holy Office condemned direct sterilization and in 1944 censured those "who either deny that the primary end of

marriage is the procreation and education of children, or teach that the secondary ends are not essentially subordinate to the primary end." The pope made the first change in the Latin Code during 1948 by suppressing the exception from canonical form of marriage made by canon 1099 in favor of those baptized but not educated in the Church. In 1949 Pius XII initiated the Oriental matrimonial code; the manner of computing affinity and the form of marriage constituted the more notable differences from the Latin. Addressing Catholic physicians in 1949, the pope "formally excluded artificial insemination from marriage." Besides renewing his predecessor's ban on contraception, Pius XII in an address to Catholic midwives during 1951 condemned the abuse of "rhythm."

B. Secular Problems

(1) WORLD WAR II (1939–45)

Causes. Versailles divided the powers into "haves" and "have-nots," and the latter were susceptible to any appeal, however radical, promising redress of their grievances. In Germany, the Socialist-Center Bloc which ran the Weimar Republic was saddled with payment of reparations. When France insisted upon repayment, however, Great Britain tended to side with Germany, thereby virtually suspending the victorious *Entente Cordiale*. The world depression (1929–33) hastened the decline of peace organization: economic self-sufficiency became the goal and over-all planning of a socialist or fascist type became attractive. The economic status of the German and Austrian states became straitened, but Laval's France vetoed any union. German President Hindenburg then turned from the discredited democratic leaders to Hitler's promises, and neither he nor the Germans were again allowed to change their minds. For Hitler cornered political power and geared the entire German economy for war. In 1935 he courted Mussolini in the latter's Ethiopian venture, and secured his benevolent neutrality the next year during his own gamble of rearming the Rhineland in defiance of Versailles terms. France, without a cabinet, hesitated and lost. Germany and Italy cemented their understanding in the Berlin-Rome Axis (1936), to which Japan, which had successfully defied the League in Manchuria, adhered later. Russia, however, held aloof from both Fascists and Liberals. Military rearmament was pushed forward to outstrip, especially in the air, Britain, France, and the lesser states, while Russian policy and strength remained an enigma. Preparedness and bluff enabled the Axis to appropriate Austria, Czechoslovakia, Memel, and Albania within a year (1938–39).

Hostilities broke out on September 1, 1939, when Britain and France refused to appease Hitler on his demands on Poland. Thinking to remedy German errors in World War I, Hitler at first avoided a war

on two fronts. He appeased Russia with half of Poland in order to be free to deal with the West. France was defeated and occupied along with the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway. Unable either to force Great Britain's surrender or her alliance in an anticommunist "crusade," Hitler seems to have assumed that he could destroy Russia alone while slowly starving out the British Isles. And so he might have done had not his Japanese partner, interested as always in local more than over-all Axis objectives, provoked the United States into global war by attack on Pearl Harbor. American-British aid was henceforth given without stint to Russia with such success that German advance was halted. Then, caught at last in his dreaded two-front war, Hitler dodged encirclement until the Allied landings in North Africa, Italy, and France produced the dire Nazi-dämmerung at Berlin, May, 1945.

Armistice, rather than peace, was the sequel. Self-defense had induced the Liberal nations to ally themselves with Communism. The war thus failed to be an ideological contest with Totalitarianism, however much wishful propaganda might sometimes represent it. Concern for their soldiers' lives led the Liberal leaders to make great concessions to their Soviet partner in order to ensure a speedy end to the war, and to this purpose also a fateful atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan, quickly terminating the contest in the Far East. Principles were again sacrificed at the peacemaking in the hope that present injustices might be eventually remedied in a new world organization, the United Nations. Fearing to ruin this, as the League had been, by American and Russian abstention, material unanimity was purchased at the expense of formal disagreement, and the world remained divided, now into the armed camps of Liberalism and Communism.

(2) PAPAL PEACE EFFORTS (1939–45)

Unsuccessful appeals. In May, 1939, Pope Pius XII privately proposed an international conference to Germany, Poland, France, Great Britain, and Italy. This plan, following several weeks after an un-co-ordinated suggestion by President Roosevelt of the United States, was rejected. But the pope continued his earnest efforts to avert war down to the last hours before the commencement of hostilities. In October, 1939, his encyclical *Summi Pontificatus* denounced the general forgetfulness of human solidarity, and the excessive use of secular power, unrestrained by either divine or human law. By December, 1939, Pius XII had a five point peace program to propose: (1) national rights to independence; (2) disarmament; (3) international institutions; (4) revision of treaties; and (5) introduction of the Christian ideals. These points, along with other recommendations, the pope reiterated in his annual Christmas

broadcasts. In 1940 he called for triumph over hate, mistrust, the sub-
stitution of utility for right, selfishly maintained disparities in economic
resources, and the "spirit of cold egoism." He pleaded during 1941 for
the rights of small nations, national minorities, while deploring hoard-
ing of economic resources, total warfare and persecution of religion.
Between 1940 and 1946 he was in frequent consultation with Myron
Taylor, personal ambassador of President Roosevelt. He did not, how-
ever, directly participate in any armistice or peace negotiations, and
while favoring a "community of nations," did not attempt to formulate
a charter for the "United Nations."

Relief activities. The Pontifical Relief Commission was set up in 1939
under Monsignor Cortesi, and in time relief centers were opened in all
occupied countries to dispense food, clothing and medicine to men of
all religions and races; by the end of the war the Commission was
operating in forty countries. Between 1939 and 1945, moreover, the
Vatican Information Service sent five million messages for private
soldiers, often anticipating the secular sources; e.g., the first news of
American survivors from the Ploesti air raid came from the Vatican.
During 1943–44 Vatican trucks foraged for food in Italy, and for a
time a third of Rome's flour was being supplied through the Vatican
commissary. Soup kitchens and emergency shelters were established in
Rome, and after the war many of these relief agencies continued to
assist dispossessed persons, especially children.

Roman crises. Throughout the war, the pope rejected suggestions
from either side to leave Rome. After the bombings of San Lorenzo
and the Lateran during the summer of 1943, the pope hastened to the
scene within the hour, and his cassock was stained with blood as he
participated in the relief work. Besides eliciting diplomatic protests,
bombing of Vatican City—without casualties—by an unidentified plane
failed to budge the pope. During the Nazi occupation of Rome, Sep-
tember, 1943, to June, 1944, the Vatican freedom was constrained, but
ways were yet discovered to help the poor and give asylum to Jews.
To Nazi pressures Pius XII replied: "Kindly inform whoever may be
interested that not only do I refuse to leave Rome no matter what hap-
pens, but herewith protest in advance any violence planned against, not
my modest person, but against the Vicar of Christ." This determination
he repeated to the cardinals in consistory of February 9, 1944, although
allowing them full freedom to leave. Allied bombing of Castel Gandolfo
and of Monte Cassino yet followed, perhaps unavoidably. Tension eased,
however, after the entry of American troops into Rome, June 6, 1944.
The day coincided with D-Day, the Norman Reconquest that soon
ended the war.

(3) Post-War Peace Efforts (1945–58)

The "Cold War." From 1947 the American Marshall Plan for European Recovery (ECA) was opposed by the "Cold War," warming in 1948 to the contest for Berlin. Already in December, 1945, the pope had deplored the surviving "bacillus" of Totalitarianism; a year later he lamented that the ideals of the Atlantic Charter and of the Four Freedoms were being tarnished. During 1947–49 he appealed for internationalization of Jerusalem and the Holy Places, and for a peaceful solution for the Arab-Jewish tension in Palestine. In 1948 he analyzed the situation as a continuing insecurity arising from fear of aggression. The pope made peace one of the intentions for the Holy Year of 1950, and pleaded: "Away with the barriers! Break down the barbed wire fences! Let each people be free to know the life of other peoples; let the segregation of some countries from the rest of the civilized world, so dangerous to the cause of peace, be abolished. How earnestly the Church desires to smooth the way for these friendly relations among peoples! For her, East and West do not represent opposite ideals, but share a common heritage to which both are called to contribute in the future also. By virtue of her divine mission she is a mother of all peoples, and a faithful ally and wise guide to all who seek peace." But apparently East and West still endorsed Kipling's dictum, for the Holy Year was marred by the opening of the Korean War (1950–53). As this and other limited conflicts ever threatened to develop into World War III, Pius XII repeated his appeals for peace, notably during the Marian Year of 1954 and the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. Yet it was not "peace at any price," for the pope pointed out the dangers of the newer Moscow line of "peaceful co-existence."

Anti-Communist defense. It was atheistic Communism with all its materialistic implications that Pius XII continued to indict to those who refused to detect the menace. In postwar elections, especially in Italy and France, the pope publicly commanded Catholic participation under pain of mortal sin. On July 1, 1949, a decree of the Holy Office declared bluntly that it was illicit for a Catholic to be a member of or to support any Communist party. He might not contribute to, subscribe to, or circulate publications in favor of Communism, and those guilty of such offenses were barred from the sacraments and remained, as apostates, subject to a specially reserved censure of excommunication. Right down to the last year of his pontificate Pius XII denounced Communist persecution, first in the Succession States and the Balkans, finally in China where schism was being fostered. In condemning the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, February 20, 1949, the pope enunciated what may be taken as a statement of the issue: "The totalitarian and antireligious state

wants a Church that is silent when she should speak; a Church that adulterates the law of God, adapting it to the whims of human desires when she should instead be loudly proclaiming it; a Church that does not resist the oppression of the conscience of the people and does not protect their legitimate rights and just liberties; a Church that with unbecoming servility remains enclosed within the four walls of the temple, forgetful of the divine mandate received from Christ: 'Go you into the highways; instruct all the nations.' Beloved sons and daughters, spiritual heirs of a countless legion of confessors and martyrs, is this the Church you venerate and love?"

103. RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

A. *"Idealistic" Period* (1917–28)

(1) COMMUNIST REVOLUTION (1917–21)

Political. The Bolsheviki overthrew the Liberal Provisional Regime—capitalistic, discordant, hesitant—by promising: (1) peace at any price; (2) land for all peasants; and (3) "all power to the *soviets*"; that is, the workers' factory councils. The first promise won over war-weary troops, although peace was purchased from Germany at the expense of ceding Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and the Ukraine by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, March, 1918. After the collapse of the Central Powers and the Russian Counter Revolution, Ukraine was regained for the Soviet Union from a rightist-alien expeditionary force (1918–21). The second pledge induced the peasants to allow the Communists to have their own way in the towns, while they were permitted to reapportion the land to suit themselves. The third part of the Communist program permitted a minority to seize control in Petrograd—soon Leningrad—and cow the Duma into submission. Though the Communists won but twenty-five per cent of the thirty-six million votes in the December, 1917, elections and gained merely 156 of the 601 seats in the Duma meeting in January, 1918, that body was soon terrorized into legalizing earlier Communist decrees of agrarian reapportionment, debt cancelation and socialization of banks. From this original concession of authority the Duma never had a chance to retreat, for in July, 1918, the primitive Communist Soviet Constitution restricted full citizenship to the proletariat; all other classes and parties were disenfranchised. Though political authority theoretically was derived from a confederation of national republics and their component local *soviets*, actually a dictatorship of the Council of Commissars existed. The Cheka Police enforced their rule by sheer terror, taking hostages for the good behavior of all suspects. The courts openly discriminated against "hostile classes" so that the old nobility and bureaucracy was killed or exiled.

Economic. Expropriation embraced government property and banking

capital (1917); transport, internal trade, large-scale industry capital, foreign trade capital and loans (1918), and small business capital (1920). From 1917 to 1921, then, the state endeavored to run everything. Workers were given charge of the factories, but their haphazard methods and lack of training resulted quickly in industrial chaos. Labor had to be made compulsory and the working day lengthened. All land was nationalized on paper, and the peasants were assured that a White Russian counter-revolt would mean a return of serfdom. During the White Russian offensives, indeed, the Reds, under guise of martial law, employed confiscation against all real or alleged reactionary groups. In self-defense the Soviet War Minister, Trotsky, organized a Red army of workers, disciplined by the Cheka—later OGPU—secret police. But the "Whites" were divided in aims and organization, and there was no enthusiasm for restoration of the monarchy or the privileged classes. Allied assistance came in halting and meager fashion from war-weary and halfhearted nations, and was abandoned in 1920. Hence, by 1921 the Communist government of Premier Lenin (1917–24) was securely in power in Russia. On the other hand, for the moment it had been foiled in its efforts to foster world revolution, for serious Communist risings in Germany and Hungary had been put down. For its first quarter century the Communist experiment was confined to Russia.

(2) COMMUNIST COMPROMISE (1922–28)

"New Economic Policy." Although successful over reactionaries, Lenin recognized danger signals for his rule appearing by 1921. There were mutinies among the armed forces; the peasants were deliberately underproducing and hiding grain; hoarding and black markets were flourishing. The state had attempted too much in trying to socialize everything, and the peasants had effectively resisted socialization while the more eager workers had bungled seriously. Too much had been tried too quickly by too few. Without abandoning his ultimate objectives, Lenin now resolved upon a strategic retreat which would placate the peasants and illegal *bourgeoisie.* Hence, peasants were reassured that requisition of grain would now cease; taxes would be equitably assessed upon the amount produced; and land grabs could be condoned as long-term leases. When the black market trading was legalized, the NEP bourgeois emerged into the open where he could be taxed—and noted for future destruction. Industries employing less than twenty workers were then turned back to private management, while the Communists concentrated upon large-scale industry. This they tried to revamp with foreign capital and technicians. Foreign trade and transport remained state monopolies, and banking and minting were government preserves.

Nevertheless, differentiated wages revived individual initiative, and economic life began to improve.

Party dictatorship. The Communist Party retained its rigid political monopoly and police system. The Constitution of 1922, although conceding cultural autonomy to the many nationalities within the federated Soviet Union, was chary about delegating political power. Only the proletariat were allowed to participate in elections, and these were little more than ratification of lists of party nominees. Even though a series of indirect representatives ascended to an All Union Congress, any expression of the popular will was practically impossible. In theory the All Union Congress selected an All Union Executive Committee which chose the Union Council of Commissars with charge over national and foreign affairs. Actually, behind this façade all real power rested with a restricted Communist Party. Though this expanded its membership from 23,000 in January, 1917, to 7,200,000 in January, 1957, at any period it constituted but a small percentage of the total Russian population.

Faction contests. When Lenin's health began to fail in 1922, a struggle for the succession began between Leftists under Trotsky who denounced NEP as a betrayal of Communism, and Rightists led by Stalin who were primarily interested in Russian nationalism. Trotsky, intellectual, mercurial, a brilliant speaker, advocated world revolt at once; Stalin, ill-educated, plodding, a wire-puller, argued that a powerful Russian state must be the immediate objective. As the secretary-general of the Party, Stalin outmaneuvered Trotsky in dominating patronage after Lenin's death in 1924. From 1923 to 1925 Zimoviev and Kamenev joined Stalin against Trotsky; then they sided with the latter. Relegated to a minor role, Trotsky agitated, opposing concessions to the rising wealthy peasants, the *kulaks*. In 1927 the OGPU under Stalin's orders began for the first time to purge Reds; by 1929 Trotsky was in exile and Stalin was dictator. Events were to demonstrate him a "realist" who stole Lenin's policy. Yet he was ever more concerned with achieving objectives by any means than with fidelity to correct theory.

(3) Religious Persecution (1917–28)

Revolutionary atrocities. The Orthodox Russian Church had been separated from the state by the Liberal revolution in March, and during August the Orthodox clergy had utilized their independence to choose their first patriarch in two hundred years: Tikhon Belavin (1917–25). By Article 13 of their 1918 Constitution the Soviets proclaimed equal freedom for religion and atheism. But in practice wholesale confiscation of church property commenced: everything except a minimum of buildings and utensils needed for cult was taken or put at the disposal of lay

trustees similar to the French "cultural associations." The clergy were deprived of all civil rights and discriminated against in the vital matter of ration cards—which all Russians needed until 1935. Popular resistance to these measures was met by severe reprisals. Between 1918 and 1920, it has been estimated that 26 Orthodox prelates and 1,200 priests were slain; by 1941 their hierarchy had declined from 130 to 28, their clergy from 50,000 to 5,000. Leading prelates from Tikhon of Moscow down had been arrested. Among Catholics, Monsignors Budkiewicz and Cieplak, and 14 clerics were outstanding victims. Between 1917 and 1950, the Catholic hierarchy was reduced from 7 to none, the clergy from 896 to 2. Meanwhile the "Living Church," a latitudinarian, subservient group of collaborationists, was foisted upon the Russian people as a government protégé. Religious instruction was strictly forbidden in all public and private schools, although catechism might still be taught to groups less than eighteen, and a few government-controlled Orthodox seminaries were permitted to function. Libertine excess was allowed and even encouraged: "bourgeois morality" was ridiculed; civil marriage introduced, concubinage condoned, parental rights unrecognized, illegitimate children placed on a legal par with legitimate, and "postcard divorces" sanctioned.

Calculated repression. During the NEP period, religious policy was likewise somewhat modified without any basic change in the Marxist long-term attitude toward religion. Exposed to international denunciation, the Soviet regime accepted some food donations through the Papal Relief Commission (1922) and released Patriarch Tikhon (1923). Less support was given to the farce of the "Living Church," and direct attacks upon the clergy and faithful were discontinued for a time. Yet during 1922-23 all of the nine Catholic prelates had been executed, imprisoned, or exiled. The Holy See named ten new prelates in 1926, but all had been apprehended by 1932 when but fifty priests survived. If less violence was displayed against the Orthodox clergy, antireligious propaganda and ridicule of religious observance increased. These measures were promoted by the Militant Atheists' League, organized in 1925, but making but slow progress before 1928. In 1924 the legal catechism class was reduced to three, and sermons subjected to a preliminary censorship. A "new calendar"—the Gregorian—together with civil holidays deliberately at variance with the ecclesiastical disrupted the Orthodox festivals. The Militant Atheists spread antireligious propaganda in markets, music-halls, by playing-cards, and children's ABC's. Anti-Christmas and anti-Easter carnivals strove to attract the people from worship. Religious ceremonies and persons were parodied or caricatured on the streets or in cartoons; shrines and miracles were "debunked"; statues equipped with flashing signs: "Join the League of Godless to-

day." If less violent means were employed, Communist persecution of religion continued.

B. *"Realistic" Period* (*1928–53*)

(1) RUTHLESS COLLECTIVIZATION (1928–38)

"Five Year Plans." After exiling the Leftists, Stalin amazed his supporters by renewing a drive for the Communist ultimate objectives: complete industrialization and collectivized farming. In the First Five Year Plan (1928–32), Russia was to become self-sufficient on a time table. This program stressed quantity, but its quality proved sub-standard. Managers were threatened with punishment for failure to turn out quotas, and the workers' authority in the factories was lessened. At the same time an agrarian program was pushed over peasants' objections. Cattle, tools, and fields were to be held in common, and any who deserted NEP for collectivized farms were favored. *Kulaks* retaliated as before by hoarding and production strikes, but food was a secondary objective to Stalin: during the famine of 1932–33 many millions (three to seven) were deliberately allowed to die. Thus the *kulak* was "liquidated." A Second Plan (1933–37) stressed increased production, but consumption and quality as well. Achievements in industry and agriculture were such that by the end of the period the Soviets could at last point to rising standards of living, and ration cards could be abandoned. By not counting human costs, Stalin had modernized Russia rapidly, if imperfectly.

Communist purges continued as Stalin struck at rivals, now to the right, then to the left. Collectivization had alienated Premier Rykov, Bukharin, and Tomski; in 1930 these Rightists were demoted, to be purged in 1938. In 1934 murder of Stalin's friend Kirov set off a series of reprisals and demonstration trials: in 1936 Zimoviev and Kamenev "confessed" plots against Stalin; in 1937 Radek and five thousand others were executed for plotting with Trotsky or Hess, or committing sabotage of one kind or another; then came the turn of Marshal Tukhachevsky and seven generals purged for conspiring with an "unfriendly power." By 1938 no dissent could be heard in Russia.

Religious persecution was accentuated during this period, with special vehemence during 1929–30 and 1937–38. The attack began with the closing of churches—1,440 during 1929—and this continued whenever and wherever expedient. The clergy were prosecuted in large numbers: imprisoned, executed, deported, or relegated to rural areas; at one time 150 bishops were under arrest. The revolutionary six-day week with periodic labor shifts, in force from 1929 to 1940, played havoc with religious observance. Once again the 1929 Constitution proclaimed "freedom of religious cult and of antireligious propaganda": all proselytizing

was banned, while the atheistic program was accelerated. Positively atheistic education became obligatory, and the Militant Atheist League used physical and moral pressure to discourage fidelity to religion. Training schools and study clubs in atheism and materialism were sponsored. During 1934–37 a lull occurred: during 1934 a stricter domestic morality was imposed, and in 1935 the anti-Easter campaign was so far abandoned as to sanction sale of Easter cakes. Christmas trees and wedding rings came back on the market. Despite these trifling baits, in 1937 indictment and arrest of the clergy was resumed, and this time chiefly on charges of lack of patriotism. More churches were closed: Timasheff cites 1,100 Orthodox, 240 Catholic, 61 Protestant, and 110 Mohammedan religious edifices closed during 1937.[8] Despite some courting of the New Deal by allowing an American priest at Moscow, the Soviet government did not deviate from a basic policy of extermination of religion during this period. Monsignor Frizon, Catholic administrator of Odessa, was shot in 1937.

(2) NATIONAL IMPERIALISM (1936–53)

Thermidor. At the end of the collectivization, Soviet Russia under Stalin's dictatorship had reached a point which Chamberlin and other qualified observers have labeled as the Thermidorian Reaction to the Communist Revolution. In defense of this hypothesis, it may be remarked that, (1) *property* is no longer egalitarian in theory or practice: though Lenin took no more than a worker's wage, now Soviet bureaucrats live luxuriously; (2) *religion* is rather to be dominated than destroyed—on which below; (3) *family morality* and school discipline again follow conventional norms; (4) *national imperialism* and Pan-Slavism have replaced cosmopolitanism; (5) *regimented discipline* has replaced progressive education; (6) *the proletarian* is no longer specially privileged: merit is recognized irrespective of class origin, and some of the second generation Communist commissars were never workers; (7) *culture* fosters the national and conservative: military titles and uniforms, clubs, servants, etc., have returned; Russian history is no longer entirely condemnatory of the czarist or even the Christian past; (8) *labor incentive* has returned with larger salaries, personal property, and savings-bank accounts. The seven-day week and eight-hour day returned in 1940. No investments are available, indeed, save in government bonds, nor are shops and farms allowed in private hands, but one may own as much non-productive wealth as he pleases, so long as he does not enter into competition with the state monopoly on production; (9) *foreign policy* veered from the Axis (1939–41) to the Liberal Allies

[8] N. S. Timasheff, *Religion in Soviet Russia* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1942), p. 52.

(1941–45), and thereafter courted satellites and allies. All territorial cessions of 1918 save Finland have been recovered, and Soviet troops, who have long outstayed their role as "liberators," hold down subject peoples against their manifest will in the immemorial imperialist fashion.

Stalinist religious policy during this period did manifest some analogies to the French Thermidorian reaction, but it will be recalled that Thermidor was followed by a "Second Terror." The 1936 Stalinist Constitution proclaimed freedom of religion and restored to the clergy their civil rights—but this document in its entirety means simply what the Communist dictatorship wishes it to signify. During 1939–40 another lull in persecution began, and the government embarked on a new compromise, possibly suggested in an interview with the modernist prelate Kallistratos of Georgia who asserted that communism and Christianity were not opposed and would eventually fuse. After the Nazi invasion of 1941, moreover, Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow declared that the Orthodox Church would support the national government in its peril. As invaders opened the churches, Stalin's government in desperation turned to the Church as a patriotic agency. A puppet patriarch was installed in 1943, and Orthodox antipathies against Catholics, Latin or Ruthenian, were encouraged. In March, 1946, the 1596 Reunion of Brest was declared abrogated and all non-Latin Catholics subjected to the Stalinist Patriarch of Moscow, both in Russia and in the satellite countries. The Militant Atheist League was suppressed in 1942, and the more blatant antireligious propaganda discontinued. Crude massacres and public tortures were abandoned for more secret and subtle methods of "brain-washing." Yet down to Stalin's death in 1953, Timasheff's words, written in 1942, remained valid: "Never forget that the 'New Religious Policy' is merely a compromise, reluctantly accepted for compelling reasons, and contrary to the convictions of the government. Hence the concessions are precarious." [9]

C. *Enigmatic Period* (1953–)

(1) POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Stalin's successors since 1953, whatever their differences of technique, have given no evidence of departing from basic Communist objectives. At first, an attempt was made to replace his one-man rule with a "collective leadership" under Stalin's hand-picked successor, Georgi Malenkov, as chairman (1953–55). But the farm program which by then enveloped ninety-nine per cent of the land, proved less successful, despite vast forces of slave labor controlled since World War II. Malenkov was then demoted and a partnership of Nikolai Bulganin as premier (1955–58) and Nikita Khrushchev as party boss succeeded. There was some

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 161.

moderation in the "hate the West" themes, and a breaking down of the isolation of the "iron curtain," although this did not permit any real independence to the satellites. In 1956 Khrushchev accused Stalin of arbitrary and not always infallible dictatorship, and proceeded to give an appearance of humanizing and democratizing the Soviet administration. Yet the leading rivals were successively eliminated and he emerged in 1958 as Stalin's sole heir, both as party chairman and premier. The Soviet Union, where already in 1937 sales taxes took eighty-five to ninety per cent of the product, geared everything to collective leadership, military might, and scientific achievement. Apparently less stress was laid on surpassing the West by war than by economic and scientific progress. Yet little seems changed and the world remains divided in two camps. Supposedly Liberal "cosmopolitan" internationalism breeds war and slavery, while Communist "proletarian" imperialism promotes freedom and peace.

(2) RELIGIOUS POLICIES

The enigmatic new regime, while not abandoning threats of war, made increasing efforts to give the impression that religious persecution exists nowhere under Soviet rule. But there is no sign of Communist leaders deserting their atheistic and materialistic premises. Dictator Khrushchev, even while giving the impression that surviving religious people would be tolerated so long as they persisted in their "illusions," admitted bluntly in 1957 that Communist doctrine remained officially "atheistic." Yet instances of "believers" did appear in Communist households, among commissars and generals. Since a *Pravda* editorial of July, 1954, Kremlin leaders have searched for "scientific-atheistic" propaganda, but ancient literature had little to offer of such a pseudo-scientific nature, and Soviet writers, even when tempted by prizes, proved sluggish or inept in producing the "high quality" propaganda desired. And young radicals were beginning to regard the "Communist Old Regime" as the "opiate of the people." Little of the Communist ideals of 1917 survived, but Soviet dictatorship was still a dread reality.

104. COMMUNIST SATELLITES

A. *Fragments of Czardom*

Introduction. Dissolution of the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and German monarchies gave rise to a number of "succession states" in Central Europe and the Balkans, national fragments endowed with "sovereign" existence by the Wilsonian principle at the Versailles Conference, without sufficient consideration as to whether they were viable as states or not.

(1) The Baltic and the Ukraine

Estonia. This territory, successively ruled by the Teutonic Knights, Sweden, and Russia, had never enjoyed independence save for the period from 1918 until its reannexation by Russia in 1940. In 1938 Catholics numbered two thousand, about two per cent of the population. Monsignor Proffittlich, the apostolic administrator, was deported to Siberia in 1940, and but two priests survived in 1945.

Latvia. Latvia, besides coming under the same suzerains as Estonia, had also been ruled by Poland for a time before gaining its independence, 1918–40. Catholics had numbered about twenty-five per cent of the population. During Soviet occupation, 1940–41, some thirty-four thousand Catholics and Lutherans were killed, and several priests brutally slain. Nazi occupation permitted religious services once more, but on the return of the Reds, bishops and priests were deported to Siberia in large numbers: 50 of 187 priests "disappeared."

Lithuania had once been a powerful state which, with the Ukraine, extended to the Black Sea. United with Poland since 1386 by a common ruler, it was legally merged with that country in 1569 by the Lublin Union, and shared its fate of partition, 1772–95. When resuscitated, 1918–40, eighty per cent of Lithuania's three million inhabitants were Catholics. Russian annexation quickly led to closing of Catholic schools and suppression of the ecclesiastical press. By 1948 there were seven hundred priests, but half of the 1940 total; by 1954, their number had fallen to four hundred, and these were severely restricted in their ministrations. In 1953 all but one of the bishops had been slain or deported.

Ukraine. This was the motherland of the Russian or Ruthenian Rite, and it contained many Catholics after the Brest Reunion of 1596. These, however, had been subjected to pressures after Russian annexation from Poland-Lithuania during the seventeenth century. Prior to 1939 the area contained some 3,500,000 Catholics and 2,200 priests of the Ruthenian Rite worked in Ukraine and Galicia. The Reds at once expelled the Latin bishops, but forebore to disturb the respected Ruthenian metropolitan, Monsignor Szeptyckyj, until his death in 1944. Although Khrushchev attended the funeral, the metropolitan's successor Slipyj and four other bishops were imprisoned in April, 1945. A weak and kindly nepotist, Monsignor Kostelnyk, was named vicar-capitular, and in March, 1946, proclaimed at Soviet dictation the dissolution of the Brest Union. According to Orthodox computation, 1,111 priests accepted the new union with Muscovy; this would mean that at least 900 openly refused. Similar forcible annexations to Muscovite Orthodoxy occurred in the Carpatho-Ukraine, and indeed wherever Soviet power extended.

(2) Polish Restoration (1918-39)

Political environment. Poland owed her political restoration to Marshal Pilsudski who set up a provisional government at Warsaw (1918-22) and defended it against Communist counter-attack; to Roman Dmowski who set up a government-in-exile and influenced President Wilson to uphold one of his Fourteen Points: and to Ignace Paderewski, famous pianist, who reconciled the de facto regime with Versailles. For the boundaries of the new state, there never was question of re-establishing the seventeenth century Smolensk-Odessa frontier, but Pilsudski disregarded the Versailles proposal of the "Curzon" or Brest-Litovsk Line and tried to seize some of the territories of medieval Poland. The Reds drove him back to Warsaw but after a critical siege—and a novena— the Poles sallied forth on August 15, 1920, to repulse the attack. The Pripet Marsh Line, midway between the 1772 frontier and the "Curzon Line," was held until recognized by Russia in the Treaty of Riga in 1921. Once established, Poland gained the ill will of her neighbors by frontier disputes with Russia and Germany, and forcible seizure of Vilna from Lithuania (1920) and of Teschen from Czechoslovakia (1938). Eventually poised between Nazism and Communism, Poland tried to live on good terms with both without alliance with either. Within, Poland's heterogeneous population brought together persons formerly living under three governments. Factions and minority groups abounded, and the latter, especially the Jews, suffered persecution. The Polish Constitution of 1921 was modeled on that of 1791. It proclaimed Poland a Republic under a titular president with a ministry responsible to parliament. Ministerial instability and a quarrelsome parliament, however, served Pilsudski as pretexts for assuming a dictatorship in 1926 and holding it until his death in 1935. His successor, Marshal Smigly-Ridz, continued the strong rule with less ability.

Religious situation. According to the 1921 census, Poland possessed 17,000,000 Catholics of the Latin Rite, 3,000,000 Oriental Catholics, 2,800,000 Orthodox, 2,800,000 Jews, and 1,000,000 Protestants. Article 11 of the Polish 1921 Constitution asserted that, "The Roman Catholic Creed, being the creed of the majority of the people, shall have a preponderating authority in the state among other religions which shall enjoy equal treatment." Without becoming an established Church, Catholicity was frankly privileged. During 1925 a Concordat with the Holy See reorganized the Catholic hierarchy with five Latin provinces, one Ruthenian, and one Armenian, adjusting the boundaries of the new sees to correspond to Poland's civil frontiers. The Polish president was to be consulted prior to episcopal nominations, and prelates were required to take an oath of fidelity to the Constitution. Religious instruc-

tion was made obligatory in primary and secondary schools, and all professors, including those of universities, subjected to hierarchical approbation. In practice, the government was accused of intolerance toward national and religious minorities in regard to education. During 1926 a civil divorce law led to friction with canonical jurisdiction. Thus, religion and politics were closely intermingled in the restored Polish state as they had been in the ancient kingdom. If the less happy consequences appeared in the days of the new Poland's prosperity, the link between religion and nationality seems to have been a sustaining force during the long years of vassalage that followed.

(3) POLISH VASSALAGE (1939–58)

Nazi-Russian occupation (1939–45). Unable to choose between the evils of Nazism and Communism, Poland was redivided between Russia and Germany in 1939. But if Poland had sinned venially in persecuting smaller groups, she was punished grievously. During 1939–41 some 1,500,000 Poles were deported by the Soviets and many never returned. Within the Russian zone also, 4,000 priests are known to have been exiled. Some survivors were released in 1941 when the Polish government in exile resumed relations with the Soviets. Meanwhile the Nazis well-nigh exterminated the Jews, as well as ruling over all Poles with extreme harshness. The Nazis arrested 39 of 46 bishops, and of 2,800 clerics imprisoned at Dachau, only 866 were found alive. Archbishop Sapieha of Cracow, later cardinal, was the "Mercier of World War II."

Soviet domination. Nazi collapse brought Russian troops into possession of Poland and their puppet Lublin Government, to which in 1943 the Soviets transferred recognition from the London regime, practically ignored Yalta demands for free, representative government. As a price of continued Soviet-Polish alliance, Stalin insisted on the "Curzon Line," renamed the "Molotov-Ribbentrop Line," Poland obtaining German Silesia and East Prussia in exchange. Under protests from the United States, some gestures toward Democracy were made until 1947 when as a result of a subtly terrorized "plebiscite," the provisional government was proclaimed "constitutional." Poland remained simply a Soviet satellite until 1956 when a nationalist, though Communist, uprising under Gomulka secured for the country a greater measure of autonomy, still under Soviet suzerainty.

Communist persecution. In 1945 the Concordat was repudiated and during 1946 the Ruthenian Catholics were arbitrarily subjected to the Muscovite puppet patriarch. Caritas, a Catholic relief organization, was suppressed in 1949, though a bogus group usurped its name. From 1949 the Reds tried to organize "patriot priests," ostensibly to defend the new Polish-German frontier from revision. Of eleven thousand

priests, an estimated seventeen hundred, mostly ex-Nazi prisoners, joined this movement which denounced German bishops. A political party called the "Catholic Social Club" elected several deputies, but was rebuked by the Vatican. In 1950 the government exacted from the hierarchy an ambiguous endorsement, twisted into an approbation of a Soviet "peace plan." In virtue of this pact, certain paper concessions to the Church were made, and religious instruction was still able to be held. But in 1953 a campaign against the hierarchy commenced with the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski and six other bishops. By the end of the year, 37 priests had been killed, 260 were missing, 350 deported, 700 imprisoned, 700 in exile. Impeded sees were filled by "patriot-priests" as vicars. But though the government could at times lure a thousand "patriot-priests" to meetings, those actually collaborating with its schemes were about one hundred or one per cent of the entire Polish clergy. Church property was nationalized and the press destroyed. In virtue of the October, 1956, uprising, however, the Cardinal was freed and five bishops allowed to resume their sees. The following December it was agreed that religion be an "optional, extracurricular subject, given by teachers appointed jointly by the school and Church authorities, and paid for by the state." Several Catholic publications reappeared, and the favor toward the "patriot-priests" diminished. But the regime continued Communist and termination of anti-Catholic persecution seemed unlikely. Great external demonstrations of Faith, indeed, were followed by a government raid on the shrine of Czestowchowa during the summer of 1958.

B. Habsburg Heirs

(1) Austria (1918-55)

Breakup of the Habsburg monarchy at Versailles destroyed a working economic unit in favor of racial and political distinctions. Austria was faced with a pressing economic problem barely capable of solution within her reduced borders. Though the Allies temporarily righted her finances, she was prevented by neighboring tariff walls from obtaining sufficient foodstuffs or markets for her industrial products. Versailles vetoed an Austrian resolution in favor of union with the nascent German Republic, and in 1931 France blocked even so much as a customs union with that state. Yet either union might well have preserved the Catholic and democratic regimes in both lands.

Austrian parties trying to cope with her domestic problems included the Marxian Social Democrats who were strong in Vienna, and the Christian Democrats prevailing in the rural areas—Soviet envoys were rejected by the workers themselves. The 1920 Constitution strove to prevent domination by either party, but mutual suspicions continued. In the absence of a national army, outlawed by the Peace, Austria was

plagued with the Social Democrat *Schutzbund* and the semifascist *Heimwehr* of Ernst Stahremberg: militia which clashed annually. Christian Democrats, led by Monsignor Ignatz Seipel, chancellor from 1922 to 1924, and 1926 to 1929, administered the central government and preserved good relations with the Vatican with which a concordat was reached in 1934. Nazi rise to power cooled Austrian desires for union with Germany, and Monsignor Seipel's successor, Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss (1932–34), hitherto in favor of it, accepted *Heimwehr* support in order to pursue an independent course. Governmental authority was strongly asserted and a bickering parliament dissolved after the resignation of all its presidents. Thereafter, Austria was ruled by decree. A new constitution proclaimed a "corporate state" purporting to be based on papal teaching, but this never commanded the support of more than a third of the people and was scarcely put into operation. Dollfuss suppressed the Socialist *Schutzbund* by a veritable siege of Vienna, but himself fell victim to a Nazi assassination plot. His successor, Kurt von Schuschnigg (1934–38), upright but inexperienced, tried to avert annexation with Italian support. The forging of the Berlin-Rome Axis doomed independent Austria, which fell to Nazi Germany by a bloodless invasion and a ninety-nine per cent "plebiscite," April, 1938.

Nazi Anschluss caused Austrian Catholics to share the trials of their German brethren from 1938 to 1945, although as co-nationalists of the *Herrenvolk* they were spared some of the persecution of Slavic Catholics. The 1934 Concordat was practically abrogated, schools closed, and property confiscated. All public support or subsidies of the Catholic Church ceased in April, 1940, and this arrangement has been accepted as permanent.

Post-War Austria was reconstituted as an independent state, but lay under American-British-French-Soviet occupation until 1955. The 1945 elections gave the new Catholic People's Party eighty-four seats, the Social Democrats seventy-six, and the Communists but five. Although the veteran Socialist statesman Renner was given the titular presidency (1946–50), the more influential chancellorship went to the Catholic Leopold Figl (1945–53). Under him and his successor Julius Raab Austria regained her freedom which she retains precariously just outside the Iron Curtain. After 1945 most of the confiscated church property was restored, Catholic schools reopened, and deported priests returned. Catholic political newspapers, however, were not revived: greater stress was now laid upon distinction of Church and state.

(2) HUNGARY (1918–56)

Brief Communism. The Peace Settlement following World War I had deprived Hungary of two-thirds of her land and three-fifths of her people. When Michael Karolyi, a Liberal nobleman, tried to establish

a Republican form of government, he found only middle-class support, the nobility and peasants holding aloof. The Allies gave little co-operation in providing food, so that Béla Kun, a half-mad journalist who had been converted to Communism in Russia, could capitalize on the emergency. Overthrowing the discredited Republic, he set up a Red dictatorship which decreed nationalization of land and industry. But his reign of terror provoked an aristocratic reaction which had better success than in Russia: Béla Kun was committed to an insane asylum and a Conservative regime set up.

Kingless monarchy. From 1920 to 1945 Hungary was officially a kingdom, provisionally ruled by a regent, Admiral Nicholas Horthy—who no longer had a navy in postwar landlocked Hungary. An agrarian regime was begun which worked fairly well until the world depression reduced the market for Hungarian wheat. Though a Calvinist, Horthy respected the predominantly Catholic religion of the Hungarians. But despite protests of the Catholic hierarchy, many Catholics as well as Protestants, claiming that Bela Kun's rule had been Jewish inspired, retaliated with violent anti-Semitism. Jews were forbidden to lease land, own more than one house, hold any position in the civil or military service, and efforts were made to deprive them of cultural positions and advantages. Subsequent political alliance with Nazi Germany naturally did nothing to discourage this sentiment, and Hungarians co-operated with the Nazis in dismembering Czechoslovakia and in invading the Balkans. Hungarians as a whole opposed the Nazis, but were forced into war against the Allies. Between the wars, the Catholic social leader was Bishop Prohaszka, the future Cardinal Mindszenty's mentor.

Communist domination returned in the wake of retreating Nazis as Soviet armies "liberated" Hungary. Horthy was replaced by a series of puppet presidents and premiers, but real power lay with the Communist boss Matthias Rakosi, one of the commissars of Kun's 133-day dictatorship in 1919. Having learned the lesson of overeagerness, Rakosi delayed in applying full Red pressure. During November, 1945 elections the Reds claimed only seventeen per cent of the votes, allowing the Small Landowners' Party to lead with fifty-seven per cent. But early in 1947 the usual Communist techniques were applied to win, with their Popular Front allies, sixty per cent of the vote. Attacks on Catholic education commenced, and when the hierarchy rallied to its defense they were indicted. Cardinal Mindszenty was railroaded to prison in 1949 on charges of collaboration with Soviet foes, and in 1951 Archbishop Grosz was sentenced to fifteen years.

Catacomb defiance. The Hungarian hierarchy refrained from useless protests, though the pope denounced these persecutions in consistory, and the Holy Office in 1949 issued censures on Catholics claiming mem-

bership in the Communist Party. By 1951 some fourteen hundred priests were reported under arrest, and at least one hundred thousand of the faithful had been deported. In 1952 Commissar Horvath deplored a "clerical reaction," and the Soviets repeatedly shifted their governmental puppets. Stalin's death provoked protests against collectivism, and Rakosi was ousted for Imre Nagy, a non-Communist. After two years of economic failure, the Hungarians staged a desperate revolt which freed Cardinal Mindszenty, who took refuge in the American embassy. But Russian military might was able to crush external dissent in blood, and religious instruction, resumed during the rising, was again outlawed in January, 1957. A new propaganda campaign against the clergy was launched.

(3) Czechoslovakia (1918–56)

Political independence. The Czechs advocated Liberalism of the French anticlerical type, and their President Masaryk (1918–35), ex-Catholic and agnostic, enjoyed support from Clemenceau. Masaryk and his successor Beneš (1935–38; 1945–48) were both capable administrators who followed a Francophile policy in preference to alliance with Soviet Russia. In February, 1920, a constitution modeled on that of France favored Czechs and Slovaks against Ruthenian, Magyar, and German Sudeten minorities. Though proportional representation was supposed to protect these minorities, each group resented the concessions made to the others. Ruthenians were denied rights because the masses were illiterate and "dominated by Magyars and Jews." Catholic peasant Slovaks complained of Czech anticlerical industrial ascendancy, and Father Hlinka's Catholic People's Party won concessions in 1929 and 1937. Hlinka and his successor, Monsignor Tiso, frowned upon by the Vatican, led the Slovaks in the Nazi direction, while Konrad Henlein's Sudeten Germans sought Nazi intervention. Generally, however, prosperity prevailed, for the state had obtained eighty per cent of Austro-Hungarian industry, with the iron and coal resources on which it depended.

Religious rivalry. Though three-fourths of the people were nominally Catholic, dissident groups were more influential. In 1919 the government began to expropriate large estates for redistribution to peasants. When church lands were taken with paltry compensation, pious Slovak peasants clashed with Czech Liberals. The government, objecting to German and Magyar bishops, sponsored in 1920 a "National Church," feted John Hus, and broke off relations with the Vatican. At its height, the schism claimed a membership of 1,300,000 and obtained possession of a number of Catholic churches. But sturdy Catholic resistance was aroused and in 1928 the government abandoned its attacks and reached

a modus vivendi with the Holy See. Diocesan boundaries were redrawn to correspond with national frontiers; some confiscated land was restored; provision was made for religious instruction; and the government was allowed some say in the choice of bishops. A few ritual concessions (e.g., chanting the Epistle and Gospel in Slovenian) were made by the Holy See.

Nazi persecution followed soon after the Munich Conference awarded Czech territories to Germany. Tiso became a Nazi collaborator in 1939 when Hitler incorporated the whole of Czechoslovakia; once the Nazis had fallen, Tiso was executed—without Vatican intervention. The Nazis withdrew state aid from Catholic education, and curbed all ecclesiastical organizations. They arrested 371 priests, of whom 73 died in prison, and 70,000 persons were confined to concentration camps.

Red persecution. Beneš returned in 1945 with a pledge of collaboration with Soviet Russia. He found himself practically subject to the local Communist boss, Klement Gottwald, who soon replaced him as president (1948–53). The Reds nationalized industry and wooed peasants with a schismatic church. In June, 1949, the Holy See had to denounce a Red-sponsored "Catholic Action" group. In February, 1948, Archbishop Beran had been put under house arrest, and from 1949 general prosecution of bishops and priests got under way, with the government intruding collaborationist "vicars" into the places of those arrested. By 1955 thirteen bishops had been thus replaced by "patriotic vicars." Despite the revolts in Hungary and Poland during 1956, Communist control of Czechoslovakia continued to be one of the most complete.

105. ITALIAN FASCISM

A. Fascist Politics (1918–45)

(1) Fascist Origins

Pre-Fascist situation. Democratic government had never been a reality in Savoyard Italy. Cliques of professional politicians despoiled the land in turn by tacit agreement, perhaps the only thing on which they agreed. In 1919 the Catholic *Partito Popolare* of Don Luigi Sturzo secured 120 seats in parliament, and tried to push through social and agrarian reforms. But the anticlericals would neither co-operate with the Catholics nor remove the social disorders which bred Socialism, represented by 156 Marxist deputies. From 1919 the Socialists used strikes to paralyze industry. The capitalists and industrial managers were kidnapped or killed and propertied classes terrorized. By September, 1920, they had six hundred industries under their control while the Liberal ministries of Giolitti, Bonomi, and Facta seemed bankrupt in money and ideas. Inflation contributed to disorganization of industry and trade; Italy's resources were inadequate for a rapidly growing population, and na-

tional pride was wounded by the Allies' refusal to grant all the Italian territorial demands, e.g., Fiume, Trentino. The time was ripe for energetic action.

Benito Mussolini (1886–1945), an ex-Socialist educated in Italy and Switzerland under the syndicalist Sorrel, had broken with the Socialists in regard to patriotic support of Italian participation in World War I. After the war he and other ex-soldiers organized the *Fascisti di combatto* (1919). With clubs, guns, and castor oil these Fascists set out to beat the Marxists at their own game of violence. Rightly or wrongly, they took credit for a lessening of the strikes. They fused with the poet D'Annunzio's Nationalists who had protested the government's pacific Balkan policy. During a national Fascist congress early in 1922 Mussolini threatened to seize rule if it were not surrendered to him. When in October, 1922, Fascists commenced a "march on Rome," Premier Facta requested a state of siege order from the king. Victor Emmanuel III, however, refused, and replaced Facta with Mussolini. It was the little king's last independent act until he dismissed Il Duce in 1943.

Fascist theory had been ultimately based on Hegelian philosophy, but more proximately on Nietzsche's double morality: a master code for the strong and virile, a "Christian-Democratic" morality for the weak or humble. A new race of supermen were to discard the latter "servile" standard, and glorify reckless force. At first Mussolini professed no official theory, for he claimed that truth was less to be had by reasoning than by intuition: "Before all I trust to my insight. What it is I don't know, but it is infallible." The masses, he contended, were emotional and irrational. Fascism would force such men to be good by causing them to conform to their real wills: e.g., a governmental fiat of the state. Guided by Il Duce, the Fascist state would lay down the law, for all men would prefer this if they really knew what was best for them. Since the Hegelian concept of the state is "the divine idea on earth," Fascism remained in absolute possession of the truth, and had no need of "dogmas, saints, salvation, heaven, charlatans." All is in the state and for it, though in practice some expedient concessions might temporarily be made to the Holy See. In aspiration, however, Fascists remained totalitarian, an absolute dictatorship of one man and his party.

(2) Fascist Rule

Government. Mussolini at first secured dictatorial power for one year, and employed it to replace opponents with Fascists. In 1923 the *Asservo Law* decreed that the party receiving the largest vote would be entitled to two thirds of parliamentary seats. Black Shirts carefully supervised the 1924 elections in which Fascism was credited with sixty per cent of the popular vote. When Matteotti, a Socialist deputy, accused

the Fascists of bribery (1924), he seems to have been murdered and all legalism abandoned. During 1925–26, local elections were abolished, and podestas appointed from Rome. Mussolini took over eight departments himself in the central government, and forbade business to be so much as discussed without his leave. All educational officials were required to be Fascists, and teachers were forbidden to criticize the regime. Rival parties and secret societies, including the Socialists and Masons, were disbanded. By the electoral law of 1928, Fascists alone might be nominated, and these the voters might merely accept or reject. Thereafter Fascism, which won many admirers from its exposé of democratic weaknesses, was incorporated into the national constitution. A Fascist Grand Council, presided over by Il Duce, formulated policies, named members who were above the law and immune from arrest. Youths were organized according to age groups: *Balilla, Avant-Guardia, Giovenezza;* all other associations were banned, and Fascist youth activities so timed as often to conflict with religious duties.

Pseudo-corporatism. Between 1925 and 1928 employers and employees of eight trades were formed into syndicates, to which later was added another for professions. Strikes and lockouts were banned. During 1928 these syndicates proposed a thousand nominees for directors, from whom the Fascist Grand Council chose four hundred. In 1930–31 a national council of these corporations was formed as an advisory group, and during 1934 this was redistributed into twenty-two "corporations." By 1939 this council supplanted the Chamber of Deputies as the national legislature, but this was but the substitution of one rubber-stamp body for another. Fascists were not averse to having their economic dictatorship mistaken for Christian corporatism, but there was no true trade autonomy in Italy and Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno* feared that "the state is substituting itself in the place of private initiative, instead of limiting itself to necessary and sufficient help and assistance."

Foreign affairs at first exalted and then destroyed Fascism. Il Duce dreamed of making the Adriatic an Italian lake: he bombed Corfu in reprisal for the deaths of members of an Italian commission (1923); he reappropriated Fiume (1924); he annexed Albania (1939). From 1934 to 1936 he successfully defied the sanctions of the League of Nations in order to conquer Ethiopia, thus avenging a rankling Italian reverse of 1898. Cries of *"Tunisia, Savoja, Nizza"* were permitted to street agitators until in 1940 Mussolini allied himself with Hitler to "stab France in the back." But in so doing the Italian dictator fatally antagonized the *Pax Brittanica-Americana* in a vain attempt to resurrect the *Pax Romana* and *Mare Nostrum.* Dismissed in 1943 in the course of severe military defeats, Mussolini lingered on as a Nazi puppet until he died in miserable fashion at the hands of irregular troops. He had displayed intelligence

and statesmanship in large measure, but during the years of his power had revealed no true appreciation of supernatural Christianity. Striving to make Italy a great power, he removed her from the ranks of European powers. It is thought-provoking that after the vaunted Fascist suppression of Marxism by violence, the Italian scene after Fascism greatly resembled the social chaos preceding the "march on Rome."

B. Fascist-Papal Polemics

(1) CONFLICTING IDEALS

Mussolini's view of Christianity—whatever his private opinion—was officially expressed in reporting the Lateran Pact to the Senate: "Within the state, the Church is not sovereign and it is not even free. It is not free because in its institutions and its men it is subjected to the general laws of the state and is even subject to the special clauses of the Concordat. . . . Christianity was born in Palestine, but became Catholic in Rome. If it had been confined to Palestine it would in all probability never have been more than one of the numerous sects which flourished in that overheated environment. . . . The chances are that it would have perished and left no trace. . . . We have buried the popes' temporal power, and not resuscitated it. . . . Any other regime than ours may believe it useful to renounce the education of the younger generations. In this field I am intractable. Education must be ours. Our children must be educated in our religious faith, but we must round out this education and we need to give our youths a sense of virility and the power of conquest. . . ."

Papal rebuttal, presented the next day, May 14, 1929, was firm: "The state should interest itself in education, but the state is not made to absorb and annihilate the family, which would be absurd and against nature, for the family comes before society and before the state. The state should perfect the activities of the family in full correspondence with the desires of the father and mother, and it should especially respect the divine right of the Church in education. . . . We cannot admit that in its educational activities the state shall try to raise up conquerors or to encourage conquests. What one state does in this line all the others can do. What would happen if all the states educated their people for conquest? Does such education contribute to general world pacification? We can never agree with anything which restricts or denies the right which nature and God gave the Church and the family in the field of education. On this point we are not merely intractable; we are uncompromising. We are uncompromising just as we would be forced to be uncompromising if asked: how much does two plus two make? Two plus two makes four and it is not our fault if it does not make five or six or fifty. When it is a question of saving a few souls and

impeding the accomplishment of greater damage to souls, we feel courage to treat with the devil in person—and it was exactly with the purpose of preventing greater evil that we negotiated with the devil some time ago when the fate of our dear Catholic Scouts was decided. We have made great sacrifices in order to prevent greater evils, but we gave witness to the great grief we felt at being so much restricted. Our rights and principles cannot even be discussed. We have no material force to sustain our uncompromising attitude, but this is no disadvantage, for truth and right have no need for material force." [10] And when Mussolini published his speech to the senate, the pope in a letter to Cardinal Gasparri, printed June 5, termed this discourse "heretical, and worse than heretical." He went on to say that he did not object to the statement that other religions were freely admitted in the Italian state, "provided it is clearly and loyally understood that the Catholic religion, and the Catholic religion alone, is the state religion with all the logical and juridical consequences, and provided that . . . the Catholic religion is not merely one of the many tolerated or permitted religions, but is what the letter and spirit of the Lateran Treaties and Concordat make it." [11]

(2) Occasions for Dispute

Catholic Action contest. The Fascists momentarily withheld attack, but the semi-official *L'Impero* retorted: "The pope . . . supposes that he can censure Il Duce. . . . Il Duce is not subject to discussion. . . . Fascism alone is able to criticize Fascism, and as for criticizing Il Duce, no one can nor must do it. . . . Mussolini, let none forget, is the man of providence." Yet when Catholic Action began to increase its membership, Fascists accused them of being Don Sturzo's old political party in disguise. In 1931 violence followed on verbal attacks in the Fascist press. Priests were insulted and threatened in public; a portrait of the pope, labeled "traitor," was paraded in the streets. Several religious houses were broken into, and a few small bombs thrown. *Osservatore Romano* was confiscated at news stands. The pope replied during June, 1931, with the encyclical, *Non Abbiamo Bisogno,* smuggled out of Italy by Monsignors Spellman and Vanneufville. This repudiated Fascist *"Statolatry,"* and branded "unlawful as it stands" the oath demanded a Fascist youth: "I swear to obey Il Duce's orders without questioning them, and to serve the cause of the Fascist Revolution with all my force and if necessary with my blood." In retaliation, Mussolini ordered all Fascists to leave Catholic Action. Cardinal Maffi broke through Fascist

---

[10] George Seldes, *The Vatican: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1934), pp. 383–87.

[11] *Ibid.,* pp. 383–87.

censorship with the tirade: "You race of Cain . . . cursed in time, cursed in eternity." But through the mediatorship of Padre Tacchi-Venturi, S.J., Cardinal Gasparri opened negotiations with Mussolini, and at last on September 3, 1931, Vatican and Quirinal announced that "Catholic Action . . . is in harmony with its ends as a religious and spiritual order; . . . does not interfere in any way in politics; . . . does not set before itself any task of a trade-union order. . . ." An audience of Il Duce with the pope, February 12, 1932, marked a truce. Fascist decrees against Catholic Action were rescinded.

Ethiopian invasion. Don Sturzo was of the opinion that the majority of Italian clerical and lay publicists defended the Ethiopian contest as a "war for Christian civilization," of the merits of which Italy, and not the League, was judge. Outside Italy, however, most Catholics denounced the invasion, Cardinal Verdier of Paris being quite outspoken. The pope, obliged to neutrality by the Lateran Pact, was in a difficult position. In an allocution of August 27, 1935, however, he avoided undiscriminating nationalism. Pius XI remarked that if the threatened conflict, as was believed abroad, were a war of conquest, an offensive war, it would be "truly an unjust war." There was talk of a war of defense and expansion, but it ought to be recalled that "the right of defense has its limits and moderation that must not be overstepped if defense is not to be culpable." And the *Osservatore Romano* asserted that "the need of expansion is not a right in itself; it is a fact that must be taken into account, but which is not identified with lawful right." But Mussolini feared neither pope nor League and overran Ethiopia, setting a precedent for later Axis seizures.

World War II. Pope Pius XII included Italy in his peace efforts despite Fascist designation of him as *persona non grata* before the 1939 conclave. In December, 1939, the pope returned a royal visit by himself visiting the Quirinal. When the *Osservatore Romano* reported the war objectively, including papal letters of sympathy to invaded Belgium and Holland, Fascists again confiscated its stocks and muzzled it. The Fascist government constrained Vatican freedom, especially in communicating with the American ambassador, Myron Taylor, but the end of the war revealed that the Holy See had survived another regime that had sought to dominate it.

C. Fascist Wake (1945–58)

(1) DEMOCRATIC EXPERIMENT

Mussolini's fall discredited the monarchy which had so long acquiesced in his dictatorship, and belated alliance with the Liberal Allies failed to restore its prestige. During 1946 a plebiscite expelled Umberto II and proclaimed the Italian Republic. A new constitution, put into

effect on January 1, 1948, proclaimed complete political, social, and economic Democracy, a "democratic republic founded on labor." Women were given equal civil rights with men. The Lateran Treaties were reconfirmed, but freedom of other religions asserted. From 1945 to 1953 Alcide di Gasperi, a disciple of Don Luigi Sturzo, presided over a coalition which successfully maintained itself against a revived Marxist menace represented by Togliati's Communists. Di Gasperi's less influential successors carried on an even more precarious ascendancy of the more conservative elements.

(2) The Papacy and Italian Communism

In preparation for the elections of April, 1948, Pius XII instructed the Lenten preachers that, "It is the strict duty of all who are entitled to vote, both men and women, to take part in the elections. Anybody who abstains, especially because of laziness or cowardice, commits a grave sin, a moral transgression. Everyone must vote according to the dictates of his conscience. Now it is evident that the voice of one's conscience urges every sincere Catholic to give his vote to those candidates or electoral lists that offer really sufficient guarantee for the safeguarding of the rights of God and of his soul, for the true welfare of individuals, of families, and of society in keeping with God's law and moral Christian doctrine." This election resulted in a clear majority for anti-Marxist parties, and the immediate peril of a Communist triumph receded. But political divisions remained among the Rightist groups—democratic, monarchical, even neo-fascist—and Marxism remained a continuing threat. Signor Luigi Gedda, professor of psychology, exposed many Communist ruses during the elections. For Communists held open air meetings, promising the peasants land and repairs. Some of their leaders did not scruple to use the Sign of the Cross or to attend Mass with their audience. On the Catholic side, Cardinal Lercaro, Padre Lombardi, the Mayor of Florence, La Pira, and the "Don Camillo Papers" courted popular favor. Despite some clerical scandals and defections of priests to Communism, the Labor Chaplains and "Flying Friars" countered the Red denunciations of the *Democristiani*. By 1956 Italy had 3,251,000 enrolled in Catholic Action, about a million more than the registered Communist membership.

106. GERMAN NAZISM

A. *Weimar Prelude* (*1918–33*)

(1) Democratic Problems

Political upheaval. Bowing to Wilson's ultimatum that the allies would not treat with the Kaiser, Germans cast out not only the federal but also the local monarchies. A constitutional assembly met at Weimar

during January, 1919, in order to fashion a republic. A new constitution provided for universal suffrage, a bill of rights, initiative and referendum. The president, chosen for seven years, had merely titular authority save when he used Article 48 to govern by decree during an emergency. The chancellor was made responsible to the Reichstag when in session, but to the president during adjournment. The Reichstag represented the people proportionally; the Reichsrat or Senate represented states, considerably reduced in power.

Religious status. The Republic separated Church from state, a step usually of benefit to the Catholic minority. Protestant monarchical *summepiscopate* ended, and Lutheran state establishments became private corporations, though sometimes enjoying financial privileges. During 1922 some twenty-two Lutheran groups formed the German Evangelical Federation which endured until Nazi attacks. For Catholics, disestablishment swept away relics of Febronian legislation interfering with discipline, education and communication with Rome, and terminated vestiges of the *Kulturkampf* against religious orders. Favorable concordats were made with the Holy See by Bavaria (1924), Prussia (1929), and Baden (1932). Financial subsidies in lieu of past confiscations were continued. Although the Socialist President Ebert (1919–25) was personally somewhat unfriendly toward the Catholic Church, his successor, Paul von Hindenburg (1925–34), was scrupulously fair. The Weimar era witnessed free development of German Catholic Action in many fields: youth organizations, social-labor movements, the Catholic press, and liturgical revival.

Weimar woes. Political and social, rather than religious, issues divided the new Republic. Socialists and Centrists struggled heroically to meet the harsh terms of Versailles, but leadership was deficient, the party system undeveloped, and the Moderate Coalition was attacked from each side for selling out Germany: Communists accused the Socialists of repudiating Marx; Ludendorf and Hitler developed the "stab in the back" theory that Germany had lost the war through the cosmopolitan wiles of Socialists, Jews, and Catholics. Yet under Gustav Stresemann, foreign minister and leading statesman from 1923 to 1929, Germany's rehabilitation seemed possible. His death in 1929 coincided with the world depression which ended the American loans on which German revival depended. Centrists divided: a left wing led by Erzberger and Wirth believed in co-operation with Socialism; Rightists under Kaas and Bruening leaned toward monarchy. Chancellor Bruening (1930–32) undertook to rule by presidential decree in default of a parliamentary majority. His efforts to achieve economic readjustment through stringent economy and orthodox finance imposed sacrifices which lent fuel to Red and Nazi agitation. French veto of an Austro-German economic bloc

and refusal of loans unless involving political commitments frustrated Bruening abroad. When he proposed agrarian reforms in the Prussian Junker sanctum he forfeited Hindenburg's confidence. The president turned to the Nationalists: Papen, a renegade Centrist, Schleicher, a military politician, and at length—Hitler.

(2) NAZI EXPLOITATION

Adolf Hitler (1889–1945), nee Schicklgruber in Austria, was socially and psychologically maladjusted. Poorly educated and unhappy in childhood, by 1914 he had become an impoverished artist, dreaming of Wagnerian glory. His prolonged war service brought him little but fatigue and chagrin, and he nursed personal and national grudges against "Jewish war traitors" at the close of World War I. In 1920 he joined a small workers' party at whose meetings he discovered latent oratorical powers. Under his leadership this group was transformed, with the accent henceforth on nationalism, and began to attract the discontented.

Nazi ideology, once completed, comprised these elements: 1) *Racism* and eugenics were stressed. From men like MacDougal, Stoddard, Gobinow, Chamberlain, and Gunther was evolved a theory that men are innately unequal and continue so despite environment. Superiority is determined by blood and is rare; in fact, it is confined largely to Aryan, especially Nordic, races. Nordics, predominating in Germany, were truthful, intelligent, taciturn, cautious, steady, technical, warlike, dominant. Theirs had been the great deeds of the past. At present Jewish contamination must be cast out of the German nation so that a pure Nordic strain can be restored. Anglo-American ideas of equality to the contrary, inferior races need domination. In his *Myth of the Twentieth Century*, Alfred Rosenberg gave the movement its *Weltanschauung:* a racial world outlook based on "blood and soil." This is "inexpressible, ineluctable, untranslatable, infallible"—and, it might be added, quite unscientific. 2) *Irrationalism.* People, Nazi philosophers declared, are for the most part stupid and feminine: they do not think. Strong men feel and enjoy intuition. The state ought to cultivate strong bodies and emotional attitudes, not logic, for "feeling decides more accurately than reason." This theory Hitler used to justify his "leader-principle," a rationalization of his own brilliant, but eventually tragically fallible, intuition. For the Nordic, morals differ: what advances the group is moral; what profits the Nazis must be right. Physics, science, religion, even mathematics, must be tinged with Nazi views. 3) *Idealism.* Hegel had stressed mind and idea, but the Nazis reversed this to fit their blood theory. Their creed demanded virtue more than pleasure: Liberalism is selfish: it says "I." Christianity is all-embracing: it invites "All." The

Nazis, however, cultivate an elite: "We." Self-abnegation subjecting an individual to the folk must be the Nazi ideal. Only supermen ought to rule, and they will be determined by force, not ballots. 4) *Anti-Semitism.* Since democracy is supposedly Jewish and unfair to the superman, the Jew, already unpopular in Germany, was made a Nazi scapegoat, as Hitler's private phobia was utilized as the personification of evil. Anything the Nazis opposed was discovered to be Jewish—and at length, of course, Christianity.

Nazi campaigning. Hitler, who claimed to have studied Barnum's showmanship and American gangster methods, acquired a shrewd propaganda chief in Goebbels. From 1921 Hitler, scorning consistency or truth, adapted his views to the audience and grievance of the moment. His Nazis appealed to all the discontented and uprooted, and to the middle class, ruined by the currency collapse, they promised economic reforms. Capitalists were assured of protection against Communism; workers were guaranteed jobs by a Nazi regime. Monarchists were led to hope in a restoration of the throne. Patriots were aroused by denunciation of the Versailles "dictated peace," and the continuing German political and military inferiority among nations. Youth were inveigled by insignia, marching, noise, games. Hitler's first bid for power through revolt in Bavaria during 1923 merely led to a jail sentence. He utilized this to turn out a Nazi masterpiece, *Mein Kampf.* Soon liberated, his appeal thereafter varied in inverse ratio to economic prosperity.

B. Nazi Dictatorship (1933–45)

(1) SECULAR PROGRAM

Advent to power. Papen, hoping to use but control Hitler, persuaded the senile president to name Hitler chancellor, January, 1933. As vice-chancellor, Papen expected to remain the power behind the throne, but Hitler, whose party was in a minority in both the ministry and parliament, dissolved the Reichstag and called for new elections. His lieutenant Goering was put in charge of the police, and during a five-week electoral campaign the opposition's press, radio time, etc. were curtailed. A fire in the Reichstag, probably Nazi-engineered, was blamed on the Communists and the latter were ruled ineligible in the voting. Even so, Hitler's Nazis won but forty-four of the seats, though by union with Hugenberg's Nationalists they could control fifty-two per cent of the Reichstag. That body on March 5, 1933, voted Hitler a limited four-year dictatorship, the Centrists under Kaas joining the rest over Bruening's protest. This was the Reichstag's last independent act, for on July 14, 1933, Hitler felt strong enough to proclaim one party-government in his Gestapo-run state. Friction, indeed, arose between the Nazi Socialist left wing and a Nationalist-Militarist right wing. In June, 1934, Hitler weak-

ened the former by crushing Roehm's old storm troopers in a blood purge. The Rightist army was humored until 1938 when it was partly conciliated and partly intimidated. When Hindenburg died in August, 1934, Hitler simply merged the presidency and chancellorship and declared himself the "Reichsführer of the Third Reich."

Nazi success may be attributed to economic depression, resentment at Versailles terms, a Hegelian tradition of statism, dread of Communism as exploited by the Nazis, collapse of parliamentarianism through inexperience and dissension, and Hitler's sense of mass psychology and shrewd timing. Once in power, the Nazis mobilized all propaganda means under Goebbels, the repetition of whose bold lies contributed to success. "Co-ordination" then became the euphemism under which all German life was subjected to Nazi rule. Gradually religion, literature, the press, broadcasting, films, education were Nazified; anything anti-Nazi was outlawed. Laborers were put into state unions; all other workers' groups were dissolved. If private ownership survived, it was minutely regulated. Leaders were taken from managers of factories, and these were obliged to work out personnel problems under the eye of a Nazi observer. Large Junker estates were not broken up; rather, farms less than 278 acres were entailed to create a new Nazi nobility. *Autarkie* was advocated for foodstuffs, and ersatz (substitutes) became a fine art. Dr. Schacht as finance minister won a favorable balance of trade by repudiating debts and intimidating buyers. Barter with small countries was successful and regimentation of the entire economic field geared a nation for war. This policy seemed to pay off from 1938 as neighboring countries and their resources fell to the Nazis.

Nazi-dämmerung. Hitler had predicted a thousand years for the Third Reich as for the First. But his foreign propaganda erred; at least its frank arrogance and brutality found fewer protagonists and white-washers than Communist crimes and lies. Nazi Germany had strained every nerve to reverse the verdict of World War I, and its armies far surpassed the military conquests of the Second Reich. But peace with Britain and Russia could not be had, and behind these stood the United States, involved in the conflict by Japanese treachery. Eventually, superior Allied manpower and resources overcame the soldiers of the Third Reich and pushed them back into their own lands. Amid a hail of bombs Hitler evaded human justice by committing suicide in his Berlin hide-out.

(2) Religious Persecution

Domination of Protestantism. The religious counterpart of Nazism, the "German Christians," with varying degrees of enthusiasm called for a "positive, virile, Aryan Christianity." Their candidate for *Reichs-*

bischof, Chaplain Ludwig Mueller, received Hitler's endorsement as against the German Evangelical Federation. In July, 1933, this Federation was legally replaced by a "German Evangelical Church," a centralized body to be "co-ordinated" by Mueller. But a "New Reformation Movement" of twenty-five hundred Lutheran ministers objected to the anti-Semitism of the new church, and were upheld in their stand by Protestant ecumenical groups. Later "German Christian" demands for rewriting the Bible and removal of the cross provoked a "Pastors' Evangelical League" led by Martin Niemöller. Its leaders were arrested or exiled and all Protestant opposition forced underground by 1938. Finally the *Reichsbischof* was supplanted by a lay minister of religion, Hans Kerrl, who demanded a "Nordic Christianity" while Rosenberg campaigned for a "National Reich Church" with a thirty-point program involving pure paganism or pantheism.

Catholic concordat. In regard to the Catholic Church, of which he had been nominally a member, Hitler adopted a temporizing policy, influenced by his hope of annexing the Catholic Saarland by League plebiscite in 1935. He used Papen to negotiate a Concordat with the Holy See, July 20, 1933. By its terms Catholics were to renounce political activity through Centrism in exchange for religious liberty. Hitler easily promised all that was demanded by the Holy See, with, it seems, the deliberate intention of repudiating his pledges as soon as practicable. Hitler's real views were: "Religions are all alike, no matter what they call themselves. They have no future—certainly none for the Germans. Fascism, if it likes, may come to terms with the Church. So shall I, why not? That will not prevent me from tearing up Christianity root and branch and annihilating it in Germany."

Persecution of the Church began in earnest in 1935 and proved severe despite Nazi disclaimers of its existence. At first every effort was made to discredit the clergy by cartoons, loud-speaking trucks, "exposés," and trials of clerics for alleged moral lapses. Chanceries were searched for incriminating documents, communication with Rome hindered, mails and phones tapped. Fines and imprisonment were inflicted upon outspoken clerics, but though the Nazis claimed 7,000 convictions, actually of 25,634 German priests but 49 were accused and 21 convicted of moral frailty. Nazi propaganda represented the Church as unpatriotic, hoarding wealth; its clerics as idle and avaricious. Catholic Action in all its forms was curtailed by threats, decrees, or violence administered by party thugs. Catholic workers were forced into state unions; Catholic youths into the *Hitler-Jugend;* Catholic welfare organizations restricted or abolished. Catholic schools were at first annoyed, and then, by April 1, 1940, wholly converted to state or party uses. Religious instruction by the clergy was confined to the church premises or the home, while anti-

Christian teaching was imparted in the public schools. Catholic libraries were gradually "expurgated," and the Catholic press, especially after its bold publication of *Mit Brennender Sorge* in 1937, confiscated or muzzled. The sermon—carefully monitored by Nazi observers—remained the sole means of communication for the hierarchy, but the German bishops spoke out boldly and repeatedly. Clerics were forced into military service and recruitment cut off. Brazen use of euthanasia on mental defectives, Jews, and other political prisoners revealed a regime that rejected not merely Christian but natural standards of morality. Everywhere in Germany the Cross of Christ was faced with the horrible caricature: the "twisted cross" of the Nazi Swastika.

C. Bonn Aftermath (1945–58)

(1) POLITICAL REHABILITATION

After the catastrophic defeat of World War II, Germany was left partitioned among the victors. When these fell out among themselves, their occupied sectors suffered, especially the Russian-controlled Eastern portion which the Soviets strove to reform in their own image and isolate from the rest of the world—apparently with the aid of some ex-Nazi die-hards. From 1947 American economic aid encountered Russian attempts to seal off Berlin which were foiled by the "Berlin air-lift." Meanwhile an Allied Military Court tried the surviving Nazi leaders, sentencing to death (1946) Goering, Ribbentrop, Frick, Rosenberg, Frank Ley, Sauckel, Seyss-Inquart, Streicher, and others. Presumably Goebbels and Gestapo chief Himmler had shared Hitler's suicide. After this questionably legal retribution, the Allies in 1949 mellowed to the extent of permitting the establishment of a West German Republic—which the Reds imitated with an East German satellite. In the West, the new Bonn Republic was similar to the Weimar regime. While Social Democrat Theodor Heuss held the titular presidency (1949–59), real political power lay with the chancellor. The latter office was filled during the Bonn regime's first decade by the able Konrad Adenauer, a Catholic. His leadership rested upon a coalition of former Centrists, the Christian Democrats, and the Socialists. Without concessions to Communism, Adenauer succeeded in rehabilitating Germany economically and in regaining the Saar in 1957. But Germany remained disunited and bordered on a militarized Soviet Union.

(2) RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

The Catholic Church, despite its opposition to Nazism, had to suffer from the consequences of that regime. Vast numbers of churches had been destroyed wholly or in part during the War, and many priests were slain. In addition, it is estimated that 800 priests had perished at Dachau.

Providentially, however, of an estimated 24,000,000 German Catholics, all but 2,700,000 were in the Western Zone. West Germany received at least 10,000,000 refugees from East Germany and Central Europe. Many of these were Catholics, and added to the tasks of a clergy which had lost over 2,000 priests under the Nazi regime, besides being deprived of vocations to the priesthood, brotherhood, and sisterhood. But makeshift Mass stations were opened, evening Masses utilized to the utmost, and adult religious training classes held. The Catholic school system, suppressed in 1940, was revived wherever possible. If there had been many apostasies during the Nazi persecution, some of these lapsed members had returned, while quite a few new converts were made. Thus, during 1955 Goethe and three other Lutheran ministers were received, while their common experience under the Nazis had promoted greater sympathy between Catholics and Lutherans.

107. FRENCH CATHOLIC REVIVAL

A. *The Third Republic* (*1918–44*)

(1) World War I and Reconstruction (1918–32)

Transition. Prewar France had been in a frenzied condition since the Franco-Prussian War. Its *élan* had been nourished on hatred for Germany which alone united a host of irreconcilable parties. Desire for revenge had been sufficient to rally even supposedly cosmopolitan Socialists to France's support in 1914, and the military peril, combined with clerical loyalty, had eased the anticlerical animus. After an exhausting struggle, victory had been won at the cost of over a million casualties among a declining population of forty million. After the war, then, the problems of reconstruction and of security were paramount.

Reparations. Local districts, devastated by the war, sent in reports of losses often estimated at five times the 1914 valuation. Despite a depreciated franc, these claims were too high, but the state reimbursed private individuals lavishly in the expectation of being recompensed from German reparation payments. But while a "Budget of Recoverable Expenditures" liberally and corruptly dispensed 21 billion francs, Germany eventually repaid only 250 millions. This and other causes produced severe economic crisis. In fear of Communism, Rightists formed a bloc in which Millerand, Briand, and Poincaré were prominent. An attempt to make the Germans pay, culminating in seizure of the Ruhr, ended in failure. This and the Leftist dissatisfaction with Rightist leniency toward clericalism, overthrew the bloc in the 1924 elections.

The Left Cartel (1924–26), led by Herriot, adopted a conciliatory policy toward Germany, but a hostile attitude toward the Vatican. The Soviet Union was recognized, but Herriot's attempt to revive the anticlerical issue and to extend the ban on religious education to the newly

recovered Alsace-Lorraine found most Frenchmen apathetic. Interest on the national debt was continually rising and reparations were barely trickling in from Germany. Afraid to tax cautious French *bourgeoisie,* the Cartel attempted inflation in vain. Finally, failure to readjust finances caused the Cartel's fall.

The National Union (1926–32) was a coalition of former President Poincaré and six ex-premiers. Armed with dictatorial financal powers, Poincaré imposed heavy taxes, reduced expenditures, balanced the budget, and stabilized the franc. Reparations resumed for a brief period, the costs of reconstruction terminated, and 1927 proved a boom year. Hence, the Union was endorsed in the 1928 election. Though Poincaré himself retired in 1929, the Conservatives remained in office until 1932 under the Rightist ministries of Laval and Tardieu. Having disposed of the damage of the last war, every effort was made to secure future security for France by isolating Germany through alliances. The Maginot Line was commenced. In 1930 France evacuated the German Rhineland, ending her stranglehold on German recovery, but within six years Nazi reoccupation and remilitarization of this crucial zone would signalize the shift of military preponderance from France to Germany.

(2) French Instability (1932–44)

The Left Cartel returned after a victory in the 1932 elections, but its tenure of office was brief. Anticlerical gestures by Herriot were again ignored by the populace in the face of renewed economic stress. For France suffered by adhering to the gold standard after the rest of the world had begun to desert it in the wake of the great depression. Production fell off in France and unemployment increased. Hence, in December, 1932, the Herriot ministry was overthrown for insisting on French debt repayment to the United States.

The totalitarian menace then loomed large during a period of unstable ministries. During 1934 severe Parisian riots were provoked by the Stavisky Case, in which leading politicians seemed to be involved in fraudulent foreign speculation. Rightist agitation for the overthrow of the Third Republic found its greatest opportunity since the Dreyfus Affair. Charles Maurras of *Action Française* backed his youthful "*Camelots du Roi,*" Colonel de la Roque organized a pro-Fascist "*Croix de Feu*" group; and the "Blue Shirts" of the *Solidarité Française* made a good deal of noise. Premier Daladier had a Parisian mob fired upon, killing eighteen. He was dismissed in disgrace, and a coalition summoned to save the Republic. Ex-president Doumergue as premier stabilized finances, but was overthrown in turn on proposing a conservative change in the constitution. Abroad, Hitler's advent to power, Mussolini's de-

fiance of the League in Ethiopia, and his alliance with the Nazis, and Franco's rebellion in Spain frightened French Liberals with the spectre of Fascist encirclement.

The Popular Front (1936–38) of Léon Blum and Camille Chautemps represented an alliance of these Liberals with Communist and Socialist groups, who were then stressing Moscow's propaganda line of co-operation with Democracy in a common front against Fascism. Though Blum's government lent all but official assistance to Communist intervention in Spain, it would seem that French Communists gave no sincere co-operation in return on the home front. If they endorsed suppression of Fascist groups within France, their strikes, if not their sabotage, weakened national defense against Germany. Blum's imitation of the American New Deal failed to satisfy his supporters or to solve France's financial problems. Eventually the Popular Front was turned out of office, and the grim Daladier returned with an austere defense program. Failure of the Communists and Socialists to endorse the Munich Pact, momentarily hailed by French Liberals, dissolved the Popular Front.

World War II revealed a decay of French spirit; at any rate, there was total unpreparedness for modern methods of conflict. French Liberals, under the leadership of Premiers Daladier and Reynaud, could offer little more consolation for military disasters than frantic appeals to the United States for aid and vague exhortations to fight on in the French colonies. Military realists, headed by Marshall Pétain, considered such plans visionary. Actuated by a desire to spare France needless suffering, but also displaying a senile pessimism, Pétain assumed a thankless premiership and capitulated to the Nazis on terms of German occupation of two-thirds of France. On July 11, 1940, Pétain virtually abolished the Third Republic in favor of a provisional dictatorship under himself as chief of state and Laval as active administrator. The dictatorship (1940–44) had a distinctly Rightist tinge and made a few anti-Semitic gestures to placate the Nazis. But despite public repudiation of De Gaulle's "Free French" forces and the Allies, Pétain secretly treated with the latter and never surrendered essential points to the Nazis.

B. *Ecclesiastical History* (1918–45)

(1) CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

Clerical war service. Some 32,700 clerics were mobilized for active duty during World War I, and of these 4,618 were slain—a severe loss for an already understaffed clergy. Besides these combatants in the trenches, four hundred chaplains were found, some from priests exiled by the Separation Laws. For though the anticlerical bloc had abolished

peace–time chaplaincies, an old law of 1880 was discovered authorizing their enrolment during armed conflict. The clergy's patriotism greatly eased anticlerical animosity and many decorations were bestowed upon clerical war heroes by the government. Among the generals, Foch, Pau, Catelnau, Gouraud, Mangin, D'Esperay, and Weygand were practicing Catholics. Previously sidetracked, they were called up in the emergency by the masonic commander-in-chief, Joffre, and with good results.

Vatican relations. Such distinguished Catholic loyalty had elicited a tribute even from Premier Clemenceau in 1919. Hence, the Rightist Bloc, chosen in 1919, proposed the reopening of diplomatic relations with the Vatican. This move was delayed by an unexpected protest by several French bishops that they were "unanimous in their respectful resistance." It is possible that they feared that a Vatican accord would accrue to the prestige and longevity of the Third Republic, for whose overthrow the popular Maurras clamored. Diplomatic relations were nonetheless resumed in 1921, and in January, 1924, Pope Pius XI in the letter *Maximam* proposed that the lay cultural associations be revised in keeping with both canon and civil law. Though both President Millerand and Premier Poincaré endorsed this solution, they were turned out of office in May, 1924, by Herriot who again severed Vatican relations. The new premier insisted on re-enforcement of the Ferry Laws against some religious who had returned to France. When several clerical war veterans retorted, "We shall not go," they were well sustained by public opinion. Herriot also met defeat in his effort to abolish religious schools in Alsace-Lorraine which had been under German rule at the time of the French Separation Laws. Except for another brief flurry in 1932, anticlericalism was thenceforth on the wane in the politics of the Third Republic. Diplomatic relations were soon resumed with Rome, and became cordial while Abbé Charles-Roux served as French ambassador from 1932 to 1940. Religious were allowed to resume instructional tasks without molestation, and ecclesiastical authorities were not disturbed in the use of church properties. The anticlerical laws, still on the statute books, were suspended by Pétain in 1940.

Catholic Action, in order to combat the mounting threat of Marxism in France, had stressed workingmen's associations. In 1887 Brother Dieron of the Christian Brothers had organized the first Catholic trade union for men, and in 1902 a Daughter of Charity founded the first for women. These and other Catholic social organizations were joined during 1919 into a *Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens.* This contributed to the defeat of a general rail strike the following year. Among the younger workers, Canon Cardijn's Jocist movement spread from neighboring Belgium into France in 1926, while priest-workers, some heroic, others venturesome, returned to Pauline norms of the

apostolate. A small political party, the *Démocrates Populaires* led by George Bidault, came into being, though scarcely prominence, during the 1930's.

(2) THE "ACTION FRANÇAISE" CRISIS

Origins. *Action Française* was the title of an organization and publication—daily from 1908—under the lead of Charles Maurras (1868–1952), a brilliant but agnostic monarchist and chauvinist. His witty sallies at the expense of the Third Republic and his care to cloak his less pious views under expressions of respect for the Church's civilizing mission, revived the hopes of clerical monarchists. Several bishops, however, had detected in Maurras's "Integrism" a latent Totalitarianism, and had denounced several articles to the Holy Office, which condemned them on January 29, 1914. St. Pius X had approved of this decree before his death, but Benedict XV withheld promulgation. The Holy See evidently did not deem it prudent to issue any condemnation of French Nationalism during the war, but did order dissolution of Monsignor Benigni's *Sodalitium Pianum* which had endorsed "Integrism."

"What is Action Française? Essentially a political movement bent on overthrowing by all means, lawful or unlawful, the republican regime. Its founder and recognized head, Maurras, is a man without religion, and who, judging from his books, has long since flung Christian moral to the winds. The existence of God he rejects, and of course the divinity of Jesus Christ and his teachings in the Gospel; while at the same time by a strange somersault of common sense and distortion of history he extols to the skies the Catholic Church because of the strong social spirit and principle of authority which, he says, it inherited from imperial Rome, and is antagonistic to the anarchy taught by the Gospel." [12]

Condemnation. On August 23, 1926, Cardinal Andrieu, archbishop of Bordeaux, condemned *Action Française*. His trenchant attack was branded as unfair by the indicted leaders, who replied in kind, eliciting considerable clerical sympathy. But the cardinal's criticism was republished in the *Osservatore Romano*, and Pope Pius XI sustained his position by sending him, January 5, 1927, the 1914 decree of the Holy Office, together with a new condemnation of Maurras's review and other writings. Though most of the French hierarchy then testified their acceptance of the papal directives, March, 1927, three bishops and numerous priests and laymen publicly questioned the wisdom of the censures by the Holy See. Cardinal Billot, long intimately connected with the leaders of *Action Française*, resigned from the cardinalate in September, 1927. Except for a note congratulating Léon Daudet on a

[12] Charles Souvay, "France," Peter Guilday, editor, *The Church in Contemporary Europe* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1932), p. 95.

published retort to Cardinal Andrieu, the Jesuit theologian remained in submissive retirement until his death in 1931. Fathers Pegues and Le Floch resigned teaching positions. Jacques Maritain not merely repudiated the movement, but defended the papal condemnation in a book, *Things That Are Not Caesar's*. Pius XI was adamant in his prosecution: on October 11, 1927, he insisted on observance of a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary of March 8 denying absolution to those who continued to read the condemned works, which had been put on the *Index*.

Dissolution. Though some of the clerical politicians continued to support *Action Française*, the majority of practicing Catholics submitted to the decisions of the Holy See. In 1939, after *Action Française* had modified some of its political views and had published an apology, Pope Pius XII removed the ban on the review. Yet the movement seems to have been permanently weakened by the papal condemnation. Disillusioned by the Nazi triumph, Maurras, sentenced to life imprisonment as a collaborationist, fell on hard days. He died, reportedly at length reconciled to the Church, in 1952.

C. The Fourth Republic (1944–58)

(1) REVIVAL OF POLITICS

General Charles De Gaulle, undersecretary of war in the Reynaud ministry, had refused to accept Pétain's capitulation and had organized at London the "Free French" forces which continued the struggle. These co-operated with "resistance fighters" springing up within occupied France until Allied troops liberated Paris in August, 1944. Until 1946 De Gaulle as provisional chief of state guided rehabilitation, though French Liberalism again reacted against any "great man" cult. Rejecting proposals for strengthening the executive power somewhat on the American model, a Constitutional Convention created a Fourth Republic quite similar to the Third in its political instability. The elections of December, 1946, returned 151 Communists to the 586 member assembly. They had been opposed by 150 MRP, a Moderate Catholic Republican group, and 139 Socialists. Communist strike tactics, however, backfired, and during 1951 the Communists lost votes to De Gaullist Rightists, while a "Third Force" Center remained comparatively stable, even though the MRP percentage of it declined. But if France was saved from immediate surrender to Communism, it was not clear what its positive program would be. Nativist movements for independence in North Africa and Indochina put an end to French colonialism, nor was it clear that a reorganized "French Union" after the British Commonwealth pattern could continue to keep its territories intact.

(2) Strenuous Apostolate

Catholics and clerics had participated in the resistance and both were brought closer to their nonpracticing environment, not always for their own good. Catholic social movements resumed and rallied to the pope's appeal for the defeat of Communism at the polls. Abbé Pierre won general commendation for his heroic work on behalf of the homeless and underprivileged of Paris. He was one of the more intelligent and submissive members of the *Mission de France,* born in 1941 to penetrate the "dechristianized" areas. Members of this movement tried in varying degrees to share the living and working conditions of the proletariat and to adapt liturgical services to their mentality. Some priest-workers also took regular jobs in factories or docks in order to win the confidence of their fellow workers. If this apostolate had its good and even heroic features, there were cases of insubordination and even apostasy which induced the Holy See and the French hierarchy to restrain the movement in 1954, and terminate it definitively in 1959. Clerical missions, however, continued, and Catholic Action groups were urged to step into the lay apostolate.

(3) Coming of the Fifth Republic

The Fourth Republic has been accused of mediocrity erected into a political system. Disgusted with the fumbling of bourgeois politicians in regard to the colonial problem, in May, 1958, the army in Algiers, led by General Massu, staged a coup and demanded: "De Gaulle to power." Though the Chamber voted Premier Pflimlin of the MRP plenary powers, the army and other elements manifested solidarity with the insurgents. Refusing to rely upon Communist assistance to repress the rising, Pflimlin resigned and President Coty advised the Assembly to summon De Gaulle. On June 1, 1958, he was named premier with plenary powers. Later in the year a new constitution, midway between the British and American systems, provided for inaugural of a Fifth Republic in 1959 with De Gaulle as an authoritative president. The Fourth Republic's dominion-status "French Union" was to yield to a revamped "French Community" made up of entirely independent states in friendly association.

108. IBERIAN CATHOLIC ORDEALS

A. *Spain* (*1874–1953*)

(1) Ineffective Compromise (1874–1931)

Monarchical retoration. The violently anti-Catholic First Republic had been overthrown late in 1874 by the generals—who would serve

the Second in like fashion. The restored monarch, Alfonso XII (1874–85), self-styled "good Catholic and good Liberal," was the soul of tact in appeasing factions, and the 1876 Constitution compromised between Carlist absolutism and extreme Liberalism. Two parliamentary parties, the Conservatives under Canovas del Castillo (d. 1897) and the Liberals headed by Sagasta (d. 1903), alternated in office. In 1887 a "law of associations" subjected religious to civil registry, and in 1901, 1906, and 1911–12 anticlericalism tried to apply this and similar regulations to the detriment of clerical freedom and religious instruction. None of these attempts had any lasting success; relations with Rome, momentarily interrupted, were restored in 1912, and no major conflict occurred until 1931. But Maura's plan of conservative modernization failed of enough support.

Social discontent. In Spain the Church and the Monarchy were the sole unifying agencies; elsewhere a proud Catalan and Basque regionalism survived, and political co-operation was hindered by traditional Iberian aversion to compromise. Yet some social changes were imperative. Farming and industry were relatively undeveloped, although the fault lay as much with Spain as with the Spaniards. It is possible that the Spanish hierarchy, in virtue of the royal patronage, was somewhat too complacent to the *status quo*, but in any event it lacked the material resources to effect a social transformation. Ever since extensive confiscation began during the nineteenth century, clerical revenues were far from excessive. Peers [13] estimated that the average bishop had but $5,000 a year, while ordinary clerics might range between $150 and $600. Yet the idea persisted in certain circles in Spain and abroad that the Church was immensely wealthy. Beginning in 1910, Cardinal Aguirre publicized a program of Catholic Action, but since 1879 Marxist Action had been at work as expounded by the Socialist Pablo Iglesias (d. 1925), while Bakunin's Anarchism advanced an ever more drastic program. The working class, largely centered in Barcelona and Madrid, was roused by the new ideas and from 1909 a series of strikes paralyzed industry. During the "Tragic Week" of riots (1909), moreover, sixty-three churches and convents were burned in Barcelona.

Dictatorship, mildly imitative of Italian Fascism, was the cure proposed by Primo de Rivera (1923–30). Though Rivera was not totalitarian, his son José founded the Falange (1933) which exhibited such tendencies. The dictator indeed repressed Red disturbances and maintained military discipline, but he solved no basic problems. Lacking political experience, Rivera could administer efficiently, but failed to

[13] E. Allison Peers, *Spain, the Church and the Orders* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1939).

reconcile divergent groups. Ill health induced him to resign in 1930, and when his successor, General Berenguer (1930–31) proved unable to carry on, King Alfonso XIII (1886–1931) announced elections preparatory to the restoration of parliamentary rule.

(2) LEFTIST PERSECUTION (1931–39)

Second Republic. The municipal elections of April 12, 1931, were interpreted as a Republican victory—though no full count was published. Alfonso left quietly on April 14, and Niceto Alcalá Zamora, a "Liberal Catholic," was installed as provisional president of a Second Republic. But whether clerical or anticlerical, the doctrinaire Liberals who assumed control of the state were inexperienced. Quickly they fell under pressure from the Socialist-Communist Left, whose violence they did little to check. An orgy of riots, confiscations, church-burnings, and attacks on clerics followed in May, only belatedly halted by the president's declaration of martial law. In June, 1931, a constitutional convention, largely influenced by the Socialists, separated Church and state, nationalized ecclesiastical property, discontinued clerical stipends, announced secularization of education by the end of 1933, proscribed the Jesuits, and placed other religious orders in a precarious legal position. Pope Pius XI directed Catholics to support the Republic provisionally and to organize politically to thwart antiecclesiastical measures. Cardinal Goma then led the Spanish hierarchy in a declaration of loyalty to the Republic, Zamora agreed to serve as constitutional president (1931–36), and Gil Robles formed a Catholic Republican Party. The Left remained in power until November, 1933, but while its policy remained consistently anticlerical, its execution was hampered by internal dissension and the need of suppressing revolts and of placating Catalonian and Basque regionalists.

A moderate respite followed a Right-Center victory in the 1933 elections. The Right was divided, however, among reactionary Carlists, moderate Alfonsists, and progressive Falangists, while the Center comprised not only Robles' Republicans, but the moderate Liberals of Lerroux. The latter served as premier (1933–35); he was adroit but superficial. Anticlerical legislation was relaxed and severed relations with the Holy See resumed. But the Socialists refused to co-operate in progressive legislation, and the Communists disrupted order with riots, strikes, and assassinations. Effective government became impossible, and President Zamora called for new elections.

Red terror commenced almost immediately after an electoral triumph of a Popular Front of Liberals, Socialists, Communists, and Syndicalists. Incendiarism was no longer checked; anticlerical riots and jailing of

Rightists followed; Conservative military leaders were demoted, side-tracked, or dismissed. On the technicality of having illegally authorized elections, Zamora was replaced by Azana (1936–39) as head of the "Loyalist" government. In July, the Rightists charged anarchy, and revolt and civil war followed. Though accuracy seems impossible, it is conservatively estimated that within a year of February, 1936, ten bishops, six thousand priests, and sixteen thousand religious or lay leaders were murdered. All churches within Leftist jurisdiction were closed to worship, and two thousand were damaged or destroyed. Unrestrained vandalism, iconoclasm, terrorism, lynch law came to be more the rule than the exception in Loyalist territory down to the end of the Civil War—all these acts were supposedly justified by an "Emergency Law in defense of the Republic." Anarchist and Communist hate reached insane proportions. Juan Peiro asserted: "To kill God Himself if He existed . . . would be perfectly natural." Yet Loyalist propaganda, largely directed from Moscow, was eminently successful in representing its regime as defending the cause of democracy against "Fascist" aggression, and in enlisting the sympathy, support, and even the military assistance of the Liberal West. Rightist sources claim that the Reds killed twelve prelates, 6,700 priests, 2,545 brothers or nuns, 400,000 lay persons, and destroyed or profaned 20,000 churches.[14]

(3) RIGHTIST RESURGENCE (1936–53)

Nationalist revolt. In the February, 1936, elections, Rightist groups were guilty of dissension, overconfidence, apathy, and blindness to the Leftist unconcern for law. Though the popular vote may have favored them, Rightists won but 176 seats to the Left's 240 and the Center's 46. When anticlerical assaults on persons and property began, Rightist members of the Cortes confined themselves to protests. In April, 1936, Zamora was impeached, and his successor Azana was an opportunist Liberal who thereafter served as a respectable front for the Reds. Azana's replies to Rightist protests gave no evidence of either the will or the power to afford relief. Calvo Soltello, who had repeatedly denounced the government for conniving with disorder, was murdered on July 13. Two days later Count Vallellano led Rightist deputies out of the Cortes, claiming that "ever since February 16 we have been living in anarchy." This was the signal for a revolt, apparently concerted with military leaders on July 17. Regiments in Morocco rebelled and General Franco flew from the Canaries to assume command. The summer months were critical for the Nationalists as they strove to convoy forces to the main-

[14] Francisco Montalban, S.J., *Historia de la Iglesia Catolica* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1951), IV, 637.

land, to relieve Colonel Moscardo in his heroic defense of Toledo's Alcazar, forty miles from Madrid, and to unite their scattered supporters from south to north. All these aims were achieved by November, and the insurgents began a siege of Madrid. If the Loyalists enjoyed greater favor abroad diplomatically and for long obtained better military equipment, the Nationalists proved superior in native man power, territory controlled and military skill. But only during February, 1939, could they terminate a bitter struggle in their favor.

Nationalist rule. The original revolt by the generals had been made in the name of the Republic, although the leaders were probably monarchist in sentiment. But by October 1, 1936, Franco had been designated as "chief of state" of a rival government at Burgos. During the Civil War and the era of Axis supremacy down to 1942, Franco was largely dependent upon the semi-totalitarian Falange. He was saluted as Il Caudillo, and in an early speech had declared: "Spain will be organized according to a totalitarian concept . . . with the establishment of a severe principle of authority." Franco's indebtedness to the Axis for military aid during the Civil War caused him acute diplomatic distress during World War II, although the United States Ambassador Carlton Hayes (1942–45) succeeded with President Franklin Roosevelt's backing in averting a formal break between Spain and the United Nations. After the Allied triumph, however, Franco's regime was long ostracized by Liberal statesmen to the detriment of economic assistance urgently needed for Spanish reconstruction. Franco, nevertheless, proved to be a well-intentioned and comparatively moderate dictator, recognized by most Spanish factions as the only alternative to renewed partisan strife.

Ecclesiastical status. Few Spanish clerics could regard the Nationalist cause as other than a crusade, and with Franco's victory the Concordat of 1851 was substantially restored. The *Fuero de los Españoles* of July 13, 1945, declared: "Profession and practice of the Catholic religion, which is that of the Spanish state, shall enjoy official protection. None shall be molested for their religious beliefs or their private practice. No other ceremonies or external demonstrations than those of the Catholic religion are permitted." Although no actual persecution of the few foreign Protestants followed, the avowed policy of the *Fuero* remained a hard saying to Liberals throughout the world. In 1953 the *Fuero* on religion was incorporated in a new Concordat with the Holy See. This confirmed the concession made in 1941 of a voice in the choice of prelates to the Chief of state. Thus, Franco's Spain remained the traditional Catholic Spain, and his religious policy at least seems to have met with the approbation of the majority of Spaniards.

B. Portugal (1900–50)

(1) ANTICLERICALISM (1906–26)

Fall of the monarchy. Pseudo-parliamentary constitutional monarchy had existed in Portugal since the expulsion of the absolutist and staunch clerical, Dom Miguel, in 1834. The monarchy lost favor with intellectuals and since 1811 a Republican Party claimed the allegiance of many extreme anticlericals. King Carlos (1889–1910) reputed something of a playboy like his contemporary, Alfonso XIII of Spain, anticipated his brother monarch in resorting to dictatorship. In 1906 Carlos entrusted full powers to Joao Franco, but this regime met an early demise in the assassination of the king and crown prince in 1908. Dom Manoel II the Unfortunate (1908–10), young and inexperienced, failed to cope with the Republican opposition, who proclaimed the Portuguese Republic, October 5, 1910.

Religious persecution. The spirit of the new government was secular, and at first anticlericalism united selfish Republican factions. Pombal's anti-Jesuitical legislation was revived by Afonso Costa, the minister of justice: schools were to be deprived of religious instruction; ecclesiastical holy days denied civic recognition; and the army forbidden to assist at cult in uniform. When the Portuguese hierarchy rebuked the government in a joint pastoral, December, 1910, Costa forbade its circulation. For defying the government, the bishop of Oporto was bidden to Lisbon and "deposed." On April 20, 1911, Liberal anticlericalism took its standard course by proclaiming separation of Church and state. The Portuguese government seems to have patterned its legislation on that of the Third French Republic, for ecclesiastical property was placed at the legal disposal of lay groups entitled "cultural associations." When these were repudiated by the bishops, the Portuguese Republic broke off diplomatic relations with the Vatican, protesting prelates were banished on one pretext or another, outspoken priests and laymen imprisoned, and clerical subsidies suspended. Meanwhile Costa and his "Democratic Party" publicly announced a program for "extinguishing Catholicism within two generations." Costa, however, went out of office in January, 1914, and Premier Machado somewhat relaxed the anticlerical laws and permitted the return of the exiled bishops.

Anarchy. Throughout its entire history the Portuguese Republic remained unstable. In 1915 General Pimenta de Castro overthrew the parliament and set up a dictatorship which abolished the "cultural associations." But within four months his regime had collapsed and the Democratic Party had returned to power. In a ministry largely dominated by Freemasons, the "cultural associations" were restored, and the patriarch of Lisbon and the bishop of Oporto sent into exile. General

Paiz, another militarist, revoked this legislation during 1918, but was promptly assassinated. Anticlericalism came back to power in 1919, although ministerial instability and attempted military uprisings followed one another with monotonous regularity. Inefficiency and corruption reduced the government to bankruptcy prior to the successful revolt of General Carmona during May, 1926. The Catholic Church in Portugal, heartened by the apparition of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Fatima in 1917, had survived the ridicule and persecution of her foes, and was now promised a respite from vexatious restrictions.

(2) CATHOLIC REVIVAL (1926–50)

Dictatorship. General Antonio di Carmona, dictator-president from 1926 until his death in 1951, was but a military chief without any political program save for the dubious claim of having rescued the country from Communism. But a period of administrative drifting terminated in 1928 when he named Antonio Salazar his minister of finance, a post which the latter held until 1940. From 1917 to 1928 the governmental deficit had amounted to 2,574,000 contos; during an equal period under Salazar there was a surplus of 1,963,000 contos. The explanation of this modern financial miracle lay in conscientious administration by an exemplary and skilled Catholic layman, using old-fashioned orthodox economy: single budgets, decreased expenditures, increased taxes. In 1932 Salazar was called to the premiership which he has held for more than a quarter century. By 1930 Portugal had become a single party state of National Union, and in 1933 a new constitution proclaimed the *Estado Novo,* an authoritarian government under Carmona and Salazar. Since 1945 there exists a legislature elected by restricted suffrage which acts as a consultive body during three months of the year; there is also a "corporative chamber," the supreme council of professional and trade associations.

Ecclesiastical affairs. Tension between Church and state had eased after 1918 when the Portuguese hierarchy at Benedict XV's suggestion had acknowledged the Republic without reservations. By 1929 accord at last proved possible, though anticlerical habits of thought persisted. In virtue of an understanding between Portugal and the Vatican in 1940, Church and state remain formally separated, but the government undertakes to allow only Catholic rites in connection with governmental celebrations. The bishops are named by the Holy See without any governmental intervention. Religion remains an extracurricular subject in the state schools. Catholic marriage as witnessed by priests is civilly recognized when the registration office is notified, but civil marriage and divorce are available for non-Catholics, who are likewise allowed freedom of worship in law and in fact.

109. CATHOLIC MINORITIES

A. Switzerland

(1) KULTURKAMPF (1870–84)

Vatican **infallibility** became the pretext for attacks on the Church. After Liberal Catholics had joined Protestants in spreading biased reports of the proceedings of the Vatican Council, the Swiss federal and cantonal governments tried to prevent the bishops from promulgating its decrees and encouraged the Old Catholic schism. In Basle, Bishop Lachat was driven into a Catholic corner of his diocese when he suspended the priests Egli and Gechward for refusing to accept the dogma; parishes were then given to the rebel clergy. During 1872 the Genevois defied Gaspard Mermillod (1824–92), auxiliary of Bishop Marilley of Lausanne-Geneva, and exiled him to France, along with the Daughters of Charity and the Little Sisters of the Poor. The Geneva Civic Council then decreed that henceforth the clergy be named by the laity. In Berne, clerics were expelled for refusing to accept a "civil constitution," and churches and university chairs given to the Old Catholics. During 1874 civil positions were bestowed on the Old Catholic prelate Herzog and the renegade Carmelite Loyson, while federal control over religious affairs in the cantons was strengthened. Sees might not be established without governmental approval, episcopal jurisdiction was scrutinized, Jesuits and "affiliates" banished, and neutral state schools provided. When Pius IX condemned this *Kulturkampf* in *Etsi Multa Luctuosa* (1873) the papal nuncio was dismissed for a decade (1874–84).

Reconciliation came during Leo XIII's pontificate. After the voting strength of Catholics had been displayed in a referendum rejecting a federal minister of education (1874), negotiations with the Vatican commenced. Although Bishop Lachat for the sake of peace exchanged the see of Basle for a new diocese in the Ticino district, hitherto subject to Italian jurisdiction, Bishop Mermillod returned to become bishop of Lausanne-Geneva and was subsequently named cardinal. In time secularism mitigated Protestant bigotry, and during 1906 even Calvin's Geneva separated Church and state. In 1955 anti-Jesuit legislation was mitigated.

(2) SOCIAL QUESTIONS (1884–1947)

Catholic social activity was organized by Cardinal Mermillod. In 1886 Gaspard Decurtins founded an *Arbeiterbund,* basically of Catholic membership, but admitting Protestant workers. During 1889 the Catholic University of Freiburg opened an international intellectual center. A Federation of Catholic Societies was formed in 1894, and from 1903

annual Catholic congresses were held. Cardinal Mermillod had interested laymen in social-political questions through journals and discussion clubs. In 1895 a Catholic became president of Switzerland, a post subsequently held for five terms by the Catholic Giuseppe Motta, honorary president of the first session of the League of Nations, at which he opposed entry of the Soviet Union. Bishop Egger and Canon Jung meanwhile had organized Catholic labor unions. Swiss society during the early twentieth century afforded a haven of tranquility and moderate progressivism amid a turbulent European environment. In 1947 Switzerland voted for moderate regulation of industry and labor, while repudiating Marxian Socialism.

B. *The Netherlands*

(1) HOLLAND (1870–1958)

Educational equality. Although Catholics had gained complete freedom of worship in 1848 and 1853, their interests were threatened by the Liberal-sponsored neutral public schools established in 1857. When the Liberals confirmed this system in 1878, the Catholics made an alliance with the Calvinists in order to secure recognition of religious instruction in private schools (1889). In return for permitting government inspection, these private schools were given subsidies. In 1894 a chair of Thomistic philosophy was set up at Amsterdam University, and in 1905 Catholics were authorized to erect their own university—though realization of this took time. By 1909 the Catholic-Calvinist political coalition had defeated the Liberals and Socialists, so that during 1917 an amended constitution provided complete state aid for private schools. Its Article 192 guaranteed that henceforth the entire cost of primary education, whether in public or private schools, would be borne by the state. When this provision went into effect in 1921, public schools had fifty-five per cent of the students; by 1947 over seventy-two per cent of the children were in private schools teaching religion, and forty-two per cent of these were Catholic. During 1923, moreover, a Catholic University had been erected at Nijmegen, and this was granted some state aid in 1948. In 1922 and 1945 the state had pledged support of eighty per cent of the costs of secondary education.

Political influence. The 1917 constitution, as revised in 1922, completed the grant of universal suffrage. In the 1918 elections the Catholic political party won about thirty per cent of the votes, a proportion which it has generally continued to hold. Indeed, a Catholic, Ruys de Beerenbrouck, became prime minister from 1918 to 1925. In 1915 a special envoy was sent to the Vatican. Though this legation lapsed in 1925, it was revived during World War II. Along with other Dutch

organizations, the Catholic Party was dissolved during the Nazi occupation. Catholics, directed by the courageous Archbishop De Jong of Utrecht, remained loyal to Queen Wilhelmina (1890–1948). After the war, they reorganized their party, to which non-Catholics were now admitted as members.

Social welfare has been a matter of keen interest to Dutch Catholics since 1888 when Father Ariens began a guild of textile workers. After *Rerum Novarum,* this expanded into local, diocesan, and national Catholic labor organizations, which helped defeat Socialist tactics during the Railway Strike of 1903. After *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) the Catholic Workers' Union, in co-operation with the Catholic Peoples' Party, began to urge acceptance of its principles upon the Dutch legislature. They inspired the Foreman Councils' Act (1933) and the Labor Contract Act (1937). During the Nazi occupation these organizations were suppressed, but they revived after the war in order to combat the Communist-dominated United Trade Union. The better to fight Communism, the Catholic labor groups allied with Protestant and Liberal organizations. Catholics have also organized a Farmers' Union, which like all these vocational groups, is solicitous for the religious and cultural welfare of its members, as well as for their economic well-being. In 1948 the Catholic vote was divided among Conservatives and Progressives, so that its influence was diminished. But in response to an episcopal appeal for unity in 1954, there was a Catholic resurgence in the 1958 elections, and a Catholic-Socialist alliance gave way to a Catholic-Liberal coalition.

(2) BELGIUM (1870–1958)

Educational issue. The control of the Belgian government by the Liberals (1845–55; 1857–70) had resulted in numerous antireligious acts which finally provoked the Catholics to political activity. Yet their victory in the 1870 elections proved abortive. Their premier, Malou (1871–78), was intimidated from repealing hostile legislation by Liberal threats from urban areas. Thus the Catholic tenure of office proved an empty parenthesis between Liberal regimes. The next Liberal premier, Frère-Orban (1878–84), was more radical than his predecessors, and the minister of education, Van Humbeck, had asserted in a masonic lodge that, "Catholicism is a corpse that bars the way of progress." His new education law, nicknamed by Catholics "law of misfortune," excluded all religious instruction from public schools and barred all teachers trained under religious auspices. This time Catholic apathy was fully shaken off. Within a year they had provided for three thousand educational centers and the public schools were crippled by the resignation of two thousand teachers and the loss of fifty-five per cent of their pupils.

Liberal reprisals failed and the Catholics won the 1884 elections by a landslide, and maintained a parliamentary majority until 1919. The "law of misfortune" was repealed along with other antireligious legislation. The primary public schools were taken from central to local control, and small subsidies granted to private schools. After 1919, the Catholic Party, while preserving a plurality, could no longer command a majority, so that subsidies to Catholic schools continued to be inadequate.

The Social question at once succeeded the educational issue. In 1886 Marxist riots portended a crisis for Belgian industrialized economy. The Catholic premier, Auguste Beernaert (1884–94), and his successors met this problem with a thorough program of social legislation—codes, minimum wages, insurance, etc.—and thwarted a Socialist-inspired general strike during 1913. Catholic Social Action was stimulated by Bishop Doutreloux of Liége who presided over Congresses of Social Work in 1886, 1887, and 1890. From these emerged the Democratic Christian League for practical social reforms. In 1909 Cardinal Mercier, coming directly from his neo-scholastic revival at Louvain University, assembled a great conference of three thousand clerics and laymen to discuss moral and social welfare. A practical program was drawn up and followed. In 1921 the various industrial and agrarian unions were confederated with religious and cultural groups into the Belgian Catholic Union. Canon Cardijn initiated his highly successful Jocist movement among Young Christian Workers in the course of 1925, and it spread to other countries.

Political problems in a predominantly Catholic country often involved the Church. King Albert (1909–34) and Cardinal Mercier of Malines (1906–26) co-operated heroically during Belgium's trials in World War I and in 1919 consecrated the country to the Sacred Heart in token of gratitude for its preservation. Racial-linguistic disputes between Flemings and Walloons disturbed postwar politics, and during the 1930's Léon Degrelle's semi-Fascist Rexists made an unsuccessful bid for power. During World War II, the surrender of the Belgian army to the Germans by King Leopold III (1934–51) exposed him to Liberal and Socialist criticism. Although the Catholics led a coalition which recalled Leopold by a fifty-seven per cent vote in 1950, strikes and sabotage paralyzed his government. To avert possible civil war, the monarch abdicated in favor of his son. The Catholic Party continued to hold about forty per cent of the parliamentary seats, and were disturbed by a return of educational discrimination. Protests and appeals by the hierarchy were long ignored, but in June, 1958, the Catholics won another landslide victory and were able to take over the ministry.

C. Scandinavia

(1) DENMARK

Danish Catholic emancipation had taken place in 1849, and steady Catholic progress is indicated by the establishment of a prefecture (1887) and a vicariate apostolic (1892). In the latter year Bishop Euch became the first Catholic prelate in Copenhagen since 1536. Catholic churches and property were incorporated, the bishop serving as head of the clerical-lay trustees. Catholic schools and hospitals had an influence in excess of Catholic numbers, estimated as forty priests and nine thousand faithful. But in 1896 the conversion of Johannes Jorgenson, a distinguished writer, demonstrated non-Catholic interest in the Catholic Church. In 1953 the Catholic residential hierarchy was formally restored in Denmark, as well as in the other Scandinavian countries.

(2) ICELAND

Iceland was not visited by a Catholic priest from the sixteenth century until 1850. In 1896 the Montfort Fathers and the Sisters of St. Joseph took up residence. After Iceland became politically autonomous in 1918, a vicariate apostolic was established (1929). To this post in 1942 was nominated the native Icelander, Johan Gunnarson, just two years before Iceland regained its full independence, lost since 1262.

(3) NORWAY

Norway exhibited little bigotry toward Catholics. In 1887 a prefecture, and in 1892 a vicariate came into being, and additional missionary districts were set up in 1931 and 1944. In 1894 and 1897 most civil disabilities were removed from the two thousand Catholics, and religious orders were admitted into the country. Conversion in 1900 of the Norwegian "Newman," the Lutheran minister Dr. Krogh-Tonnin, and in 1922 a Nobel prize–winning novelist Sigrid Undset, raised Catholic prestige among Protestants. By 1946 there were nearly five thousand Catholics and in 1953 a bishopric was erected.

(4) SWEDEN

Sweden did not relax her ban on Catholic office holding until 1870, and only in 1873 were dissenters allowed to open churches and acquire property without restriction. Even then minors were not permitted to leave the established religion before their majority, and all religious save nursing sisters were banned. The remains of the penal laws were removed on January 1, 1952. Though Protestant bigotry remained stronger in Sweden than elsewhere in Scandinavia, Bishop Erik Müller,

vicar apostolic since 1923, attended the funeral of King Gustavus V (1907–50). Catholics then numbered about five thousand.

(5) FINLAND

The few Finnish converts requested a vicar apostolic in 1906. What the Russian government then denied was granted to independent Finland by the Holy See in 1920. Diplomatic relations with the Holy See were established in 1942.

D. The Balkans

(1) GREECE

Greece was the first Balkan nation to establish its independence of Turkey (1820–29). The European powers imposed freedom of worship as a condition of recognition of the new state (1830), but popular sentiment has continued anti-Catholic. A Latin Rite bishopric was established at Athens in 1875, and other sees were added so that there were six in 1950. The Latin clergy were not allowed to wear clerical dress in public, but Catholic primary and secondary schools flourished. By 1950 there were twenty-six thousand Catholics of the Latin Rite, with perhaps a thousand more of the Greek Rite, but 93½ per cent of the Greek nation remained dissident.

(2) YUGOSLAVIA

The Serbs began to agitate for independence in 1806, but were not recognized as fully sovereign until 1878. The vast majority of the Serbs remained Orthodox Dissidents, but there were fifty-five thousand Catholics of the Byzantine Rite under their bishop by 1945.

Croats and Slovenes, subject to the Habsburg Monarchy until 1918, added some six million Latin Catholics to the new state of Yugoslavia set up after World War I. National and racial disagreements disturbed the monarchy until the Nazi-Fascist occupation in 1941. During this crisis, General Nedich essayed the role of Pétain, and Colonel Mihailovich that of De Gaulle. The latter for a time achieved considerable success, but eventually was outmaneuvered in propaganda by the Croatian Communist leader, Broz, alias Tito.

Communist persecution of the Church began with Tito's accession to power in 1944. The Catholic hierarchy, headed by Archbishop Stepinac of Zagreb, were accused of collaboration with the Fascist-inspired puppet Croatian monarchy. The archbishop was condemned to sixteen years of forced labor, a sentence reduced to partial detention after six years. By 1956, four hundred priests had been killed during or after the war, others were imprisoned, and at least five hundred had been forced into exile.

(3) ALBANIA

Albanian independence (1913–39) granted religious toleration to Catholics, though the majority of Albanians were Mohammedans or Dissidents. In 1944 Enver Hoxha, a sub-satellite of Tito, gained control of the government. His Communist regime persecuted the some 100,000 Catholics and 250,000 Dissidents. Catholic prelates were forced from office on one pretext or another, the majority of priests inhibited from priestly functions, nuns interned or exiled, and all Catholic institutions suppressed.

(4) BULGARIA

In 1856 the Turkish government promised religious freedom and the Bulgarian Orthodox clergy demanded reforms from the patriarch of Constantinople. When the latter refused to concede these, the Bulgarian Nationalists obtained them by a grant of the *Porte*. In 1870 they declared the Bulgarian Orthodox Church autocephalous, and in 1878 political autonomy was achieved, full independence following in 1909. Although Prince Ferdinand (1887–1918) was a Catholic, he allowed his heir, Boris, to apostasize in 1896. To the fifty thousand Latin Rite Catholics were added sixty thousand converts from the Greek Rite Dissidents in 1861, although only one-tenth of the latter persevered. Communist persecution at first concentrated upon the Orthodox, but eventually Bishop Basilkov and three Catholic priests were executed, and the usual constraints placed upon Catholic clerics and institutions.

(5) RUMANIA

Rumanian autonomy was obtained in 1829 and political independence was recognized in 1864. King Charles (1881–1914) was a Catholic, but his descendants conformed to Dissident Orthodoxy. Of the three million Rumanian Catholics in the twentieth century, half were of the Latin Rite and half of the Byzantine Rite. The latter were accordingly forced into external apostasy when the Communists subjected them to the Muscovite puppet patriarchate (1949). At the same time efforts were made to create a schism within the ranks of the Latin Catholics. Eventually the Catholic clergy were executed, imprisoned, or inhibited, and the Church's many social institutions destroyed or confiscated.

110. MILITANT BRITISH CATHOLICITY

A. *Political Background* (*1922–51*)

(1) ECONOMIC-SOCIAL CRISES (1922–35)

Readjustment to peace baffled the old Liberal creed of "free trade," and in 1922 Lloyd George's resignation ended sixteen years of Liberal

tenure; thereafter the party declined in appeal. But Conservative Prime Ministers Bonar Law (1922–23) and Stanley Baldwin (1923–24) fared little better. Deflation brought heavy taxation and high prices. Exports waned and wartime tariffs were retained or revised. Unemployment and unrest were inadequately met by the "dole." Hence the Fabian Socialist MacDonald, with Liberal support, formed the first Labor ministry. This did not survive 1924, for financial interests opposed the government which they accused of an alliance with Russian Communism. Baldwin returned (1924–29) and withstood a menacing general strike (1926) when citizens rallied to take over essential transport and distribution services. Within a few days the strike was broken, and moderate elements then retreated before the peril of civil conflict. But charges of lack of sympathy with the workers cost Baldwin votes, and MacDonald and the Laborites returned in the 1929 elections. This time the world depression blighted their hopes of social reform, and all parties accepted the king's invitation to form a "National Coalition," in which, however, the Conservatives dominated. MacDonald, retained as premier (1931–35), grew cautious. American debt payments were suspended, taxes raised and heavy tariffs imposed. For a time Great Britain was threatened with bankruptcy, but by 1935 the pound was stabilized. The 1935 elections clearly favored the Conservatives.

(2) MILITARY CRISES (1935–45)

Totalitarianism overshadowed domestic issues during the next decade, if we except the dictated abdication of King Edward VIII (1936) to marry a divorcee. Premiers Baldwin (1935–37) and Neville Chamberlain (1937–40) were criticized by Winston Churchill for lack of appreciation of the Nazi danger, and their mild policies later were branded as appeasement. Churchill was accordingly called to leadership (1940–45) during World War II. Though he had nothing to offer but "blood, tears, and sweat," his doggedness did much to bring the conflict to a victorious conclusion over Nazism, but at the expense of appeasement of Communism. But the war had shaken acquiescence in traditional aristocratic leadership, and once the foreign peril had been removed, Churchill was defeated in the 1945 elections for Conservatism on questions of domestic social reform.

(3) SOCIALIST EXPERIMENT (1945–51)

The Labor ministry of Clement Attlee (1945–51) advocated a nationalization of banks, mines, and railways as indispensable means to reconstruction and progress to a "fuller life" for all. Needless to say, such a program increased government regulation of lives, a "cradle to grave" solicitude that provoked violent criticism. Socialized medicine

proved a not unmixed gain, and a new educational policy raised Catholic anxiety. The Lords' suspensive veto was reduced to one year (1949), and in 1957 life peerages threatened to destroy what remained of aristocratic prerogative. Perspective is lacking to appraise the Welfare State as a *via media* between Capitalism and Communism. At least the British public refused to take all in one dose; in 1951 the Laborites were turned out of office.

B. English Catholicity

(1) PUBLIC ISSUES

Politics. King George V (1910–36) was a conservative but honest man who treated Catholics fairly. In 1915 a Vatican legation was opened. But in 1919 departure of some eighty Irish members from the British Parliament deprived English Catholics of their support on religious issues. English Catholics thereafter tended in the main toward a qualified support of the Labor Party, and several Laborites spoke for the Catholic Relief Act (1927) which removed remaining restrictions upon Catholic emancipation. Social reform without Marxism required tightrope walking for Catholic Laborites. Cardinal Bourne, archbishop of Westminster (1903–35), denounced the general strike of 1926 as a "direct challenge to a lawfully constituted authority," and ordered Catholics to assist the government, while praying for a peaceful solution. The cardinal's stand elicited praise from Conservatives and Moderates, but lessened his popularity with some Catholic urban workingmen.

Sword of the Spirit. Cardinal Hinsley, Bourne's successor at Westminster (1935–43), was a doughty Yorkshireman, simple and direct. He rose to great leadership during World War II by founding an organization for united social effort known as the Sword of the Spirit. It began in August, 1940, and reached a climax the following December with public endorsement of Pius XII's peace program by the cardinal, the Anglican prelates of Canterbury and York, and the moderator of the Free Churches. Christopher Dawson was named the lay co-ordinator. But war work hastened the cardinal's death, and the movement was hampered both by the social isolation of some Catholics, and the doctrinal Latitudinarianism of non-Catholics. Yet it did demonstrate that Catholicity could exercise no negligible influence upon English public life.

Education became a critical problem. The dual system of subsidy to denominational schools provided by the Balfour Education Act of 1902 was denounced by Augustine Birrel, Liberal president of the Education Board, as putting "Rome on the rates." Before 1914 some twenty bills to change the system were blocked. In 1918 Scottish Catholics

secured a highly favorable arrangement for their five hundred parochial schools. These were placed under a local governmental supervision and support, while the hierarchy preserved a veto on the instructors named. The Holy See urged acceptance of this plan, but in England the hierarchy were divided on its desirability since Catholic expenses were greater. After the Irish exodus in 1919, English Catholics could ill resist legislative attacks upon the dual system. In 1930 the Catholic Laborite, Mr. Scurr, barely defeated a discriminatory act through amendment. A new education act offering inadequate subsidies in view of mounting costs was accepted by Archbishop Hinsley in 1936, for want of a better. But in 1944 the government offered denominational schools, by then largely Catholic, three options: "They could become 'aided' by paying half costs; 'controlled,' by failing to—thereby losing their denominational character, except for two periods a week; or 'special arrangement' schools under the 1936 Act." [15] Although the 1944 legislation was not administered with deliberate unfairness, it soon bore heavily upon Catholic finances in view of the rise of prices, higher building standards, and shifts in the population. Yet neither parent-strikes, protest marches, nor episcopal petitions brought about any essential modifications.

(2) CATHOLIC ACTION

Social questions. In 1909 Father Charles Plater, S.J. (1875–1922) had founded the Catholic Social Guild at Oxford. Its first president, Monsignor H. C. Parkinson (1854–1924), published a widely appreciated *Primer of Social Science*. In 1922, moreover, this group commenced the Catholic Workers' College for "education of Catholic workingmen in ethics and apologetics, and in the social sciences from the standpoint of Catholic principles." Hilaire Belloc's *Servile State* (1912) had launched the distributist theory of economic-social reform. This program, endorsed by Cecil and G. K. Chesterton, advocated redistribution of capitalistic wealth through decentralization of industry and commerce, and extension of co-operatives. While distributism was far from being an official Catholic project, it was tolerated or even viewed with approval by members of the English hierarchy. In 1918 Cardinal Bourne made a noteworthy address in which he asserted that Christianity and labor ought to co-operate in solving the problem of distribution of surplus wealth to achieve a more equitable remuneration for the laborer and clerk.

The Catholic Truth Society, founded in 1884 by James Britten, expanded its functions about 1920. By its own definition, it is an "organization of members of the Catholic faith, clerical and lay, men and women,

---

[15] A. C. Beales, *The English Catholics: 1850–1950* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1950), p. 401.

founded to promulgate the truths of the Catholic religion by means of the written word." After World War I, interest in its pamphlets grew; by 1930 it had sold or distributed over a million copies. In that year alone it disseminated seventy-five thousand, and a rack in Westminster Cathedral had to be replenished thrice daily. It is understandable, then, that conversions to Catholicity took place at a rate of ten thousand a year. In 1950 Father Philip Hughes estimated Catholics at 2,750,000, about six per cent in a total population of 43,000,000. Allied in purpose, the Catholic Evidence Guild commenced street preaching in 1918, and by 1931 had six hundred speakers, of whom one-third were women. All these unpaid lay volunteers were carefully trained in Catholic doctrine and in platform technique. They were then allowed to speak for twenty minutes on some subject. Neither preachers nor controversialists, they endeavored rather to explain Catholic doctrine patiently and clearly to all inquirers. Some of the Guild engaged to speak each week.

Pax Romana, an international federation of Catholic University Societies, which had been founded at Freiburg in 1921, received the adherence of the British Catholic Federation during 1922. The organizational headquarters was moved to Rome in 1947, and it was given a cardinal-protector. English Catholics continued to attend secular universities, not only Oxford and Cambridge, but also eighteen provincial colleges. Full or part time chaplaincies were maintained at all of these institutions for the sake of the Catholic students. Many of these chaplains, such as Fathers Martindale and Knox, became influential beyond Catholic circles. Ronald Knox (1888–1957) had immense influence, while "to be seen walking with the Jesuit, Father D'Arcy, helps one's intellectual reputation. Catholicism has intellectual audacity at Oxford, and not a few of the young intellects in revolt have become Catholics." [16] Anglican recognition of the South India Church prompted a new wave of defections to Catholicity.

C. Irish Catholicity

(1) POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE (1922–49)

The Irish Free State, inaugurated under Prime Minister William Cosgrave (1922–32), enjoyed dominion status under the British crown. In 1930 the Statute of Westminster defined such status as one of complete autonomy in constitution, administration, declaration of war and peace, quite independently of the British parliament. Yet De Valera and his followers objected to the formal oath of allegiance to the British crown. Until 1927 they boycotted the Free State assembly, and then took the oath with the claim that it was a "mere formality." The Free State constitution guaranteed "freedom of conscience and the free pro-

[16] Daniel Sargent, "England," Peter Guilday, editor, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

fession and practice of religion," so that "no law may be made either directly or indirectly to endow any religion or give any preference." Indeed, the statesmen of Catholic Ireland have been meticulous in safeguarding the interests of Protestants, hoping thereby to allay the prejudices of the defenders of the Ulster counties constituting the separate government of Northern Ireland. In practice, however, the Free State administration with Catholic principles worked on the following bases: divorce was not granted, religious education was safeguarded; censorship of the press and of films decreed; and an envoy named to the Vatican.

Eire was the revived Gaelic name for the Irish State after December, 1937, until 1949. This was the work of De Valera, who defeated Cosgrave in the 1932 elections, abolished the oath of allegiance (1933), and then, inaugurating a new constitution (1937), proclaimed Ireland's "indefeasible and sovereign right to choose its own form of government." Governor-general Buckley was replaced by President Douglas Hyde (1938–45), Gaelic scholar and non-Catholic. Thenceforth, De Valera argued, Ireland was "of, but not in, the British Commonwealth," a status advertised by Irish neutrality despite British belligerency during World War II. The new constitution accorded the Catholic Church a privileged position, and explicitly acknowledged the duty of public worship to God. The state, however, did not endow nor establish the Church. No discrimination against Protestants took place, and Mr. Hyde's election was a symbol of religious impartiality in politics.

Republic of Ireland. Although De Valera was defeated in the 1948 elections, the new Prime Minister John Costello (1948–51) carried through the final severance of ties with Great Britain. On December 21, 1948, the British king's function of accrediting Ireland's foreign representatives was transferred to the new president of Ireland, Sean O'Kelly. Henceforth the Republic of Ireland was completely independent in form as well as in fact. But Irish aspirations for the recovery of the Ulster counties remained unfulfilled. In Northern Ireland voting districts were gerrymandered, and financial discrimination practiced at the expense of Catholic education. Vociferous disagreement sometimes erupted in border clashes.

(2) Religious Activities

Missionary participation. The International Eucharistic Congress at Dublin during 1932 was the first held in a free Ireland; nearly a million persons participated at the closing Mass of the Congress. Such gatherings drew back to Ireland many of the remarkable Irish *diaspora*, including some of her missionary workers in foreign lands. In 1950 it was estimated that there were nearly 3,000 Irish priests and 5,000 nuns serving

in English-speaking lands, while 385 priests, 259 brothers, and 1,000 nuns were *in partibus infidelium*. Irish missionary societies included the Maynooth Mission, founded in 1916, the Columbans (1923), and the Irish province of the Society of African Missions, begun in 1876.

Lay sodalities included the Third Order of St. Francis, many confraternities, six hundred sodalities of Mary, the Apostleship of Prayer, the League of Daily Mass, the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Pioneer Abstinence Association, and others. A Central Catholic Library, founded at Dublin in 1922, provided an arsenal of information for both experts and inquirers.

Legion of Mary. But the Irish foundation which has attracted the greatest attention in the field of Catholic Action is the Legion of Mary, founded at Dublin on September 7, 1921, by Mr. Frank Duff and associates. Its professed object is "the sanctification of its members by prayer and active co-operation in Mary's and the Church's work of crushing the head of the serpent and advancing the reign of Christ." This organization soon spread beyond Irish frontiers, and received papal endorsement. Unobtrusive but persistent, it has worked effectively at maintaining or reviving the Faith in parishes in both Christian and missionary territories, and has been singled out for special attack by Communists in China and elsewhere.

111. THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

A. Canada

(1) British North America (1763–1867)

Religious discrimination. By the terms of the Treaty of Paris (1763), "His British Majesty consents to grant the inhabitants of Canada the liberty of the Catholic religion," but the fine print qualified this "insofar as the laws of England permit." The civil government introduced during 1764 contemplated a speedy Anglicizing of the new British province: English laws and courts were to be instituted and the Anglican religious establishment officially recognized. Only in 1766 was Bishop Briand of Quebec allowed to take up residence as "superintendent of the Roman Church in Canada." The Jesuits had already been suppressed before the fall of Canada; they and the Franciscans were now ordered to dispose of their property to British subjects and depart. This left Canada to the ministrations of some 146 secular priests, including 28 Sulpicians, who tried to keep some sort of a seminary going. The Ursulines, 28 in 1760, were also allowed to remain. The new English law was frequently misused by adventurers to defraud the French natives who failed to understand its intricacies. It was not long before English and Scottish settlers, though in a minority of a few thousand to ten or fifteen times their number, had taken possession of local government and strove to in-

troduce the English penal laws against Catholic worship. British officials insisted on interfering in the temporal concerns of parishes and in passing on nominations for benefices.

Religious toleration. Sir Guy Carleton was an experienced colonial administrator and enjoyed some foresight in his terms as Canadian governor (1766–78; 1786–96). He came to recognize the danger of revolt pending in the American colonies and determined to enlist French Canadian loyalty by concessions in the important matter of religion. The Quebec Act (1774) designed to achieve this has been termed the French Canadian *Magna Charta*. This assured the French settlers of the free exercise of their religion, and restored French law for civil cases. French as well as Anglo-Saxon Canadians were now summoned to an appointed gubernatorial advisory council. Canadian loyalty during the revolt of the United States was thus secured, and Bishop Briand declared in 1775: "Religion is perfectly free. I can exercise my ministry without restriction." It is true that there were some cases of deportation of French sympathizers when France joined the American States in the Revolutionary War, but on the whole the French clergy held their people in allegiance to the British crown, and this was generally true as well of the War of 1812 between Great Britain and the United States. Although the French Canadian native clergy remained almost static during these years, the French Revolution proved Canada's salvation in that many *émigré* clerics came to Canada to assist those priests already in Canada. The Maritime Provinces and Ontario saw the influx of a considerable number of Irish and Scottish Catholics who brought priests of their own nationality with them.

Separate Colonies. During 1791 Canada was divided into the separate provinces of Quebec (Lower Canada) and Ontario (Upper Canada), largely on racial grounds. Although religious liberty was reaffirmed, a Francophobe "Château Clique" about the governor long schemed to coerce or persuade the French Canadians into abandoning their nationality, and if possible, their religion as well. These designs were generally unsuccessful for the French Canadians closed their ranks in defense of their customs, and the British government in London, engaged in world-wide conflicts, was little disposed to encourage local dissensions among British subjects. Hierarchical organization accordingly became possible, and between 1817 and 1821 episcopal vicars-apostolic were named for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Montreal, Upper Canada, and the Northwest. Quebec, made metropolitan over these jurisdictions, did not officially employ this style until 1844 in order to humor governmental susceptibilities. In Ontario, Catholic population steadily increased, chiefly through immigration of Irish and Scottish Catholics, directed by Father Alexander MacDonnell (1760–1840),

vicar-apostolic from 1819. Jesuits and Oblates worked among the Indians and Eskimos of the North and West.

Canadian autonomy became the chief issue at mid-century. Education was the subject of lengthy controversies. The French Catholic majority insisted that state schools provide religious instruction, while the Episcopalians demanded separate provision. This contest, reaching high points in 1829, 1841, and 1863, was eventually settled by compromise: in Quebec, the state schools would provide instruction in the Catholic religion, with separate provision for the Protestant minority; in Ontario, religious instructions would be Protestant, with separate arrangements for the Catholic minority. But all of the Canadians had grievances against British administration, and French Canadian discontent erupted into rebellion during 1837 when patriots called for the "right to legislate on the internal affairs of this colony." Yet the bishops of Quebec and Montreal denied French Canadians any right to revolt, and in some instances denied the sacraments and Christian burial to belligerent Catholics. The rebellion, indeed, was quickly crushed, but the British government attempted to remove the causes for secession. The British commissioner, Lord Durham, suggested that French Canadians be swamped by reuniting Upper and Lower Canada and flooding the hybrid colony with British population and customs. This plan, when tried, proved a failure, although his additional suggestion that limited responsible government be conceded proved to be a political safety valve. For despite racial and religious tensions, English and French Canadian statesmen like Cartier and MacDonald succeeded in cooperating in the introduction of parliamentary government for the colony. Separate state schools contributed to allaying sources of friction, and various privileges for the Anglicans were abolished in Ontario while feudal dues were commuted in Quebec. The Catholic hierarchy strove to reconcile French and Irish Catholics. Archbishop Turgeon presided over the first provincial council in 1851 which, besides regulating discipline and liturgy, provided for Laval University which came into being the next year with branches at Quebec and Montreal. Colonization societies strove to preserve the Faith among Catholics moving to the West, and new vicariates or dioceses were erected as the need arose.

(2) DOMINION OF CANADA (1867–1949)

Confederation proved to be the only solution for the various local and racial differences. In March, 1867, the British North America Act created the self-governing Dominion of Canada for the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario. It was subsequently augmented by the inclusion of Manitoba (1870), Columbia (1871), Prince Edward Island (1873), Alberta and Saskatchewan (1905), and New-

foundland (1949). The Statute of Westminster (1930) made Canada and other British dominions politically independent.

Educational disputes. The Canadian constitution "froze" the pre-existing educational arrangements in the provinces before confederation. A Catholic question arose in 1890 when the Protestant majority in the Manitoba provincial legislature and an anti-French school board abolished the existing system of separate denominational tax-supported schools in favor of a single non-sectarian program. Though the Canadian Supreme Court declared the Manitoba Act unconstitutional, a series of Dominion premiers could or would not force the province to yield. The Liberal premier, Wilfred Laurier (1896–1911), though a Catholic and a French Canadian, refused to accept episcopal resolutions of intransigence. Instead he suggested a compromise on the bases of released time and partial subsidies in proportion to the local Catholic population. Other Catholics were dissatisfied with this replica of the Faribault Plan, and appealed to the Holy See. In 1897 Monsignor Merry del Val obtained additional safeguards of a Catholic voice in the school board, right to reject undesirable texts, and provision for inspection by Catholic representatives. With papal approbation, this compromise was put into operation. When a similar issue arose in Alberta in 1905, Laurier insisted on the constitutional guarantee of separate schools. Agitation died away only to revive in Ontario during World War I. From 1913 the Protestant school inspectors made the teaching of French in the dual system schools practically impossible. French Canadians, who were lukewarm toward Canadian participation in the war, denounced this as religious discrimination, although many Irish Catholics in Ontario sympathized with the measures. Governmental bilingual schools practically ceased and French Canadians talked of secession. Then Pope Benedict XV, while conceding the legitimate aspirations of the French to preserve their language, forbade any "violent or illegitimate methods." French Canadian demands were then toned down and in 1927 Ontario recognized bilingual schools as proper.

Ultramontane disputes in French Canada also caused trouble during the nineteenth century. Ultramontanism of the most violent type induced French Canadians to volunteer in the Papal Zouaves for defense of the Papal States during the 1860's. Ultramontanism provoked anticlerical Liberalism, such as that of Guibord's *Institut Canadien,* whose *Year Book* for 1868 was blacklisted by the hierarchy. Nor did Guibord's death in 1869 bring peace, for until 1875 the Case of Guibord's Grave agitated Montreal. When Bishop Bourget denied ecclesiastical burial, the lawyer Doutré, after protracted, litigation had Guibord buried in Notre Dame cemetery by means of a police escort but without benefit of clergy.

On the project of a Catholic political party, moreover, a "Holy War"

was fought between sections of the clergy from 1871 to 1886. When some curés went so far as to direct the voting of their flocks from the pulpit under penalty of censures, Justice Taschereau voided the elections as subject to undue influence. The Judge's brother, Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec, gained the ascendancy in the hierarchy by advising the clergy to distinguish between political and theological Liberalism, and Rome advised greater hierarchical unity and considerable prudence. Cardinal Taschereau was also sustained by Pope Leo XIII in his defense of the instruction at Laval University against accusations of Liberalism by Bishop La Fleche and the Ultras.

Nationalism remained an abiding issue. The extreme Nationalism of Henri Bourrassa (1868–1952) during the twentieth century tended to confuse religious and racial questions, but the temperate guidance of the French Canadian hierarchy averted extremes. Of Bourrassa and his ilk, Cardinal Villeneuve noted that "he better understands a faraway or a dead pope than living bishops, who embarrass him." Canon Groulx fostered a historical Romanticism that captivated many, but the Canadian version of *Action Française* collapsed in 1928—without schism. French Canadian isolation became acute during World War II, and despite the consistent loyalty of the hierarchy, stout resistance was put up to registration and conscription, and there was talk of an independent French Canadian state. The close of the war eased tensions, French Canadian particularism remained an important factor. Catholics, numbering forty-three per cent of the Canadian population at the 1941 census, were nonetheless capable of defending all their religious rights, and active in many forms of religious, social, and economic movements.

B. Australia and New Zealand

(1) CATHOLIC BEGINNINGS

Discovery. On Pentecost, 1606, the Spanish mariner De Quiros named the *"Tierra Austral del Espiritu Santo,"* but for long the appellation, "New Holland," affixed by the Dutch Captain Tasman in 1642, was applied to Australia. Tasman also discovered and named New Zealand. The English Captain Cook treated with New Zealand natives in 1769, and landed at and named Botany Bay, on the coast of New South Wales.

Colonization began in Australia on January 26, 1788, when Governor Arthur Phillip landed the first convict contingent at Botany Bay. Those deported included many Irishmen arrested for political reasons, and by 1792 Catholics in the colony were estimated at three hundred. Until 1800 they were constrained to attend Protestant services. Then three priests, accused of complicity in the 1798 Irish rising, were transported. One of these, James Dixon, was permitted in 1802 to say Mass, using a tin chalice and a vestment cut from old damask curtains. In 1804 Rome

named him prefect apostolic, but the same year Catholic convicts were deprived of leave to hear Mass and again constrained to Anglican services. Until 1817 they were without Catholic ministrations. Father Jeremiah Flynn then attempted to defy the British Colonial Office by going to the colony and exercising his priestly functions on behalf of an estimated six thousand Catholics. But he was soon arrested and deported.

Authorized ministration commenced in 1819 as a result of protests in parliament against the treatment of Father Flynn, and petitions by influential Catholics. The British government agreed to subsidize Catholic "chaplains" for the Australian and South African colonies, and in 1819 the Holy See appointed Bishop Slater vicar-apostolic of Mauritius with jurisdiction over both Australia and South Africa. The bishop conceded faculties to Father Phillip Connolly (d. 1839) and John Therry (1790–1864), both of whom labored in Australia for the rest of their lives; the former in Tasmania, the latter at first in Sydney. Here he at once embarked on an ambitious project of erecting a Catholic church; it was not completed until 1836. Father Therry, if somewhat tactless and meticulous, was yet a zealous and tireless apostle, ever ready to protest to the government against discrimination toward his flock. During 1833 Father Ullathorne, future bishop of Birmingham, visited the mission as episcopal delegate. He composed feuds and gave evidence before parliament which contributed to the eventual abolition of the convict system.

Hierarchical organization came in 1834 when John Polding (1794–1877) was appointed vicar-apostolic for an estimated twenty thousand Catholics in the Australian colony. The bishop was diligent in visiting his new and vast vicariate and in erecting churches and schools, although the remoteness of New Zealand caused it to be included in the Oceanic vicariate of Bishop Jean Pompalier in 1835. Bishop Polding formed a seminary in 1838, and secured some governmental subsidies for Catholic education from Governor Richard Bourke (1831–38). During 1842 the vicar apostolic was named first archbishop of Sydney, with Hobart and Adelaide as suffragan sees, to which Perth and Melbourne were added within five years. By this time there were twenty-four priests and forty thousand Catholics distributed in eighteen parochial districts. Certain aspects of trusteeism and other financial difficulties complicated the new ecclesiastical province; the former problem was settled by compromise in 1857.

(2) CATHOLIC DEVELOPMENT

Educational question. Catholic growth continued during the pontificates of Archbishops Polding (1834–77) and Roger Vaughan (1877–83). During the latter's administration, however, a long-standing

educational question reached a crisis. The subsidies accorded by Governor Bourke in 1836 had been the subject of repeated protests by non-Catholics. It was hoped to solve this controversy in 1846 by setting up two boards of education to supervise, one the public, and the other the private but subsidized system. During 1852, moreover, St. John's Catholic College was permitted to affiliate with the State University of Sydney with accreditation privileges. Yet in 1866 bigotry won what proved to be a victory in securing the nomination of a single board of education to supervise all Australian schools. The Catholic hierarchy was obliged to protest certain undesirable features, e.g., obligatory use of Whately's *Scripture Lessons,* and during 1870 did obtain modification of some objectionable features. But during 1879 all of the governmental subsidies were declared canceled, effective in 1882. The state schools were henceforth entirely secular in principle, and theology was excluded from the university curriculum, despite protests from both the Catholics and the "Puseyite" wing of the Episcopalians. The Catholic hierarchy then urged Catholics to provide for their own parochial schools. They responded so generously that by 1950 there were sixty-five per cent of Australian Catholic children in Catholic schools: 182,000 in 1,150 elementary, and 44,000 in 350 secondary institutions. In New Zealand during 1877 the government also decreed that primary schools ought to be "free, secular, and compulsory." Catholics, however, were permitted to found their own schools and did so. To these in time the government conceded incidental subsidies, e.g., free textbooks and schoolbus transportation.

Catholic life. Archbishop Vaughan was succeeded by Cardinal Patrick Moran (1884–1911) who became the first Australian member of the Sacred College, and as such presided over the first plenary council convened in Australia. During World War I, Archbishop Mannix of Melbourne provoked hostility by opposing conscription and championing Irish independence, and the ill feeling elicited by the attendant controversies lingered for some time. Catholics participated in the labor movements, and Premiers Scullin and Lyons (1929–39) were members of the Church. A Catholic worker movement, based on the Belloc-Chesterton distributist thesis, was launched in 1936. During 1937 the National Catholic Action Committee was formed with an episcopal board of directors, to which were affiliated bureaus for Rural Life, Workers, Catholic Students, Christian Girls, etc. By 1950 there were twenty-six dioceses with nine hundred religious and seventeen hundred secular priests, assisted by fourteen hundred lay brothers and eleven thousand sisters.

In New Zealand, by 1954 there was a population of over two million

of whom about fourteen per cent were Catholic. In a society keenly alive to labor questions, Catholic social action was important. Extensive missionary work among the Maori natives was conducted and before 1860 the number of converts had reached forty thousand. But a native insurrection (1860–70), provoked by white penetration of Maori lands, prejudiced the natives against the missionaries and reduced the Catholic flock to ten thousand. Marists and Mill Hill Fathers, however, courageously resumed work after the uprising. The Legion of Mary and the Catholic Youth movement became popular among Catholic New Zealanders.

C. Union of South Africa

(1) ALIEN ORIGINS (1486–1806)

Portuguese exploration. Bartholomeu Diaz in Portuguese service in 1486 planted the Cross at Santa Cruz Isle, Al-Goa Bay, near the present Port Elizabeth. On Christmas Day, 1497, Vasco da Gama named the port of Natal which became a Portuguese way station en route to India. The Portuguese occupied Sofala in Mozambique in 1505, but their settlements in South Africa were checked by Moslem possession of the Zanzibar coast. Missionaries landed in Mozambique during Cabral's voyage of 1500, but they and their successors were obliged for the most part to confine their ministrations to European settlers. A courageous Jesuit mission up the Zambesi (1559–62) by Fathers Silveira and Fernandez resulted in baptism of two chiefs and their courts, but Father Silveira was slain in a Moslem reaction, and his colleague went on to India. Repeated efforts to penetrate the interior failed to achieve lasting success.

Dutch occupation. Capetown was founded in 1652 as an Indian way station by Jan van Riebeeck, governor for the Dutch East India Company, which was supplanting the Portuguese in the East Indies. Catholicity was denied public profession by the dominant Dutch Reformed sect, though this did not prevent several Jesuits who stopped off at the Cape in 1685 en route to Siam from ministering to a few scattered Catholics. During the French domination of Holland, three priests were sent out to the Cape in 1805, but they were deported when the Cape Colony was ceded to the British in 1806.

(2) BRITISH RULE (1806–1910)

Catholicity was at a disadvantage in South Africa until 1820 when Bishop Slater, newly appointed vicar-apostolic of the Oceanic area, installed Father Scully as "Roman Catholic chaplain" at the Cape. Father Scully and his immediate successors encountered difficulty with insubordinate churchwardens, and Catholic life remained in considerable dis-

order until 1837 when Bishop Raymond Griffith, O.P., was named vicar-apostolic of the Cape. From his arrival in 1838 until his death in 1862, the bishop was indefatigable in his enormous charge. After an oxcart visitation, he estimated his flock at but five hundred souls. The trustees were summarily dismissed and discipline restored. But the magnitude of his task forced the bishop to confine his efforts chiefly to the white settlers, for whom churches and schools were erected. His successor, Bishop Grimley, who attended the Vatican Council, stressed education, and such was the need for schools in South Africa, that the government often subsidized Catholic institutions. Catholicity tried to keep pace with the development of the secular provinces, and Bishop John Leonard (1871–1907), constantly saying his beads on his travels, carried on the educational tradition, sustained by a Catholic press directed by Father Kolbe. New vicariates were erected in Natal, Transvaal, and Basutoland, with prefectures elsewhere. The Jesuits and Oblates devoted their efforts to conversion of the natives.

Ruthless British imperialism, however, considerably hampered any missionary effort. The Boer War (1899–1902), though unsuccessful in restoring Dutch independence, did halt British imperialism in South Africa. The British and Dutch joined forces against the blacks, and the Boers were conciliated with responsible government under the British crown.

(3) Strife in Union (1910–61)

The Union of South Africa, formed in 1910, achieved dominion status. Anglo-Boer conflict was replaced by native resentment of white domination. In 1926 the Colour Bar Law opened a series of discriminatory statutes. From 1910 to 1948, however, a moderate South African Party favored the British tie and Anglo-Boer dominance. A minority had always favored secession and extreme white exclusiveness. This group came to the fore in 1948 and took South Africa out of the Commonwealth in 1961. It remained problematical how long a white minority could hold down a resolute and often warlike black majority.

Catholics, however, were a small group among the whites and exercised a negligible influence in parliament. Education had been left to the provinces by the Union constitution, and thus Cape Colony and Natal continued subsidies to Catholic schools, while Transvaal and Orange Free State did not. Communist infiltration proved a menace to labor unions, and the bishops, forbidding Catholics to join such organizations, formed a Catholic group in their stead. In 1922 an apostolic delegation was established, and in 1951 the vicariates were replaced by the archdioceses of Cape Town, Pretoria, Durban, and Bloemfontein. These sees with their suffragans comprised 20 dioceses and an abbacy

nullius for a Catholic population of 107,000 Europeans, 707,000 Bantu, and 78,000 Negroes.

112. NORTH AMERICAN PRIMACY

A. *Domestic Social Ferment* (*1921–53*)

(1) SOCIAL IDEOLOGIES

Financial ogres. The decade, 1919–29, saw the disappearance of 6,000 manufacturing and mining firms, of 3,700 public utilities, of over 10,000 banks—all merged into giant corporations which came to rule American business. In 1933, only 594 corporations, each capitalized at over $50,000,000, owned fifty-three per cent of the corporate wealth—the other forty-seven per cent was divided among 387,970 firms. J. P. Morgan alone controlled twenty-five per cent—$74,000,000,000—by means of interlocking directorates. By 1940, some 200 corporations controlled half the wealth. The leading financial groups were Morgan First National, Kuhn-Loeb, Rockefeller, Mellon, and Du Pont.

Prosperity of unprecedented proportions seemed to attend this development of financial behemoths, and Commerce Secretary Hoover felt that the United States was nearer the abolition of poverty than ever before. Yet this was not the case for the farmer, whose mortgage debt had increased from three to nine billions between 1910 and 1930, while his land decreased in valuation by twenty billions between 1920 and 1932. Nor was the laborer and small wage earner much better off, for in 1929 six million families had incomes of less than $1,000; twelve million less than $1,500; sixteen million less than $2,000, so that perhaps a third or more of the population were under what many would consider a fair wage.

Political views. The Republicans claimed credit for much of this prosperity as a result of Harding's pledge of "less government in business and more business in government." Herbert Hoover was to extol the "rugged individualism" of the Americans who had created such a society, by making their own way in life without governmental aid. Yet one who had so made his way, Alfred E. Smith, his opponent for the presidency in 1928, dissented that, "it is a fallacy that there is inconsistency between progressive measures protecting the rights of the people, including the poor and the weak, and a just regard for the rights of legitimate business. . . . Property to the extent that we have it is unduly concentrated, and has not equitably touched the lives of the farmer, the wage earner, and the individual business man." But Smith's analysis was rejected by the electorate in 1928, although four years later they would hear Smith's heir excoriate "Toryism" and pledge himself to a "New Deal for the American people."

(2) Republican "Normalcy" (1921–29)

President Warren Harding (1921–23) captured the mood of war-weary America with his diagnosis: "America's present need is not heroics but healing; not nostrums but normalcy; not revolution but restoration; not surgery but serenity." Friendly, commonplace, undistinguished senator from Ohio, Harding had been an opponent of the League of Nations and an exponent of the McKinley-Hanna-Foraker school.

Social reaction was the result of this attitude. Andrew Mellon, secretary of the treasury from 1921 to 1932, was the key figure in the three Republican presidential administrations that followed and was presently saluted as the "greatest secretary of the treasury since Alexander Hamilton." It is true that within a decade (1920–30) the national debt was reduced from twenty-four to sixteen billions, but this paid off large bond-holders, whose higher income taxes were reduced. Railroads and shipping were put back in private hands, although consolidation was encouraged. Taxes on corporations were substantially reduced. The Fordney-McCumber Tariff raised duties to the highest level ever, to the manufacturers' gain but to the disadvantage of farmers seeking to dispose of surplus.

Corruption unfortunately accompanied the new regime, through Harding's negligence and moral obtuseness, though not with his connivance. Charles Forbes was convicted of wasting a quarter of a billion dollars appropriated for veterans. Thomas Miller was detected in defrauding the Government in the sale of alien property. Attorney General Daugherty resigned under fire for lax prosecution of corporations and connivance with prohibition violation. Fall, secretary of the interior, was convicted of bribery in leasing government oil reserves to private concerns, among whom Sinclair was sentenced to prison. These scandals shook public confidence and probably contributed to the president's death in August, 1923. He was succeeded by Vice-President Coolidge who had not been directly involved. Despite Senator Walsh's probe of the Republican scandals, the Republicans won the 1924 elections by default when the Liberal vote was divided between John W. Davis, nominee of an acrimonious Democratic convention, and Progressive Senator Robert La Follette.

President Calvin Coolidge (1923–29) announced laconically that "America's business is business." He claimed for the Republican Party the traditions of the Federalists and Whigs, and paid his tribute to Alexander Hamilton. Shrewd, evasive, and exceedingly *laissez faire* in any legislative sense, Coolidge made no basic changes from the financial-commercial policies of Secretaries Mellon and Hoover. He presented Congress with a minimum of legislation, and a congressional attempt

in 1928 to assist the farmer by the McNary-Haugen Bill had to be passed
over his veto. At length, not choosing to run for a third term, he recom-
mended his secretary of commerce, Herbert Hoover, as his heir.

(3) ABNORMAL DEPRESSION (1929–33)

President Herbert Hoover (1929–33), strongly victorious over his
Democratic opponent, Alfred E. Smith, was undoubtedly the most com-
petent of the "Normalcy" chief executives, though he proved the scape-
goat for the mistakes of all. Throughout his term he scarcely deviated
from established policies. The Hawley-Smoot Tariff maintained pro-
tectionism at a high level. An Agricultural Marketing Act did make a few
efforts to subsidize farmers' co-operatives, but had scant opportunity to
be tried before the Depression. The president insisted on law enforce-
ment, including that of the ban on liquor, but his Wickersham Commis-
sion came up with no practicable means.

Social hysteria, however, had long been increasing tensions to a break-
ing point. Prohibition, more violated than observed, lowered respect for
all law. Emancipation of women in some instances was a pretext for
excesses in feminine "freedom": abandon of restraints in modesty and
decorum, birth prevention and divorce. New inventions ever attracted
society to stress things rather than persons, gadgets more than ideas.
Mass production in factories was often paralleled by mass imitation and
lack of personal initiative. Great advances in communications and
mobility tempted many from home life to public commercialized amuse-
ments, and to more aimless activity. Impatience and avarice tempted
others to widespread installment buying, and to speculation on margin
in stock market depths that they could not fathom. Labor received no
adequate protection, though the steel industry worked a twelve-hour day
and a seven-day week until 1923, and miners' conditions led to pitched
battles as late as 1931. State minimum wage laws, sanctioned by the
Supreme Court in 1916, were outlawed by a reversal of the same court in
1923. Only ten per cent of the wage earners were organized by 1914, and
during the 1920's the mild A.F.L. declined in membership by one to two
millions. Judges usually favored employers with injunctions, lock-outs,
upholding of "yellow-dog" contracts exacting pledges against unionism,
and tolerating black-lists, company spies and even provocative agents.

Depression came in October, 1929, and by 1933 prices sank from an
average of ninety-five per cent to sixty-six per cent; wages from one
hundred per cent to forty-four per cent; employment from ninety-seven
per cent to sixty-five per cent. Industrial stocks sank from 252 to 61; rails
from 167 to 33, and utilities from 353 to 99. Some thirty-two thousand
businesses failed in 1932; within three years five thousand banks closed.
Trade declined from nine to three billion, national income from an

estimated eighty-five billion in 1929 to thirty-seven billion in 1932. Remedies offered by the Hoover Administration were few. Only in 1932 when the Democrats were in control of Congress, was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation founded to lend money to foundering businesses, while the Norris–La Guardia Act curbed injunctions. Hoover warned that this was to head for disaster, socialistic schemes and "so-called New Deals" that would destroy the American way of life. But in the 1932 elections the American peoples displayed their weariness of Republican interpretations of the American way of life and turned to a "New Deal."

(4) DEMOCRATIC NEW DEAL (1933–45)

President Franklin Roosevelt (1933–45) in his inaugural rebuked Manchester Liberalism, and proposed to utilize the power and resources of the Federal Government to meet the emergency and build a better economy. Foes of the New Deal would term "regimentation" the president's appeal: "We must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline, because without such discipline no progress is made, no leadership becomes effective." During the first two years of the New Deal, however, there was general support for certain emergency measures that departed from laissez-faire theories. When some of this hastily drawn legislation was declared unconstitutional by a reactionary Supreme Court, and after business began to revive and panic subside, there was an outcry against governmental direction. Conservatives tried in 1936 to replace Roosevelt with a "Mid-Western Coolidge," Alf Landon, but were snowed under by an unprecedented landslide of votes: F.D.R. won sixty per cent of the popular vote and all but eight electoral votes. Interpreting this as a mandate, the president tried to discipline the Supreme Court by increasing its membership. Eventually he lost this "battle, but won the war": though the proposed legislation was defeated by Congress, the court began to reverse itself on New Deal legislation in 1937 and retirement of its members enabled Roosevelt to appoint sympathetic justices. The "Second New Deal," more permanent legislation, could now go forward, bringing the United States abreast of the social codes already adopted in Germany and Great Britain. Capitalists doggedly denounced these changes, but were repeatedly faced down by the militant votes of workingmen, courted and defended by the administration. Conservatives feared that the bureaucracy and expense entailed by this "Welfare Liberalism" would imperil the traditional "American way of life," but Liberals brushed such fears aside by re-electing the president to unprecedented third and fourth terms. Preoccupation with World War II caused a slackening of new legislation from 1939, but existing gains were not

abandoned and the president remained in political control of both houses of Congress throughout his administration—not that Congress ever allowed him to be a true dictator. War exertions brought death to President Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, leaving behind an undelivered address: "Let us move forward with strong and active faith." Neither saint nor ogre, he was probably a more magnetic leader than farsighted statesman. But none doubted the personal courage of this polio victim and few could deny the energy and infectious optimism of the president who brought the United States through great trials to momentary world primacy.

Financial reforms. President Roosevelt began with a dramatic closing of the nation's banks, to be reopened only after satisfactory evidence of their solvency had been given. This and subsequent New Deal measures he explained to the people in his "fireside chats" on the radio. During April, 1933, the United States was taken off the gold standard to conform to action already taken by other nations. Inflation was allowed until the dollar was fixed in 1934 at about fifty-nine per cent of its 1900 value. To secure a "managed currency," commercial banks were now obliged to become members of the Federal Reserve. This system was reorganized so that its board of governors was given authority to control expansion and contraction of currency, and to regulate security speculation by controlling loans. With the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board was given power to expand or contract credit by increasing or decreasing the reserves that member banks were obliged to maintain with the system—as well as by other means. In 1933 the Glass-Steagall Deposit Act provided insurance for deposits up to $5,000, which actually covered ninety-eight per cent of the depositors. The Securities and Exchange Act, passed in 1934 and revised in 1938, placed investment banking under federal supervision, requiring publicity for all fees, remuneration, earnings, capitalization, stock structure, salaries, etc., from investment firms. The board of governors was empowered to raise or lower stock margins and control brokers' loans made by member banks. It might also require registration of all securities, license stock exchanges, ban pools, options, and sharp practice. This regulatory authority was extended by the Commodity Exchange Act (1936) and the Investment Advisers Act (1940).

Agrarian relief. The New Deal's agricultural program began with the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA), declared unconstitutional in 1936. This curtailed production and extended credit. In 1934 the Farm Mortgage Refunding and Foreclosure Acts and the Bankruptcy Acts sought to preserve farmers' holdings during hard times. After a series of Supreme Court reversals, it was possible to pass the Farm Tenancy Act and Soil Conservation and Allotment Act (1936). Finally

in 1938 the definitive and constitutional AAA, after incorporating and codifying previous measures, empowered the Department of Agriculture to fix acreages, arrange parity prices, and grant subsidies to those farmers who co-operated in regulating production. It laid down a policy of an "ever-normal granary" designed to store surpluses and provide insurance against bad years.

Industrial regulation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was continued in existence from the Hoover Administration, and its facilities expanded. Early in the Roosevelt administration, the National Industrial Relations Act (NIRA) directed industries to draw up labor codes concerning wages, hours, and labor conditions in conjunction with the Federal Government, and to submit to collective bargaining and arbitration. There was a trace of papal "corporatism" in the NRA organized to implement this act, but the program was too hastily formulated and imposed upon an economy ideologically unprepared to receive it. The NRA probably achieved an inspirational purpose before it was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1935. It was followed by more lasting legislation. In 1933 the Tennessee Valley Authority was established to regulate development of a Federal Government power project within the states, a pattern for similar programs of public improvements to come. During 1933 a federal co-ordinator of railroads was named, and in 1935 the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission was extended to motor vehicles, and in 1940 to inland waterways. In 1935 the Public Utility Holding Company Act required registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act (1936) was partially antimonopolistic, but the New Deal was unable to control monopolies and corporations perfectly.

Labor legislation. The NIRA laid down a charter for labor, which was more solidly and legally established by the Wagner-Connery National Labor Relations Act of 1935. This vindicated collective bargaining, and practically outlawed company spies and yellow dog contracts. The National Labor Relations Board was established to arbitrate disputes. This legislation was supplemented by the Child Labor Act (1936) and the Public Contracts Act (1938). The latter measure, which regulated employment in any firm having a public contract of over $10,000, laid down the principle of the eight-hour day and forty-hour week to be achieved by 1940. As emergency measures, the Civilian Conservation Corps had provided disciplined employment and lodging for indigent citizens working on public construction programs. These programs under the Works Progress Administration (WPA) distributed ten billions in wages to employ the jobless on governmental projects between 1935 and 1942, when it was discontinued. In 1935 the Social Security Act was passed. This measure, revised in 1939 and 1949, offered a system of old-age

and unemployment insurance pensions from funds amassed through federal, state, and employer contributions. In 1937 the Wagner-Steagall Housing Act came to the assistance of home-seekers. Such legislation provided long denied social justice to workingmen, and its retention in substance by succeeding administrations is an indication of its basic soundness. Nonetheless, subsequent abuses by union racketeers demonstrated that government regulation of labor organization would also be necessary.

(5) The "Fair Deal" (1945–53)

President Harry S. Truman (1945–53), who had been elected vice-president in 1944, succeeded to the presidency on Franklin Roosevelt's death. He had distinguished himself as head of an investigating committee into war production activities. He was an "average" American in politics, unassuming, forthright, if blunt and somewhat irascible. Without his predecessor's extraordinary political skill and advantages, he was yet burdened by none of the animosities that Roosevelt had provoked in his long and vigorous administration.

Republican resurgence. The new president continued his predecessor's policies, but was hampered by Communist infiltration of government personnel, facilitated by the wartime military alliance. A postwar reaction to austerity and controls was seen in the Democratic defeat in the 1946 midterm elections, when the Republicans took over control of Congress for the first time since 1931. The new Congress passed over the president's veto the Taft-Hartley Labor Management Relations Act. This outlawed the "closed shop" employing only union members, but permitted the "union shop" if desired by a majority of workers: the employer is free to hire anyone but the latter must join the union. Injunctions against strikes "menacing public health and safety" were sanctioned, and it was envisioned that these might be used against jurisdictional strikes, strikes for compulsory hiring to "stand by," and secondary boycotts. Unions were made liable to damage suits by employers, and political contributions, "featherbedding" and excessive dues were forbidden, and a conciliation service set up outside the Labor Department. Congress also restricted the presidency to two terms by constitutional amendment, and altered the presidential succession in favor of the speaker and president pro tempore in preference to the cabinet. In 1947–49 the War and Navy Departments were consolidated into a unified Department of Defense.

Democratic comeback. The Taft-Hartley Act had roused labor's ire and its activity surprised prognostications for the 1948 elections. But though President Truman was re-elected, the Democrats were unable to reverse the Taft-Hartley Act by 1950 when the Korean War again

distracted attention from domestic issues. This dragged on to an inconclusive compromise and in 1952 the American electorate, without repudiating the New Deal, decided that there was no need for further advance by a "Fair Deal." The war hero, General Dwight Eisenhower, was elected on the Republican ticket, ending twenty years of Democratic occupancy of the White House. But the Democrats remained in partial control of Congress, and regained complete control in 1954.

(6) BIPARTISAN IMPASSE (1953–61)

While American confidence in the sincerity, integrity, and simplicity of President Eisenhower was expressed in his election and re-election to the presidency by wide margins, the Democratic Party remained the majority party in Congress. Accordingly there were few startling developments in legislation, and the nation paused to incorporate the changes. But domestic issues were dwarfed by the menacing situation of the "Cold War" against Communism, and the continuing necessity of expending enormous sums upon existing defenses and research into atomic and spatial possibilities of offense and defense. Things seemed more than ever in the saddle, and there was anxious national self-questioning about the American way of life in relation to the Communist challenge.

B. Church-State Tensions

(1) KLAN BIGOTRY

The Ku Klux Klan was founded on Thanksgiving Day, 1915, at Stone Mountain near Atlanta. The founder, William Simmons, served as the "Imperial Wizard" until his resignation in 1922, prompted by an abortive Congressional investigation. Prior to 1920 the Klan was a local group of but five thousand members, but during the 1920's under the direction of Edward Clarke its propaganda captured from two to five millions for its anti-Catholic-Jewish-Negro movement. In 1922 Hiram Evans of Dallas replaced Simmons, and moved Klan headquarters to Indianapolis. Crude terrorism was abandoned for subtler but far more effective methods.

Political activity. In 1924 the Klan threat halted the Underwood presidential candidacy and divided the Democratic National Convention. McAdoo, though nominated by the Catholic Phelan, was believed to be the Klan candidate. Al Smith, well-known Catholic Governor of New York, was nominated by Franklin Roosevelt who excoriated "bogies and hobgoblins, encouragement of false fears." Yet a motion to denounce the Klan by name lost by a vote of 543 to 540. Klan political activity revived on a national scale in 1928. Senator Heflin denounced supposed Catholic machinations on the senate floor, and was rebuked by Senator Robinson.

Under the chairmanship of the Methodist prelate, James Cannon, Jr., the Klansmen made a supreme effort to defeat Al Smith's candidacy for the presidency, and subsequently wrested five Southern states from the Democratic column. During the campaign, Mabel Willebrant, assistant attorney general, urged Methodist conventions to vote for Hoover. In contrast, the Catholic hierarchy directed clerics to abstain from politics, and the attitude of the Catholic laity elicited praise from fair-minded Protestants. The Klan, however, sent out postcards with these and similar alarm calls: "Smith's success means the president on his knees in the White House kissing the hand of a Roman cardinal, just as he has previously done; a confessional box in the White House, and the secrets of the government whispered into the ear of a representative of the Vatican; Rome enthroned in the Supreme Court; America embroiled in war with Mexico in the interest of papal despotism; the public school scuttled and wrecked in the interest of the parochial school with its curriculum of thirteenth century superstition; the Romanizing of our postal system and the destruction of the Protestant press; the nullification of the Prohibition Law as it has been done in New York State and a free reign to every whiskey vandal. It means the pope above the president, the Canon Law above the Constitution, and the papal rag above the American flag." [17]

Klan propaganda spared nothing in its attack on Catholics and "convent horror" stories revived, together with misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine. In a Chicago suburb, a sinister development was seen: "Forces town to take new papist name: 'Area' becomes 'Mundelein' honoring wearer of red hat. Cardinal, enthroned at Chicago, is godfather of unwilling little village." Fears were expressed that soon Washington, D.C., would be changed to Piusville or St. Patricksburg, while New York might become New Rome. But soon the great depression was renaming towns "Hooverville" and the Klan was forgotten, dwindling to minor proportions.

(2) RACIAL-RELIGIOUS BIGOTRY

Racial Trusteeism. In Providence, Rhode Island, a minority of French Americans formed a secret society, *Les Croisés,* whose organ *Sentinelle* accused the diocese of Americanizing French Canadians (1922–27). The bishop and trustees of parish corporations were sued in 1927 to exact an account, but the courts upheld the episcopal stewardship. In 1928 the rebels were excommunicated by Rome. Between 1930 and 1932 five lay trustees of the Lithuanian St. George's church in Shenandoah, Pennsylvania, harassed the pastor with civil prosecution, although the state supreme court eventually sustained the pastor.

[17] Michael Williams, *Shadow of the Pope* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1932), p. 227.

Anti-Semitism. Father Charles Coughlin, pastor of Royal Oak, Michigan, from 1926, began to devote himself to labor problems about 1930 and won a large following by his radio addresses. But during 1932–35, his earlier exposition of Catholic social principles, turned into denunciation of international bankers, largely Jewish, and advocacy of a dubious monetary system. At first favorable to the New Deal, he turned against it in 1935 and made derogatory remarks about President Roosevelt during 1936 which drew public rebukes from Archbishop McNicholas and Monsignor Ryan. After his own candidate, Lemke, was overwhelmed by Roosevelt in 1936, Father Coughlin turned to formation of a "Christian Front" against Jewry which he linked with Communism. His weekly paper, *Social Justice*, was criticized by Catholic leaders for its anti-Semitism. Always submissive to his ordinary, Father Coughlin disassociated himself from *Social Justice* in May, 1940, and later ceased his radio activity. *Social Justice* was denied use of the mails in 1942.

Sectarian bigotry or Nativism also revived. The Jehovah Witnesses, founded by the minister Charles Russell of Pittsburgh in 1876, became after Russell's death (1916) a militant pacifist and anti-Catholic group under his successor, "Judge" Rutherford (d. 1942). They fell foul of the law in many instances by forcing their propaganda upon individuals, or refusing to salute the flag. A less violent attack was launched in 1949 by Paul Blanchard with his book, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. This and other books of the same author dreaded an international dictatorship emanating from Rome, scarcely less menacing than Communism. With an appearance of fairness and specious display of distorted documentation, Blanchard practically roused a new nativist movement. Though Catholic patriotism was defended by James O'Neill in *Catholicism and American Freedom*, "Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State" (POAU) organized to deny Catholic schools any share in public funds or services, such as bus transportation. Within Catholic ranks, a minor schism led by Leonard Feeney, S.J., broke out at Boston in 1949 over *"extra Ecclesiam nulla salus."* But in 1952 the Holy Office assured honest inquirers that the "good dispositions of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to God's will" suffice for salvation in one ignorant of the truth of the Catholic Church.

(3) EDUCATIONAL THREATS

Compulsory public education was a danger early in this period, and this instrument of totalitarian propaganda could thus equally be made to serve the aims of Liberalism and Secularism. Accordingly the American hierarchy looked askance at the trend toward federal control of education beginning in the 1920's. Following the bishops' warning in 1923

against "paternalism in government," Monsignor Pace of Catholic University opposed a Federal Department of Education as tending to be too dictatorial and bureaucratic. In the states, Michigan (1920) proposed a law compelling attendance at public schools, but it was defeated. In 1922, however, the Oregon electorate imposed a similar law by means of the initiative. Its interpretation was referred to the Supreme Court of the United States, which declared it unconstitutional in 1925. In a decision praised by Pius XI the Court asserted: "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the state to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only." In 1949 the Barden Bill providing federal educational subsidies again indirectly threatened private education, and creation of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1953) and the President's Committee on Education are indications of a continuing trend.

State subsidies. Increasing costs of parochial education induced many Catholic educators to seek assistance from public funds, and various local and national agencies did provide some indirect aid. In 1944 the Soldiers' Bill of Rights virtually allotted federal funds to private schools to help veterans complete their education. During 1947 the United States Supreme Court upheld a New Jersey law authorizing use of public buses to transport parochial school pupils: the Everson Bus Case. But even these minor concessions aroused objections from non-Catholics on the ground that "separation of Church and state" prevented any public aid, however indirect, to private schools. In 1948 the Supreme Court reversed itself by sustaining Vashti McCollum of Illinois, a professed atheist, in her objections to released time for religious instruction. Justice Hugo Black declared that in the McCollum Case, "this is beyond all question a utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public school system to aid religious groups to spread their faith." Brady accuses the Court of inconsistency for ruling three months later in Saia vs. New York that the City of Lockport was obliged to permit use of a public park for religious instruction by a member of one sect, despite protests of prospective pupils. Again, the Supreme Court decision of April, 1952, sanctioning the release of students at a stated time each week to receive religious instruction elsewhere, is hailed as displaying more sympathy to religion. In any event, James O'Neill seems justified in his contention that the First Amendment leaves all such questions to the individual states, and that the "religious establishment" envisioned by that amendment is in no way involved in school subsidies.

California taxation. Another case, happily unique in the United States, existed in California where Catholics, in addition to supporting the public schools by taxation, were also obliged to pay taxes on their own

privately financed parochial school system. Against this unjust measure, Cardinal McIntyre, archbishop of Los Angeles, led the fight for an amendment to the California Code, "Proposition 3" on the 1952 ballot, exempting private school property from taxation. Though voters approved of this measure, determined masonic opposition threatened its execution by appeals in state courts until the United States Supreme Court dismissed protest cases in 1956. When the parochial taxation measure reappeared on the 1958 ballot as initiative "Proposition 16," it was heavily defeated, and this threat seemed repulsed.

(4) POLITICS

Diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the United States, which had existed between 1848 and 1867, were semi-officially resumed between 1939 and 1950. During his visit to the United States in 1936, Cardinal Pacelli had visited President Roosevelt, and the latter after the outbreak of World War II proposed collaboration in the search for peace. With the consent of Pacelli, then Pius XII, the president named Myron Taylor his personal representative with the rank of ambassador. Mr. Taylor, a friendly Protestant, continued to serve Presidents Roosevelt and Truman in this capacity until his resignation in 1950. When President Truman nominated General Mark Clark as Taylor's successor in 1951, a storm of protest from bigots led to discontinuance of the mission.

Outstanding Catholic statesmen during the period included Alfred E. Smith (1873-1944), governor of New York for four terms, and nominee for the presidency; the cabinet members were Farley, Walker and Hannegan under Franklin Roosevelt; McGrath, Tobin, and McGranery under Truman; and Mitchell, and Durkin under Eisenhower. Catholic Supreme Court justices were Butler, Frank Murphy, and William Brennan. Catholics continued to constitute a percentage of American senators and congressmen, and in 1960 one of these, John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, was elected President of the United States.

C. Catholic Apostolate

(1) ORGANIZED CATHOLIC CO-OPERATION

"The National Catholic Welfare Conference is the agency of the archbishops and bishops of the United States for unified, corporate action on the national level to promote the welfare of the Church and the country. It has for its incorporated purposes 'unifying, co-ordinating, and organizing the Catholic people of the United States' in works of social welfare, education, and other activities." [18]

Origin of NCWC. The National Catholic War Council, organized in

[18] Bishop Michael Ready, "NCWC," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Supplement II.

1917 to co-ordinate the Catholic war effort, proved so successful that in February, 1919, many American bishops proposed to retain its organization during peacetime. With the concurrence of the papal representative, Cardinal Ceretti, it was decided that henceforth the American hierarchy would meet annually. At the first of these meetings, September, 1919, the War Council, renamed Welfare Council, was expanded to include the entire American hierarchy. Between sessions, administrative work was committed to a permanent board under the chairmanship of Archbishop Hanna of San Francisco, who served in that capacity until 1935. Father John J. Burke, C.S.P., prominent in the formation of the War Council, served as secretary-general until 1936. The original six departments were: Executive; Education; Press; Law; Social Action; and Lay Organization, including the National Councils of Catholic Men and Women. Bishop McDonnell of Brooklyn and several other prelates, fearing that the organization might invade diocesan jurisdiction, criticized it at Rome with such effect that on the advice of Cardinal De Lai, Pope Benedict XV withdrew his tentative approbation, and dissolved it in January, 1922, just before his death. But when Bishop Schrembs as delegate of the American hierarchy had explained its work to Pope Pius XI, the latter gave his approval to a decree of the Consistorial Congregation that "nothing is to be changed concerning the National Catholic Welfare Council," July 2, 1922. Renamed "Conference" in 1923 to avoid the canonical implications of "council," the NCWC was firmly established with papal approbation.

Organization was presently expanded. The administrative board was increased to ten members, with the United States cardinals holding ex officio membership. This board, elected annually, meets at least twice a year to supervise the various departments, each under an episcopal chairman. The Catholic Action and Youth departments were added to the original six, and bureaus apportioned to existing departments to co-ordinate Catholic interests regarding immigration, motion pictures, historical records, rural life, Christian doctrine, information, family life, health, and hospitals. Other subordinate or affiliated agencies were concerned with United Nations affairs, international affairs, publications, radio, the nurses' council, and a mission secretariate. Archbishop Hanna was succeeded as general chairman by Archbishops Mooney of Detroit, Stritch of Milwaukee and Chicago, and McNicholas of Cincinnati. Many NCWC activities will be considered under specialized headings below; here certain miscellaneous undertakings may be noted. During the early years of Prohibition, it provided for production and distribution of Mass wine. Between 1926 and 1936 the NCWC intervened repeatedly on behalf of Mexican Catholics, and Father Burke helped arrange a modus vivendi through Ambassador Morrow. Depression and

recovery evoked many statements, pamphlets, and outlines under NCWC auspices which proved influential with several statesmen, e.g., Senator Wagner. During World War II the Conference returned to its 1917 activities with better organization and experience.

(2) LABOR QUESTIONS

Catholic labor activity. Monsignor John A. Ryan (1869–1945) as writer, teacher, and organizer continued in the fore of social studies at Catholic University. Later he became an enthusiastic supporter of the New Deal, and was invited to give the invocation at President Roosevelt's Fourth Inaugural. During the same years at Catholic University, Monsignor William Kerby (1887–1936) stressed the spiritual and charitable aspects of social action. More recently, Father John A. Cronin's expositions of social and economic principles have been noted. From the Boston Labor School founded in 1913 many Catholic study clubs and seminars have been held on labor problems, and a number of priests have followed up the work of Father Peter Dietz (1878–1947) in working with unions. Among the hierarchy, Bishop Muldoon of Rockford, an original member of the NCWC administrative committee, was prominent in pioneer Catholic Labor work, and has been followed by Auxiliary Bishop Sheil of Chicago and Archbishop Cushing of Boston. Philip Murray of the CIO and George Meany of the merged AFL-CIO were Catholic leaders in union organization. A start has also been made by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists and the Young Christian Workers, and Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day have promoted a more radical Christian Worker movement.

NCWC Social guidance. The first episcopal statement through the NCWC was the "Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction" in 1919. This document was drafted under hierarchical guidance by Monsignor Ryan, director of the Social Action Department of the NCWC from 1920 to 1945. The document set forth the right of labor to organize, recommended greater co-operation between management and labor, and endorsed a legal minimum wage and labor insurance. To finance social improvements, there might be "heavy taxation of incomes, excess profits and inheritances." This frank statement elicited a protest from Stephen Mason, president of the National Manufacturers' Association. Yet it anticipated some of the recommendations of Pope Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno,* and during President Roosevelt's New Deal eleven of its twelve proposals were enacted into law. In 1922 Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara organized the National Catholic Rural Life Conference for the rural laborers, and this movement has been vigorously championed by Monsignor Ligutti. In 1933 the bishops made an important "Statement on the Present Crisis": unrestrained economic liberty and unlimited

profits were excoriated as false theories, and it was observed that by reaction this "extreme of individualism has led to the extreme of Communism." Proposed remedies were fairer distribution of wealth, tax reforms, stricter control of corporations, protection of just wages and unions, and destruction of international economic barriers. In 1940 in the *Church and Social Order* the hierarchy reaffirmed "the jurisdiction of the Church as the teacher of the entire moral law, and more particularly as it applies to man's economic and social conduct in business, industry, and trade." The bishops warned in 1948 that secularism was "threatening the religious foundations of our national life and preparing the way for the advent of the omnipotent state." In order to prevent this, "Christ must be the Master in our classrooms and lecture halls"; and "freely organized co-operation between accredited representatives of capital and labor in each industry and in the economy as a whole" should be fostered "under the supervision, but not the control of government."

(3) CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Education. Recent developments in Catholic education show an increase of forty-one per cent between 1920 and 1954. In 1920, there were 6,551 Catholic elementary schools with 1,970,507 pupils; in 1954, there were 9,279 schools with 3,235,251 pupils, taught by 76,833 teachers, of whom 67,477 were religious. In 1954, likewise, there were 2,296 Catholic secondary schools with 27,216 teachers and 623,751 students. Catholic colleges numbered 224. The 139 women's colleges had 6,232 instructors; and 80,813 students; the 85 men's colleges had 12,839 professors with 201,186 students. In addition there were 294 seminaries with 29,578 students. It is estimated that about 3,000,000 Catholics attended public elementary schools; from 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 were in public high schools; and 375,000 in secular colleges. The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has multiplied its efforts to reach the latter by means of released time programs, religious vacation schools, preparatory courses to lay teachers of religion; inquiry classes, religious discussion clubs, and adult instruction groups. To contribute to this work the Confraternity has enlisted lay teachers of religion, home visitors, discussion club leaders, and other helpers. It also has tried to assist parent-educators in the home training of children. Finally, the National Catholic Educational Association was founded in 1904 to co-ordinate Catholic efforts in education.

Press. The Catholic Press Association, organized during 1908, was affiliated with the NCWC in 1919. It has promoted greater interest in all forms of existing Catholic publications, including the widely circulated *Sunday Visitor* and its pamphlet series founded in 1912 by

Bishop Noll of Fort Wayne, and the *Register* and its affiliates begun during the 1920's by Monsignor Matthew Smith of Denver. More specialized reviews have appeared in each of the ecclesiastical sciences, though these have had but a minor influence upon the non-Catholic reading public. The work of the Catholic press has been supplemented by radio and television programs, in which media Bishop Sheen has equaled the appeal of Lacordaire. The apostolate of the press has also been extended by many editions of pamphlets, the Kenrick Home Study Service (1936), and its imitators, and the Knights of Columbus advertising program.

Intellectual life among American Catholics has come under increasing self-criticism. They have not been free from the mental isolationism of a minority and they have shared to some extent American suspicion of booklearning, at least of such a nature as incapable of immediate translation into practical gadgets. Probably the primary demands of the minimum essentials of Catholic education and the apostolate will serve to excuse most of the failures of past generations—though scarcely those of the future. And if scholarship is the product of leisure, there has been very little leisure thus far for the majority of American priests, religious, teachers, and educators.

(4) Missionary Enterprise

Negro apostolate. The Catholic clergy of the nineteenth century, swamped by the needs of immigrants and an ever-expanding congregation, had had little time to spare for the Negro apostolate so that by 1955 only 483,000 of 16,000,000 American Negroes were Catholics. For a long time Catholics acquiesced in the secular system of segregation in civil intercourse, though the hierarchy seized on the first signs of a break in this custom during the twentieth century to take the lead. In 1936 Catholic University was the first college in the Federal District to accept Negro students. The Jesuits followed at St. Louis University and in 1947 Archbishop Ritter of St. Louis terminated segregation in the parochial schools. Prior to the Supreme Court's ruling on desegregation in 1954, Bishop Vincent Waters of Raleigh had opened the churches, schools, and hospitals of his diocese to Negroes. While disturbances occurred in many public schools in the South, desegregation passed off comparatively quietly in Catholic schools, though prejudices died hard at New Orleans.

Oriental Rites. Before major restrictions were laid upon immigration from 1921, many Catholics of Eastern Rites had come to the United States. By 1954 there were about 860,000 distributed among ten rites. To take care of these, not only have chapels and parishes of their rite

been erected, but a Ukrainian diocese was created at Philadelphia in 1913, and a Greek Rite diocese at Pittsburgh in 1924.

Recent immigration trends have stressed the importance of pastoral Spanish, since many Mexicans have been imported as agrarian workers in the West, while Puerto Ricans have settled in large numbers in the New York and Chicago metropolitan areas. Pending their incorporation into parochial life, missionaries have tried to care for their needs in camps and special centers. Native Americans in isolated rural areas have been contacted from the 1930's by the motor missions conducted by diocesan and Vincentian priests, and in 1939 the Glenmary Missioners were founded by Father Howard Bishop to work especially in the non-Catholic districts of the country. Already in 1929 Father Judge, C.M., had founded the Missionary Servants of the Most Blessed Trinity for pastoral and missionary work, especially in the South. These clerical communities have been assisted by numerous brotherhoods and sisterhoods of medical missionaries, social workers, or parish visitors.

The Foreign Missions, meanwhile, have not been neglected. The annual American Catholic monetary contribution reached $100,000 in 1904; it had passed $1,000,000 in 1919, while in 1957 about sixty-six per cent of the Propagation of the Faith contribution came from the United States. The Chicago International Eucharistic Congress (1926) helped publicize missionary activity. Following upon the foundation of the Maryknoll missionary priests and sisters, Dr. Anna Dengel, an Austrian, founded the Catholic Medical Missionaries in the United States, and this foundation has been followed by others. A more recent development has been the enlistment of lay medical or educational missionaries, usually for limited terms of service in foreign lands.

(5) CATHOLIC ACTION

The NCWC department of lay organizations has served as a coordinating agency for many types of Catholic Action, as sponsored by the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women. Its Catholic Evidence Bureau provides many pamphlets of information on Catholic topics; other bureaus endeavor to provide Catholic radio and television programs. Soon after 1930 the Maternity Guild was begun by the National Catholic Women's Union, and imitated by other Catholic groups for mutual help. The Cana Conference movement has instructed both married couples and prospective married persons in the ideals of Christian matrimony. A rosary crusade, begun by Irish-born Father Patrick Peyton of Notre Dame in 1941, has embraced the world, employing every publicity device, and encouraging parochial and block recitation as sponsored by other projects. The

St. Vincent de Paul Society continues since 1845 to give charitable aid to poor families. The Legion of Decency, urged by Fathers Lord, Dineen, and Parsons, S.J., together with Monsignor Corrigan of Catholic University and Messrs. Quigley and Breen, was decided upon in the bishops' meeting of 1933 and launched in 1934 by Bishop Cantwell of Los Angeles. Its efforts to improve the standards of films received papal commendation. Most of the adult organizations sponsored youth groups, while the Catholic Youth Organization (CYO) started in 1930 by Bishop Sheil in Chicago, gained considerable popularity.

Religious life, even to the extent of monastic asceticism, was a natural sequel to such lay fervor. The Trappists had returned in 1848 but for nearly a century made little appeal to American Catholics. The apocalyptic disasters of World War II, however, seemed to provoke a more thoughtful mood, and Thomas Merton's *Seven Storey Mountain* became an inspiration as well as a literary curiosity. Not merely the Trappists, but other contemplative and monastic orders began to secure numerous vocations, vocations taken by Monsignor Ellis as indications of American Catholic spiritual maturity.[19] Accompanying this trend is the appearance of *Cross and Crown* and other periodicals devoted to asceticism. Allied with these developments was a new interest in the liturgy, promoted among others by Father Virgil Michel, O.S.B. of St. John's Abbey, Minnesota. A monthly journal was begun in 1926. Greater interest in following the Mass by the Missal was created, so that by 1940 it was found possible to sponsor annual Liturgical Weeks. The Pius X School of Liturgical Music, begun in 1916, now found more response in its efforts to promote better rendition of Gregorian chant.

(6) HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATION

New dioceses and ecclesiastical provinces were steadily multiplied after World War I: metropolitan sees were erected at San Antonio (1926), Los Angeles (1936), Detroit, Louisville, Newark (1937), Washington (1939), Denver (1941), Indianapolis (1944), Omaha (1945), Seattle (1951), and Kansas City in Kansas (1952). American bishops raised to the cardinalate during the period were Dennis Daugherty of Philadelphia (1921), George Mundelein of Chicago and Patrick Hayes of New York (1924), Samuel Stritch of Chicago, Francis Spellman of New York, Edward Mooney of Detroit and John Glennon of St. Louis (1946), James McIntyre of Los Angeles (1953), John O'Hara of Philadelphia and Richard Cushing of Boston (1958), Albert Meyer of Chicago and Aloisius Muench of Fargo (1959). More than two hundred American prelates attended the dedication of the Na-

[19] John Tracy Ellis, *American Catholicism* (University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 132.

tional Church of the Immaculate Conception at Washington, D.C., November, 1959.

D. International Relations

(1) SEARCH FOR PEACE

Armistice. Since the American Senate had rejected President Wilson's League of Nations which was inextricably interwoven with the Peace of Versailles, the United States remained technically at war with Germany until the new Republican Congress and President Harding terminated hostilities by joint resolution in July, 1921. The League of Nations, repudiated in the 1920 elections, became too dangerous a subject for any American politician to endorse. Nevertheless the United States participated in more than forty League meetings through unofficial observers. The World Court did not excite the same animosity, and the Americans, Moore, Hughes, and Kellogg served as judges. But proposals for official American participation in the World Court, periodically repeated under various administrations, culminated in the 1935 Senate vote, seven short of the required two-thirds majority for treaties.

Disarmament was ardently sought in a series of international conferences. The Washington meeting (1922) did persuade the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy to agree to a graduated proportional reduction. But subsequent conventions at Geneva (1927) and London (1930, 1936), failed of any major agreement. In 1934 Japan repudiated the 10-10-7 ratio adopted in 1930 and withdrew from the League of Nations. This and other acts of defiance indicated that the League and Peace of Versailles were defunct, despite signature of the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact of 1928, whereby many nations renounced war as an instrument of national policy.

Economic internationalism, however, was manifest in the fact that despite the political isolation of the United States, her trade increased fourfold between 1900 and 1929, and that from being a debtor to the extent of three billion dollars before World War I, America reached a credit of seventeen billion by 1929. It is true that little of the American war loans was repaid. While most Americans agreed with President Coolidge, "They hired the money, didn't they?" many Europeans exclaimed against "Uncle Shylock." After France had failed to collect German reparations assessed at thirty-three billion dollars, the Dawes Plan (1924) reduced the annual payments. The Young Plan (1928) provided for further reduction of reparations and offered the hope of mutual cancellation of reparations and war debts, though the last proposal was vetoed by President Hoover. But from 1929 the great depression forced extensive withdrawals of American funds advanced to Germany, and that country's artificially stimulated recovery collapsed to the

ultimate profit of Nazi malcontents. Progress of the depression in Europe finally prompted President Hoover in 1931 to propose a moratorium on war debt payments, and the United States acquiesced in tacit repudiation.

(2) Totalitarian War

Origins. Though the Versailles Peace hoped to "make the world safe for democracy," its harsh and partly unfair terms actually provoked dictatorship. In their claims to the whole of man's loyalties, Communism, Fascism, and Nazism were alike totalitarian, and something of the sort animated the "Banzaist" military clique which gained control of Japan in 1931. Though the others remained chiefly external dangers, Communism tried to bore from within. Though founded in 1919, the American Communist Party was ineffective until 1929 when Stalin deposed its founder, William Foster. From then until 1935 the new commissar, Earl Browder, followed Stalin's lead in trying to capitalize on the depression and to sabotage the New Deal. When the Fascist-Nazi Axis (1936) menaced Russia, Stalin and Browder shifted from denunciation of the "New Deal of hunger, Fascism, and war," to a "Popular Front" of all Democracies, including the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., against "Fascism." Until 1939 the New Deal was alternately courted and reminded that "Communism is the Americanism of the twentieth century." Though President Roosevelt repudiated Communist support, members of government, society, and the intelligentsia were induced to favor or address "fellow traveler" organizations of insidious nature.

World War II erupted from totalitarian ambitions and hates as well as from Liberal disunion and appeasement. Though the president as early as 1937 at Chicago had proposed to "quarantine the aggressors," he evoked little support from a neutral Congress and war-shy public. But when smaller nations in Europe were annexed one by one (1939–40) Americans became convinced of the need of defense, and the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor (1941) rallied all in prosecution of war. American Communists now changed their denunciation of the "imperialist war" to cries for "united war effort." American military strength, however, contributed mightily to the complete destruction of both the Nazi and Japanese forces.

Catholic participation. During 1939 and 1940, Catholic efforts were directed toward relief of Polish refugees. During December, 1939, the presidential embassy to the Vatican was inaugurated and frequent interchanges down to 1945 probably contributed to the preservation of the city of Rome. When war came in December, 1941, the American Catholic hierarchy pledged President Roosevelt "our whole-hearted cooperation in the difficult days that lie ahead. . . . We will lead our

priests and people in constant prayer that God may . . . strengthen us all to win a victory that will be a blessing, not for our nation alone, but for the whole world." During the war, the National Catholic Community Service, which had been set up during the prewar emergency, participated in USO work among the armed forces, of whom an estimated twenty-five to thirty-five per cent were Catholic. Catholic literature, rosaries, missals, prayer books, Bibles were provided for the troops, and Catholic colleges participated in specialized training programs. Archbishop Spellman of New York as military ordinary made four extensive inspection tours, and was assisted by Bishop John O'Hara as chaplain general. Of 3,036 Catholic chaplains in the armed forces, 83 died in the course of World War II. All Catholic organizations contributed to the national defense work.

(3) INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

The United Nations had been President Roosevelt's term for a new international organization to replace the inoperative League. Established in 1942 to unite peoples who subscribed to traditional Western ideals, re-expressed in the Atlantic Charter and the "Four Freedoms"— of speech and religion, from want and fear—the institution was to make and safeguard the peace. President Roosevelt was spared the disillusionment of his strenuous efforts to avoid the American mistakes at Versailles. For Russian Communism utterly refused to co-operate and began from the start to hamper international harmony by a "cold war" of threats and seizures. In the United States, Foster replaced Browder to resume boring within, especially in the labor movement. President Truman's efforts to placate insatiable Communist aggression were finally abandoned in the undeclared but very hot Korean War (1950–53). Its inconclusive termination with the division of Korea into free and Communist zones was symptomatic of the world situation, divided between the Liberal world and Communist dictatorships. Denied physical coercive power, the United Nations remained a moral force against tyranny, and at least a dream of international harmony.

Catholic international views. While statesman began preliminary peace plans in 1944, the Catholic hierarchy in the United States endorsed the Atlantic Charter and denounced "power politics with its balance of power, spheres of influence in a system of puppet governments." But if the United States did not sin in this respect, her troublesome ally, Soviet Russia, did. The hierarchy also called for a sound international organization, but had to regret in November, 1945, that, "the Charter which emerged from the San Francisco Conference, while undoubtedly an improvement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, does not provide for a sound international organization. . . . Nevertheless

to participate in this world organization . . . is better than world chaos." During 1946 the NCWC administrative board appealed for food for the children of the Far East, and protested the injustice in the trial of Archbishop Stepinac. The Board in 1949 and 1950 echoed the pope's plea for internationalization of the Holy Places. In 1951, drawing a parallel between the current national and international situation and the decadent Roman empire, the Catholic hierarchy urged a return to God's law as the measure of man's conduct, closing with a citation from President Washington's farewell address: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of the religious principle."

113. LATIN AMERICAN PROBLEMS

A. General Survey

(1) SECULAR BACKGROUND

Relations with the United States were on the whole cordial until 1845, for the Monroe Doctrine was deemed a shield against the still existing threat of reconquest by Spain, aided by a coalition of reactionary powers. The war with Mexico and the annexation of New Mexico and California, however, raised Latin American suspicions of the United States, and these were increased by the irresponsible demands of American Jingoists. This mounting tension (1845–98) was changed into acute fear and dislike by the Spanish-American War which found most of the Latin Americans sympathizing with Spain. From 1898 to 1918 United States intervention in Cuba, Nicaragua, Haiti, Dominica, and Mexico provoked a rabid anti-North American polemic in Latin American lands. World War I, however, forced these to resort to the United States, as much trading with Europe was cut off, while American military prowess elicited new respect. Waning North American intervention in the Caribbean, and the conciliatory policies of Presidents Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt somewhat mitigated suspicion. World War II drove the American nations together and culminated in the Declaration of Chapultepec, February, 1945, that "every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state . . . shall be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this declaration."

Inter-American conflict, frequent during the nineteenth century, lessened during the twentieth. The Chilean-Peruvian Nitrate dispute was arbitrated in 1929, and the Bolivian-Paraguayan Chaco War between 1935 and 1938. There was increasing willingness to make use of arbitral machinery, whether of a World Court, Pan-American Union, or ABC

Powers. Union to preserve hemispheric freedom against Totalitarianism furnished an enduring motive for Pan-American solidarity, but fear of the United States still rendered Latin American non-co-operation quite possible.

Pan-American Union had been originally suggested by President Bolívar of Columbia and Secretary of State Clay, but the Panama Congress of 1826 was poorly attended and without practical result. The project was revived by Secretary of State Blaine and an initial meeting held at Washington during 1889. Other meetings followed at frequent intervals, and in addition there were hemispheric conferences of American statesmen regarding World War II. "It has become evident from the above that as the twentieth century progressed toward its middle point, Pan-Americanism, as represented by the official congresses and the official but more especial meetings, became increasingly identified with the Monroe Doctrine as it developed from a unilateral instrument to a multilateral agreement. The example of international co-operation given to the world since the 1930's by the free nations of the Western Hemisphere has been one to edify and encourage." [20]

(2) ECCLESIASTICAL PROGRESS

Hierarchical organization. The effects of the Plenary Latin American Council of 1899–1900 appeared in improved clerical leadership. The Holy See followed up the meeting by erecting new sees or vicariates. Between 1900 and 1921, twenty-one dioceses were erected in Spanish South America, forty-one in Brazil, and eight in Central America. Yet by 1940 an estimated 100,000,000 Catholics were served by only 227 bishops and 17,370 priests. Maryknoll missionaries from the United States began to reinforce the Latin American clergy in 1942, and the expulsion of many of their confreres from the Far East enabled them to send more help to this new field. By 1946, there were 571 priests and brothers and 511 sisters of United States religious communities laboring in Latin America, and this roster has been increasing. Yet in 1946 the lack of priests was still serious.

Education. Improved clerical education is seen in new seminaries at Montevideo and Lima, a Brazilian college at Rome, and better curricula in older institutions. New Catholic universities for lay training were established at Bogotá and Medellin, and improved facilities added to other institutions. More guidance was furnished Catholic college students, and there has been greater exchange between Latin and North American Catholic institutions. Educational in a religious sense were the International Eucharistic Congress at Buenos Aires (1934) and

[20] John Bannon and Peter Dunne, *Latin America* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1946), p. 862.

similar gatherings. Catholic Action is beginning to take hold among the youth. Bishop Andrea in Buenos Aires became noted for the social centers that he organized and the study and recreational opportunities afforded in the city's youth center, *Ateneo de la Juventud.*

Parochial life. "One of the weaknesses in the Church in South America is the lack of parochial life as that is understood in other countries. There is not the same family spirit binding the people to the priest, not the same interest in such parochial concerns as sodalities, as one finds in countries where hampering traditions do not exist. Personal visits, the taking of a census, the making of annual reports about the spiritual state of the parish, which are ordinary concerns of a pastor in the United States, are practiced only in parts of the southern continent. That is a serious matter since parochial life is the foundation of the Church and no degree of progress in other fields—monasteries, universities, and the rest—can make up for the lack of a closely knit and well organized parish life. Many of the younger clergy realize that and are trying to remedy the situation, but the old traditions die hard and the type of parish priest who does little beyond saying Mass, reciting the Breviary, and attending the sick when summoned is not yet extinct in South America. The blame must, however, be placed on the shoulders of many of the laity themselves, who are prone to misinterpret the motives of a priest who displays an eagerness to mingle with his people and get to know them, the clergy being in consequence forced to forego many such outlets for their zeal for fear of giving scandal." [21] Hierarchical concern was reflected in the meeting of six hundred Latin American bishops at Rio during July, 1955, and the setting up of an episcopal conference which first met at Bogotá in 1956.

B. Mexican History (1877–1956)

(1) Benign Liberalism (1876–1913)

Porfirio Díaz (1830–1915) won power by successful revolution in November, 1876, and remained *caudillo* until expelled by the same means during 1911. His prolonged dictatorship gave Mexico good order, increased railway transport, promoted commerce and stimulated construction and industry, all with the assistance of foreign capital. Unfortunately the chief benefits of this new prosperity went to a few. President Díaz, without removing the anticlerical legislation, did not try to enforce it in many details. Seminaries, novitiates or schools might be operated by religious, and Catholic welfare institutions were unhindered. But the state schools, from which all ecclesiastical control

---

[21] Edwin Ryan, *The Church in the South American Republics* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1943), Introduction, v–vi.

had been removed, did little for the temporal benefit of the great proportion of the Mexican people.

Francisco Madero, a doctrinaire idealist and wealthy landowner, was installed as Díaz's successor in 1911 after a successful rising against the aging dictator who had neglected to infuse new blood into his governmental system. Madero, though sincere and honest, was something of a neurotic and in any event could not promptly redeem promises made to the divergent elements of the coalition which had promoted him to the presidency. In February, 1913, Madero was deposed by General Huerta and subsequently killed. A promising Catholic social party, founded by Gabriel Fernandez Somellera in 1911, was denied an opportunity to initiate a reform program and was later (1917) outlawed.

(2) SOCIALIST DICTATORSHIP (1917–40)

Victoriano Huerta (1913–14) was an able but unscrupulous military chieftain who sought Mexico's pacification in accord with his own ambitions. President Wilson of the United States, ill-advised by his personal agent in Mexico, Mr. Lind, insisted upon Huerta's retirement and the installation of his rival Carranza, a disciple of Madero, as legitimate president. Ammunition was accordingly sent to the latter and denied to the former. Importation of arms from abroad by Huerta led to the Tampico Incident (1914) when detention of American sailors by Huerta provoked American intervention and an armed clash at Vera Cruz which resulted in two hundred casualties. When all the Mexican leaders denounced this action, President Wilson invited ABC mediation. Huerta finally took the hint and resigned—he died two years later, reconciled to the Church.

Venustiano Carranza (1914–20) now gradually emerged as the generally recognized President of Mexico, although he was long troubled by the guerilla chief, Pancho Villa, whose raid into New Mexico in March, 1916, provoked a futile American pursuit into Mexico by General Pershing. Though Carranza had once been a practicing Catholic and had been friendly toward the Church before his "election" to the presidency, he had accepted the support of Villareal, Obregon, Calles, Alvarado, and other Jacobin Liberals. In Yucatán, Alvarado imprisoned or exiled all of the bishops and most of the priests; nuns were molested and expelled, churches profaned and the sacred vessels stolen. In 1915, President Wilson, though disposed to regard these excesses as by-products of an otherwise wholesome revolution, protested against the treatment of the clergy. Carranza attempted to fulfill his pledges to Wilson of fair treatment, but proved incapable of controlling his followers, or rather masters.

The Jacobin Constitution of 1917 proved the source of all modern persecution of the Catholic Church in Mexico. Besides nationalizing certain natural resources and announcing a division of the large estates, it attacked the Church which was declared separate from, but subject to, the state. Article 3 banned religious from teaching in either public or private schools. Article 27 secularized churches and other clerical institutions. Article 130, besides disenfranchising ministers of religion, claimed the right to intervene in worship and discipline. All priests were required to register with the civil authorities, who often took it upon themselves to determine the number allowed to function within a given area. It is true that all of these measures were not immediately put into operation, but Carranza was deposed in 1920 for trying to have them amended.

President Alvaro Obregon (1920-24) avoided open persecution of the Church until he had secured the recognition of the United States in 1923. But then he dismissed the apostolic delegate for presuming to bless the cornerstone of a monument to the Sacred Heart, and during 1924 arrests were made of those who attended Eucharistic celebrations, even within church buildings.

President Plutarco Calles (1924-28), like Obregon, was a capitalist exploiting the poor in the name of Socialism. He prefaced his attack upon the Church by engineering an unsuccessful plot to create a schism. But though a Padre Perez was installed in 1925 as the "Patriarch of the Mexican Catholic Church," he drew only one clerical adherent and himself submitted to the Church in 1931. Next Calles expelled some two hundred Spanish priests and other foreign clerics or nuns, and began to close religious houses, schools, and shrines. The registration of priests was insisted upon, and some states restricted the number of the clergy unreasonably; e.g., Sonora allowed but one priest for every ten thousand.

The Ley Calles was a sweeping penal code announced by the president in June, 1926, to go into effect the following July 31. This enforced a most rigorous and even extended interpretation of the anticlerical provisions of the Constitution of 1917, and added to any violation extreme penalties. Clerics might not officiate without authorization, teach, wear clerical garb, or comment on the penal code itself.

Resistance. Although the Mexican hierarchy placed an interdict on public church services, and Catholics presented a petition with two million signatures to Congress, no redress was given. A nationwide boycott failed. From January, 1927, Flores and his *Cristeros* waged guerilla warfare in Jalisco; though Flores was shot in April, 1927, some of his followers held out until July, 1929. Calles himself struck back. Most of the bishops were exiled, and hundreds of priests or laymen shot on one charge or another. Among these was Padre Miguel Pro, S.J., falsely

accused with his brothers of trying to assassinate Obregon. When Obregon was actually slain in July, 1928, Calles seems to have been frightened, for he entered into negotiations with Archbishop Ruiz through the mediation of Father Burke of NCWC and Ambassador Morrow of the United States. In September, 1928, Calles retired from the presidency in favor of Emilio Portes Gil, though as minister of war he remained *caudillo* in all subsequent presidential administrations until 1935.

The Arreglo or Pact of 1929 between President Portes Gil (1928–30) and Bishops Ruiz and Díaz, promised: (1) restoration of churches, rectories, and seminaries; (2) respect for church property in the future; (3) amnesty for the *Cristeros.* The president announced that officials should not interpret the anticlerical laws unreasonably, nor interfere with ecclesiastical services and instructions within the church buildings. Federal anticlericalism was thus considerably mitigated during the next six years, despite occasional flare-ups, but Governor Canabal of Tabasco continued to terrorize his province until expelled by a revolt in 1935.

President Lazaro Cardenas (1934–40), substituted by Calles for several incompetent puppets, soon (1935) turned on the dictator and exiled him. Cardenas seems to have had genuine sympathy for the poor and sought their betterment through a socialistic program. But Church-state relations reached a new crisis when Cardenas decreed, January 8, 1935, that all schools, public or private, must teach Socialism or be closed. Teachers were obliged to be devoid of any religious convictions, and preferably atheists. Sex education was offered indiscriminately to pupils through crude methods. Parents then began to withhold their children from attendance at school, while others did not hesitate to beat up or mutilate the teachers. The government struck back with the enforcement of all of the old penal laws, and sent troops to protect the instructors. But the police slaying of a fourteen-year-old girl in a raid upon a catacomb Mass during 1937 aroused such ominous popular remonstrances that Cardenas and the state governors drew back in alarm. Desiring Catholic support for his economic policies, the president then relaxed the persecution and many laws fell into desuetude but were not repealed. Meanwhile the masonic clique which ran Mexican politics repudiated Cardenas at the 1940 elections, presumably for naïve radicalism.

(3) Unofficial Toleration

Mitigation of persecution followed under President Avila Camacho (1940–46) who suppressed the Cardenas educational directives in 1941. Although ecclesiastical property remained "nationalized," it was placed under the protection of the Supreme Court, itself less dependent on

factional politics through its life membership. Camacho admitted publicly that he was a "believer," and permitted two small conservative parties to operate. One was the *Acción Nacional* founded in 1939 by the Catholic lawyer, Don Gomez Morin; the other the *Union Nacional Sinarquista,* sometimes accused of Fascist leanings. The official candidates nevertheless—perhaps inevitably—triumphed in the 1946, 1952, and 1958 elections. But Camacho's successors, Aleman, Ruiz Cortines, and Lopez Mateos, continued his policy of benign religious toleration, without, however, disturbing the antiecclesiastical legislation still on the statute books.

Catholic Action, evoked by the persecutions, has labored in the narrow sphere allowed it. *Buena Prensa,* begun in 1937, distributes Catholic literature. The national organization of Catholic Action enlisted 345,000 members, and Bishop Miranda, a progressive sponsor of this work, was promoted to the primatial see of Mexico City in 1956. While Mexican seminaries are reviving, the mission seminary at Montezuma, New Mexico, founded during 1937, is still being maintained. In 1917 a Mexican missionary congregation, Missionaries of the Holy Spirit, was formed. Promotion of a Mexican prelate to the cardinalate, which in the past had encountered governmental opposition, seemed a portent of better times in 1958.

114. CATHOLICITY AND DISSENT

A. *Catholic Attitude toward Reunion*

(1) REUNION TRENDS

Agnostic and materialistic assaults upon Christian truth had influenced many earnest religiously minded persons to deplore the disunion of Christendom, and to discuss projects of co-operation or union among all who revered Christ. The Holy See had never ceased to invite Dissidents to return, and appeals to this effect were sent out prior to the First Vatican Council of 1869 and in preparation for the Second in 1959. Oriental Dissidents, if gradually thawing, remained cool toward papal overtures, while the Protestants generally ignored any reunion upon Rome's terms. The most promising reunion movement in the West, the Oxford, had failed of mass conversion. In the United States, Lewis Wattson (1863–1940), an Episcopalian minister, founded the Society of the Atonement on Franciscan models in 1898. As Father Paul Francis he had worked and prayed for Christian reunion, instituting the Church Unity Octave in 1908. Presently he applied to Rome and during 1909 was received with his community, numbering, however, less than a score. Individual rather than group reunion continued to be the pattern, despite many non-Catholic meetings and expressions of good will.

(2) ROMAN NORMS

Ecclesia Catholica, a decree of the Holy Office, December 20, 1949, instructed the hierarchy on the Holy See's attitude toward this increasingly publicized "ecumenical movement."

1) Rome, it was pointed out, deplored the existing disunion. Though she takes no part in "ecumenical" conferences arranged by schismatic or heretical sects, she remains intensely concerned and continually prays that all "who believe in Him may be perfect in one." Bishops should promote agencies and information centers for consultation by non-Catholics, and train worthy and competent counselors.

2) Union, however, must be attained without sacrifice of truth. "Unity can result only from one single rule of faith and one same belief among all Christians." Hence: a) Differences in dogma must not be deemed negligible, and Catholic dogma is not to be "accommodated" to suit apologetic needs. b) "Bishops will not allow recourse to a perilous mode of speaking which engenders false notions and raises deceitful hopes." c) In treating of accounts of the Protestant Reformation, Catholic faults and foibles should not be exaggerated nor dwelt upon exclusively without indicating the malice of rebellion. d) Catholic doctrines should not be adulterated or suppressed, but expounded "whole and entire" without reservation or ambiguity.

3) Bishops ought, then, (a) exercise vigilance and care; (b) be well informed on prospects through able priests; (c) lay down rules for mixed meetings held only after careful scrutiny and authorization of the hierarchy, and when there is prospect of good result; (d) these reservations are not to apply to catechetical instructions or conferences to non-Catholic inquirers, nor to non-doctrinal meetings for promotion of joint social works with non-Catholics.[22]

B. Protestant Attitudes

(1) REUNION CONFERENCES

Proposals. During 1888 the Anglican Lambeth Conference urged reunion of Christians on what became known as the "Lambeth Quadrilateral": (1) the Bible as containing all truths necessary for salvation; (2) the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds; (3) acceptance of baptism and Holy Communion; (4) the historic episcopate. Anglo-Catholics (High Church) opposed such a program, but Evangelicals (Low Church) for the most part favored union on some such terms. At the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, the Episcopalian prelate Brent urged a

[22] Bishop Émile Blanchet, "Union of Christendom," *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Supplement II.

world conference looking toward reunion. This was delayed by World War I, but in 1920 the Lambeth Conference issued an "Appeal to all Members of Christendom" on the basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

Congresses. Such a world conference, subsidized by J. P. Morgan to the extent of $100,000, convened at Lausanne, Switzerland, during 1927. But working agreement could not be reached even on the basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral; yet a delegation invited the Holy See to participate. Another conference was scheduled for Utrecht in 1938, but was prevented by the strained international political conditions. After World War II, the delayed World Conference met at Amsterdam where 136 sects were represented in 1948. It was claimed that this non-authoritative "World Council" was not designed to further union so much as to demonstrate unity already existing. The conference finally issued this qualified declaration: "We cannot unite because there are deep and serious differences between us in matters of faith, but neither can we continue to live in complete separation from one another. . . . We are not ready to enter into a full communion with each other and to act as one unified body, but we are now ready to give up all policies of isolation, to enter a truly Christian conversation with each other, and to act together whenever we can find common ground." A third ecumenical conference of the permanent World Council and Secretariate was held at Evanston, Illinois, during 1954; Cardinal Stritch of Chicago in a pastoral of June 29, 1954, tactfully but firmly reiterated the Catholic stand that true Christian unity must be based on the Rock that is Peter. The Ninth Lambeth Conference (1958) reached no real unity, even on Primate Fisher's proposed three points of the Bible, the Creeds, and the *Book of Common Prayer.* Evading any definition of schism, they conceded contraception to the married.

(2) INTER-DENOMINATIONAL FEDERATIONS

Prior to the Norwegian Lutheran Union of 1917, the only fusion of note among Protestant denominations had been the Prussian Evangelical Union which had been externally imposed by Hohenzollern fiat. Lutherans, disrupted by the overthrow of the monarchical German state churches in 1918, strove to achieve a *Präktisches Christentum,* a "Life and Work" program confining itself to social activity and minimizing doctrine. This was the spirit of the Stockholm Conference (1925) which advocated a Christianity, if need be, "without Church and without Bible." American Lutherans formed a Conference in 1918, and a World Lutheran Federation was set up in 1948. During 1929 the United Free Churches of Scotland joined the Presbyterian Establishment, and during 1937 an American Methodist Union was formed. In 1925 Canadian Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists formed a loose "ex-

perimental" union, and in 1947 the "Church of South India" attempted to fuse Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists—though the project did not receive the full sanction of the Anglican Lambeth Conference of 1948. Anglicans, Jansenists, American National Polish, and Filipino Aglipayans have inter-communicated and exchanged orders at times, and there has been some co-operation between Episcopalians and Greek Orthodox, though most of the latter have remained reserved on all doctrinal issues. Outside of Rome, no universal or lasting bond of union has been discovered.

C. Byzantine Dissidents

(1) POLITICAL STATUS

Nationalistic movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries within the Ottoman dominions occasioned the Byzantine patriarchate much grief. Now the patriarchs' co-operation with the sultans in Hellenizing the Slavic churches led to their identification with the Turkish regime by nationalist patriots. Thus, secular independence from Turkish rule as achieved in the Balkans usually soon entailed repudiation of patriarchal jurisdiction as well. Eventually all of these national churches became autocephalous, and the patriarch, while retaining an honorary precedence, was reduced to jurisdiction over less than one hundred thousand subjects. The patriarchs, indeed, excommunicated such rebels, but ultimately were obliged to concede a grudging recognition of an accomplished fact. Moreover, as Russia grew powerful, her secularized Holy Synod monopolized and regimented ecclesiastical discipline in all the Byzantine-Slavic lands, asserting a protectorate over the Orthodox still under Turkish rule. Most Orthodox bishops now took the title of metropolitan, which accordingly came to be meaningless. After the overthrow of the Ottoman dynasty, there arose a secular leader, Mustapha Kemal Pasha (1923–38), who knew not the Phanar. Not merely did the patriarch lose all of his official privileges, but even the Mohammedan religion was disestablished.

(2) RELIGIOUS POSITION

Internal theological disputes during the nineteenth century caused a number of divisions. During the patriarchate of Gregory V, three times in office between 1797 and 1821, controversy raged about the propriety of *colybes,* wheaten cakes blessed at funeral repasts. The monks of Athos moved obsequies from the customary Saturday to Sunday for financial reasons. The patriarch allowed each community to follow local option, and Sunday observance has become common. He also introduced some disciplinary reforms and renewed the canon against second marriage for those in major orders.

Roman relations. Though an estimated fifteen thousand Catholics survived Turkish persecutions into the nineteenth century, they received in 1830 bare toleration from either Turkey or the newly created Greek state. Greek Orthodox prejudice, both among clergy and people, has remained strong against Latins. The papal encyclicals of Pius IX (1848, 1868) inviting the return of the Dissidents to Catholic unity were officially ignored, and that of Leo XIII (1894) elicited an insulting reply from Patriarch Anthemios VII of Constantinople. Patriarch Joachim III (1901–12), indeed, displayed a friendlier spirit, but his proposal of discussions was overruled by the other Orthodox patriarchs. Subsequent papal overtures were studiously ignored, but a representative of the Byzantine patriarch attended the coronation of Pius XII in 1939, and a papal envoy attended the installation of Maximos V. During 1957 the Phanar's official newspaper, *Apostolos Andreas*, congratulated Pius XII on his eightieth birthday, and after the accession of Pope John XXIII Patriarch Athenagoras welcomed "appeals for peace . . . from a Christian center such as that of Old Rome." Continued Roman solicitude for reunion has been manifested in the erection of new Oriental colleges in Rome, more frequent recognition of Oriental liturgies, erection of an Oriental curial congregation (1917), and direction of the Leonine Prayers after Low Mass to Russia's conversion (1929). Hence, hopeful eyes were turned toward Venice, where unofficial discussions between Catholic and Orthodox theologians were expected.

D. Catholic Orientals

(1) BYZANTINE RITE

Greeks. Most of the Catholics in Turkey and Greece belonged to the Latin Rite, and efforts to form a Catholic Byzantine Rite mission date only from Father Marango's arrival in Constantinople in 1856. By 1861 he had a small congregation at Pera, and had reconciled two Dissident bishops on their deathbeds. He was followed by Father Polycarp Anastides in 1878. During 1895 Pope Leo XIII sent French Assumptionist Fathers who founded a seminary and two parishes, going over to the Byzantine Rite in 1897 with the approbation of the Holy See. Their review, *Echos d'Orient*, began to appear in 1907. In 1911 the Byzantine Catholics received an episcopal exarch, Isaias Papadopoulos, subsequently an advisor of the Roman curia. After a century of effort, however, only three thousand Greeks had been won to reunion, under episcopal exarchs at Constantinople and Athens.

Rumanians of the Byzantine Rite prospered under the independent Rumanian principality, several of whose princes were Catholic. By the time of the opening of Communist persecution, Rumania had some

1,500,000 Catholics of the Greek Rite under a metropolitan and four suffragans. In 1948 these were all declared "Orthodox" by the Soviet fiat.

Serbian Byzantine Catholics remained comparatively few—only fifty-five thousand under a bishop by 1945—but the Croats and Slovenes, later united with the Serbs in Yugoslavia, numbered six million Catholics, though mostly of the Latin Rite.

Albanian Catholics of the Greek Rite were but 120 in 1945, but there were 100,000 of the Latin Rite.

Bulgarian Catholicity of the Latin Rite dated from Franciscan evangelization during the sixteenth century, but Greek Rite converts began only in 1861 with the reconciliation of Bishop Sokolsky with nearly sixty thousand followers. Though many of these relapsed, in 1945 there were six thousand Byzantine Rite Catholics under an exarch, besides forty thousand Latins.

Ruthenians, forcibly subjected to Moscow by the czar in 1839, had been given liberty to reunite with Rome openly during the twentieth century. The Communists forced them back into the Greek Orthodox Church in 1946, although many refugees and emigrants had carried the Ruthenian Rite to Poland, Austria-Hungary, the United States, Canada, and elsewhere.

Melkites were disturbed during the nineteenth century both by elements of Jansenism and Gallicanism introduced from the Synod of Pistoia (1796) by Bishop Germanus Adama of Acre, and by Turkish persecutions which claimed the lives of eleven Catholics in 1817, and exiled many of the clergy. French intervention halted this persecution by 1831. The great Patriarch Maximos III (1833–55) organized the Melkite Rite, and the healthy condition of the community continued into the twentieth century when the Catholic Melkite patriarch of Antioch exercises jurisdiction over 150,000 in the Levant, not counting a *diaspora*.

(2) ARMENIAN RITE

Since the Catholics remained subject to the civil jurisdiction of the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, petty persecutions continued until religious liberty was proclaimed in 1831. The Catholic Armenians thereafter constituted a separate protectorate. Codification of Armenian legislation was begun in 1851, but Armenian Rite views clashed with those of the Roman Curia. A temporary schism was provoked by the papal bull *Reversurus* which defined episcopal jurisdiction and curbed lay interference. Rome had to intervene again in 1910–11. Turkish atrocities during World War I took the lives of seven Catholic bishops, one hundred priests, forty-five nuns, and thirty thousand of the faithful,

besides destroying eight hundred churches. Since 1937 Patriarch Aga-
ganian, named cardinal by Pius XII, has exercised jurisdiction over some
150,000 Catholic Armenians.

(3) SYRIAN RITES

"Catholic Jacobites" were recognized as a distinct body in 1830 by
the Sultan, and conversions multiplied. The most extraordinary was that
of the fanatic anti-Catholic, Mar Matthew Nakkar, metropolitan of
Mosul, in the Vinentian house at Aleppo, November 27, 1832. Within
two months he had won over fifty-four more Jacobites. Despite im-
prisonment, he continued a staunch Catholic until his death in 1868,
bringing about the reconciliation of five Jacobite bishops. By the end of
the century three more bishops and eight thousand Dissidents had been
converted. Mar Gabriel Tappuni was named patriarch in 1929. Named
cardinal in 1935, he became in 1939 the first residential patriarch to
participate in a papal election. By this time Catholic Syrians nearly
equaled the Dissidents in numbers: seventy-five to eighty thousand.

The Maronites had enjoyed comparative toleration under the auton-
omous Emirs of Lebanon, but were exposed after 1840 to attacks by the
Druzes, a fanatical sect of Moslems. During May–June, 1860, over seven
thousand Catholics were killed—eleven of the victims were beatified in
1926. French intervention restored order, though still others were slain
by the Turks during World War I. After the war, the Maronites were
included in the Republic of Lebanon under French protection. With-
drawal of this protection during and after World War II exposed the
Maronites alike to Communist attacks and Pan-Arabian Nationalism. In
1932 there were 10 sees and 366,000 Catholics.

The Malankarese are a small group of Indian ex-Jacobites who re-
turned to Catholic unity under Mar Ivanios and Mar Theophilus during
1930. By 1946 their example had been followed by fifty thousand of the
faithful, including two more Dissident prelates.

(4) COPTIC RITE

Progress remained slow during the nineteenth century under vicars
apostolic and there were but five thousand Catholic Copts in 1895 when
the patriarchate was revived. The first patriarch of the new era, Cyril
Makarios (1899–1908), subsequently resigned, apostatized, but returned
to union on his deathbed. Rome returned to the system of apostolic
administrators until 1947 when the patriarchate was restored in the
person of Mark II Khuzam (1947–58), who had been administrator
since 1926. By this time Catholics numbered fifty thousand and there
were sixty-six priests.

(5) CHALDEAN RITE

The **Chaldeans** of Mesopotamia and Persia had been converted from Nestorianism in the sixteenth century but long continued restive in the Catholic fold. Disputes about the patriarchate continued until 1830, and Patriarch Joseph VI Audo (1848–78), who attended the Vatican Council, defied papal commands for a number of years, though he was reconciled before his death. Under the patriarchate of Emmanuel II (1900–46), the Chaldeans survived Turkish massacres, and numbered at its close about one hundred thousand, exceeding the Dissidents.

The **Malabarese** are converts from Nestorian missions in India during the Portuguese occupation. Though subjected to Latinizing and occasionally relapsing, numbers survived to 1887 when they received a native hierarchy, accorded full status in 1923.

115. PARTES INFIDELIUM

A. *African Missions*

(1) MOSLEM AREAS

North African territories began to come under French rule early in the nineteenth century, though at first anticlerical governors conciliated the Moslems by banning missionaries. A bishop was admitted in 1838, but obliged to confine his ministrations to French colonists. In 1849 Fathers Schembri, S.J., and Girard, C.M., were recalled for trying to evangelize the natives. This prohibition continued until 1867 when Charles Lavigerie (1825–92), named archbishop of Algiers, secured greater freedom of action from the secular authorities. His foundation of the White Fathers endeavored to adopt native dress and customs. Concentrating more on the immediate promotion of good will than upon making of converts, they at first devoted themselves chiefly to educational and charitable works. Proselytizing brought renewed difficulties, and Lavigerie, archbishop of Carthage in 1884, forbade baptism until 1888 when three Kabylians implored the sacrament during an audience with Pope Leo XIII. More exceptions were made thereafter, and by 1906 there were eight hundred converts and two hundred catechumens from Islam. The White Fathers subsequently extended their efforts to the Sudan and the Sahara where the work of preparation had to be renewed. During the twentieth century the remarkable career of Charles de Foucauld (1858–1916) again drew attention to the Moslem mission.

In Ethiopia, missionary efforts were resumed in 1839 by Blessed Justin de Jacobis and his Vincentian confreres from the Alexandrian mission. The martyred Blessed Ghebre Michael was won from the Coptic

schism. Capuchins followed in the same field and Father Massaja, later cardinal, established a close friendship with Prince Menelik of Shoa, who as king (1889–1911) terminated persecution and allowed foundation of Catholic schools and orphanages. Italian-held Moslem lands, such as Libya, were evangelized according to Lavigerie's methods. These Catholic outposts were tested severely in the Pan-Arabic nationalist movement in North Africa and the Levant against European colonialism after World War II.

(2) PAGAN AREAS

Negro missions called forth the labors of the White Fathers, the Lyons Missionaries, who lost 283 members within 65 years, and the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, founded by Father Liebermann, 600 of whom died in service between 1843 and 1900. Within a century they had converted 2,000,000 and reorganized declining earlier missions, which included the mid-century efforts of Fathers Barron and Kelly of Pennsylvania, in Liberia. The Holy Ghost Fathers, settled at Dakar under Bishop Truffet in 1847, struggled against Moslem influence in Guinea throughout the nineteenth century; only during the twentieth century was success marked. Marion de Bresillac and his missionaries from Lyons labored in Dahomey under similar handicaps. Missionaries in the Congo at first found anticlerical restrictions, but in 1888 King Leopold II of Belgium opened the field to the Belgian Sheutveld Fathers, who achieved noteworthy success. Even in British territories Catholic missionaries have as a rule outdistanced Episcopalians in making converts. The discouraging prospect of the nineteenth century has yielded to a phenomenal twentieth-century harvest, menaced, indeed, by the ever-extending tentacles of Communism. In 1800 there were but 50 missionaries and about 50,000 Catholics; in 1957 there were 20,-000,000 Catholics distributed in 257 vicariates and prefectures, served by 9,000 foreign and 1,688 native missionaries. There were but 66 native priests in 1923; in 1957 there were 1,700 and 20 native bishops, the first of whom was consecrated in 1939. Yet but ten per cent of Africa's 213,000,000 were Catholic at mid-twentieth century.

B. *The Middle East*

(1) INDIA

Missionary revival. During the eighteenth century the Indian mission had declined, both internally through suppression of the Society of Jesus and degeneration of the Portuguese *patroado,* and externally by reason of the extension of Dutch and British political domination. After the departure of the Jesuits, the Parisian Foreign Mission Society stepped into the breach, but persecution by Sultan Tippu of Mysore (d. 1799)

reduced them for a time to comparative inactivity. Père Dubois (1765–1848), however, prepared the way for future conversions by his patient performance of works of charity among all classes; the British governor of Madras testified to the respect in which he was held. By 1800, estimates of the Indian Catholic population vary between 172,000 and 1,300,000. The French missionary bishops at Pondicherry, Monsignors Bonnand (1836–61) and Laouënan (1868–92), eventually built on the good will of Père Dubois a flourishing Catholic life. After the British government replaced the East India Company in the rule of India in 1857, religious liberty was proclaimed. By 1886 the number of Catholics was estimated at 2,500,000, but the clergy had all they could do in caring for existing Church members without undertaking evangelization of new fields.

Patronage crisis. Clerical discipline had seriously declined within the Portuguese patronal patriarchate of Goa, and yet the Liberal monarchy clung to the privileges bestowed upon more apostolic kings. Finally when Pope Gregory XVI intervened within the patronal jurisdiction in the sees of Cochin, Cranganore, and Mylapore, a serious schism ensued. Patriarch Silva y Torres excommunicated papally designated vicars apostolic, and promoted unworthy individuals to the priesthood. A partial accord in 1857 failed to reach the root of the difficulties, and peace was not entirely restored before 1886 when Pope Leo XIII reached a settlement which permitted him to reorganize the Indian hierarchy into eight provinces and twenty-nine dioceses or vicariates. Goa, raised to patriarchal honors, saw its patronal rights reduced to Portuguese India. Double jurisdiction of reorganized patronal sees continued until 1928, when it ceased.

Native progress. After these ancient barriers had been removed, the drive for a native clergy was pressed. By 1914 there were eighteen hundred native priests, and in 1923 the first native bishop of the Latin Rite was consecrated. In 1930 the submission of the Jacobite bishops, Mar Ivanios and Mar Theophilus, with several thousands of their followers, paved the way for a new Catholic Malankarese Rite. Meanwhile greater autonomy had been accorded the Malabarese Catholics: in 1887 they were given a separate hierarchical jurisdiction, and in 1923 the metropolitan see of Ernakulum and three suffragan dioceses were erected, directly subject to the Holy See. Though the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had witnessed renewed missionary activity by European and later American religious in India, their status became precarious with the establishment of Indian independence (1947; 1950). The Holy See endeavored to dissipate this suspicion of foreign missionaries by promoting more native Indians to the hierarchy and naming Archbishop Gracias of Bombay to the college of cardinals. During 1950,

Cardinal Gilroy of Sydney, Australia, presided as papal legate over the first Indian Plenary Council at Bangalore, a step toward uniform legislation. At the same time many foreign missionaries applied for Indian citizenship. Father Souza, S.J., was a member of the Indian constitutional convention, and a delegate to the United Nations. Communist pressure from within and without was an ever-present danger, though when Communist control of Kerala state threatened Catholic schools, President Krasad of India vetoed a hostile measure (1957–58).

(2) THE INDO-OCEANIC AREA

Indochina. Missions in the countries of Southeast Asia had been attempted since the sixteenth century with varying success. Through intermittent persecutions many sturdy converts survived into the nineteenth century. In Siam or Thailand, missionaries entering from Macao and Malacca made progress despite Moslem opposition. By treaty with France in 1685, freedom of preaching was ensured, although converts were made chiefly from poor fishermen and Chinese immigrants instead of among the Buddhist intellectuals. King Chulalongkorn (1868–1910), modernizer of the country, proved quite favorable toward the Catholic missionaries. From 1940 intense hostility toward French colonialism was displayed, which redounded against the missions, where six were slain. Although one hundred thousand converts had been made, Buddhism remains entrenched. Laos received missionaries from Siam in 1881, and was made a prefecture in 1950.

In French Annam, now Viet-Nam, despite repeated persecutions there were three hundred thousand Christians by 1800. Nor was their ordeal over. Despite, or because of, French intervention, the princes showed themselves fanatical persecutors until the French occupation of the country in 1886. The Edict of Minh (1825) forbade entry of foreign missionaries. Isidore Gagelin was executed in 1833, and other missionaries and catechists shared his fate in following years. As the Church went underground, another edict (1836) imposed the death penalty on both missionaries and those who hid them. Prince Tue-Duc (1847–82) was one of the worst of the persecutors, but Bishop Retord (d. 1858) was the soul of the resistance. Theophile Venard was slain in 1861; the following year French intervention began to lessen the persecution. Within a half century of persecution, 115 priests and 100,000 of the faithful had been slain, of whom 100 have been beatified. Yet there were 500,000 Christians in 1886 and this number had doubled by 1930. French colonialism, however, furnished fuel for Communist propaganda and half of the country was occupied by Communists in 1954. Of 860,000 refugees from this area, 676,000 were Catholics. The Viet-Namese have shown staunch loyalty to the Catholic Church, and

the fact that four-fifths of their priests are natives refutes anti-Western propaganda.

In Burma, evangelization proceeded on a small scale; but 3,000 converts had been made by the nineteenth century. The great upsurge of missionary activity came with Monsignor Bigandet in 1856, who lived to ordain fourteen native priests. New vicariates were formed in 1870, and the hierarchy completely reorganized under the archdioceses of Mandalay and Rangoon in 1955. There were then 160,000 Catholics and 226 priests, of whom 80 were natives.

In Indonesia, where Dutch domination had blighted the Catholic missions begun by the Portuguese, temporary French control of Holland under Bonaparte permitted Catholic missionaries to re-enter, and the Dutch later relaxed some of their restrictions in certain areas. By 1848 when complete missionary freedom was accorded, it is estimated that there were but four Catholic churches and 5,500 Catholics. Though in the interval of exclusion the greater number of natives had become Protestant or Mohammedan, considerable progress was made. By the end of the century the priests had increased to 46, and the Catholics to 45,000; by 1948 there were 459 priests and some 467,000 Catholics, and counting outlying districts, 784,000 according to another estimate.

Malay, for a time under the flourishing vicariate of Malacca (1558), had also declined after Dutch occupation (1641) until the jurisdiction was merged with the vicariate of Siam (1669). But a limited mission among the Chinese and Indians was permitted from 1787, and in 1841 the Malacca vicariate was re-established; it became a metropolitan see in 1953. Though the Malays remain Moslem, converts among Eurasians had reached one hundred thousand.

Oceania, or the South Sea Isles of Polynesia and Melanesia, had been opened to European exploration during the eighteenth century by the English Captain Cook and the French explorer Bougainville. French missionaries followed in the wake of French occupation, the Picpus Fathers leading the way in 1827, to be followed by the Marists and Sacred Heart Missionaries. Vicariates were established in East Oceania (1833), West (1836), and Central (1842). Excessive reliance upon French military protection may sometimes have prejudiced missionary success, but nothing can detract from the heroism of Bishop Jean Pompalier, later ordinary in New Zealand, and of St. Pierre Chanel (1803–41) martyred in the not yet Friendly Isles. In British territories, pioneer Catholic missionaries encountered opposition from rival Protestant evangelists at first, but eventually room was found for all. World War II, besides disturbing the missions, revolutionized life in Oceania and ended the colonial era. The Bandoeng, Java Congress in 1955 stressed anticolonialism and anti-Caucasian aims of the Oceanic peoples,

so that here, too, the future of the Catholic missions was likely to lie with the native clergy.

The Philippine Islands, for the most part evangelized by the nineteenth century, continued on their tranquil course until the Spanish-American War. The Church was then threatened by nationalistic antagonism to the Spanish clergy culminating in the Aglipayan Schism and American Protestant proselytizing. American Catholic missionaries largely repaired these damages, and the ultimate good faith of the United States government in conceding independence voluntarily (1946) probably saved the islands from succumbing to Communism, although for their preservation they were chiefly indebted to their own great President Magsaysay (1953–57).

C. The Far East

(1) China

Persecution by the monarchy continued to be the lot of missionaries after 1785 when the Vincentians replaced the suppressed Society of Jesus in the Chinese mission. Court contacts continued intermittently, however, and the Jesuit Père Bourgeois was able to introduce Père Raux (1754–1801) and his band to the king. For the greater part of the nineteenth century Peking had to be avoided, because of official hostility, though it was reoccupied in 1860. The Chinese Christians numbered at least three hundred thousand and in 1803 a synod was held under Bishop Dufresse at Sechwan. During 1811, the suspicions of the ruler, Chia King (1796–1820), were aroused, and a decree ordered execution of all missionaries and catechists. Christian communities were to be transplanted, churches destroyed, and Christian books burned. Bishop Dufresse was denounced to the pagans and beheaded with thirty others in 1815; he was beatified in 1900. In 1820 Blessed François Clet, C.M., and in 1840 Blessed Jean Perboyre, C.M., headed other groups of martyrs. The mission would have been bereft of workers had not Vincentians, Paris Foreign Missionaries, and others come to the rescue. Though French intervention procured an edict of toleration in 1844, the aggressive attitude of the European powers toward China aroused general animosity toward the missionaries. The pseudo-mystic Taiping Rebellion (1850–1865), a blend of Protestantism with Oriental lore, led to new reprisals against Catholic missionaries. While the penal laws were abrogated in 1862, popular bigotry still produced the massacre of thirty thousand at Tientsin in 1870, including two priests and ten Daughters of Charity. In 1875 placards of a nationalist anti-Christian society ridiculed the Christian faith, and depicted the "barbarous king of France and king of England" kneeling before the Crucified—clear evidence of the confusion of imperialism and evangelization in the Oriental

mind. During the Boxer Rising of 1900, five bishops, thirty foreign missionaries, ten nuns, and four lay brothers were slain, but the fury did not abate until one hundred Chinese priests and religious and thirty thousand of the faithful had been killed.

The Republic proclaimed in 1912 but scarcely ever put into general operation, for the most part respected religious liberty. From two to three million Chinese Christians were now under Propaganda, and Father Vincent Lebbe, C.M. (1877–1940), persuaded the Holy See to place greater stress upon a native clergy. An apostolic delegate was named in 1921 and a plenary council held in 1924. During 1926 Pope Pius XI consecrated six native Chinese bishops. This trend continued so that between 1925 and 1948 the native clergy increased from 1,220 to 2,676, while in 1946 residential sees were erected and Bishop Tien named the first Chinese cardinal. An instruction of Propaganda, December 8, 1939, had relaxed some of the provisions of the 1742 ban on Chinese rites because of the more secularistic attitude toward such customs in modern Chinese society. Priests were now permitted to be present at functions held before an image of Confucius, to place his image in Catholic schools and make a ceremonial bow before it, to assist at public ceremonies which were civil in character, and to show certain secular signs of respect to the dead. The Jesuits had returned to China and opened Aurora University, while colleges and seminaries were begun. Fu-Jen University at Peking, begun by the Benedictines, was continued by the Society of the Divine Word. The noted convert, Lou-Tseng-Tsung (1871–1949), one time foreign minister and envoy, became a Benedictine monk, while John Wu in 1946 was named China's first envoy to the Vatican.

Communist persecution soon dimmed this bright prospect after World War II. Mao Tse-tung, who had set up a Communist government at Hankow as early as 1928, not only survived nationalist Chinese and Japanese attacks, but after World War II extended his rule to embrace most of the Chinese mainland, forcing the nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek to take refuge on Formosa. On October 1, 1949, the Communists could proclaim the People's Republic at Peking. In 1945 there were about 4,000,000 Chinese Catholics with 105 sees, 39 prefectures, ruled by 27 Chinese ordinaries with the aid of 3,000 foreign missionaries and about 2,500 native priests. Communist attacks were at first chiefly directed against the foreigners so that the 5,496 foreign priests, brothers, and sisters of 1947 had by 1956 been reduced by death or exile to 23, and all of these were in detention. Under such circumstances lay guidance became extremely important. Morale was maintained by the Legion of Mary, organized by Monsignor Riberi, the papal nuncio, assisted by Father Aidean McGrath and Miss Joan Hsiao, who was later imprisoned

by the Communists. The most serious development, however, was the establishment of a schismatic hierarchy during 1958. The Communists reported the consecration of twenty priests to fill the "vacant" sees held by legitimate bishops who had been imprisoned or exiled. Five of the legitimate hierarchy are reported to have participated in these consecrations which were denounced by Pius XII in an encyclical of June 29, 1958—published only in September.

(2) JAPAN

Christian resurrection. So far as Western Christendom knew, the savage persecutions of the seventeenth century had extinguished Catholicity in Japan. Yet in 1812 a Russian traveler in the Orient reported a crucifixion of Japanese Christians, and in 1829 twenty Japanese sailors shipwrecked in Manila displayed medals and asked for baptism. Père Forcade finally succeeded in entering Japan in 1844 but was unable to evangelize. After years of detention, he was expelled. During 1858 the Japanese government admitted chaplains for the French embassy, but denied them missionary activities. The chaplains nonetheless established contact with the native Christians in 1865, after passing their three tests: clerical celibacy, veneration for Mary, and obedience to the pope. When these secret communications were discovered by the government, several thousand Japanese were deported for professing Christianity, until Japan yielded to European protests in 1872 to the extent of releasing native Christians. In 1875 religious toleration was formally sanctioned.

Catholic progress. At once two vicariates were erected, and in 1882 Bishop Petitjean ordained the first native Japanese priest in modern times, a son of a confessor of the 1867 persecution. By 1891 it became possible to erect the archdiocese of Tokyo with three suffragan sees. The Paris Missionary Society took the lead in re-evangelizing Japan and reported fifty thousand Christians by 1900. At this time (1899) also the Japanese government decreed full religious liberty. The drive for a native clergy was accentuated, and in 1927 Pius XI consecrated the first native Japanese bishop of the new hierarchy. During 1936 a decision of the Holy See permitted Catholic participation in the now secularized State Shinto rite, since "the civil authorities and the common estimation of cultured persons attribute to the ceremonies held at the national shrines a mere civil significance of patriotism; namely, a feeling of filial reverence toward the Imperial Family and to the heroes of the country." The discrediting of militarism and imperialism during World War II portended a promising mission field, provided that Indifferentism or Communism did not anticipate the missionaries. Since 1940 all of the hierarchy have been Japanese, and by 1955 there were ten dioceses or

vicariates and five prefectures. The number of Japanese Catholics mounted from 59,000 in 1905, to 105,000 in 1935, to 227,000 in 1956.

(3) KOREA

Christianity penetrated into Korea from China in 1785 through the Chinese convert, Peter Ly. Despite repeated persecutions, the number of Korean Christians had increased to ten thousand by the nineteenth century. In 1831 a vicariate was created, but the first vicar-apostolic was unable to reach Korea, and the second, Monsignor Imbert, was martyred in 1839. In 1866 Bishop Berneux and most of his missionaries were slain and another persecution occurred in 1887. By the time that Japan annexed Korea (1895), she had already conceded religious toleration, so that Korean Catholics at length enjoyed liberty. Bishop Mutel saw the Catholic population increase from 18,000 in 1890 to 78,000 in 1911. At the outbreak of World War II, there were 125 foreign and 121 native priests. In 1941 Paul Ro became the first native Korean bishop. During World War II American missionaries were arrested and the vicariates filled with native or Japanese bishops. More serious was the Red persecution which took the lives of Bishop Byrne and many others. In Communist dominated Northern Korea the Church was driven underground, but in the South Catholics still numbered 189,000 in 1955, with 56 foreign and 189 native priests.

D. Missionary Direction

Catholic missionary resources were severely strained during the years following the French Revolution by the disruption of the religious congregations in Europe, although occasionally persecution at home temporarily freed priests for service abroad. As the nineteenth century advanced, the material advantages, combined with vexatious meddling of the Iberian patronage system, dwindled, though these were partially replaced by the new colonial imperialism. This new imperialism was frankly secular, and yet it often patronized and defended missionaries for its own objectives, perhaps to the ultimate detriment of the missionary effort.

The Congregation of Propaganda was reconstituted in 1817 after Pope Pius VII's return to Rome, and continually perfected its organization. In 1862 a separate administration was provided for the missions of the Oriental Rite, and in 1908 many European and American countries were restored to normal hierarchical jurisdiction and thereby withdrawn from Propaganda's supervision. The Congregation could now rely on the missionary resources of reorganized religious communities, as well as upon new societies formed specifically for missionary work

abroad, such as the Milan Society, the White Fathers, the Lyons Society, the Mill Hill Fathers, and Maryknoll. The laity responded generously and founded no less than 250 associations within a century to assist the foreign missions. Chief among these was the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, begun by Pauline Jaricot at Lyons in 1822, and transferred by Pius XI to Rome in 1922. Missionary literature, both in books and pamphlets, has increased interest and financial support, and technical courses in Missiology have analyzed methods from the records of the past. During the twentieth century the objective of the Holy See to form a native and self-recruiting clergy came nearer to realization. Benedict XV and Pius XI issued noteworthy missionary encyclicals (1919; 1926). The latter pontiff also sponsored a Missionary Exhibit in 1925, specified a monthly mission intention for the Apostleship of Prayer, established the Fides Mission News Service, and dramatically inaugurated native hierarchies in China and Japan, a course continued in India and Africa by Pius XII.

Missionary revival began chiefly with the pontificate of Gregory XVI, former prefect of Propaganda, and continued without interruption. In 1800 there were twenty missionary vicariates and prefectures; in 1956, some six hundred existed. Missionary support comes to Propaganda, which has always issued documents gratis, from the Propagation of the Faith Society, the Peter the Apostle Fund for Native Seminarians, and the Holy Childhood. In 1957, the sums from the first two categories amounted to over $18,000,000, of which sixty-six per cent came from the United States. And yet missionary goals remain immense: by mid-twentieth century, Catholics were but seventeen per cent of an estimated world population of 2,655,000,000, and non-Christians were still sixty-five per cent of the children of Adam.

Conclusion. During the proletarian era of mass production and in face of totalitarian mobilization of manpower, stress has been laid upon imperialistic control of the minds and resources of the masses. Ideological conflicts have led to contests for the support of mankind the world over. These trends have but heightened the emphasis on the Catholicity of the Christian Church, and have laid new stress upon the ever present duty of missionary evangelization, last injunction of the Master until He comes again: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world" (Matt. 28:19).

Epilogue

POPE JOHN AND HIS TIMES

Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli (1881–   ) was born of peasant ancestry at
Sotto il Monte near Bergamo on November 25, 1881, the third of thirteen
children. He attended the minor seminary at Bergamo and the Cerasola
College at Rome, where during 1904 he obtained the doctorate in
theology. He was ordained to the priesthood on August 11, 1904, and
after a further year of study became secretary to Bishop Radini-
Tedeschi of Bergamo. He accompanied his bishop to the French
Semaines Sociales frequently and taught history, patrology, and apolo-
getics in the seminary. He published six historical works, chiefly on the
Christian antiquities of Bergamo. During his research on St. Charles
Borromeo's visitation of Bergamo, he met Monsignor Ratti at the Milan
library. During the first world war he served as sergeant in the medical
corps; later he became a chaplain with the rank of lieutenant. After the
war, he founded a student center at Bergamo and participated in the
direction of Catholic Action. Summoned to Rome by Pope Benedict XV
during 1920, he was placed at the head of the Italian Propagation of the
Faith Society, just at the time that the central headquarters were being
transferred from Lyons to Rome. On this task he traveled extensively in
Europe. On March 19, 1925, he was consecrated bishop by Cardinal
Tacci and named papal nuncio to Bulgaria. Later he was transferred to
the nunciature of Greece and Turkey, serving in this capacity through
World War II until 1944. Resident at Istanbul, he was also the apostolic
administrator for the Latin Rite at Constantinople. After the liberation
of France, Roncalli was promoted to the post of papal nuncio to that
country where he served from 1945 to 1953. Here he tactfully acted as
mediator in religious and political readjustments to the satisfaction of
all, and from 1946 to 1953 he also acted as Vatican UNESCO observer.

Named cardinal in January, 1953, he was promoted to the patriarchate of Venice a few days afterwards. In his new post he interested himself in all pastoral activities. Aloof from politics, he yet warned the Italian Catholics against the snares of Communists and Leftists.

Papal inaugural. Called to Rome by the death of Pius XII, Cardinal Roncalli was elected to the papacy on the third day of the conclave after a number of inconclusive ballots. On October 28, 1958, he was saluted as Pope John XXIII—thereby implicitly rejecting Baldassare Cossa from the ranks of legitimate pontiffs. Within a month the new pope had raised the Sacred College to the unprecedented number of seventy-five cardinals, by filling all of the titular sees. With the evident intention of further expanding the membership of the Sacred College, he named eight additional cardinals during 1959. Pope John displayed great informality toward the Vatican entourage, and visited Roman institutions, including the hospitals and the jail on his tours.

Conciliar preparations. In a consistorial allocution, January 25, 1959, Pope John announced his intention to convoke what would become the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council. He urged preparatory synods in each diocese, and himself set an example by holding one at Rome during 1960. Roman synodal decrees divided the city into four districts, each under an auxiliary bishop, and enacted lengthy disciplinary regulations. During 1960, consultation of the Catholic episcopate throughout the world was completed, and the ante-preparatory phase of the council terminated with the compilation of fifteen volumes of *acta*. The contents are confidential, but it was revealed that episcopal suggestions had been summarized in 8,972 propositions embracing doctrinal matters, canon law, clerical and lay discipline, divine worship and sacramental liturgy, ecclesiastical precepts and magisterium, movements for church unity, missions, and social and charitable works. To the foregoing must be added recommendations by the Roman congregations and the pontifical universities. On June 12, 1961, the pope presided over the first meeting of the central preparatory commission, with Cardinal Micara as deputy president and Archbishop Felici secretary.

Reunion efforts. One of the aims of the forthcoming council was the reunion of Christendom. Invitations were sent to the Dissidents, and Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople expressed willingness to promote better understanding, even styling the pope "a man sent by God whose name was John." Unofficial Catholic observers attended Greek Orthodox discussions at Rhodes in 1959, and in the same year the Orthodox Archbishop Iakovos was presented to the pope for the first time. It was hoped, though in vain, that informal talks between Greek and Latin theologians might be held at Venice in 1960. Yet a preliminary meeting for a Pan-Orthodox Synod was planned for the autumn of 1961.

Father DeVries, S.J., of the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies warned Catholics against hasty optimism, explaining that Dissidents are divided among themselves; have eighty-five per cent of their membership behind the Iron Curtain; and display a tendency to lay down an ultimatum to Rome that prior to discussions all "Catholic innovations," e.g., papal infallibility, must be set aside. The pope, however, continued his conciliatory course, and in April, 1961, celebrated Mass in the Byzantine Rite when consecrating the Melkite Archbishop Coussa— something that had not been done by his predecessors for centuries.

Omission of the *pro perfidis Judaeis* from the Good Friday liturgy, and of other relics of a blunter age, such as the "darkness of idolatry and of Islamism" in the Sacred Heart consecration, strove to remove any needless embarrassment for non-Catholics. The Protestant leaders paid some courteous tributes to Pope John, though concrete reunion proposals were scarcely to be expected. Yet in December, 1960, the Vatican visit of Dr. Fisher, Anglican Primate of Canterbury, broke a diplomatic alienation of four centuries.

Diplomatic activity. Pope John named his predecessor's under-secretary, Domenico Tardini, his own secretary of state, and on the latter's death in 1961, appointed Cardinal Amletto Cicognani to succeed him. The Vatican did not renew recognition of the envoys of the Polish and Lithuanian governments-in-exile in January, 1959, but it was explained that this was in accord with protocol and did not imply recognition of the Communist *de facto* regimes. Though Castro's government in Cuba was promptly recognized in January, 1960, it had not at that time declared itself Communist. Turkey opened diplomatic relations with the Holy See during 1960. The Vatican tried to induce Iron Curtain countries to admit a commission seeking information on displaced persons for canonical matrimonial cases.

In February, 1959, the pope erected a permanent pontifical commission for cinema, radio, and television, under the presidency of Archbishop O'Connor, rector of the North American College at Rome. In December, 1959, President Eisenhower was cordially received by the pope, and in November, 1960, the pontiff congratulated the Catholic President-elect, John F. Kennedy, in the same formula used by Pius XII in saluting victors in previous American elections. Other chiefs of state who visited Pope John included King Paul of Greece, Queen Elizabeth II of England, and the king and queen of Belgium.

Church-State relations. Within the free world it might be noted that Austria in 1960 voted the Church compensation for Nazi confiscations. The Italian government in 1961 conceded pensions and insurance to the secular clergy. The DeGaullist Fifth French Republic broke anticlerical tradition by voting some governmental aid to Catholic schools in 1960,

over protests of Liberal politicians and educators. Since 1958 the Portuguese hierarchy has felt obliged to criticize the growing authoritarianism of the Salazar dictatorship, and to disassociate itself from any union with it. During 1961 the first priest was ordained in Finland since the Protestant Revolt.

Behind the Iron Curtain, governmental gestures toward better relations usually proved illusory or temporary. Periodic prison sentences were meted out to new groups of clergy in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans. In Poland governmental pressure elicited from the Cardinal the defiance: "You caesars will have to bow your head to God and to no one else." But in August, 1961, religious instruction was banned from state schools, though still allowed outside of public edifices. Yet membership in religious communities revealed an increase from 30,000 in 1949 to 36,000 in 1958.

Liturgical change. In July, 1960, as effective from January 1, 1961, Pope John announced a revised code of rubrics for the Missal and Breviary. This incorporated most of the provisional changes of 1955, and further strengthened the Proper of the Time against the *Sanctorale*. All except first and second class feasts were reduced to three lessons, Sundays were given precedence over all but first class feasts, and lenten ferias over all but second class ones. To eliminate duplication, some feasts were suppressed or reduced to a commemoration, but added to the universal calendar were Sts. Lawrence of Brindisi, named Doctor of the Church, Antonio Claret, and Gregorio Barbarigo. The Confiteor was omitted from the pre-Communion Ordinary of the Mass, and other modifications made for exceptional or sung Masses. In promulgating the revised code, John XXIII announced that any discussion of basic liturgical principles would be referred to the forthcoming council.

Mater et Magistra. Pope John's "Septuagesimo Anno" commemoration of *Rerum Novarum* reasserted the rights of private property and individual initiative. While conceding that increased regulatory resources lay with the state, the pope urged it to concede all possible autonomy and direct supervision to subordinate social-economic associations. He deplored continuing inequitable distribution of income, and urged increased workmen's participation in enterprise and profits, compatible with private ownership and efficient management. Depressed agrarian society ought to be raised to standards on a level with industrial. Emergency aid should be given undernourished peoples, and long-term, disinterested technical assistance offered to underdeveloped areas. Sanctification of Sundays was stressed. The pope foresaw no imminent danger of overpopulation, and expressed confidence in divine Providence and human ingenuity without need to resort to immoral means. A major obstacle to social and economic progress lay in the division of the world

by mutual suspicions, so that vast resources were diverted from productive uses to military preparedness. In social questions guidance ought ever be sought from the Catholic Church, for "the Church is the standard bearer and herald of a way of life that is ever up to date."

Conclusion. Thus Pope John, Christ's Vicar and Peter's successor, utilized every resource of nature and grace to win souls to the flock of the Good Shepherd, and so would the Catholic Church continue to do for a time known only to God, until all Church History must terminate, as does the Bible, with St. John the Evangelist's prayer, "Come, Lord Jesus."

Appendices

The Supreme Pontiffs

Nicholas V	*Tommaso Parentucelli*	1447–1455
Calixtus III	*Alonso Borgia*	1455–1458
Pius II	*Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini*	1458–1464
Paul II	*Pietro Barbo*	1464–1471
Sixtus IV	*Francesco della Rovere*	1471–1484
Innocent VIII	*Giovanni Battista Cibo*	1484–1492
Alexander VI	*Rodrigo Borgia-Lanzol*	1492–1503
Pius III	*Francesco Piccolomini*	1503–1503
Julius II	*Giuliano della Rovere*	1503–1513
Leo X	*Giovanni de' Medici*	1513–1521
Adrian VI	*Adrian Florenz Dedel*	1522–1523
Clement VII	*Giulio de' Medici*	1523–1534
Paul III	*Alessandro Farnese*	1534–1549
Julius III	*Giovan Maria del Monte*	1550–1555
Marcellus II	*Marcello Cervini*	1555–1555
Paul IV	*Gian-Pietro Carafa*	1555–1559
Pius IV	*Gian-Angelo de' Medici*	1559–1565
St. Pius V	*Antonio Michele Ghislieri*	1566–1572
Gregory XIII	*Ugo Buoncompagni*	1572–1585
Sixtus V	*Felice Peretti Montalto*	1585–1590
Urban VII	*Giambattista Castagna*	1590–1590
Gregory XIV	*Niccolò Sfondrati*	1590–1591
Innocent IX	*Gian Antonio Facchinetti*	1591–1591
Clement VIII	*Ippolito Aldobrandini*	1592–1605
Leo XI	*Alessandro Ottavio de' Medici*	1605–1605
Paul V	*Camillo Borghese*	1605–1621
Gregory XV	*Alessandro Ludovisi*	1621–1623
Urban VIII	*Maffeo Barberini*	1623–1644
Innocent X	*Giambattista Pamfili*	1644–1655
Alexander VII	*Fabio Chigi*	1655–1667
Clement IX	*Giulio Rospigliosi*	1667–1669
Clement X	*Emilio Altieri*	1670–1676
B. Innocent XI	*Benedetto Odescalchi*	1676–1689
Alexander VIII	*Pietro Ottoboni*	1689–1691
Innocent XII	*Antonio Pignatelli*	1691–1700
Clement XI	*Gian-Francesco Albani*	1700–1721

Innocent XIII	*Michelangelo dei Conti*	1721–1724
Benedict XIII	*Pietro Francesco Orsini*	1724–1730
Clement XII	*Lorenzo Corsini*	1730–1740
Benedict XIV	*Prospero Lambertini*	1740–1758
Clement XIII	*Carlo Rezzonico*	1758–1769
Clement XIV	*Giovanni Lorenzo Ganganelli*	1769–1774
Pius VI	*Gianangelo Braschi*	1775–1799
Pius VII	*Gregorio Barnabo Chiaramonti*	1800–1823
Leo XII	*Annibale della Genga*	1823–1829
Pius VIII	*Francesco Castiglione*	1829–1830
Gregory XVI	*Mauro Capellari*	1831–1846
Pius IX	*Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti*	1846–1878
Leo XIII	*Gioacchino Pecci*	1878–1903
St. Pius X	*Giuseppe Sarto*	1903–1914
Benedict XV	*Giacomo della Chiesa*	1914–1922
Pius XI	*Achille Ratti*	1922–1939
Pius XII	*Eugenio Pacelli*	1939–1958
John XXIII	*Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli*	1958

Ecumenical Councils

Lateran V	(Conciliarism; Reform)	1512–1517
Trent	(Protestantism; Reform)	1545–1564
Vatican I	(Papal Infallibility)	1869–1870

Reading Lists

GENERAL HISTORICAL WORKS

Acton, John (ed.), *Cambridge Modern History* (Macmillan, 1902–11)
Bannon, John, *Epitome of Western Civilization* (Bruce, 1942)
Blau, Joseph (ed.), *Chapters in Western Civilization* (Columbia, 1954)
Bogardus, Emory, *Development of Social Thought* (Longmans, Green, 1940)
Bury, John (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History* (Macmillan, 1923–39)
Clark, George (ed.), *New Cambridge Modern History* (Cambridge, 1957–)
Copleston, Frederick, *History of Philosophy* (Newman, 1946–)
Dunning, William, *History of Political Theories* (Macmillan, 1926)
Eyre, Edward (ed.), *European Civilization* (Oxford, 1934–39)
Ferguson and Bruun, *Survey of European Civilization* (Houghton Mifflin, 1939)
Furfey, Paul, *History of Social Thought* (Macmillan, 1942)
Gwatkin, H. W. (ed.), *Cambridge Medieval History* (Macmillan, 1911–36)
Hassall, Arthur (ed.), *Periods of European History* (Rivington, 1890–1931)
Hayes, Baldwin and Cole, *History of Europe* (Macmillan, 1949–56)
Heaton, Herbert, *Economic History of Europe* (Harper, 1936)
Heimann, Eduard, *History of Economic Doctrines* (Oxford, 1945)
Johnson, Allen (ed.), *Chronicles of America* (Yale, 1919–50)
Langer, William (ed.), *Rise of Modern Europe* (Harper, 1936–)
———— *Encyclopedia of World History* (Houghton, 1948)
Latourette, Kenneth, *Short History of the Far East* (Macmillan, 1951)
Lucas, Henry, *Short History of Civilization* (McGraw-Hill, 1953)
Mihanovich, Clement, *Social Theories* (Bruce, 1953)
Robinson and Shotwell, *History of Western Europe* (Ginn, 1946)
Sabine, George, *History of Political Philosophy* (Holt, 1937)
Seagle, William, *History of Law* (Tudor, 1946)
Seignobos, Charles, *Rise of European Civilization* (Knopf, 1938)
Singer, Charles (ed.), *History of Technology* (Oxford, 1954–59)
Sorokin, Pitirim, *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (American Book, 1937–41)
Tsanoff, R. S., *Great Philosophers* (Harper, 1953)
Ulich, Robert, *History of Educational Thought* (American Book, 1945)
Willmann, Otto, *Science of Education* (St. Vincent's Abbey, 1930)

GENERAL ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIES

Algermissen, Konrad, *Christian Denominations* (Herder, 1945)
Alzog, John, *Manual of Universal Church History* (Clarke, 1874–78)

817]

Bihlmeyer, Karl, *Church History,* I (Newman, 1958–)

Brueck, Heinrich, *History of the Catholic Church* (Benziger, 1884–85)

Cayré, Fulbert, *Manual of Patrology* (Desclée, 1936–)

Delacroix, Simon (ed.), *Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques* (Librarie Grund, 1957–58)

Fliche and Martin (ed.), *Histoire de l'Église* (Bloud & Gay, 1940–)

Funk, Franz, *Manual of Church History* (Herder, 1910)

Gilson, Étienne, *History of Christian Philosophy* (Random House, 1955)

Guggenberger, Anthony, *History of the Christian Era* (Herder, 1915–16)

Hergenroether, Joseph, *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (Herder, Freiburg, 1879–80)

Hertling, Ludwig, *History of the Catholic Church* (Newman, 1957)

Hughes, Philip, *History of the Church* (Sheed & Ward, 1937–47)

———— *Popular History of the Catholic Church* (Macmillan, 1949)

Karrer, Otto, *Religions of Mankind* (Sheed & Ward, 1936)

Kirsch, Johann, *Kirchengeschichte* (Herder, Freiburg, 1930–)

Lortz, Joseph, *History of the Church* (Bruce, 1939)

McSorley, Joseph, *Outline History of the Church* (Herder, 1944)

Messenger, Ernest (ed.), *Studies in Comparative Religion* (C.T.S., 1935)

Mourret, Fernand, *History of the Catholic Church* (Herder, 1931–57)

Neill and Schmandt, *History of the Catholic Church* (Bruce, 1957)

Otten, Bernard, *Manual of History of Dogmas* (Herder, 1922–25)

Parsons, Reuben, *Studies in Church History* (Pustet, 1886–1900)

Poulet, Charles, *Histoire de l'Église* (Beauchesne, 1947)

Poulet and Raemers, *Church History* (Herder, 1934–35)

Pourrat, Pierre, *Christian Spirituality* (Newman, 1953–55)

Ring, George, *Religions of the Far East* (Bruce, 1950)

Schmidlin, Joseph, *Catholic Mission History* (S.V.D. Mission Press, 1933)

Sturzo, Luigi, *Church and State* (Longmans, Green, 1939)

Tixeront, Joseph, *History of Dogma* (Herder, 1926–30)

Walker, Reginald, *Outline History of the Church* (Newman, 1959)

Weber, Nicholas, *Christian Era* (Catholic U., 1953)

METHODOLOGY AND TELEOLOGY

Adam, Karl, *Das Wesen des Katholizismus* (Schwann, 1931)

Allies, Thomas, *Formation of Christendom* (Longmans, Green, 1865–96)

Aquinas, St. Thomas, *On Governance of Rulers* (Sheed & Ward, 1938)

———— *Summa Theologica* (Marietti, 1901)

Augustinus, St. Aurelius, *City of God* (Scribner's, 1903)

Balmes, Jaime, *Protestantism and Catholicity* (Burns, 1849)

Belloc, Hilaire, *Crisis of Civilization* (Fordham, 1937)

Bossuet, Jacques, *Discours d'Histoire Universelle* (Hachette, 1868)

Butterfield, Herbert, *History and Human Relations* (Macmillan, 1952)

———— *Man on His Past* (Cambridge, 1955)

Chudoba, Bohdan, *Meaning of Civilization* (Kenedy, 1951)

Dawson, Christopher, *Dynamics of World History* (Sheed & Ward, 1957)

———— *Enquiries into Religion and Culture* (Sheed & Ward, 1933)

—————— *Progress and Religion* (Sheed & Ward, 1939)
Devas, Charles, *Key to World's Progress* (Wagner, 1923)
DuPlessis, Joachim, *The Human Caravan* (Sheed & Ward, 1939)
Dutcher, George, *Guide to Historical Literature* (P. Smith, 1931)
Furfey, Paul, *Three Theories of Society* (Macmillan, 1937)
Garraghan, Gilbert, *Guide to Historical Method* (Fordham, 1946)
Guilday, Peter, *Introduction to Church History* (Herder, 1925)
—————— *Catholic Philosophy of History* (Kenedy, 1936)
—————— *Church Historians* (Kenedy, 1926)
Hegel, Georg, *Philosophy of History* (Collier, 1900)
Hockett, Homer, *Critical Method in Historical Research* (Macmillan, 1955)
Hoffman, Ross, *Tradition and Progress* (Bruce, 1938)
Johnson, Henry, *The Teaching of History* (Professional Library, 1915)
Leo XIII, Pope, *Saepenumero* (Acta Sanctae Sedis, 1883)
Mohan, Robert, *Thomistic Philosophy of Civilization* (Catholic U., 1948)
Nevins, Allan, *Gateway to History* (Appleton-Century, 1938)
Newman, John Henry, *Essay on Development* (Longmans, Green, 1897)
Otto, Bishop of Freising, *The Two Cities* (Columbia, 1928)
Sertillanges, Antonin, *The Intellectual Life* (Newman, 1948)
Smedt, Charles de, *Principes de la Critique Historique* (S.B.B., 1883)
Sturzo, Luigi, *The True Life* (St. Anthony Guild, 1943)
—————— *Inner Laws of Society* (Kenedy, 1944)
Toynbee, Arnold, *Study of History* (Oxford abridged, 1947)
Vico, Giambattista, *The New Science* (Cornell U., 1948)

PAPAL HISTORY

Allies, Thomas, *St. Peter, His Name and Office* (C.T.S., 1895)
—————— *See of Peter* (Lawrence Kehoe, 1866)
Attwater, Donald, *Dictionary of Popes* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1939)
Bagnani, Gilbert, *Rome and the Papacy* (Crowell, 1929)
Baldwin, Marshall, *Medieval Papacy in Action* (Macmillan, 1940)
Barnes, Arthur, *St. Peter in Rome* (Sonnenschein, 1900)
—————— *Martyrdom of Sts. Peter and Paul* (Oxford, 1933)
Barraclough, Geoffrey, *Papal Provisions* (Oxford, 1935)
Barry, William, *Papal Monarchy: 590–1303* (Putnam, 1902)
Bernhart and Shuster, *Vatican as a World Power* (Longmans, Green, 1939)
Carrère, Jean, *The Pope* (Holt, 1926)
Cavanagh, Sr. Agnes, *Gregory VII and the Theocratic State* (Catholic U., 1934)
Chapman, John, *Studies on the Early Papacy* (Sheed & Ward, 1928)
Cianfarra, Camille, *Vatican and the Kremlin* (Dutton, 1950)
—————— *Vatican and the War* (Dutton, 1944)
Duchesne, Louis, *Beginnings of Temporal Sovereignty* (Benziger, 1908)
Dvornik, Frantisek, *The Photian Schism* (Cambridge U., 1948)
Edmundson, George, *Church in Rome in the First Century* (Longmans, Green, 1913)
Farrow, John, *Pageant of the Popes* (Sheed & Ward, 1942)

Fliche, Augustin, *La Réforme Grégorienne* (Spicilegium, 1924–26)
Fouard, Constant, *St. Peter and First Years of Christianity* (Longmans, Green, 1892)
Goodwin, Sr. Mary, *Papal Conflict with Josephinism* (Fordham, 1938)
Graham, Robert, *Vatican Diplomacy* (Princeton U., 1959)
Grisar, Hartmann, *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages* (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1911–12)
Guarducci, Margherita, *Tomb of St. Peter* (Hawthorn, 1960)
Halperin, Samuel, *Italy and the Vatican at War* (Chicago U., 1939)
Jaffe, Philipp, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (Akademische Druck, 1956)
Kirschbaum, Engelbert, *Tombs of Sts. Peter and Paul* (St. Martin's, 1959)
Knapke, Paul, *Barbarossa's Conflict with the Papacy* (Catholic U., 1939)
Loomis, Louise, *Book of the Popes* (Columbia U., 1916)
Lunt, William, *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages* (Columbia U., 1934)
Mann, Horace, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, 19v (Herder, 1902–32)
Mollat, Guillaume, *Les Papes d'Avignon* (Letouzey & Ane, 1950)
Moore, Thomas, *Peter's City* (Macmillan, 1930)
Morgan, Thomas, *The Listening Post* (Putnam's, 1944)
———— *Reporter at the Papal Court* (Longmans, Green, 1937)
Mourret, Fernand, *The Papacy* (Sands-Herder, 1931)
Parsons, Wilfrid, *The Pope and Italy* (American Press, 1929)
Pastor, Ludwig, *History of the Popes*, 40v (Herder, 1902–53)
Pichon, Charles, *The Vatican* (Dutton, 1950)
Salembier, Louis, *Le Grand Schisme d'Occident* (Lecoffre, 1900)
Seldes, George, *The Vatican: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow* (Harper, 1934)
Seppelt and Löffler, *Short History of the Popes* (Herder, 1932)
Shotwell and Loomis, *See of Peter* (Columbia, 1927)
Thurston, Herbert, *No Popery* (Longmans, Green, 1930)
Ullman, Walter, *Growth of Papal Government* (Barnes & Noble, 1955)
———— *Medieval Papalism* (Methuen, 1949)
———— *Origins of the Great Schism* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1948)
Williams, Michael, *Shadow of the Pope* (McGraw-Hill, 1932)

CONCILIAR HISTORY

Butler, Cuthbert, *The Vatican Council* (Longmans, Green, 1930)
Dolan, Thomas, *The Papacy and First Councils* (Herder, 1910)
Gill, Joseph, *Council of Florence* (Cambridge U., 1959)
Guilday, Peter, *History of the Councils of Baltimore* (Macmillan, 1932)
Hefele, Joseph, *History of the Councils* (Clark, 1883–96)
Hefele and LeClercq, *Histoire des Conciles* (Letouzey & Ane, 1907–52)
Jedin, Hubert, *Ecumenical Councils* (Herder & Herder, 1960)
———— *History of the Council of Trent*, I (Nelson-Herder, 1957)
———— *Papal Legate at the Council of Trent: Seripando* (Herder, 1947)
Kinsman, Frederick, *Trent* (Longmans, Green, 1921)
Manning, Henry Edward, *Vatican Council* (Sadlier, 1871)

Mansi, Giovanni, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Amplissima Collectio* (Hubert Welter, 1901–27)

Raab, Clement, *Twenty Ecumenical Councils* (Longmans, Green, 1937)

Schroeder, Henry, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (Herder, 1937)

———— *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Herder, 1941)

Tierney, Brian, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge, 1955)

GENERAL ANCIENT HISTORY

Albright, William, *From Stone Age to Christianity* (Johns Hopkins, 1946)

Allard, Paul, *Christianisme et L'Empire Romain* (Lecoffre, 1898)

Allies, Thomas, *Formation of Christendom* (Longmans, Green, 1865–96)

Bardenhewer, Otto, *Patrology* (Herder, 1908)

Batiffol, Pierre, *Études d'Histoire* (Lecoffre, 1905–6)

Betten, Francis, *Ancient World* (Allyn & Bacon, 1916)

Boak, Arthur, *History of Rome* (Macmillan, 1943)

Bonnard, George, *Greek Civilization* (Macmillan, 1957)

Botsford and Robinson, *Hellenic History* (Macmillan, 1939)

Bury, John (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History* (Macmillan, 1923–39)

Cary, Max, *History of Rome* (Macmillan, 1954)

Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society*, 3v (Macmillan, 1904–26)

Duchesne, Louis, *Early History of the Christian Church* (Murray, 1909–24)

Eyre, Edward (ed.), *European Civilization*, I, II (Oxford, 1934–39)

Fliche and Martin, *Histoire de l'Église,* I–IV (Bloud & Gay, 1940–)

Frank, Tenney, *History of Rome* (Holt, 1926)

Grisar, Hartmann, *History of Rome and the Popes* (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1911)

Kirch, Konrad, *Enchiridion Fontium Historiae Ecclesiasticae Antiquae* (Herder, Freiburg, 1956)

Kirsch, Johann, *Die Kirche in der Antiken Kulturvelt* (Herder, Freiburg, 1930)

Lebreton and Zeiller, *History of the Primitive Church* (Macmillan, 1957)

Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* (Columbia U., 1951)

Llorca, Bernardino, *Historia de la Iglesia Catolica:* 1–681 A.D. (B.A.C., 1950)

Rostovtzev, Mikhail, *History of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1936–39)

Trever, Albert, *Ancient Civilization* (Harcourt, Brace, 1936–38)

ARCHAEOLOGY AND PROTOHISTORY

Albright, William, *Stone Age to Christianity* (Johns Hopkins, 1946)

Allier, Raoul, *Mind of the Savage* (Harcourt, Brace, 1929)

Boas, Franz, *Mind of Primitive Man* (Macmillan, 1924)

Cadoux, Jean, *One Thousand Metres Down* (Barnes, 1957)

Cleator, Philip, *The Past in Pieces* (Allen & Unwin, 1957)

Finegan, Jack, *Light from the Ancient Past* (Princeton U., 1946)

Gerard, John, *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer* (Longmans, Green, 1904)

Goldenweiser, Alexander, *Early Civilization* (Knopf, 1929)

Guibert, Jean, *Whence and How of the Universe?* (St. Mary's, 1928)
Haddon, Alfred, *History of Anthropology* (Putnam's, 1910)
Husslein, Joseph, *Evolution and Social Progress* (Kenedy, 1920)
Karrer, Otto, *Religions of Mankind* (Sheed & Ward, 1936)
Kenyon, Kathleen, *Beginning in Archaeology* (Praeger, 1952)
Kroeber, Alfred, *Anthropology* (Harcourt, Brace, 1923)
Lauring, Palle, *Land of the Tollund Man* (Lutterworth, 1957)
Lowie, Robert, *Primitive Religion* (Boni & Liveright, 1924)
—— *Primitive Society* (Boni & Liveright, 1925)
McCann, Alfred, *God or Gorilla* (Devin-Adair, 1922)
Merak, Kurt, *March of Archaeology* (Knopf, 1958)
Messenger, Ernest (ed.), *Studies in Comparative Religion* (C.T.S., 1935)
Muntsch, Albert, *Evolution and Culture* (Herder, 1923)
Murray, Raymond, *Man's Unknown Ancestors* (Bruce, 1943)
O'Toole, George, *Case Against Evolution* (Macmillan, 1925)
Pritchard, James, *Ancient Near East Texts* (Princeton U., 1958)
—— *Archaeology and the Old Testament* (Princeton U., 1958)
Radin, Paul, *Method and Theory of Ethnology* (McGraw-Hill, 1933)
—— *Social Anthropology* (McGraw-Hill, 1932)
Schmidt, Wilhelm, *Origin and Growth of Religion* (Methuen, 1931)
—— *Primitive Revelation* (Herder, 1939)
—— *Culture Method of Ethnology* (Fortuny's, 1939)
Sieber and Mueller, *Social Life of Primitive Man* (Herder, 1941)
Wasmann, Erich, *Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution* (Herder, 1923)
Windle, Bertram, *Evolutionary Problem* (Wagner, 1927)
Zacharias, Hans, *Protohistory* (Herder, 1947)

PRE-CHRISTIAN PERIOD

Albright, William, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Johns Hopkins, 1946)
—— *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Biblical Colloquium, 1955)
—— *The Biblical Period* (Harper, 1950)
Bonnard, André, *Greek Civilization* (Macmillan, 1957)
Botsford and Robinson, *Hellenic History* (Macmillan, 1939)
Breasted, James, *History of Egypt* (Scribner's, 1912)
Buchan, John, *Julius Caesar* (Appleton-Century, 1932)
—— *Augustus* (Houghton Mifflin, 1937)
Bury, John (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History*, I–IX (Macmillan, 1923–39)
Cary, Max, *History of Rome* (Macmillan, 1954)
Copleston, Frederick, *History of Philosophy*, I (Newman, 1948)
Daniel-Rops, Henri, *Sacred History* (Longmans, Green, 1949)
Eyre, Edward (ed.), *European Civilization*, I, II (Oxford, 1936–39)
Fowler, W. W., *Rome* (Williams & Norgate, 1912)
Frank, Tenney, *History of Rome* (Holt, 1926)
Freeman, Kathleen, *Greek City States* (Norton, 1950)
Gilson, Étienne, *God and Philosophy* (Oxford-Yale, 1941)

Heinisch, Paul, *History of the Old Testament* (Liturgical Press, 1952)
—————— *Theology of the Old Testament* (Liturgical Press, 1950)
—————— *Christ in Prophecy* (Liturgical Press, 1956)
Hubert, Henri, *Rise of Celts* (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1934)
—————— *Greatness and Decline of Celts* (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1934)
Jaeger, Werner, *Aristotle* (Oxford, 1948)
Lauring, Palle, *Land of Tollund Man* (Lutterworth, 1957)
Maritain, Jacques, *Introduction to Philosophy* (Sheed & Ward, 1930)
Martin, Daniel, *Guide to Old Testament History* (Kenrick Seminary, 1951)
Olmstead, A. T., *History of Assyria* (Scribner's, 1923)
Ricciotti, Giuseppe, *History of Israel* (Bruce, 1955)
Rice, Tamara, *The Scythians* (Praeger, 1957)
Ross, William, *Aristotle* (Methuen, 1945)
Rostovtzev, Mikhail, *Caravan Cities* (Oxford, 1932)
Seminary Professor, *Histoire Sainte* (Paris, 1938)
Taylor, A. E., *Plato, His Life and Work* (Humanities Press, 1949)
Trever, Albert, *Ancient Civilization* (Harcourt, Brace, 1936–38)
Vawter, Bruce, *A Path Through Genesis* (Sheed & Ward, 1956)
Walter, Gerard, *Caesar* (Scribner's, 1952)
Wheeler, Benjamin, *Alexander the Great* (Putnam's, 1900)
Wilchen, Ulrich, *Alexander the Great* (Chatto & Windus, 1932)
Windelband, Wilhelm, *History of Ancient Philosophy* (Scribner's, 1906)

IMPERIAL PERIOD: 1–565 A.D.: INSTITUTIONS

Allard, Paul, *Christianisme et L'Empire Romain* (Lecoffre, 1898)
—————— *Ten Lectures on Martyrs* (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1907)
Allies, Thomas, *Formation of Christendom* (Longmans, Green, 1865–96)
Bardy, Gustave, *Church at End of the First Century* (Sands & Co., 1938)
Bardy *et al., Histoire de l'Église:* 395–590 (Bloud & Gay, 1945)
—————— *Histoire de l'Église:* 313–395 (Bloud & Gay, 1947)
Barnes, Arthur, *Christianity at Rome in Apostolic Age* (Methuen, 1938)
—————— *Early Church in Light of Monuments* (Longmans, 1913)
—————— *Martyrdom of Sts. Peter and Paul* (Oxford, 1933)
—————— *St. Peter in Rome* (Sonnenschein, 1900)
Batiffol, Pierre, *Études d'Histoire* (Lecoffre, 1905–6)
—————— *La Paix Constantinienne* (Lecoffre, 1914)
—————— *Primitive Catholicism* (Longmans, Green, 1911)
Boak, Arthur, *History of Rome to 565* (Macmillan, 1943)
Bury, John (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History*, X–XII (Macmillan, 1923–39)
Butler, Cuthbert, *Benedictine Monachism* (Longmans, Green, 1924)
Chapman, John, *Studies on Early Papacy* (Sheed & Ward, 1928)
—————— *St. Benedict and Sixth Century* (Longmans, Green, 1929)
Danielou, Jean, *Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity* (Helicon, 1958)
Daniel-Rops, Henri, *L'Église des Apotres et Martyrs* (Fayard, 1948)
Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society*, 3v (Macmillan, 1904–26)
Dolan, Thomas, *Papacy and the First Councils* (Herder, 1910)
Duchesne, Louis, *Christian Worship* (C.K.S., 1931)

Duchesne, Louis, *Origenes Chrétiennes* (Blanc-Pascal, n.d.)
—————— *Early History of the Christian Church* (Murray, 1909–24)
Edmundson, George, *Church in Rome in the First Century* (Longmans, Green, 1913)
Eusebius Pamphili, *Ecclesiastical History* (Nicene Fathers, I, 1904)
Frank, Tenney, *History of Rome* (Holt, 1926)
Frend, William, *The Donatist Church* (Oxford, 1952)
Graystone, Geoffrey, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ* (Sheed & Ward, 1956)
Grisar, Hartmann, *History of Rome and the Popes* (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1911)
Guarducci, Margherita, *Tomb of St. Peter* (Hawthorn, 1960)
Guerdan, Rene, *Byzantium* (Putnam's, 1957)
Hertling and Kirschbaum, *Roman Catacombs and the Martyrs* (Bruce, 1956)
Jungmann, Joseph, *Early Liturgy* (Notre Dame U., 1959)
—————— *Mass of the Roman Rite* (Benziger, 1951–)
Kane, Thomas, *Patriarchal Jurisdiction* (Catholic U., 1949)
Kirch, Konrad, *Enchiridion Historiae Antiquae* (Herder, 1956)
Kirsch, Johann, *Die Kirche in der Antiken Kulturvelt* (Herder, 1930)
Kirschbaum, Engelbert, *Tombs of Sts. Peter and Paul* (St. Martin's, 1959)
Labourt, Jerome, *Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse* (Lecoffre, 1904)
Laistner, Max, *Christianity and Pagan Culture* (Cornell U., 1951)
Lebreton and Zeiller, *History of the Primitive Church*, 2v (Macmillan, 1957)
LeClercq, Henri, *L'Afrique Chrétienne* (Lecoffre, 1904)
—————— *L'Espagne Chrétienne* (Lecoffre, 1906)
—————— *Manuel d'Archeologie Chrétienne* (Letouzey & Ane, 1907)
Loomis, Louise, *Book of the Popes* (Columbia U., 1916)
Marucchi, Orazio, *Éléments d'Archeologie Chrétienne* (Lefebvre, 1902)
—————— *Epigrafia Cristiana* (Hoepli, 1910)
—————— *Manual of Christian Archeology* (St. Anthony Guild, 1935)
Murphy, Roland, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible* (Newman, 1956)
Parker, Henry, *The Roman Legions* (Barnes & Noble, 1958)
Ricciotti, Giuseppe, *Age of Martyrs* (Bruce, 1959)
Rostovtzev, Mikhail, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926)
Shahan, Thomas, *Beginnings of Christianity* (Benziger, 1903)
Shotwell and Loomis, *See of Peter* (Columbia U., 1927)
Vasiliev, Alexander, *History of Byzantine Empire* (Wisconsin U., 1952)
Wheeler, Mortimer, *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontier* (Phil. Library, 1955)

IMPERIAL PERIOD: BIOGRAPHY

Adam, Karl, *St. Augustine* (Macmillan, 1932)
Attwater, Donald, *St. John Chrysostom* (Bruce, 1939)
Baumann, Émile, *St. Paul* (Harcourt, Brace, 1929)
Bourke, Vernon, *Augustine's Quest of Wisdom* (Bruce, 1945)
Buchan, John, *Augustus* (Houghton Mifflin, 1937)
Cadiou, René, *Origen: Life at Alexandria* (Herder, 1944)

Cavallera, Fernand, *St. Athanase* (Bloud & Gay, 1908)
Chadwick, Owen, *John Cassian* (Cambridge U., 1950)
Chapman, John, *St. Benedict* (Longmans, Green, 1929)
Danielou, Jean, *Origen* (Sheed & Ward, 1955)
DeBlacam, Aodh, *St. Patrick* (Bruce, 1941)
Didon, Henri, *Jesus Christ*, 2v (Appleton, 1891)
Dudden, Frederick, *Gregory the Great*, 2v (Longmans, Green, 1905)
———— *Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Oxford, 1935)
Fichter, Joseph, *St. Cecil Cyprian* (Herder, 1942)
Fillion, Louis, *Life of Christ*, 3v (Herder, 1947–48)
Fink, Leo, *John, Apostle of Peace* (Paulist Press, 1939)
———— *Peter, Commander-in-Chief* (Paulist Press, 1939)
Fortescue, Adrian, *The Greek Fathers* (C.T.S., 1908)
Fouard, Constant, *Christ, the Son of God* (Longmans, Green, 1891)
———— *Last Days of St. Paul* (Longmans, Green, 1928)
———— *St. Paul and His Missions* (Longmans, Green, 1894)
———— *St. John and the Close of Apostolic Age* (Longmans, Green, 1905)
———— *St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity* (Longmans, Green, 1892)
Gheon, Henri, *St. Martin of Tours* (Sheed & Ward, 1946)
Goodier, Alban, *Public Life of Jesus Christ*, 2v (Kenedy, 1944)
———— *Passion and Death of Jesus Christ* (Kenedy, 1944)
Gunmere, Richard, *Seneca* (Marshall Jones, 1922)
Herwegen, Ildefonso, *St. Benedict* (Herder-Sands, 1924)
Holsapple, Lloyd, *Constantine the Great* (Sheed & Ward, 1942)
Holzner, Josef, *Paul of Tarsus* (Herder, 1944)
Jalland, Trevor, *Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (C.K.S., 1941)
Kurth, Godefroid, *St. Clothilda* (Benziger-Washbourne, 1913)
Labriolle, Pierre de, *Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Herder, 1928)
Lagrange, M. J., *Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 2v (Newman, 1938)
Lebreton, Jules, *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, 2v (Macmillan, 1957)
Martindale, Cyril, *St. Justin the Martyr* (Kenedy, 1921)
McCann, Justin, *St. Benedict* (Sheed & Ward, 1937)
Murphy, Francis, *A Monument to St. Jerome* (Sheed & Ward, 1952)
Prat, Fernand, *Jesus Christ*, 2v (Bruce, 1950)
———— *Theology of St. Paul* (Burns, Oates, Washbourne, 1942)
———— *Origene* (Bloud, 1907)
Ricciotti, Giuseppe, *Life of Christ* (Bruce, 1947)
———— *Paul the Apostle* (Bruce, 1953)
Russell, William, *Jesus, the Divine Teacher* (Kenedy, 1944)
Walsh, William, *St. Peter the Apostle* (Macmillan, 1948)
Walter, Gerard, *Caesar* (Scribner's, 1952)
Wilson, James, *St. Columban* (Clonmore & Reynolds, 1952)

IMPERIAL PERIOD: IDEATIONAL

Allies, Mary, *St. Damascene on Images* (Burke, McVey, 1898)
Arand, Louis, *St. Augustine on Faith, Hope and Charity* (Ancient Christian
    Writings, 3: Newman, 1947)

Bardenhewer, Otto, *Patrology* (Herder, 1908)

Batiffol, Pierre, *Études d'Histoire et de Theologie* (Lecoffre, 1905)

———— *Literature Grecque* (Lecoffre, 1898)

Bevenot, Maurice, *St. Cyprian's on the Lapsed; Unity of Church* (Ancient Christian Writings, 25: Newman, 1957)

Bourke, Vernon, *Augustine's Quest of Wisdom* (Bruce, 1945)

Boyer, Charles, *Essais sur la Doctrine de St. Augustine* (Beauchesne, 1932)

Cabrol, Fernand, *Liturgical Prayer, History and Spirit* (Kenedy, 1922)

Cadiou, René, *Origen* (Herder, 1944)

Cassidy, Frank, *Molders of the Medieval Mind* (Herder, 1944)

Cavallera, Fernand, *St. Athanase* (Bloud & Gay, 1908)

Cayré, Fulbert, *Manual of Patrology*, 2v (Desclée, 1936)

———— *Spiritual Writings of the Early Church* (Hawthorn, 1959)

Chadwick, Owen, *John Cassian* (Cambridge, 1950)

Chapman, Emmanuel, *St. Augustine's Philosophy of Beauty* (Sheed, 1939)

Christopher, Joseph, *St. Augustine's First Catechetical Instruction* (Ancient Christian Writings: Newman, 1946)

Copelstone, Frederick, *History of Philosophy*, II (Newman, 1950)

Dawson, Christopher, *Enquiries into Religion and Culture* (Sheed & Ward, 1933)

Duchesne, Louis, *Christian Worship* (C.K.S., 1931)

Duval, Paul, *Literature Syriaque* (Lecoffre, 1900)

Falls, Thomas, *St. Justin's Writings* (Fathers of the Church, 1948)

Felder, Hilarin, *Christ and the Critics* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1924)

Fichter, Joseph, *St. Cecil Cyprian* (Herder, 1942)

Fillion, Louis, *Life of Christ* (Herder, 1947–48)

Galtier, Paul, *De Paenitentia* (Beauchesne, 1931)

Garvey, Sr. Mary, *St. Augustine* (Marquette U., 1939)

Gilson, Étienne, *God and Philosophy* (Oxford-Yale, 1941)

———— *History of Christian Philosophy* (Random House, 1955)

Giordani, Igino, *Social Message of Jesus* (St. Anthony Guild, 1943)

———— *Social Message of the Early Church Fathers* (St. Anthony, 1944)

Gordillo, Maurice, *Compendium Theologiae Orientalium* (Pontifical Institute, 1939)

Graef, Hilda, *St. Gregory of Nissa's Lord's Prayer; Beatitudes* (Ancient Christian Writings, 19: Newman, 1954)

Grandmaison, Leonce de, *Jesus Christ*, 3v (Sheed & Ward, 1934–35)

Husslein, Joseph, *Mass of the Apostles* (Kenedy, 1929)

Jepson, John, *St. Augustine's: On the Lord's Prayer; Sermon on Mount* (Ancient Christian Writings, 5: Newman, 1947)

Kirsch, Johann, *Communion of Saints in Early Church* (Herder, 1911)

Kleist, James, *Epistles of Sts. Clement and Ignatius* (Ancient Christian Writings, 1: Newman, 1946)

———— *Didache and Apostolic Writings* (Ancient Christian Writings, 6: Newman, 1948)

Labriolle, Pierre de, *Latin Christianity* (Knopf, 1924)

Lagrange, M. J., *Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 2v (Newman, 1938)

Lawler, Thomas, *St. Augustine's Sermons for Christmas and Epiphany* (Ancient Christian Writings, 15: Newman, 1952)

LeSaint, W., *Tertullian's Treatises on Marriage* (Ancient Christian Writings, 13: Newman, 1951)

Lewis, C. S., *St. Athanasius on Incarnation* (Macmillan, 1946)

Livius, Thomas, *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome* (Burns, Oates, 1888)

Messenger, Ernest (ed.), *Studies in Comparative Religion* (C.T.S., 1935)

Meyer, Robert, *St. Athanasius's Life of St. Anthony* (Ancient Christian Writings, 11: Newman, 1950)

Murphy, Francis, *Monument to St. Jerome* (Sheed & Ward, 1952)

O'Meara, John, *Origen's On Prayer* (Ancient Christian Writings, 19: Newman, 1954)

Osborn, Eric, *Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge, 1957)

O'Sullivan, Jeremiah, *Writings of Salvian* (Fathers of the Church, 1947)

Otten, Bernard, *Manual of History of Dogmas*, I (Herder, 1922–25)

Parsch, Pius, *Liturgy of the Mass* (Herder, 1958)

———— *Breviary Explained* (Herder, 1952)

Pourrat, Pierre, *Christian Spirituality*, I (Newman, 1953)

Prat, Fernand, *Jesus Christ* (Bruce, 1950)

———— *Theology of St. Paul* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1942)

Quasten, Johannes, *Patrology*, 2v (Newman, 1950–)

———— *Monumenta Eucharistica* (Florilegium Patristicum, 1935)

Redding, John, *Influence of St. Augustine on the Second Council of Orange* (Catholic U., 1939)

Ricciotti, Giuseppe, *Life of Christ* (Bruce, 1947)

———— *Paul the Apostle* (Bruce, 1953)

Schumacher, Henry, *Social Message of the New Testament* (Bruce, 1937)

Sheed, Frank, *St. Augustine's Confessions* (Sheed & Ward, 1942)

Sherwood, Polycarp, *St. Maximus's Ascetical Life* (Ancient Christian Writings, 21: Newman, 1955)

Smith, Joseph, *St. Irenaeus's Proof of Apostolic Preaching* (Ancient Christian Writings, 16: Newman, 1952)

Suelzer, Sr. Mary, *Julianus Pomerius on Contemplative Life* (Ancient Christian Writings, 4: Newman, 1947)

Tixeront, Joseph, *Handbook of Patrology* (Herder, 1934)

———— *History of Dogmas*, 3v (Herder, 1910–16)

———— *Holy Orders and Ordination* (Herder, 1928)

———— *Apologetical Studies* (Herder, 1917)

Vassall-Philips, A., *St. Optatus's Works against the Donatists* (Longmans, Green, 1917)

Vega, Angel, *St. Augustine: His Philosophy* (Peter Reilly, 1931)

Wagner, Sr. Monica, *St. Basil's Ascetical Works* (Fathers of the Church, 1950)

———— *Rufinus the Translator* (Catholic U., 1945)

Weisswurm, Alcuin, *Nature of Human Knowledge according to St. Gregory of Nissa* (Catholic U., 1952)

GENERAL MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Baldwin, Marshall, *The Medieval Church* (Cornell U., 1953)
———— *Medieval Papacy in Action* (Macmillan, 1940)
Barraclough, Geoffrey, *Papal Provisions* (Oxford, 1935)
Barry, William, *Papal Monarchy* (Putnam's, 1902)
Brehier, Louis, *L'Église et L'Orient* (Lecoffre-Gabalda, 1907)
Brown, William, *Achievement of the Middle Ages* (Sands, 1928)
Bryce, James, *Holy Roman Empire* (Hurst & Co., 1886)
Cram, Ralph Adams, *The Great Thousand Years* (Marshall Jones, 1918)
Copleston, Frederick, *History of Philosophy*, II, III (Newman, 1950–)
———— *Medieval Philosophy* (Philosophic Library, 1952)
Curtis, Stanley, *Short History of Western Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (Mac-
    Donald, 1950)
Davis, William, *Life on a Medieval Barony* (Harper, 1923)
Drane, Sr. Augusta, *Christian Schools and Scholars* (Burns, Oates & Wash-
    bourne, 1924)
Eyre, Edward (ed.), *European Civilization*, III (Oxford, 1936–39)
Fliche and Martin, *Histoire de L'Église*, V–XIV (Bloud & Gay, 1940–)
Gilson, Étienne, *Being and Some Philosophers* (Medieval Institute, 1949)
———— *History of Christian Philosophy* (Random House, 1955)
———— *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages* (Scribner's, 1938)
———— *Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (Scribner's, 1940)
———— *Unity of Philosophical Experience* (Scribner's, 1937)
Gougaud, Louis, *Devotional and Ascetical Practices in the Middle Ages*
    (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1927)
Graves, Frank, *History of Education in the Middle Ages* (Macmillan, 1910)
Guerdan, René, *Byzantium* (Putnam's, 1957)
Guiraud, Jean, *Medieval Inquisition* (Benziger, 1930)
Gwatkin, H. M. (ed.), *Cambridge Medieval History* (Macmillan, 1911–36)
Haskins, Charles, *Studies in Medieval Culture* (Oxford, 1929)
———— *Studies in Medieval Science* (Harvard U., 1927)
Jarrett, Bede, *Medieval Socialism* (Jack & Dodge, 1914)
———— *Social Theories in the Middle Ages* (Newman, 1942)
LaMonte, John, *World of the Middle Ages* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949)
Mann, Horace, *Lives of Popes in the Middle Ages* (Paul, Trench, Trübner,
    1902–32)
Montalembert, Charles, *Monks of the West* (Noonan, 1860)
Nickerson, Hoffman, *The Inquisition* (Houghton Mifflin, 1923)
O'Sullivan and Burns, *Medieval Europe* (Crofts & Co., 1943)
Pargoire, Jules, *L'Église Byzantine* (Lecoffre, 1905)
Pirenne, Henri, *Economic and Social History of Medieval Europe* (Harcourt,
    Brace, 1937)
———— *Medieval Cities* (Princeton U., 1939)
———— *History of Europe* (Norton, 1939)
Previte-Orton, Charles, *Shorter Cambridge Medieval History*, 2v (Cambridge
    U., 1952)

Rashdall, Hastings, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 3v (ed. Powick and Emden: Oxford U., 1936)

Shahan, Thomas, *The Middle Ages* (Benziger, 1904)

Stephenson, Carl, *Medieval History* (Harper's, 1935)

————— *Medieval Institutions* (Cornell U., 1954)

Thompson, James W., *Introduction to Medieval Europe* (Norton, 1937)

Ullmann, Walter, *Medieval Papalism* (Methuen, 1949)

————— *Growth of Papal Government* (Barnes & Noble, 1955)

Vacandard, Elphege, *The Inquisition* (Longmans, Green, 1924)

Vasiliev, Alexander, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Wisconsin U., 1952)

Villoslada, Ricardo, *Historia de la Iglesia Catolica: Edad Media* (B.A.C., 1953)

VonGrunebaum, Gustave, *Medieval Islam* (Chicago U., 1953)

Walsh, Gerald, *Medieval Humanism* (Macmillan, 1942)

Wulf, Maurice de, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, 2v (Dover Publications, 1952)

————— *Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages* (Dover Publications, 1956)

FEUDAL PERIOD: 565–1059: INSTITUTIONS

Amann, Émile, *L'Époque Carolingienne* (Bloud & Gay, 1947)

————— *L'Église au Pouvoir des Laiques* (Bloud & Gay, 1940)

Anderson, Robert, *Biography of a Cathedral* (Longmans, Green, 1944)

Barraclough, Geoffrey, *Medieval Germany: 911–1250* (Blackwell, 1938)

Barrett, Michael, *Footprints of Ancient Scottish Church* (Herder, 1914)

Brehier, Louis, *L'Église et L'Orient* (Lecoffre-Gabalda, 1907)

————— *Gregoire le Grand, Les États Barbares, et Conquete Arabe: 590–757* (Bloud & Gay, 1947)

Curtis, Edmund, *History of Medieval Ireland* (Macmillan, 1923)

Dawson, Christopher, *Making of Europe: 400–1100* (Sheed & Ward, 1939)

Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society in Merovingian Gaul* (Macmillan, 1926)

Duchesne, Louis, *Beginnings of Temporal Sovereignty* (Benziger, 1908)

Duckett, Eleanor, *Gateway to the Middle Ages* (Macmillan, 1938)

Dvornik, Francis, *The Photian Schism* (Cambridge U., 1948)

Evans, Joan, *Life in Medieval France* (Phaidon, 1957)

FitzPatrick, Benedict, *Ireland and the Foundations of Europe* (Funk, 1927)

————— *Ireland and the Making of Britain* (Funk, 1922)

Fliche, Augustin, *La Réforme Grégorienne* (Spicilegium, 1924–26)

Fortescue, Adrian, *Orthodox Eastern Church* (C.T.S., 1908)

————— *Uniate Eastern Churches* (Benziger, 1923)

Gallagher, John J., *Church and State in Germany under Otto the Great* (Catholic U., 1938)

Gougaud, Louis, *Gaelic Pioneers of Christianity* (Gill, 1923)

————— *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (Sheed & Ward, 1932)

Guerdan, René, *Byzantium* (Putnam's, 1957)

Hitti, Philip, *History of the Arabs* (Macmillan, 1956)

Joyce, Patrick, *Social History of Ancient Ireland* (Longmans, Green, 1903)

Kane, Thomas, *Patriarchal Jurisdiction* (Catholic U., 1949)

Knowles, David, *Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge, 1940)
Labourt, Jerome, *L'Empire Perse: 224–632* (Lecoffre, 1904)
Lingard, John, *History of England,* I (Nimmo & Bain, 1883)
Lopez and Raymond, *Medieval Trade in Mediterranean World* (Columbia, 1955)
McNeill, Eoin, *Phases of Irish History* (Gill, 1937)
Muir, William, *The Caliphate* (Grant, 1915)
Oman, W. C., *The Dark Ages: 476–918* (Rivington's, 1928)
Painter, Sidney, *French Chivalry* (Johns Hopkins, 1940)
Pargoire, Jules, *L'Église Byzantine: 527–847* (Lecoffre, 1905)
Pirenne, Henri, *Mohammed and Charlemagne* (Norton, 1939)
Poole, Austin, *Medieval England* (Oxford, 1958)
Ryan, John, *Irish Monasticism* (Talbot Press, 1931)
Tellenbach, Gerd, *Church, State and Christian Society* (Oxford, 1948)
Thompson, James W., *Feudal Germany* (Chicago U., 1928)
Tout, T. F., *Empire and Papacy: 918–1272* (Rivington's, 1924)
Vacandard, Elphege, *The Inquisition* (Longmans, Green, 1924)
Vasiliev, Alexander, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Wisconsin U., 1952)
Vernadsky, George, *Origins of Russia* (Oxford, 1959)
VonGrunebaum, Gustave, *Medieval Islam* (Chicago U., 1953)

FEUDAL PERIOD: BIOGRAPHY

Audisio, Gabriel, *Harun Al Rashid* (McBride, 1931)
Blum, Owen, *St. Peter Damian* (Catholic U., 1947)
Bowker, Alfred, *Alfred the Great* (Black, 1899)
Buxton, Wilmot, *Story of Hildebrand* (Kenedy, 1920)
Curtis, Edmund, *Roger of Sicily and Norman Conquest* (Putnam's, 1912)
Dalgairns, John, *Life of St. Stephen Harding* (Newman, 1946)
Davis, H. W., *Charlemagne* (Putnam, 1925)
Duckett, Eleanor, *Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne* (Macmillan, 1951)
———— *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars* (Macmillan, 1947)
———— *St. Dunstan of Canterbury* (Norton, 1955)
Dudden, Frederick, *St. Gregory the Great* (Longmans, Green, 1905)
Gillet, H. M., *St. Bede the Venerable* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935)
Kurth, Godefroid, *St. Boniface* (Bruce, 1935)
———— *St. Clothilda* (Washbourne-Benziger, 1913)
Montalembert, Charles de, *St. Columban* (Columban Press, 1927)
Muir, William, *Life of Mahomet* (Smith & Elder, 1894)
Pirenne, Henri, *Mohammed and Charlemagne* (Norton, 1939)
Roy, Jules, *St. Nicholas I* (Duckworth, 1901)
Sitwell, Gerard, *St. Odo of Cluny* (Sheed & Ward, 1958)
Talbot, C. H., *Anglo-Saxon Missionaries* (Sheed & Ward, 1954)
Turgot, Bishop, *St. Margaret of Scotland* (Douglas, 1896)

FEUDAL PERIOD: IDEATIONAL

Allies, Mary, *St. Damascene on Images* (Burke-McVey, 1898)
Bardenhewer, Otto, *Patrology* (Herder, 1908)

Butler, Cuthbert, *Western Mysticism* (Constable, 1951)
Cassidy, Frank, *Molders of the Medieval Mind* (Herder, 1944)
Cayré, Fulbert, *Manual of Patrology*, II (Desclée, 1936)
Galtier, Paul, *De Penitentia* (Beauchesne, 1931)
Jungmann, Joseph, *Mass of the Roman Rite* (Benziger, 1951)
King, Archdale, *Liturgy of the Roman Church* (Bruce, 1957)
———— *Rites of Eastern Christendom* (Catholic Book, 1947)
Otten, Bernard, *Manual of History of Dogmas* (Herder, 1922–25)
Pourrat, Pierre, *Christian Spirituality*, II (Newman, 1953)
Schnürer, Gustav, *Church and Culture in the Middle Ages: 350–814* (St. Anthony's Guild, 1956–)
Steenberghen, F. van, *Aristotle in the West* (Neuwelaerts, 1955)
Taylor, Henry, *The Medieval Mind*, 2v (Harvard U., 1957)
Tixeront, Joseph, *History of Dogmas*, III (Herder, 1910–16)

THEOCRATIC PERIOD: 1059–1453: INSTITUTIONS

Anderson, Robert, *Biography of a Cathedral* (Longmans, Green, 1944)
———— *The City and the Cathedral* (Longmans, Green, 1948)
Barraclough, Geoffrey, *Medieval Germany* (Blackwell, 1938)
Belloc, Hilaire, *The Crusades* (Bruce, 1937)
Brehier, Louis, *L'Église et L'Orient* (Lecoffre, 1907)
Brockelman, Karl, *History of Islamic Peoples* (Putnam's, 1947)
Cavanagh, Sr. Agnes, *Gregory VII and Theocratic State* (Catholic U., 1934)
Cheyney, Edward, *Dawn of a New Era: 1250–1453* (Harper, 1936)
Compayere, Gabriel, *Abelard and the Origin of Universities* (Scribner's, 1893)
Coulton, G. S., *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge, 1923–27)
Curtis, Edmund, *History of Medieval Ireland* (Macmillan, 1923)
Dahmus, Joseph, *Prosecution of John Wyclyf* (Yale U., 1952)
Daniel-Rops, Henri, *Cathedral and Crusade: 1050–1350* (Dutton, 1957)
Dawson, Christopher, *The Mongol Mission* (Sheed & Ward, 1955)
Duchesne, Louis, *Churches Separated from Rome* (Benziger, 1907)
Emerton, Ephraim, *Correspondence of Gregory VII* (Columbia U., 1932)
Evans, Joan, *Life in Medieval France* (Phaidon, 1957)
Fliche, Augustin, *La Réforme Grégorienne* (Spicilegium, 1924–26)
———— *Réforme Grégorienne et la Reconquete Chrétienne* (Bloud & Gay, 1944)
Fliche and Foreville, *Du Premier Concile du Latran a l'Avènement D'Innocent III: 1123–98* (Bloud & Gay, 1953)
Fliche and Thouzellier, *La Chrétienté Romaine* (Bloud & Gay, 1950)
Fortescue, Adrian, *Orthodox Eastern Church* (C.T.S., 1908)
Gasquet, Francis, *Henry III and the Church* (Bell, 1910)
———— *Religious Life of Henry VI* (Bell, 1923)
———— *Parish Life in Medieval England* (Methuen, 1906)
Gill, Joseph, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge U., 1959)
Gleason, Sarell, *Ecclesiastical Barony in Middle Ages: Bayeux: 1066–1204* (Harvard U., 1936)
Guerdan, René, *Byzantium* (Putnam's, 1957)

Guiraud, Jean, *Medieval Inquisition* (Benziger, 1930)

Haskins, Charles, *Renaissance of Twelfth Century* (Harvard U., 1939)

———— *Rise of the Universities* (Holt, 1923)

Heymann, Frederick, *John Ziska and Hussite Revolution* (Princeton, 1955)

Hitti, Philip, *History of the Arabs* (Macmillan, 1956)

Hoyt, Robert, *Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History:* 1066–1272 (Cornell U., 1950)

Janssen, Johannes, *History of the German People at Close of the Middle Ages,* I, II (Herder, 1896–1910)

Knapke, Paul, *Barbarossa's Conflict with the Papacy* (Catholic U., 1939)

Knowles, David, *Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge, 1940)

———— *Religious Orders in England* (Cambridge, 1948–55)

Lamb, Harold, *The Crusades: Iron Men and Saints* (Doubleday, 1930)

———— *The Crusades: Flame of Islam* (Doubleday, 1931)

LeBras, Gabriel, *Institutions Ecclesiastiques* (Bloud & Gay, 1959)

Lodge, R., *Close of the Middle Ages:* 1272–1494 (Rivington's, 1928)

McDonnell, Ernest, *Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture* (Rutgers U., 1954)

Michaud, Joseph, *History of the Crusades* (Barrie, 1890)

Mollat, Guillaume, *Les Papes d'Avignon* (Letouzey et Ane, 1950)

Moorman, John, *Church Life in England in 13th Century* (Cambridge, 1945)

Mulholland, Sr. Mary, *Early Guild Records of Toulouse* (Columbia, 1944)

Munro, Dana G., *Kingdom of the Crusaders* (Appleton-Century, 1935)

Nickerson, Hoffman, *The Inquisition* (Houghton Mifflin, 1923)

Pacaut, Marcel, *La Theocratie* (Auvier, 1957)

Partner, Peter, *Papal State under Martin V* (British School, 1958)

Pastor, Ludwig, *History of the Popes,* I–VI (Herder, 1902–53)

Poole, Austin, *Medieval England* (Oxford, 1958)

Preveden, Francis, *History of the Croatian People to 1397* (Phil. Library, 1955)

Rickert, Edith, *Chaucer's World* (Columbia U., 1948)

Runciman, Stefan, *The Crusades,* 3v (Cambridge, 1951–54)

———— *Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge, 1958)

Ryan, John, *Irish Monasticism* (Talbot, 1931)

Salembier, Louis, *Grand Schisme d'Occident* (Lecoffre, 1900)

Tellenbach, Gerd, *Church, State, Christian Society* (Oxford, 1948)

Thompson, Alexander, *English Clergy in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1947)

Thompson, James W., *Economic and Social History of Europe in the Later Middle Ages* (Appleton-Century, 1931)

Tierney, Brian, *Medieval Poor Law* (California U., 1959)

Ullmann, Walter, *Medieval Papalism* (Methuen, 1949)

———— *Origins of the Great Schism* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1948)

Vacandard, Elphege, *The Inquisition* (Longmans, Green, 1924)

VonGrunebaum, Gustave, *Medieval Islam* (Chicago U., 1952)

Waley, Daniel, *Medieval Orvieto* (Cambridge U., 1952)

Walsh, William, *Characters of the Inquisition* (Kenedy, 1940)

THEOCRATIC PERIOD: BIOGRAPHY

Aron, Marguerite, *St. Dominic's Successor: B. Jordan* (Blackfriars, 1955)
Balfour-Melvile, Evan, *James I, King of Scots* (Methuen, 1936)
Belloc, Hilaire, *Joan of Arc* (McMullen, 1949)
Butler, H. C., *Chronicle of Jocelin de Brakelond* (Oxford, 1949)
Buxton, Wilmot, *Story of Hildebrand* (Kenedy, 1920)
Chesterton, Gilbert, *St. Francis of Assisi* (Doran, 1924)
———— *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Sheed & Ward, 1933)
Clayton, Joseph, *Pope Innocent III and His Times* (Bruce, 1941)
———— *St. Anselm* (Bruce, 1933)
Curtayne, Alice, *St. Catherine of Siena* (Macmillan, 1930)
Curtis, Edmund, *Roger of Sicily* (Putnam's, 1912)
Cuthbert, Father, *St. Francis of Assisi* (Longmans, Green, 1933)
D'Arcy, M. C., *Thomas Aquinas* (Newman, 1944)
DelaBedoyere, Michael, *The Greatest Catherine* (Bruce, 1947)
DeRobeck, Nesta, *St. Elizabeth of Hungary* (Bruce, 1954)
Dunn-Pattison, Richard, *The Black Prince* (Methuen, 1910)
Fabre, Lucien, *Joan of Arc* (McGraw-Hill, 1954)
Gilson, Étienne, *Heloïse and Abélard* (Regnery, 1951)
Grabmann, Martin, *Thomas Aquinas* (Longmans, Green, 1928)
Greenaway, George, *Arnold of Brescia* (Cambridge, 1931)
Guiraud, Jean, *St. Dominic* (Benziger, 1901)
Hart, Henry, *Venetian Adventurer: Marco Polo* (Stanford U., 1947)
Hofer, Johannes, *St. John Capistran* (Herder, 1943)
Hogan, Stanislaus, *St. Vincent Ferrer* (Longmans, Green, 1911)
Hope, Isabel, *Life of St. Thomas à Becket* (Burns, Oates, 1868)
Howell, A. Ferrers, *St. Bernardine of Siena* (Methuen, 1913)
Huber, Raphael, *St. Anthony of Padua* (Bruce, 1948)
Hutton, William, *Thomas à Becket* (Cambridge, 1926)
Jarrett, Bede, *St. Dominic* (Newman, 1947)
———— *St. Antonino* (Herder, 1914)
———— *Emperor Charles IV* (Sheed, 1935)
Jenks, Edward, *Edward Plantagenet* (Putnam's, 1902)
Joinville, Jean de, *Life of St. Louis* (Sheed & Ward, 1955)
Jorgenson, Johannes, *St. Bridget of Sweden* (Longmans, Green, 1954)
———— *St. Catherine of Siena* (Longmans, Green, 1938)
———— *St. Francis of Assisi* (Longmans, Green, 1922)
Kelly, Amy, *Eleanor of Aquitaine and Four Kings* (Harvard U., 1950)
Kirkfleet, Cornelius, *St. Norbert* (Herder, 1916)
Knowles, David, *Episcopal Colleagues of Thomas à Becket* (Cambridge, 1951)
Lamb, George, *Brother Nicholas* (of Flüe) (Sheed & Ward, 1954)
Lamb, Harold, *Tamerlane the Earthshaker* (Garden City, 1928)
Lang, Andrew, *Maid of France* (Longmans, Green, 1908)
Luddy, Ailbe, *Life and Teaching of St. Bernard* (Gill, 1927)
———— *Case of Peter Abelard* (Gill, 1947)
———— *Life of St. Malachy* (Gill, 1950)

MacManus, Francis, *Boccacio* (Sheed & Ward, 1947)

Magennis, Peter, *Life of St. Simon Stock* (Carmelite Press, 1920)

Mandonnet, Pierre, *St. Dominic and His Work* (Herder, 1944)

Maritain, Jacques, *The Angelic Doctor* (Longmans, Green, 1931)

Mary Catherine, Sr., *B. Henry Suso* (Blackfriars, 1947)

Mauriac, François, *St. Margaret of Cortona* (Philosophic Library, 1948)

Maynard, Sara, *Princess of Poverty* (Longmans, Green, 1941)

Merton, Thomas, *What Are These Wounds?* [St. Lutgarde] (Bruce, 1950)

O'Brien, Isidore, *Mirror of Christ* [St. Francis] (St. Anthony's, 1944)

Pratt, Fletcher, *The Third King* [Waldemar III] (Sloane, 1950)

Redpath, Sr. Helen, *God's Ambassadress* [St. Bridget] (Bruce, 1947)

Rigg, James, *St. Anselm of Canterbury* (Methuen, 1896)

Sackville-West, Victoria, *St. Joan of Arc* (Doubleday, 1936)

Schimberg, Albert, *Tall in Paradise* [St. Colette] (M. Jones, 1947)

Thureau-Dangin, Paul, *St. Bernardine of Siena* (Dutton, 1906)

Vann, Gerald, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Benziger, 1947)

Waddell, Helen, *Peter Abelard* (Holt, 1947)

Walsh, Gerald, *Emperor Charles IV* (Appleton, 1924)

———— *Dante Alighieri* (Bruce, 1946)

Walz, Angelus, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Newman, 1951)

Wilms, Hieronymus, *Albert the Great* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1933)

THEOCRATIC PERIOD: IDEATIONAL

Adler, Mortimer, *St. Thomas and the Gentiles* (Marquette U., 1938)

Aquinas, St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica* (Marietti, 1901)

———— *Contra Gentiles* (Forzani, 1894)

Bourke, Vernon, *St. Thomas and the Greek Moralists* (Marquette U., 1947)

Brennan, Sr. Rose, *St. Thomas: On the Trinity; Unicity of Intellect* (Herder, 1946)

Burch, George, *St. Bernard's Steps of Humility* (Harvard U., 1940)

Butler, Cuthbert, *Western Mysticism* (Constable, 1951)

Cayré, Fulbert, *Manual of Patrology*, II (Desclée, 1936)

Clayton, Joseph, *St. Anselm* (Bruce, 1933)

Collins, Joseph, *Catechetical Instructions of St. Thomas* (Herder, 1939)

Connolly, Terence, *St. Bernard's Treatise on the Love of God* (S.B.A., 1937)

Copleston, Frederick, *History of Philosophy*, II, III (Newman, 1950–53)

Cuthbert, Father, *Romanticism of St. Francis* (Longmans, Green, 1924)

Deane, Sidney, *St. Anselm's Proslogium and Monologium* (Open Court, 1926)

DeBenedictis, Matthew, *Social Thought of St. Bonaventure* (Catholic U., 1946)

Dobbins, Dunstan, *Franciscan Mysticism* (Wagner, 1927)

Eales, Samuel, *Some Letters of St. Bernard* (Hodges, 1904)

Felder, Hilarin, *Ideals of St. Francis* (Benziger, 1925)

Forest and Steenberghen, *Le Mouvement Doctrinal* (Bloud & Gay, 1951)

Frances Clare, Sr., *Life and Revelations of St. Gertrude* (Newman, 1949)

Gillet, Martin, *Mission of St. Catherine* (Herder, 1955)

Gilson, Étienne, *Mystical Theology of St. Bernard* (Sheed & Ward, 1940)
—— *Philosophy of St. Bonaventure* (Sheed & Ward, 1938)
—— *Philosophy of St. Thomas* (Herder, 1941)
Huber, Raphael, *St. Anthony of Padua* (Bruce, 1948)
Hutchins, Robert, *St. Thomas and the World State* (Marquette U., 1949)
Jarrett, Bede, *Social Theories in the Middle Ages* (Newman, 1942)
—— *St. Antonino and Medieval Economics* (Herder, 1914)
Leckie, George, *St. Thomas On Being and Essence* (Appleton-Century, 1937)
Luddy, Ailbe, *Life and Teaching of St. Bernard* (Gill, 1927)
McCormick, John, *St. Thomas and Life of Learning* (Marquette, 1937)
Meyer, Hans, *Philosophy of St. Thomas* (Herder, 1944)
Müller-Thym, Bernard, *University of Being* (Sheed & Ward, 1939)
Mulligan and McGlynn, *St. Thomas' Treatise on Truth* (Regnery, 1952)
Nemmers, Erwin, *St. Bonaventure's Breviloquium* (Herder, 1946)
Noonan, John, *Scholastic Analysis of Usury* (Harvard U., 1957)
Pegis, Anton, *Basic Works of St. Thomas* (Random House, 1945)
—— *St. Thomas and the Greeks* (Marquette U., 1939)
—— *St. Thomas and Problem of Soul* (St. Michael's, 1934)
Phelan, Gerald, *St. Thomas and Analogy* (Marquette, 1941)
—— *St. Thomas On Governance of Rulers* (Sheed & Ward, 1938)
Pourrat, Pierre, *Christian Spirituality,* II (Newman, 1953)
Procter, John, *St. Thomas On the Religious State* (Herder, 1949)
Rand, Edward, *Cicero in the Courtroom of St. Thomas* (Marquette, 1946)
Rowan, John, *St. Thomas On the Soul* (Herder, 1949)
Sertillanges, Antonin, *St. Thomas d'Aquin* (Alcan, 1922)
Shapcote, Lawrence, *St. Thomas On the Power of God* (Newman, 1952)
Sharp, Dorothea, *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford* (Oxford, 1930)
Shircel, Cyril, *Univocity of Concept of Being in the Philosophy of John Duns
    Scotus* (Catholic U., 1942)
Steenberghen, Fernand van, *Aristotle in the West* (Nauwelaerts, 1955)
Taylor, Henry, *Medieval Mind* (Harvard U., 1951)
Thorndyke, Lynn, *University Records and Life* (Columbia U., 1944)
—— *Science and Thought* (Columbia U., 1929)
Thorwald, A., *St. Catherine's Dialogue* (Newman, 1943)
Tierney, Brian, *Foundations of Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge, 1955)
Vann, Gerald, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Benziger, 1947)
Walsh, Gerald, *Medieval Humanism* (Macmillan, 1942)
—— *Dante* (Bruce, 1946)
Walz, Angelus, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Newman, 1951)
Wilms, Hieronymus, *Albert the Great* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1933)
Wolter, Allen, *Transcendentals in Duns Scotus* (Catholic U., 1946)

GENERAL MODERN HISTORY

Acton, John (ed.), *Cambridge Modern History* (Macmillan, 1902–11)
Bannon, John, *History of the Americas,* 2v (McGraw-Hill, 1952)
Betten and Kaufman, *Modern World* (Allyn & Bacon, 1919)

Brinton, Crane, *Modern Civilization* (Prentice-Hall, 1957)

Clark, George (ed.), *New Cambridge Modern History* (Cambridge, 1957–)

Dawson, Christopher, *Religion and Modern State* (Sheed & Ward, 1937)

———— *Judgment of the Nations* (Sheed & Ward, 1942)

———— *Understanding Europe* (Sheed & Ward, 1952)

Eyre, Edward (ed.), *European Civilization,* IV–VII (Oxford, 1936–39)

Fanfani, Aminitore, *Capitalism, Catholicism & Protestantism* (Sheed & Ward, 1939)

Fliche and Martin, *Histoire de l'Église,* XV–XXI (Bloud & Gay, 1940–)

Hayes, Carlton, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe,* 2v (Macmillan, 1916)

———— *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe,* 2v (Macmillan, 1932–36)

———— *Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism* (Macmillan, 1931)

Hughes, Emmett, *The Church and Liberal Society* (Princeton U., 1944)

Johnson, Allen (ed.), *Chronicles of America* (Yale U., 1919–50)

Kirsch, Johann (ed.), *Kirchengeschichte,* III, IV (Herder, 1930–)

Langer, William (ed.), *Rise of Modern Europe* (Harper, 1936–)

MacCaffery, James, *History of the Catholic Church,* 4v (Gill-Herder, 1910)

Neill, Thomas, *Makers of the Modern Mind* (Bruce, 1949)

Pastor, Ludwig, *History of the Popes,* 40v (Herder, 1902–53)

Pichon, Charles, *Vatican in World Affairs* (Dutton, 1950)

Randall, John, *Making of the Modern Mind* (Houghton Mifflin, 1940)

Schapiro, J. S., *Modern European History* (Houghton Mifflin, 1947)

Schevill, Ferdinand, *History of Europe: 1517–1945* (Harcourt, Brace, 1946)

Sturzo, Luigi, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (Roy, 1946)

Tawney, Richard, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (Harcourt, Brace, 1926)

HUMANISTIC PERIOD: 1453–1789: INSTITUTIONS

Abercrombie, Nigel, *Origins of Jansenism* (Oxford U., 1936)

Andrews, Charles, *Colonial Folkways* (Yale U., 1919)

———— *Fathers of New England* (Yale U., 1919)

Ashley, William, *Economic Organization of England* (Longmans, Green, 1935)

Aubenas, Roger, *L'Église et Le Renaissance* (Bloud & Gay, 1951)

Bannon and Dunne, *Latin America* (Bruce, 1947)

Barnes, Arthur, *Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders* (Longmans, Green, 1922)

Barnouw, Adriaan, *Making of Modern Holland* (Norton, 1944)

Barraclough, Geoffrey, *Origins of Modern Germany* (Blackwell, 1946)

Baudrillart, Alfred, *Catholic Church, Renaissance and Protestantism* (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1908)

Becker, Carl, *Eve of the Revolution* (Yale U., 1921)

Belloc, Hilaire, *How the Reformation Happened* (McBride, 1928)

Bolton, Herbert, *Spanish Borderlands* (Yale U., 1921)

Brodrick, James, *Origin of the Jesuits* (Longmans, Green, 1940)

———— *Progress of the Jesuits* (Longmans, Green, 1947)

Chapman, Charles, *Colonial Hispanic America* (Macmillan, 1938)

Chudoba, Bohdan, *Spain and the Empire* (Chicago U., 1952)

Conroy, Charles, *The Reformation* (Wayside Press, 1917)

Constant, Gustave, *Reformation in England* (Sheed & Ward, 1934–42)

Coonan, Thomas, *Irish Catholic Confederacy* (Columbia U., 1954)

Cristiani, León, *L'Église a l'Époque du Concile de Trente* (Bloud & Gay, 1947)

Cuevas, Mariano, *Historia de la Iglesia en Mexico* (Revista Catolica, 1928)

Cuthbert, Father, *The Capuchins* (Longmans, Green, 1929)

DesChamps, Nicolas, *Les Sociétés Secretes et La Société*, 3v (ed. by C. Jannet. Avignon: Sequin Frères, 1882–83)

Dorn, Walter, *Competition for Empire: 1740–63* (Harper, 1940)

Drummond, Andrew, *Story of American Protestantism* (Beacon Press, 1950)

Eder, Karl, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Konfessionellen Absolutismus: 1555–1648* (Freiburg: Herder, 1949)

Engelhardt, Zephyrin, *Missions and Missionaries of California* (Santa Barbara Mission, 1929–)

Fisher, Sydney, *The Quaker Colonies* (Yale U., 1821)

Friedrich, Carl, *Age of the Baroque: 1610–60* (Harper, 1952)

Funck-Brentano, Frantz, *The Renaissance* (Macmillan, 1936)

——— *Old Regime in France* (Longmans, Green, 1929)

Gasquet, Francis, *Eve of the Reformation* (Bell, 1905)

——— *Henry VIII and English Monasteries* (Hodges, 1893)

——— *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (Hodges, 1891)

Gershoy, Leo, *From Despotism to Revolution: 1763–89* (Harper, 1944)

Gilmore, Myron, *World of Humanism: 1453–1517* (Harper, 1952)

Gipson, Lawrence, *Coming of the Revolution: 1763–75* (Harper, 1954)

Goodwin, Sr. Mary, *Papal Conflict with Josephinism* (Fordham, 1938)

Goodwin, Maud, *Dutch and English on the Hudson* (Yale U., 1921)

Guiraud, Jean, *L'Église et La Renaissance* (Lecoffre, 1906)

Hanus, Francis, *Church and State in Silesia* (Catholic U., 1944)

Hassall, Arthur, *Balance of Power: 1715–89* (Rivington's, 1935)

Hibbert, Eloise, *Jesuit Adventure in China* (Dutton, 1941)

Hollis, Christopher, *Monstrous Regiment* (Sheed, 1929)

Hughes, Philip, *Popular History of the Reformation* (Hanover House, 1957)

——— *Reformation in England*, 3v (Macmillan, 1951–54)

——— *Rome and Counter-Reformation* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1944)

——— *Catholic Question: 1689–1829* (Sheed, 1929)

Huntington, Ellsworth, *Red Man's Continent* (Yale U., 1921)

Iswolsky, Helene, *Soul of Russia* (Sheed & Ward, 1943)

Ives, Joseph, *The Ark and the Dove* (Longmans, Green, 1936)

Janelle, Pierre, *The Catholic Reformation* (Bruce, 1949)

Johnson, A. H., *Europe in 16th Century: 1494–1598* (Rivington's, 1932)

Johnston, Mary, *Pioneers of the Old South* (Yale U., 1918)

Kenton, Edna, *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (Boni, 1925)

Kinsman, Frederick, *Trent* (Longmans, Green, 1921)

Knox, Ronald, *Enthusiasm* (Oxford U., 1950)

Lortz, Joseph, *Die Reformation im Deutschland* (Freiburg: Herder, 1949)

Lucas, Henry, *Renaissance and Reformation* (Harper, 1934)

MacCaffery, James, *Renaissance to French Revolution* (Herder, 1915)

McNeill, John, *History and Character of Calvinism* (Oxford U., 1954)

Mathew, David, *Catholicism in England:* 1535–1935 (Longmans, Green, 1936)

———— *Celtic Peoples and Renaissance Europe* (Sheed & Ward, 1933)

———— *Age of Charles I* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1951)

———— *Scotland under Charles I* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955)

———— *Social Structure of Caroline England* (Oxford U., 1948)

Mattingly, Garrett, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Houghton Mifflin, 1955)

Maynard, Theodore, *Story of American Catholicism* (Macmillan, 1942)

Merriman, Roger, *Rise of Spanish Empire,* 4v (Macmillan, 1918–34)

Moreau, Édouard, *La Crise Religieuse du xvie Siècle* (Bloud & Gay, 1950)

Morison and Commager, *Growth of the American Republic* (Oxford, 1950)

Mowat, Robert, *England in the 18th Century* (McBride, 1932)

Munro, Dana G., *Latin American Republics* (Appleton-Century, 1942)

Munro, William, *Crusaders of New France* (Yale U., 1918)

Nicoll, Allardyce, *The Elizabethans* (Cambridge, 1957)

Nussbaum, Frederick, *Triumph of Science and Reason* (Harper, 1953)

Ogg, David, *Europe in 17th Century* (Black, 1926)

———— *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford, 1955)

Phelan, Thomas, *Catholics in Colonial Days* (Kenedy, 1935)

Piette, Maximin, *John Wesley in Evolution of Protestantism* (Sheed, 1937)

Pollen, John, *Counter-Reformation in Scotland* (Sands, 1921)

———— *English Catholics in the Reign of Elizabeth* (Longmans, 1920)

Preclin and Jarry, *Luttes Politiques et Doctrinales au xviieme et xviiieme Siècles,* 2v (Bloud & Gay, 1955–56)

Richman, Irving, *The Spanish Conquerors* (Yale U., 1921)

Roberts, Penfield, *Quest for Security:* 1715–40 (Harper, 1947)

Roemer, Theodore, *Catholic Church in the U.S.* (Herder, 1950)

Ronan, Myles, *Reformation in Dublin:* 1536–58 (Longmans, Green, 1926)

Rust, Paul, *First of Puritans and Book of Common Prayer* (Bruce, 1949)

Ryan, Edwin, *Church in South American Republics* (Newman, 1943)

Schlarman, Joseph, *From Quebec to New Orleans* (Buechler, 1929)

Shea, John, *History of the Catholic Church in U.S.* (McBride, 1886–92)

Veit, Ludwig, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus* (Herder, 1931)

Wakeman, H. O., *Ascendancy of France:* 1598–1715 (Macmillan, 1935)

Williamson, Hugh, *The Gunpowder Plot* (Macmillan, 1952)

Williamson, James, *Short History of British Expansion* (Macmillan, 1931)

Wolf, John, *Emergence of Great Powers:* 1685–1715 (Harper, 1951)

Wood, William, *Elizabethan Sea-dogs* (Yale U., 1918)

Wrong, George, *Conquest of New France* (Yale U., 1918)

HUMANISTIC PERIOD: BIOGRAPHY

Allan, John, *John Hancock* (Beechhurst Press, 1953)

Anthony, Katharine, *Queen Elizabeth* (Literary Guild, 1929)

Armstrong, Edward, *Emperor Charles V* (Macmillan, 1902)

Atkinson, Christopher, *Michel de L'Hôpital* (Longmans, Green, 1900)
Aubin and Miller, *St. Alphonsus de Liguori* (Quebec Redemptorists, 1940)
Auclair, Marcelle, *St. Teresa of Avila* (Pantheon, 1953)
Ausubel, Nathan, *Superman: Life of Frederick the Great* (Washburn, 1931)
Baring, Maurice, *In My End Is My Beginning* [Mary Stuart] (Knopf, 1931)
Barthou, Louis, *Mirabeau* (Hachette, 1913)
Battersby, W. J., *Delasalle* (Longmans, Green, 1949)
Belloc, Hilaire, *Characters of the Reformation* (Sheed & Ward, 1940)
———— *Charles I* (Lippincott, 1933)
———— *Charles II* (Harper, 1939)
———— *Cranmer* (Lippincott, 1931)
———— *Cromwell* (Cassell, 1934)
———— *Elizabeth* (Harper, 1942)
———— *James II* (Lippincott, 1928)
———— *Louis XIV* (Harper, 1938)
———— *Marie Antoinette* (Putnam's, 1924)
———— *Milton* (Lippincott, 1930)
———— *Richelieu* (Garden City, 1929)
———— *Wolsey* (Lippincott, 1930)
Bertrand, Louis, *Louis XIV* (Longmans, Green, 1928)
Beuf, Carlo, *Cesare Borgia* (Oxford U., 1942)
Bordeaux, Henry, *St. Francis de Sales* (Longmans, Green, 1929)
Boudignon, J. B., *St. Vincent de Paul* (Vincentian Press, 1925)
Bougaud, Émile, *History of St. Vincent de Paul* (Longmans, Green, 1899)
Boultin, William, *Aeneas Silvius* (Constable, 1908)
Brodrick, James, *St. Francis Xavier* (Wicklow Press, 1952)
———— *St. Peter Canisius* (Carroll Press, 1950)
———— *B. Robert Bellarmine* (Kenedy, 1928)
Bruno, Father, *St. John of the Cross* (Sheed & Ward, 1932)
Buchan, John, *Montrose* (Houghton Mifflin, 1928)
Calvet, Jean, *St. Vincent de Paul* (McKay, 1951)
Capecelatro, Alfonso, *Life of St. Philip Neri* (Benziger, 1926)
Carr, John, *St. Clement, Patron of Vienna* (Sands, 1939)
———— *To Heaven Through a Window* (McMullen, 1949)
Cecil, Algernon, *Portrait of Thomas More* (Putnam's, 1937)
Chevalier, Jacques, *Pascal* (Longmans, Green, 1930)
Clayton, Joseph, *Luther and His Work* (Bruce, 1937)
Collins, Thomas, *Martyr in Scotland: B. Ogilvie* (Macmillan, 1956)
Concannon, Helena, *B. Oliver Plunket* (Browne & Nolan, 1935)
Coste, Pierre, *Life and Works of St. Vincent de Paul* (Newman, 1949)
Cronin, Vincent, *Wise Man from the West* [Ricci] (Dutton, 1955)
DelaBedoyere, Michael, *Lafayette* (Scribner's, 1934)
———— *Meddlesome Friar: Savonarola* (Collins, 1957)
Douglas, Richard, *Jacopo Sadoleto* (Harvard U., 1959)
Dudon, Paul, *Le Quietiste Espagnol Michel Molinos* (Beauchesne, 1921)
———— *St. Ignatius of Loyola* (Bruce, 1949)
Dunn and Stephenson, *George Washington* (Oxford, 1940)

Farnum, Mabel, *Wool Merchant of Segovia* [Rodriguez] (Bruce, 1945)
Ferrara, Orestes, *Borgia Pope: Alexander VI* (Sheed & Ward, 1940)
Fichter, Joseph, *James Laynez, Jesuit* (Herder, 1944)
———— *Man of Spain: Suárez* (Macmillan, 1940)
FitzPatrick, Edward, *DelaSalle* (Bruce, 1951)
Foley, Albert, *St. Regis, Social Crusader* (Bruce, 1941)
Forbes, Esther, *Paul Revere* (Houghton Mifflin, 1942)
Fortescue, John, *Marlborough* (Appleton-Century, 1932)
Gade, John, *Christian IV* (Houghton Mifflin, 1928)
Gheon, Henri, *Secret of St. Margaret Mary* (Sheed & Ward, 1937)
Goldie, Francis, *Life of St. John Berchmans* (Burns, Oates, 1912)
Gooch, George, *Frederick the Great* (Knopf, 1947)
Graham, Stephen, *Peter the Great* (Simon & Schuster, 1929)
Grisar, Hartmann, *Luther*, 6v (Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1913–17)
Grisar and Eble, *Martin Luther, His Life and Work* (Newman, 1950)
Guitton, Georges, *Perfect Friend* [B. La Colombière] (Herder, 1956)
Gwynn, Denis, *Bishop Challoner* (D. Organ, 1946)
Hackett, Francis, *Francis the First* (Doubleday, Doran, 1935)
———— *Henry VIII* (Liveright, 1929)
Haile, Martin, *Life of Reginald Pole* (Longmans, Green, 1910)
Hamon, André, *Life of St. Francis de Sales* (Kenedy, 1925)
Hanly, Daniel, *B. Joseph Pignatelli* (Benziger, 1937)
Harcourt-Smith, Simon, *Cardinal of Spain* [Alberoni] (Knopf, 1944)
Hendrick, Burton, *Lees of Virginia* (Little, 1935)
Hill, Benjamin, *Hunter of Souls* [St. Paul of the Cross] (Newman, 1947)
Hollis, Christopher, *Erasmus* (Bruce, 1933)
———— *St. Ignatius Loyola* (Sheed & Ward, 1945)
———— *St. Thomas More* (Bruce, 1934)
Hughes, Philip (ed.), *Hall's Life of St. John Fisher* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935)
Huxley, Aldous, *Grey Eminence* [Père Joseph] (Harper, 1941)
Jedin, Hubert, *Papal Legate to Trent* [Seripando] (Herder, 1947)
Kendall, Paul, *Richard the Third* (Norton, 1956)
LaGorce, Agnes de, *St. Benedict Labre* (Sheed & Ward, 1952)
Lamb, Harold, *Suleiman the Magnificent* (Doubleday, 1951)
Lee, Frederick, *Edward VI, Supreme Head* (Burns, Oates, 1886)
Lerman, Leo, *Michelangelo* (Knopf, 1942)
Lewis, D. B. W., *Charles of Europe* (Coward-McCann, 1931)
———— *King Spider* [Louis XI] (Coward—McCann, 1929)
———— *Ronsard* (Sheed & Ward, 1944)
Little, Katharine, *François de Fénelon* (Harper, 1951)
Loth, David, *Lorenzo the Magnificent* (Brentano's, 1929)
Lunn, Arnold, *Saint in Slave Trade* [Claver] (Sheed & Ward, 1935)
Mackie, Robert, *James IV of Scotland* (Oliver & Boyd, 1958)
Magner, James, *Men of Mexico* (Bruce, 1942)
Magnin, Ignatius, *Hero of Charity: John of God* (Ouseley, 1936)
Mangan, John, *Desiderius Erasmus*, 2v (Macmillan, 1927)

Marcuse, Ludwig, *Soldier of the Church: Ignatius* (Simon & Schuster, 1939)

Maritain, Jacques, *Three Reformers* (Scribner's, 1942)

Martindale, Cyril, *Life of St. Camillus* (Sheed & Ward, 1946)

———— *Vocation of Aloysius Gonzaga* (Sheed & Ward, 1945)

Maynard, Theodore, *Apostle of Charity* [St. Vincent] (Dial, 1939)

———— *Henry VIII* (Bruce, 1949)

———— *Humanist as Hero: Thomas More* (Macmillan, 1947)

———— *Life of Thomas Cranmer* (Regnery, 1956)

———— *Long Road of Father Serra* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954)

———— *Mystic in Motley: Philip Neri* (Bruce, 1946)

———— *Queen Elizabeth* (Bruce, 1940)

Misciatelli, Piero, *Savonarola* (Appleton-Century, 1930)

Monica, Sr., *Angela Merici* (Longmans, Green, 1927)

Morison, Samuel, *Admiral of the Ocean Sea* (Little, Brown, 1942)

Morris, Constance, *Maria Theresa, Last Conservative* (Knopf, 1937)

Neill, Thomas, *Makers of the Modern Mind* (Bruce, 1949)

Nock, Albert, *Jefferson* (Blue Ribbon, 1936)

Noyes, Alfred, *Voltaire* (Sheed & Ward, 1936)

Olf, Lilian, *Sword of St. Michael: Pius V* (Bruce, 1943)

Orsenigo, Cesare, *Life of St. Charles Borromeo* (Herder, 1943)

Oudard, Georges, *Peter the Great* (Payson & Clarke, 1929)

Peers, E. A., *Spirit of Flame* [John of the Cross] (Morehouse-Gorham, 1944)

Pollen, John, *St. Ignatius Loyola* (Kenedy, 1922)

Ponelle and Bordet, *St. Philip Neri* (Sheed & Ward, 1932)

Prescott, Hilda, *Mary Tudor* (Macmillan, 1953)

Repplier, Agnes, *Pere Marquette* (Doubleday, Doran, 1929)

Reynolds, Ernest, *St. John Fisher* (Kenedy, 1956)

———— *St. Thomas More* (Kenedy, 1954)

Rigault, George, *St. Louis de Montfort* (Montfort Fathers, 1947)

Roeder, Ralph, *Man of the Renaissance* (Viking, 1933)

Royer, Fanchon, *St. Francis Solanus* (St. Anthony Guild, 1955)

Ruville, Albert von, *William Pitt*, 3v (Putnam's, 1907)

Sanders, Ella, *St. François de Sales* (Macmillan, 1928)

Sargent, Daniel, *Christopher Columbus* (Bruce, 1941)

———— *Their Hearts be Praised* [Eudes] (Kenedy, 1949)

———— *Thomas More* (Sheed & Ward, 1938)

Schenk, Wilhelm, *Reginald Pole* (Longmans, Green, 1950)

Schevill, Ferdinand, *The Great Elector* (Chicago U., 1947)

Sheppard, Lancelot, *Barbe Acarie* (McKay, 1953)

Smith, Doreen, *St. Philip Neri* (Sands, 1945)

Stone, Jean, *History of Mary I, Queen of England* (Dutton, 1901)

Strachey, G. Lytton, *Elizabeth and Essex* (Harcourt, Brace, 1928)

Talbot, Francis, *Saint Among Savages* [Jogues] (Harper, 1935)

———— *Saint Among Hurons* [Brebeuf] (Harper, 1949)

VanDoren, Carl, *Benjamin Franklin* (Viking, 1938)

VanDyke, Paul, *Ignatius Loyola* (Scribner's, 1926)

Waliszewski, Kazimierz, *Ivan the Terrible* (Heinemann, 1904)

Waliszewski, Kazimierz, *Marysienka Sobieski* (Heinemann, 1898)
———— *Peter the Great* (Heinemann, 1898)
———— *Catherine II of Russia* (Appleton, 1894)
Walsh, William, *Characters of the Inquisition* (Kenedy, 1940)
———— *Isabella of Spain* (McBride, 1930)
———— *Philip II of Spain* (Sheed & Ward, 1937)
———— *St. Theresa of Avila* (Bruce, 1943)
Waugh, Evelyn, *Edmund Campion* (Little, Brown, 1946)
Weismantel, Leo, *Mantle of Mercy* [St. Vincent] (Bruce, 1939)
Weygand, Maxime, *Turenne* (Houghton Mifflin, 1930)
Whitehead, Arthur, *Gaspard de Coligny* (Methuen, 1904)
Willson, David, *King James VI and I* (Holt, 1956)
Woodgate, Mildred, *Charles de Condren* (Newman, 1950)
———— *Madam Elizabeth* (Browne & Nolan, 1943)
———— *St. Louise de Marillac* (Herder, 1942)
Yeo, Margaret, *Don Juan of Austria* (Sheed & Ward, 1934)
———— *Greatest of Borgias* [St. Francis] (Bruce, 1936)
———— *Reformer: St. Charles Borromeo* (Bruce, 1938)
Zweig, Stefan, *Mary, Queen of Scotland and Isles* (Viking, 1935)

HUMANISTIC PERIOD: IDEATIONAL

Adam, Karl, *One and Holy* (Sheed & Ward, 1951)
Battersby, William, *De la Salle: Meditations* (Longmans, Green, 1953)
Becker, Carl, *Heavenly City of 18th Century Philosophers* (Yale, 1932)
Bergin and Fish, *New Science of Giambattista Vico* (Cornell, 1948)
Bosco, St. John, *Virtue & Christian Refinement according to St. Vincent de Paul* (Ouseley, 1933)
Brice, Father, *In Spirit and Truth* [Paul of the Cross] (Pustet, 1948)
———— *Journey in Night* [John of the Cross] (Pustet, 1945)
———— *Spirit in Darkness* [John of the Cross] (Pustet, 1946)
Cassirer, Ernst, *Philosophy of Enlightenment* (Princeton U., 1951)
Castell, Alburey, *Introduction to Modern Philosophy* (Macmillan, 1943)
Cayre, Fulbert, *Histoire de Theologie*, III (Desclées, 1944)
Chevalier, Jacques, *Pascal* (Longmans, Green, 1930)
Cognet, Louis, *Post-Reformation Spirituality* (Hawthorn, 1959)
Collins, James, *History of Modern European Philosophy* (Bruce, 1954)
Copleston, Frederick, *History of Philosophy*, III–V (Newman, 1953–59)
Davitt, Thomas, *Nature of Law* (Herder, 1951)
Dirksen, Cletus, *Hooker's Theory of Church & State* (Notre Dame, 1947)
Grimm, Eugene, *Ascetical Works of St. Alphonsus* (Redemptorists, 1926–29)
Herbst, Clarence, *Letters of St. Margaret Mary* (Regnery, 1954)
Knox, Ronald, *Enthusiasm* (Oxford, 1950)
Leonard, Joseph, *Letters of St. Vincent de Paul* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1937)
———— *Conferences of St. Vincent* (Newman, 1952)
Mackey, Benedict, *St. Francis de Sales on Love of God* (Burns, Oates, 1894)
———— *St. Francis de Sales' Conferences* (Burns, Oates, 1906)

McGovern, William, *From Luther to Hitler* (Houghton Mifflin, 1941)
Maritain, Jacques, *Dream of Descartes* (Philosophic Library, 1944)
Murphy, Leo, *St. John Eudes' On the Priest* (Kenedy, 1947)
O'Conor, J. (ed.), *Autobiography of St. Ignatius* (Benziger, 1900)
Peers, E. A., *Works of John of the Cross* (Newman, 1945)
—————— *Works of St. Teresa* (Sheed & Ward, 1946)
Piette, Maximin, *Wesley in Evolution of Protestantism* (Sheed, 1937)
Pourrat, Pierre, *Christian Spirituality,* III (Newman, 1953)
Randall, John, *Making of Modern Mind* (Houghton Mifflin, 1940)
Rickaby, J., *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius* (Burns, Oates, 1923)
Ryan, E. A., *Historical Scholarship of St. Bellarmine* (Fordham, 1934)
Scott, James, *Catholic Concept of International Law* (Georgetown, 1934)
—————— *Catholic Origin of International Law* (Oxford, 1934)
Wagget, P. N., *Bellarmine's Mind's Ascent to God* (Mowbray, 1925)
White, Helen, *Social Criticism in the 16th Century* (Macmillan, 1944)
Wright, William, *History of Modern Philosophy* (Macmillan, 1941)
Zeeden, Ernst, *Legacy of Luther* (Newman, 1954)
Zwierlein, Frederick, *Reformation Studies* (Rochester Art Print, 1938)

PROLETARIAN PERIOD: 1789–: INSTITUTIONS

Adamic, Louis, *My Native Land* [Yugoslavia] (Harper, 1943)
Adams, James T., *Epic of America* (Little, Brown, 1931)
Agresti and Zimmern, *The New Italy* (Chatauqua Press, 1920)
Albrecht-Carrié, René, *Italy from Napoleon to Mussolini* (Columbia, 1950)
—————— *Diplomatic History of Europe* (Harper, 1958)
Alden, John, *The American Revolution* (Harper, 1954)
Almedigen, Martha, *Catholic Church in Russia Today* (Kenedy, 1923)
Artz, Frederick, *Reaction and Revolution: 1814–32* (Harper, 1934)
Aubert, Roger, *Le Pontificat de Pie IX* (Bloud & Gay, 1952)
Aubry, Octave, *The Second Empire* (Lippincott, 1940)
Bailey, Thomas, *Diplomatic History of American People* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950)
—————— *Wilson and the Peacemakers* (Macmillan, 1947)
Bannon and Dunne, *Latin America* (Bruce, 1947)
Barnouw, Adriaan, *Making of Modern Holland* (Norton, 1944)
Barraclough, Geoffrey, *Origins of Modern Germany* (Oxford, 1946)
Barry, Colman, *Catholic Church and German Americans* (Bruce, 1953)
Baunard, Louis, *Un Siècle de l'Église de France* (Poussielgue, 1901)
Bayard, Ralph, *Lone Star Vanguard* (Vincentian Press, 1945)
Beard, Charles, *Rise of American Civilization* (Macmillan, 1937)
Beck, George (ed.), *English Catholics: 1850–1950* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1950)
Benns, Frank, *Europe Since 1914* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949)
Bernadotte, Folke, *The Curtain Falls* [Germany] (Knopf, 1945)
Bertaut, Jules, *Paris: 1870–1935* (Appleton-Century, 1936)
Billington, Ray, *Far Western Frontier: 1830–60* (Harper, 1956)
—————— *The Protestant Crusade: 1800–60* (Rinehart, 1952)

Binkley, Robert, *Realism and Nationalism:* 1852–71 (Harper, 1935)

Birnie, Arthur, *Economic History of Europe:* 1760–1930 (Methuen, 1933)

Bishop, Claire, *France Alive* (McMullen, 1947)

Bolton, Herbert, *Spanish Borderlands* (Yale, 1921)

Bowden, *et al., Economic History of Europe Since 1750* (American Press, 1930)

Brady, Joseph, *Confusion Twice Confounded* (Seton Hall, 1955)

Brebner, J. B., *Canada* (Michigan U., 1960)

Brenan, Gerald, *Spanish Labyrinth* (Macmillan, 1943)

Brogan, Denis, *Era of Franklin D. Roosevelt* (Yale U., 1950)

————— *France under the Republic* (Harper, 1940)

————— *French Personalities and Problems* (Knopf, 1947)

Bruun, Geoffrey, *Europe and the French Imperium* (Harper, 1938)

————— *World in the Twentieth Century* (Heath, 1948)

Budenz, Louis, *Men without Faces* (Harper, 1950)

————— *Techniques of Communism* (Regnery, 1954)

Bullitt, William, *The Great Globe Itself* (Scribner's, 1946)

Butler, E. Cuthbert, *The Vatican Council* (Longmans, Green, 1930)

Chamberlin, William, *Collectivism, False Utopia* (Macmillan, 1937)

————— *Russian Enigma* (Scribner's, 1943)

————— *Russian Revolution* (Macmillan, 1935)

————— *The Ukraine* (Macmillan, 1944)

————— *Soviet Russia* (Little, 1930)

Churchill, Winston, *Second World War* (Abridged *Time* edition, 1959)

Cianfarra, Camille, *Vatican and the Kremlin* (Dutton, 1950)

————— *Vatican and the War* (Dutton, 1944)

Clark, Grover, *The Great Wall Crumbles* (Macmillan, 1935)

Considine, John, *Across a World* (Longmans, Green, 1942)

————— *Call for Forty Thousand* (Longmans, Green, 1946)

————— *New Horizons in Latin America* (Dodd, Mead, 1958)

Corrigan, Raymond, *Church and Nineteenth Century* (Bruce, 1938)

Curran, Francis, *Major Trends in American Church History* (American Press, 1946)

Cuevas, Mariano, *Historia de la Iglesia en Mexico* (Revista Catolica, 1928)

Curtis, Edmund, *History of Ireland* (Methuen, 1950)

Daniels, Josephus, *The Wilson Era* (N. Carolina U. 1944–46)

Dard, Émile, *Napoleon and Talleyrand* (Allan & Co., 1937)

Dawson, Christopher, *Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (Sheed & Ward, 1942)

Derrick, Michael, *Portugal of Salazar* (Campion Books, 1939)

Diamant, Alfred, *Austrian Catholics and First Republic* (Princeton, 1960)

Dignan, Patrick, *History of Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property in U.S.:* 1784–1932 (Kenedy, 1935)

Drummond, Andrew, *Story of American Protestantism* (Beacon, 1950)

Dulles, Foster R., *America's Rise to World Power* (Harper, 1955)

————— *Labor in America* (Crowell, 1949)

————— *U.S. Since 1865* (Michigan U., 1959)

Earle, Edward (ed.), *Modern France* (Princeton, 1951)

Ebon, Martin, *World Communism Today* (Whittlesey House, 1948)

Eisenhower, Dwight, *Crusade in Europe* (Garden City, 1952)

Ellis, John Tracy, *American Catholicism* (Chicago U., 1956)

———— *Consalvi and Anglo-Papal Relations* (Catholic U., 1942)

Etteldorf, Raymond, *Catholic Church in Middle East* (Macmillan, 1959)

Faulkner, Harold, *American Economic History* (Harper, 1943)

———— *American Political and Social History* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1948)

———— *From Versailles to New Deal* (Yale, 1950)

Fay, Sidney, *Origins of World War* (Macmillan, 1930)

Feis, Herbert, *The China Tangle* (Princeton, 1953)

———— *Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin* (Princeton, 1957)

———— *Europe, the World's Banker: 1870–1914* (Oxford, 1930)

———— *The Road to Pearl Harbor* (Princeton, 1950)

Fischer, Louis, *The Great Challenge* (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1946)

Fogarty, Michael, *Christian Democracy in Western Europe* (Notre Dame U., 1957)

Frazier, Edward, *Negro in the United States* (Macmillan, 1949)

Galter, Alberto, *Red Book of the Persecuted Church* (Newman, 1957)

Gibbs, Philip, *Across the Frontiers* (Doubleday, 1938)

Gillard, John, *Colored Catholics in U.S.* (Josephite Press, 1941)

Gooch, George, *History of Modern Europe: 1878–1919* (Holt, 1923)

Gottschalk, Louis, *Era of French Revolution* (Houghton Mifflin, 1929)

Graham, Robert, *Vatican Diplomacy* (Princeton U., 1959)

Greene, Robert, *Calvary in China* (Putnam's, 1953)

Greenwood, Gordon (ed.), *Australia* (Angus & Robertson, 1955)

Guedalla, Philip, *The Second Empire* (Putnam's, 1924)

Guerard, Albert, *France, A Modern History* (Michigan U., 1959)

Guilday, Peter, *History of the Council of Baltimore* (Macmillan, 1932)

———— *Catholic Church in Contemporary Europe* (Kenedy, 1932)

Gulovich, Stephen, *Windows Westward* (McMullen, 1947)

Gurian, Waldemar, *Bolshevism* (Notre Dame U., 1952)

———— *Bolshevism, Theory and Practice* (Sheed & Ward, 1935)

———— *Catholic Church in World Affairs* (Notre Dame U., 1954)

———— *Soviet Imperialism* (Notre Dame U., 1953)

Gwynn, Denis, *Catholic Reaction in France* (Macmillan, 1924)

———— *Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation* (Longmans, Green, 1929)

———— *Irish Free State: 1922–27* (Macmillan, 1928)

———— *Second Spring: 1818–52* (Catholic Book Club, 1944)

———— *Struggle for Catholic Emancipation* (Longmans, Green, 1928)

Hacker and Kendrick, *U.S. Since 1865* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949)

Haffner, Sebastian, *Germany: Jekyll and Hyde* (Dutton, 1941)

Haines and Hoffman, *Origins and Background of World War II* (Oxford, 1943)

Hales, Edward, *Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Hanover House, 1958)

———— *Mazzini and Secret Societies* (Kenedy, 1956)

———— *Pio Nono* (Kenedy, 1954)

Hall and Davis, *Course of Europe Since Waterloo* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951)

Halperin, Samuel, *Italy and Vatican at War* (Chicago U., 1939)

Hayes, Carlton, *Brief History of the Great War* (Macmillan, 1920)

———— *Contemporary Europe Since 1870* (Macmillan, 1958)

———— *A Generation of Materialism: 1871–1900* (Harper, 1941)

———— *The U.S. and Spain* (Sheed & Ward, 1951)

———— *Wartime Mission in Spain* (Macmillan, 1945)

Hazen, Charles, *Europe Since 1815* (Holt, 1910)

———— *The French Revolution,* 2v (Holt, 1932)

Heller, Andor, *No More Comrades* [Hungary] (Regnery, 1957)

Henderson, Nevile, *Failure of a Mission* (Putnam's, 1940)

Hersey, John, *Hiroshima* (Knopf, 1946)

Hicks, John, *Populist Revolt* (Minnesota U., 1931)

Hockett and Schlesinger, *Political and Social Growth of American People,* 2v (Macmillan, 1941)

Hoover, J. Edgar, *Masters of Deceit* (Holt, 1958)

Huc, Evariste, *High Road in Tartary* (Scribner's, 1948)

Huddleston, Sisley, *France: Tragic Years: 1939–47* (Devin-Adair, 1955)

Hughes, Emmet, *Church and Liberal Society* (Princeton, 1944)

Ingrim, Robert, *After Hitler, Stalin?* (Bruce, 1946)

Iswolsky, Helene, *Soul of Russia* (Sheed & Ward, 1943)

———— *Light before Dusk* [France] (Longmans, Green, 1942)

Jäckh, Ernst, *Rising Crescent* [Turkey] (Farrar & Rinehart, 1944)

Jordan, Max, *Beyond All Fronts* (Bruce, 1944)

Kane, John J., *Catholic-Protestant Conflict in America* (Regnery, 1955)

Kelley, Francis, *Blood-Drenched Altars* [Mexico] (Bruce, 1935)

———— *Story of Extension* (Extension Press, 1922)

Kelly, Eric, *Land of the Polish People* (Stokes, 1943)

Kelly, Sr. Mary, *Catholic Immigration Colonization* (U.S.C.H.S., 1939)

Kertesz, Istvan, *Fate of East Central Europe* (Notre Dame U., 1956)

Keynes, John M., *Economic Consequences of Peace* (Harcourt, 1920)

Kinsman, Frederick, *Americanism and Catholicism* (Longmans, Green, 1924)

Kohn, Hans, *Pan-Slavism* (Notre Dame U., 1953)

Kraus, Michael, *U.S. to 1865* (Michigan U., 1959)

Krzeninski, Andresej, *Poland's Rights to Justice* (Devin-Adair, 1946)

———— *National Cultures, Nazism and Church* (Humphries, 1945)

Kuykendall, Ralph, *Hawaii* (Prentice-Hall, 1948)

Lane, Arthur, *I Saw Poland Betrayed* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1948)

Langsan, Walter, *World Since 1919* (Macmillan, 1954)

Lednicki, Waclaw, *Life and Culture of Poland* (Roy, 1944)

Lefebvre, Georges, *Coming of French Revolution* (Princeton, 1947)

LeFlon, Jean, *La Crise Revolutionnáire* (Bloud & Gay, 1949)

Leslie, Shane, *Oxford Movement: 1833–1933* (Bruce, 1933)

Link, Arthur, *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era* (Harper, 1954)

Loew, Jacques, *Mission to the Poorest* (Sheed & Ward, 1950)

Lukacs, John, *Great Powers and Eastern Europe* (American Book, 1953)

Lunn, Arnold, *Science of World Revolution* (Sheed, 1938)

Lyons, Eugene, *Assignment in Utopia* (Harcourt, Brace, 1937)

———— *The Red Decade* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1941)

McAvoy, Thomas, *Great Crisis in American Church History* (Regnery, 1957)

MacCaffery, James, *Catholic Church in the 19th Century* (Herder-Gill, 1910)

MacCarran, Sr. Margaret, *Fabianism in Britain* (Chicago Heritage, 1954)

McCracken, J., *Representative Government in Ireland* (Oxford, 1958)

McDonald, Fergus, *Catholic Church & Secret Societies* (U.S.C.H.S., 1946)

McDonald, Forrest, *We the People* (Chicago U., 1958)

MacEoin, Gary, *Communist War on Religion* (Devin-Adair, 1951)

MacFarland, Charles, *New Church and New Germany* (Macmillan, 1934)

McGuire, Paul, *Australia* (Stokes, 1939)

MacMahon, Francis, *A Catholic Looks at the World* (Vanguard, 1945)

McNeill-Moss, Geoffrey, *Siege of the Alcazar* (Knopf, 1937)

Madelin, Louis, *French Revolution* (Putnam's, 1928)

————— *Consulate and Empire*, 2v (Heinemann, 1934–36)

Manning, Clarence, *Forgotten Republics* (Philosophic Library, 1952)

Mansergh, Nicholas, *Ireland in the Age of Reform and Revolution* (Allen, 1940)

Marchi, Joao de, *Immaculate Heart* [Fatima] (Farrar, Straus, 1952)

Martin, David, *Ally Betrayed* [Yugoslavia] (Prentice-Hall, 1946)

Martindale, Cyril, *African Angelus* (Sheed & Ward, 1932)

Mary Just, Sr., *Rome and Russia* (Newman, 1954)

Mathews, Basil, *Consider Africa* (Friendship House, 1936)

May, Arthur, *Habsburg Monarchy: 1867–1914* (Cambridge, 1951)

Maynard, Theodore, *Story of American Catholicism* (Macmillan, 1942)

Moorad, George, *Behind the Iron Curtain* (Fireside Press, 1946)

Moore, Edmund, *A Catholic Runs for President* (Ronald Press, 1956)

Morgan, Thomas, *The Listening Post* (Putnam's, 1944)

————— *Reporter at the Papal Court* (Longmans, Green, 1937)

Morison and Commager, *Growth of American Republic*, 2v (Oxford, 1950)

Mowat, Charles, *Britain between Wars: 1918–40* (Chicago U., 1955)

Mowry, George, *Era of Theodore Roosevelt* (Harper, 1958)

Munro, Dana, *Latin American Republics* (Appleton-Century, 1942)

Myers, Gustavus, *History of Bigotry in U.S.* (Random House, 1943)

Neill, Thomas, *Weapons for Peace* (Bruce, 1945)

————— *Rise and Decline of Liberalism* (Bruce, 1953)

Nemec, Ludvik, *Church and State in Czechoslovakia* (Vantage, 1955)

Nevins, Allan, *New Deal and World Affairs: 1933–45* (Yale, 1950)

————— *U.S. in a Chaotic World: 1918–33* (Yale, 1950)

O'Connor, John, *Catholic Revival in England* (Macmillan, 1942)

O'Gorman, Thomas, *History of the Roman Catholic Church in U.S.* (Scribner's, 1907)

O'Neill, James, *Catholicism & American Freedom* (Harper, 1952)

————— *Religion & Education under Constitution* (Harper, 1949)

Ortega-Gasset, José, *Revolt of the Masses* (Norton, 1932)

Orton, William, *Twenty Years' Armistice: 1918–38* (Farrar, 1938)

Palmer, Greta, *God's Underground* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949)

Palmer, Robert, *Twelve Who Ruled* (Princeton, 1941)

Pares, Bernard, *History of Russia* (Knopf, 1953)

Parsons, Wilfrid, *The Pope and Italy* (American Press, 1929)
—— *The First Freedom* (McMullen, 1948)
Pattee, Richard, *This Is Spain* (Bruce, 1951)
—— *Case of Cardinal Stepinac* (Bruce, 1953)
Peers, E. Allison, *Spain, Church and Orders* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1945)
—— *Spanish Tragedy: 1930–36* (Oxford, 1937)
Peffer, Nathaniel, *Far East, A Modern History* (Michigan U., 1958)
Phillips, Alison, *Modern Europe: 1815–99* (Rivington's, 1932)
Pinson, Koppel, *Modern Germany* (Macmillan, 1954)
Powell, Alexander, *Long Roll on the Rhine* (Macmillan, 1934)
Preuss, Arthur, *Study in American Freemasonry* (Herder, 1908)
Putz, Louis (ed.), *Catholic Church, U.S.A.* (Fides, 1956)
Rauch, Basil, *History of the New Deal: 1933–38* (Creative Age, 1944)
Rauschning, Hermann, *Revolution of Nihilism* (Longmans, Green, 1939)
—— *Time of Delirium* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946)
—— *Voice of Destruction* (Putnam's, 1940)
Reist, Werner, *Switzerland* (Government, 1952)
Reves, Emery, *Anatomy of Peace* (Harper, 1945)
Rippy, James, *Latin America, A Modern History* (Michigan U., 1958)
Roberts, Stephen, *The House That Hitler Built* (Harper, 1938)
Roemer, Theodore, *Catholic Church in the U.S.* (Herder, 1950)
—— *Ten Decades of Alms* (Herder, 1942)
Rosen, Peter, *Church and Secret Societies* (Houtkamp & Cannon, 1902)
Rothfels, Hans, *German Opposition to Hitler* (Regnery, 1948)
Rueff, Jacques (ed.), *The Third Reich* (Weldenfeld & Nicolson, 1955)
Ryan, Edwin, *Church in South American Republics* (Newman, 1955)
Salvatorelli, Luigi, *Concise History of Italy* (Oxford, 1940)
Sargent, Daniel, *Our Land and Our Lady* (Longmans, Green, 1939)
Schevill, Ferdinand, *Balkan Peninsula and Near East* (Bell, 1922)
Schlarman, Joseph, *Mexico, Land of Volcanoes* (Bruce, 1950)
Schlesinger, Arthur Sr., *Rise of Modern America* (Macmillan, 1951)
Schlesinger, Arthur Jr., *Age of Jackson* (Little, Brown, 1945)
—— *Age of Roosevelt* (Houghton Mifflin, 1957–)
Schramm, Wilhelm, *Conspiracy Among Generals* (Scribner's, 1957)
Schwarzchild, Leopold, *Primer of Coming World* (Knopf, 1945)
Sforza, Carlo, *Totalitarian War and After* (Chicago U., 1941)
—— *Contemporary Italy* (Dutton, 1944)
Shea, John G., *History of the Catholic Church in U.S.* (McBride, 1886–92)
Shirer, William, *Berlin Diary: 1934–41* (Knopf, 1941)
Shuster, George, *Religion behind Iron Curtain* (Macmillan, 1954)
—— *Catholicism in America* (Harcourt, Brace, 1954)
Simmons, Ernest, *U.S.S.R., A Concise Handbook* (Cornell U., 1947)
Simon, Alois, *Le Parti Catholique Belge* (Renaissance du Livre, 1958)
Simon, Boris, *Abbé Pierre and the Ragpickers of Emmaus* (Kenedy, 1955)
Simon, Yves, *Road to Vichy: 1918–38* (Sheed & Ward, 1942)
Smelser, *et al.*, *Conceived in Liberty* (Doubleday, 1955)
Sorokin, Pitirim, *Crisis of Our Age* (Dutton, 1942)

———— *Russia and U.S.* (Dutton, 1944)

Stephens, Morse, *Revolutionary Europe: 1789–1815* (Rivington's, 1936)

Sturzo, Luigi, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (Roy, 1946)

———— *Italy and the Coming World* (Roy, 1945)

Taylor, Alan, *Habsburg Monarchy: 1809–1918* (Hamilton, 1948)

Taylor, George, *Hamilton and the National Debt* (Heath, 1950)

———— *Jackson versus Biddle* (Heath, 1949)

———— *The Turner Thesis* (Heath, 1956)

Thebaud, Augustus, *Three Quarters of a Century* (U.S.C.H.S., 1912)

Thorning, Joseph, *Religious Liberty in Transition* (Benziger, 1931)

Thornton, Sr. Mary, *Church and Freemasonry in Brazil* (Catholic U., 1948)

Thureau-Dangin, Paul, *English Catholic Revival*, 2v (Dutton, 1899)

Timasheff, Nicholas, *Religion in Soviet Russia* (Sheed & Ward, 1942)

Turner, Edward, *Europe: 1789–1920* (Doubleday, Page, 1920)

Turner, Frederick, *Significance of Sections* (P. Smith, 1950)

VanDoren, Carl, *Secret History of American Revolution* (Viking, 1941)

———— *The Great Rehearsal* [Constitution] (Viking, 1948)

Veit, Ludwig, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus* (Herder, 1933)

Wade, Mason, *The French Canadians: 1760–1945* (Macmillan, 1955)

Walsh, Edmund, *Fall of the Russian Empire* (Blue Ribbon, 1931)

———— *Last Stand: Soviet Five Year Plan* (Little, Brown, 1931)

Walsh, Warren, *Russia and the Soviet Union* (Michigan U., 1958)

Ward, Leo (ed.), *American Apostolate* (Newman, 1952)

Ward, Maisie, *Insurrection versus Resurrection* (Sheed & Ward, 1937)

Watkin, Edward, *Roman Catholicism in England* (Oxford, 1957)

White, John W., *Our Good Neighbor Hurdle* (Bruce, 1943)

Whitehead, Donald, *The FBI Story* (Random House, 1956)

Williams, Michael, *Shadow of the Pope* (McGraw-Hill, 1932)

Williamson, James, *Short History of British Expansion* (Macmillan, 1931)

Wrong, George, *The Canadians* (Macmillan, 1938)

Yale, William, *The Near East, a Modern History* (Michigan U., 1958)

Yarmolinsky, Avraham, *Road to Revolution* (Macmillan, 1959)

PROLETARIAN PERIOD: BIOGRAPHY

Adams, James T., *The Adams Family* (Little, Brown, 1930)

Adams, Samuel, *Incredible Era* [Harding] (Houghton Mifflin, 1939)

Ahern, Patrick, *Life of John J. Keane* (Bruce, 1955)

Aldington, Richard, *The Duke* [Wellington] (Viking, 1943)

Alexander, Edgar, *Adenauer and the New Germany* (Farrar, 1957)

Alexander, Holmes, *American Talleyrand* [Hamilton] (Harper, 1933)

Allan, Herbert, *John Hancock* (Beechhurst Press, 1953)

Allison, John, *Monsieur Thiers* (Norton, 1932)

Angle, Paul (ed.), *The Lincoln Reader* (Rutgers, 1947)

Anthony, Joseph, *B. Conrad of Parzham* (St. Bonaventure, 1932)

Aradi, Zsolt, *Pius XI, the Pope and the Man* (Hanover House, 1958)

Arraras, Joaquin, *Francisco Franco* (Bruce, 1938)

Bagger, Eugene, *Francis Joseph* (Putnam's, 1927)

Bailey, Ralph, *American Colossus* [Hamilton] (Lothrop, Lee, Shepard, 1933)

Barnard, Harry, *Eagle Forgotten* [Altgeld] (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1938)

Barthou, Louis, *Mirabeau* (Hachette, 1913)

Beals, Carleton, *Porfirio Díaz* (Lippincott, 1932)

Belloc, Hilaire, *Marie Antoinette* (Putnam's, 1924)

—————— *Danton* (Scribner's, 1899)

—————— *Napoleon* (Lippincott, 1932)

—————— *Robespierre* (Putnam's, 1927)

Bemis, Samuel, *John Quincy Adams and the Union* (Knopf, 1956)

Benson, Edward, *King Edward VII* (Longmans, Green, 1933)

Bolitho, Hector, *Albert the Good* (Appleton-Century, 1932)

—————— *King Edward VIII* (Literary Guild, 1937)

Bosco, St. John, *Life of St. Dominic Savio* (Salesiana, 1955)

Bowers, Claude, *Beveridge and Progressive Era* (Houghton Mifflin, 1932)

Boyne, Mrs. P., *Life of St. Catherine Labouré* (Virgo Potens, 1948)

Bruun, Geoffrey, *Clemenceau* (Harvard U., 1943)

Budenz, Louis, *This Is My Story* (McGraw-Hill, 1947)

Buehrle, Marie, *Rafael Cardinal Merry del Val* (Bruce, 1957)

—————— *St. Maria Goretti* (Bruce, 1950)

Bulman, David, *Molders of Opinion* (Bruce, 1945)

Burton, Katherine, *Celestial Homespun* [Hecker] (Longmans, Green, 1943)

—————— *Difficult Star* [Jaricot] (Longmans, Green, 1947)

—————— *Great Mantle* [St. Pius X] (Longmans, Green, 1950)

Butler, E. C., *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne* (Benziger, 1926)

Cammaerts, Émile, *Albert of Belgium* (Macmillan, 1935)

Carr, John, *St. Clement Hofbauer* (Sands, 1939)

Cecil, Algernon, *Metternich* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1947)

Chesterton, Gilbert, *Autobiography* (Sheed & Ward, 1936)

Clapesattle, Helen, *The Doctors Mayo* (Minnesota U., 1941)

Clarke, Edward, *Disraeli* (Murray, 1926)

Clonmore, William, *Pius XI and World Peace* (Dutton, 1938)

Coit, Margaret, *John C. Calhoun* (Houghton, Mifflin, 1950)

Coles, Sydney, *Franco of Spain* (Newman, 1956)

Corti, Egon, *Rise of the House of Rothschild* (Cosmopolitan, 1928)

—————— *Reign of the House of Rothschild* (Gollancz, 1928)

Cory, Herbert, *Emancipation of a Freethinker* (Bruce, 1941)

Cresson, William, *James Monroe* (N. Carolina U., 1946)

Curley, Michael, *Ven. John Neumann* (Catholic U., 1952)

Daniels, Josephus, *Tar Heel Editor* (N. Carolina U., 1939)

DelaBedoyere, Michael, *Lafayette* (Scribner's, 1934)

Deschanel, Paul, *Gambetta* (Heinemann, 1920)

Dirvin, Joseph, *St. Catherine Labouré* (Farrar, Straus, 1958)

Dodd, Anna, *Talleyrand* (Putnam's, 1927)

Dubly, Henry, *Life of Cardinal Mercier* (Mercier Press, 1949)

DuCoudray, Helene, *Metternich* (J. Cape, 1935)

Dyer, Brainerd, *Zachary Taylor* (Louisiana State U., 1946)

Ebon, Martin, *Malenkov* (McGraw-Hill, 1953)

Elliot, Charles, *Winfield Scott* (Macmillan, 1937)

Ellis, John Tracy, *Life of James Cardinal Gibbons* (Bruce, 1952)

Farley, James, *Behind the Ballots* (Harcourt Brace, 1938)

Fay, Bernard, *The Two Franklins* (Little, Brown, 1933)

———— *George Washington* (Houghton Mifflin, 1931)

Field, Carter, *Bernard Baruch* (McGraw-Hill, 1944)

Fischer, Hermann, *Life of Arnold Janssen* (Techny Press, 1925)

Forbes, Frances, *Rafael, Cardinal Merry del Val* (Longmans, Green, 1932)

Freeman, Douglas, *George Washington,* 7v (Scribner's, 1948–54)

———— *Robert E. Lee,* 4v (Scribner's, 1934–35)

———— *Lee's Lieutenants,* 3v (Scribner's, 1944)

Freidel, Frank, *Franklin D. Roosevelt,* 3v (Little, Brown, 1952–)

Fuess, Claude, *Carl Schurz* (Dodd, Mead, 1952)

———— *Daniel Webster* (Little, Brown, 1930)

———— *Calvin Coolidge* (Little, Brown, 1940)

Fülop-Miller, René, *Leo XIII and Our Times* (Longmans, Green, 1937)

Gatzke, Hans, *Stresemann* (Johns Hopkins, 1954)

Gavin, Catherine, *Louis Philippe* (Methuen, 1933)

Gay, Sydney, *James Madison* (Houghton Mifflin, 1895)

Gheon, Henri, *Secret of St. John Bosco* (Sheed & Ward, 1936)

———— *Secret of Curé d'Ars* (Sheed & Ward, 1936)

Gibson, Hugh (ed.), *The Ciano Diaries* (Doubleday, 1946)

Giordani, Igino, *Pius X* (Bruce, 1954)

Graef, Hilda, *Scholar and Cross* [Edith Stein] (Newman, 1955)

Graham, Frank, *Al Smith* (Putnam's, 1945)

Grant, Dorothy, *John England* (Bruce, 1949)

Grunwald, Constantin de, *Napoleon's Nemesis: Stein* (Scribner's, 1936)

Guedalla, Philip, *Palmerston* (Putnam's, 1927)

———— *Wellington* (Harper, 1931)

Guilday, Peter, *Life and Times of John Carroll* (Encyclopedia Press, 1922)

———— *Life and Times of John England* (America Press, 1927)

Gumpert, Martin, *Dunant, Story of the Red Cross* (Oxford, 1938)

Gurn, Joseph, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton* (Kenedy, 1932)

Gwynn, Denis, *Cardinal Wiseman* (Kenedy, 1929)

———— *De Valera* (Dutton, 1933)

Hale, William, *Horace Greeley* (Harper, 1950)

Halecki, Oskar, *Eugenio Pacelli* (Creative Age, 1951)

Hall, Walter, *Mr. Gladstone* (Norton, 1931)

Hammond, John, *Lord Shaftesbury* (Constable, 1925)

Haslip, Joan, *Parnell* (Stokes, 1937)

Haussonville, Gabriel d', *Lacordaire* (Herder, 1915)

Heiden, Konrad, *Der Fuehrer* (Houghton Mifflin, 1944)

Hesseltine, William, *U. S. Grant, Politician* (Dodd, Mead, 1935)

Hollis, Christopher, *Lenin* (Bruce, 1938)

Howe, George, *Chester A. Arthur* (Ungar, 1935)

Huddleston, Sisley, *Pétain, Patriot or Traitor?* (Dakers, 1951)

Hyde, Douglas, *I Believed* (Putnam's, 1950)

James, Marquis, *Andrew Jackson, Border Captain* (Garden City, 1940)
———— *Andrew Jackson, President* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1937)
———— *The Raven* [Sam Houston] (Bobbs-Merrill, 1929)
Jourdan, Vital, *Heart of Father Damien* (Bruce, 1955)
Kennedy, John F., *Profiles in Courage* (Harper, 1956)
Keppel, Leopoldina, *Philippine Duchesne* (Longmans, Green, 1940)
Laux, John, *Christian Social Reform* [Ketteler] (Dolphin Press, 1912)
LeMoyne, Jean, *Character Sketch of Don Bosco* (Salesian, 1927)
Leslie, Shane, *Cardinal Gasquet* (Kenedy, 1953)
———— *Henry Edward Manning* (Kenedy, 1921)
———— *Mrs. FitzHerbert* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1939)
Lochner, Louis (ed.), *The Goebbels Diaries* (Doubleday, 1948)
Lubac, Henri de, *Un-Marxian Socialist* [Proudhon] (Sheed & Ward, 1948)
Lucas-Dubreton, Jean, *Louis XVIII* (Putnam's, 1927)
Ludwig, Emil, *Bismarck* (Little, Brown, 1928)
———— *Napoleon* (Boni & Liveright, 1926)
———— *Wilhelm Hohenzollern* (Putnam's, 1927)
———— *Roosevelt* (Viking, 1938)
Lyons, Eugene, *Stalin, Czar of All the Russias* (Lippincott, 1940)
MacDonagh, Michael, *Daniel O'Connell* (Irish Book Shop, 1929)
McHugh, Roger, *Henry Grattan* (Sheed & Ward, 1937)
MacKenzie, Compton, *Mr. Roosevelt* (Dutton, 1944)
McNaughton, Frank, *This Man Truman* (McGraw-Hill, 1945)
McSorley, Joseph, *Father Hecker and His Friends* (Herder, 1952)
Madelin, Louis, *Talleyrand* (Roy, 1948)
Maurois, André, *Chateaubriand* (Harper, 1938)
———— *Disraeli* (Appleton-Century, 1928)
Maynard, Theodore, *Orestes Brownson* (Macmillan, 1943)
———— *Reed and Rock* [Bruté] (Longmans, Green, 1942)
———— *Too Small a World* [St. Cabrini] (Bruce, 1945)
Melville, Annabelle, *Elizabeth Seton* (Scribner's, 1951)
———— *John Carroll of Baltimore* (Scribner's, 1955)
———— *Jean de Cheverus* (Bruce, 1958)
Miller, John, *Sam Adams* (Little, Brown, 1936)
Monaghan, Frank, *John Jay* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1935)
Morley, John, *Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (Macmillan, 1903)
Morse, John, *John Quincy Adams* (Houghton Mifflin, 1899)
Moynihan, James, *Life of Archbishop John Ireland* (Harper, 1953)
Nedoncelle, Maurice, *Baron Friedrich von Hügel* (Longmans, Green, 1937)
Neill, Thomas, *They Lived the Faith* (Bruce, 1951)
Nevins, Allan, *Ford, Times and Man* (Scribner's, 1954)
———— *Frémont, Pathfinder* (Longmans, Green, 1955)
———— *Grover Cleveland* (Dodd, Mead, 1932)
———— *Hamilton Fish* (Dodd, Mead, 1936)
———— *Study in Power: John D. Rockefeller* (Scribner's, 1953)
Nichols, Roy, *Franklin Pierce* (Pennsylvania U., 1958)
Nolan, Hugh, *Francis Patrick Kenrick* (A.C.H.S., 1949)

Olf, Lilian, *Pius XI, Pope of Peace* (Macmillan, 1938)
Oliver, Frederick, *Alexander Hamilton* (Putnam's, 1918)
Padover, Saul, *Jefferson* (Harcourt, Brace, 1942)
Paleologue, Georges, *Cavour* (Harper, 1927)
Perkins, Frances, *The Roosevelt I Knew* (Viking, 1946)
Peters, Walter, *Life of Benedict XV* (Bruce, 1959)
Pringle, Henry, *Alfred E. Smith* (Macy-Masins, 1927)
———— *Life and Times of W. H. Taft* (Farrar-Rinehart, 1939)
———— *Theodore Roosevelt* (Harcourt, Brace, 1931)
Proserpio, Leone, *St. Gemma Galgani* (Bruce, 1940)
Redlich, Joseph, *Francis Joseph of Austria* (Macmillan, 1929)
Robertson, William, *Iturbide of Mexico* (Duke U., 1952)
Rope, Henry, *Benedict XV* (Catholic Book Club, 1940)
Rose, John, *Life of Napoleon I* (Macmillan, 1910)
Rosenman, Samuel, *Working with Roosevelt* (Harper, 1952)
Ross, John E., *John Henry Newman* (Norton, 1933)
Royer, Fanchon, *Padre Pro* (Kenedy, 1954)
———— *St. Anthony Claret* (Farrar, Straus, Cudahy, 1957)
Saint-Michael, Sr., *Portrait of St. Gemma* (Kenedy, 1950)
Saint-Pierre, Michel de, *Bernadette and Lourdes* (Farrar, Straus, Cudahy, 1954)
Sargent, Daniel, *Assignments of Antonio Claret* (McMullen, 1948)
———— *All the Day Long* [Walsh] (Longmans, Green, 1941)
Schauinger, Joseph, *Cathedrals in Wilderness* [Flaget] (Bruce, 1952)
Schimberg, Albert, *Great Friend* [Ozanam] (Bruce, 1946)
Sharman, Lyon, *Sun Yat-sen* (John Day, 1934)
Sheppard, Lancelot, *Don Bosco* (Newman, 1957)
Sherwood, Robert, *Roosevelt and Hopkins* (Harper, 1948)
Shub, David, *Lenin* (Doubleday, 1948)
Stevens, John, *Albert Gallatin* (Houghton Mifflin, 1897)
Strachey, G. Lytton, *Queen Victoria* (Blue Ribbon, 1921)
Strakhovsky, Leonid, *Alexander I of Russia* (Norton, 1947)
Stryker, Lloyd, *Andrew Johnson* (Macmillan, 1929)
Swift, Stephen, *The Cardinal's Story* [Mindszenty] (Macmillan, 1949)
Swisher, Carl, *Roger B. Taney* (Macmillan, 1935)
Thibaut, Raymond, *Abbot Columba Marmion* (Herder, 1942)
Thomas, Benjamin, *Abraham Lincoln* (Knopf, 1952)
Trochu, François, *The Curé d'Ars* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1930)
———— *St. Bernadette Soubirous* (Pantheon, 1958)
VanDeusen, Glyndon, *Life of Henry Clay* (Little, Brown, 1937)
VanDoren, Carl, *Benjamin Franklin* (Viking, 1938)
Ward, Wilfrid, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (Longmans, 1897)
———— *Life of John Henry Newman* (Longmans, 1921)
Wheeler-Bennett, John, *Wooden Titan* [Hindenburg] (Morrow, 1936)
White, William, *Puritan in Babylon* [Coolidge] (Macmillan, 1938)
———— *Woodrow Wilson* (Houghton Mifflin, 1924)
Wright, Gordon, *Raymond Poincaré* (Oxford, 1942)

Ydewalle, Charles d', *Albert and the Belgians* (Morrow, 1935)
Zombory, Akos, *Cardinal Mindzenty Speaks* (Longmans, Green, 1949)
Zweig, Stefan, *Marie Antoinette* (Viking, 1933)
—————— *Joseph Fouché* (Viking, 1930)
Zwierlein, Frederick, *Archbishop Corrigan* (Rochester Art Print, 1946)
—————— *Bishop McQuaid* (Rochester Art Print, 1927)

PROLETARIAN PERIOD: IDEATIONAL

Adams, James, *Our Business Civilization* (Boni, 1929)
Ardley, Gavin, *Aquinas and Kant* (Longmans, Green, 1950)
Beard, Charles, *The Republic* (Viking, 1943)
Belloc, Hilaire, *The Servile State* (Holt, 1946)
Benard, Edmond, *Preface to Newman's Theology* (Herder, 1945)
Bochenski, Innocentius, *Contemporary European Philosophy* (California U., 1956)
Bruni, Gerardo, *Progressive Scholasticism* (Herder, 1929)
Buckley, William, *God and Man at Yale* (Regnery, 1951)
Burns and Kohlbrenner, *History of Catholic Education in U.S.* (Benziger, 1937)
Cahill, Edward, *Framework of a Christian State* (Gill, 1932)
Campbell, Francis, *Menace of the Herd* (Bruce, 1943)
Castell, Alburey, *Introduction to Modern Philosophy* (Macmillan, 1943)
Cognet, Louis, *Post-Reformation Spirituality* (Hawthorn, 1959)
Collins, James, *Mind of Kierkegaard* (Regnery, 1953)
—————— *History of Modern European Philosophy* (Bruce, 1954)
Copleston, Frederick, *History of Philosophy,* VI (Newman, 1960)
Corwin, Edward, *The President* (New York U., 1948)
Cronin, John F., *Catholic Social Action* (Bruce, 1948)
—————— *Catholic Social Principles* (Bruce, 1950)
—————— *Economic Analysis and Problems* (American Book, 1945)
Cross, Robert, *Emergence of Liberal Catholicism* (Harvard U., 1958)
Cubberley, Ellwood, *Public Education in U.S.* (Houghton Mifflin, 1919)
Curti, Merle, *Growth of American Thought* (Harper, 1943)
Ellis, John Tracy, *American Catholics and Intellectual Life* (Heritage, 1956)
Eppstein, John, *Catholic Tradition of Law of Nations* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935)
—————— *Code of International Ethics* (Newman, 1953)
Ford and Kelly, *Contemporary Moral Theology* (Newman, 1958–)
Gilson, Étienne, *Unity of Philosophical Experience* (Scribner's, 1937)
Hayek, Friedrich, *Individualism* (Chicago U., 1948)
Hitler, Adolf, *Mein Kampf* (ed. by Chamberlain and Fay: Raynal, 1940)
Hoffman, Ross, *The Organic State* (Sheed & Ward, 1939)
Kelly and Harbison, *American Constitution* (Norton, 1948)
Kennedy, Gail, *Evolution and Religion* (Heath, 1957)
—————— *Democracy and the Gospel of Wealth* (Heath, 1942)
—————— *Education for Democracy* (Heath, 1952)
—————— *Pragmatism and American Culture* (Heath, 1950)

Kirk, Russell, *The Conservative Mind* (Regnery, 1953)
LeBuffe and Hayes, *American Philosophy of Law* (Crusader Press, 1947)
Lippmann, Walter, *Inquiry into Principles of Good Society* (Little, Brown, 1943)
MacDonald, Forrest, *We the People* (Chicago U., 1958)
McFadden, Charles, *Philosophy of Communism* (Benziger, 1939)
McGovern, William, *From Luther to Hitler* (Houghton Mifflin, 1941)
Maritain, Jacques, *Bergsonian Philosophy* (Philosophic Library, 1955)
———— *Existence and the Existent* (Pantheon, 1948)
———— *Freedom in the Modern World* (Scribner's, 1936)
———— *Man and the State* (Chicago U., 1951)
Martin, St. Therese, *Histoire d'une Ame* (Carmelites, 1924)
Mascia, Carmin, *History of Philosophy* (St. Anthony Guild, 1957)
Mercier, Louis, *American Humanism and the New Age* (Bruce, 1948)
Milton, George, *Use of Presidential Power* (Little, Brown, 1944)
Morley, Felix, *The Power in the People* (VanNostrand, 1949)
Mott, Frank, *American Journalism* (Macmillan, 1950)
Mumford, Lewis, *The Golden Day* (Boni & Liveright, 1926)
Newman, John Henry, *Apologia pro Vita Sua* (Longmans, Green, 1897)
———— *Grammar of Assent* (Longmans, Green, 1897)
———— *Development of Christian Doctrine* (Longmans, Green, 1897)
O'Dea, Thomas, *American Catholic Dilemma* (Sheed & Ward, 1958)
O'Neill, James, *Catholics in Controversy* (McMullen, 1954)
Ong, Walter, *Frontier in American Catholicism* (Macmillan, 1957)
Reinhardt, Kurt, *Existentialist Revolt* (Bruce, 1952)
Ryan, John A., *A Living Wage* (Macmillan, 1920)
———— *Distributive Justice* (Macmillan, 1916)
Ryan and Boland, *Catholic Principles of Politics* (Macmillan, 1940)
Schenk, Hans, *Aftermath of Napoleonic Wars* (Oxford, 1947)
Shields, Currin, *Democracy & Catholicism in U.S.* (McGraw-Hill, 1958)
Sheed, Frank, *Communism and Man* (Sheed & Ward, 1938)
Sheen, Fulton, *Communism and Conscience of West* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1948)
Simon, Yves, *Philosophy of Democratic Government* (Chicago U., 1951)
Smith, Vincent, *Idea Men of Today* (Bruce, 1950)
Timasheff, Nicholas, *Three Worlds* (Bruce, 1946)
Werkmeister, William, *History of Philosophical Ideas in America* (Ronald Press, 1949)
Whalen, William, *Christianity and American Freemasonry* (Bruce, 1958)
Wright, William, *History of Modern Philosophy* (Macmillan, 1941)

Index