



THE
HISTORY OF THE POPES

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

DRAWN FROM THE SECRET ARCHIVES OF THE VATICAN AND OTHER
ORIGINAL SOURCES

FROM THE GERMAN OF THE LATE ✓

LUDWIG, FREIHERR VON PASTOR

TRANSLATED BY

E. F. PEELER

VOLUME XXXV

BENEDICT XIV. (1740-1758)

LONDON

ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL, LTD.

BROADWAY HOUSE: 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.

1949

*Owing to production delays
this book was not published
until 1950*

FOREWORD

THIS Volume XXXV. of the *History of the Popes* corresponds to the first part of Volume XVI. of the German original, which was published in three parts and covers the period beginning with the election of Benedict XIV. and ending with the death of Pius VI. (1740-1799).

The portions of the MS. of this German volume which were incomplete at the time of the author's death (1928) were rounded off with the material he had left behind him. The chapters on the internal activity of the Church, the missions, and the conclusion of the ritual dispute were written by Fr. Kneller, of Munich. Dr. W. Wühr, of Munich, described the conclaves of 1740, 1758, and 1774-75, the sections on the ecclesiastical history of the German-speaking countries and Poland, and the last three chapters of the pontificate of Pius VI. Chapters VII.-X. of the pontificate of Clement XIII. and the description of the conclave of 1769 were the work of Fr. Kratz, of Rome, who also contributed towards the chapters dealing with ecclesiastico-political events in the reign of Pius VI.

For the history of the missions use was made of the compilations of Professor Dr. Schmidlin, of Münster.

The motto on p. vii was chosen by the author himself. He had written in his diary for February 12th, 1923: "Coronation ceremony in the Sistina. As I listened to the stirring words of the Gospel ('Tu es Petrus') the thought came into my mind that they were the right motto for the last volume of my *History of the Popes*."

In accordance with the wish of His Holiness Pope Pius XI., Her Excellency Freifrau Constanze von Pastor dedicated the final volume of her departed husband's life-work to the first Pope and Prince of the Apostles, St. Peter.

Motto :

“ Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam
meam, et portae inferi non praevallebunt adversus eam.”

Matt. XVI., 18.

NOMINI HONORI
PERBEATI SIMONIS PETRI
APOSTOLORUM PRINCIPIS
PRIMIQUE A CHRISTO SERVATORE
CONSTITUTI ROMANI PONTIFICIS
HOC HISTORiarUM VOLUMEN
QUOD LABORE EXTREMO EXTREMUM
LUDOVICUS DE PASTOR ABSOLVIT
CONSTANTIA CONIUX SUPERSTES
SACRUM VOLUIT

ANNO DOMINI MCMXXXI.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXV.

	PAGE
Collections of Archives and Manuscripts referred to in Volumes XXXV.—XL.	x
Complete Titles of Books quoted in Volumes XXXV.— XL.	xii
Table of Contents	xxxviii
List of Unpublished Documents in Appendix	xliv
The Conclave of the Year 1740—Career and Personality of Benedict XIV.—The Cardinal Secretary of State, Valenti Gonzaga—The Church's Peace Policy— The Concordats with Savoy, Naples, and Spain	1-75
Benedict XIV. and the War of the Austrian Succession —His Attitude towards the Elections of the Emperors Charles VII. and Francis I.—The Peace Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle	76-140
The States of the Church—The Encouragement of Art and Learning	141-225
Jansenism in France and Holland	226-293
Benedict XIV.'s Activity within the Church—The Veneration of the Saints—The Jubilee Year of 1750—The Appointment of Cardinals—The Index —The Beginning of the Undermining of the Society of Jesus	294-391
Benedict XIV. and the Missions	392-476
Appendix of Unpublished Documents and Extracts from Archives	477
Index of Names	500

COLLECTIONS OF ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS REFERRED TO IN VOLUMES XXXV.—XL.

- AACHEN—Municipal Archives.
 AUGSBURG—Ordinariats-Archiv.
 ——— Municipal Archives.
- BENEVENTO—Archiepiscopal Archives.
 BERLIN—Secret State Archives.
 ——— State Library.
- BOLOGNA—Biblioteca dell' Archiginnasio.
 ——— Archiepiscopal Library.
 ——— University Library.
 ——— Malvezzi Library.
- BROLIO DEL CHIANTI (Tuscany) Ricasoli Archives.
- COLORNO—Private Ducal Archives.
 COLOGNE—Archdiocesan Archives.
 ——— Municipal Archives.
- DRESDEN—Catholic Parish Archives.
 DÜSSELDORF—State Archives.
 ——— Landes-Archiv.
- FLORENCE—State Archives.
 ——— Biblioteca Laurenziana.
- FORLÌ—Biblioteca Comunale.
- FRASCATI—Seminary Library.
- FREIBURG (im Breisgau)—Archdiocesan Archives.
- FRIBOURG (Switzerland)—Episcopal Archives.
- GENOA—State Archives.
- GLATZ—Gymnasial-Archiv.
- INNSBRUCK—Pastor Library.
 ——— State Library.
- KARLSRUHE—General-Landes-Archiv.
- LONDON—British Museum.
- LUCERNE—State Archives.
- MADRID—Arch. General Central. (Alcalá de Henares.)
 ——— Arch. Prov. Toledo.
 ——— Bibl. S. Isidro.
- MAINZ—Cathedral Archives.
 ——— Municipal Archives.
 ——— Municipal Library.
- MODENA—Bibl. Estense.
- MOSCOW—Archives de la Mission de Varsovie.
 ——— State Archives.
- MUNICH—State Archives.
 ——— State Library.
- NAPLES—Boncompagni Archives.
 ——— State Archives.
 ——— National Library.
- OSNABRÜCK—State Archives.
- PADUA—Archives of the Curia.
 ——— Chapter Archives.
- PARIS—Foreign Affairs Archives.
 ——— Archives Nationales.
 ——— Bibl. Nationale.
- PARMA—State Archives.
 ——— Private Archives of the Duke of Parma.
- PIACENZA—Collegio S. Lazaro.

PLESS—Archives of Prince Metternich.

ROME—

Archives :

Apostolic Nunciature to Munich.
Austrian Historical Institute.
Boncompagni.
Briefs, Archives of.
Civiltà Cattolica.
Congr. Cerimoniale pontificia.
Costaguti.
Galician Province S.J.
German Province S.J.
Papal Secret Archives.
Propaganda.
Prosperi.
S. Croce in Gerusalemme.
S. Pietro.
SS. Vincenzo ed Anastasio.
Spanish Embassy.
State.

Libraries :

Angelica.
Casanatense.
Corsini.
Corvisieri.
Luzietti.
Ricci.

Torricelli.
Vallicelliana.
Vatican.
Vittorio Emanuele.

ST. PETERSBURG—State Archives.

——— State Library.

SALZBURG—Provincial Government Archives.

SIMANCAS—Archives.

SION (Sitten)—State Archives.

SOLOTHURN—State Archives.

SPEYER—Cathedral Chapter Archives.

SPOLETO—Campello Archives.

SUBIACO—Archives of St. Scholastica.

TRENT—Library of the Episcopal Seminary.

TURIN—State Archives.

URBINO—Archiepiscopal Archives.

VENICE—State Archives.

VIENNA—Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

——— State Archives.

——— Archives of the Ministry of Education.

COMPLETE TITLES OF BOOKS QUOTED IN VOLUMES XXXV.-XL.

- Abhandlungen der Kgl. bayr. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-philol. u. hist. Kl. Munich, 1827 *seqq.*
- Abhandlungen der Kgl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Berlin, 1804 *seqq.*
- Accademia Reale delle scienze di Torino. Atti. Torino, 1865 *seq.* Memorie. Torino, 1759 *seqq.*
- Acta Benedicti XIV. sive nondum sive sparsim edita nunc primum collecta cura Raphaelis de Martinis. 2 Vols. Neapoli, 1894.
- Acta historico-ecclesiastica saeculi XIX. Ed. by G. Fr. H. Rheinwald, 2 Vols. Hamburg, 1838.
- Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana vindicata. Antverpiae, 1755 *seqq.*
- Adinolfi, P.*, Roma nell'età di mezzo. 2 Vols. Torino-Roma, 1881.
- Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie. Vols. 1-56. Leipzig, 1875 *seqq.*
- Almeida, Fortunato de*, Historia da Igreja em Portugal. 4 Vols. Coimbra, 1910-1921.
- Amelung, Walther*, Die Skulpturen des Vatikanischen Museums. 4 Vols. Berlin, 1903-1908.
- Analecta Augustiniana, divo parenti Augustino dicata. Vol. 1 *seqq.* Romae, 1905 *seq.*
- Analecta iuris pontificii. Dissertations sur divers sujets de droit canonique, liturgie et théologie. Rome, 1855 *seqq.*
- Anecdotes sur l'état de la religion dans la Chine [by *Villiermaule*]. 7 Vols. Paris, 1733-1742.
- Annalen des Hist. Vereins für den Niederrhein. Köln, 1855 *seq.*
- Annales de la Société des soi-disants Jésuites. Paris, 1764-1771.
- Annales révolutionnaires. Paris, 1908 *seqq.*
- Annuario Pontificio. Roma, 1716 *seqq.*
- Antonianum. Periodicum philosophico-theol. trimestre. Romae, 1926 *seq.*
- Antonini, Prosp.*, Il Friuli orientale. Milano, 1865.
- Archief voor de Geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht. Utrecht, 1874 *seq.*
- Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht. Innsbruck, 1857 *seqq.*
- Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters. Berlin and Freiburg, 1885 *seqq.*
- Archiv für österreichische Geschichte. Vienna, 1865 *seqq.*
- Archivalische Zeitschrift. Stuttgart, 1876 *seqq.*
- Archivio della Reale Società Romana di storia patria. Roma, 1878 *seqq.*
- Archivio storico italiano. 5^a serie. Firenze, 1842 *seqq.*
- Archivio storico per le provincie Napolitane. Napoli, 1876 *seqq.*
- Arneth, Alf. v.*, Geschichte Maria Theresias. 10 Vols. Vienna, 1863-1879.

- Arneth, Alfr. v.*, Maria Theresia und Joseph II. Ihre Korrespondenz. Vienna, 1867.
- Arneth, Alfr. v.*, Briefe der Kaiserin Maria Theresia an ihre Kinder und Freunde. Vienna, 1881.
- Arneth, Alfr. v.*, Joseph II. und Leopold von Toskana. Ihr Briefwechsel 1781—1790. Vienna, 1872.
- Arneth, Alfr. v.*, Joseph II. und Katharina von Russland. Ihr Briefwechsel. Vienna, 1869.
- Arte, L'*, Continuazione dell'Archivio storico dell'arte. Roma, 1898 *seqq.*
- Arte e storia.* Firenze, 1882 *seqq.*
- Assemanus, Ios. Sim.*, Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus. 3 Vols. Romae, 1756—59.
- Astráin, A.*, Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España. 7 Vols. Madrid, 1902—1925.
- Atti dell'assemblea degli arcivescovi e vescovi tenuta in Firenze 1787.* 7 Vols. Firenze, 1788.
- Atti della Reale Accademia nazionale dei Lincei.* Roma. (Memorie 1870 *seq.*; Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 1885 *seqq.*; Rendiconti, 1901 *seqq.*)
- Atti e decreti del concilio diocesano di Pistoia.* Paris, 1788.
- Aulard, F. A.*, La Société des Jacobins. 6 Vols. Paris, 1889—1897.
- Aulard, A.*, Histoire politique de la Révolution. Paris, 5th ed., 1921.
- Azara, El espíritu de D. José Nicolas de Azara descubierto en su correspondencia epistolar con D. Manuel de Roda.* 3 Vols. Madrid, 1846.
- Baldassari, Geschichte der Wegführung und Gefangenschaft Pius' VI.* Trans. by *F. N. Steck.* Tübingen, 1844.
- Barbier de Montault, Les musées et galeries de Rome.* Catalogue général. Rome, 1870.
- Barbier de Montault, Œuvres complètes.* 6 Vols. Poitiers et Paris, 1889—1890.
- Barruel, Aug.*, Collection ecclésiastique. 14 Vols. Paris, 1791—3.
- Baudrillart, A.*, De Cardinalis Quirini vita et operibus. Parisiis, 1899.
- Bauer, A. F.*, Ausführliche Geschichte der Reise des Pabstes Pius VI. (Braschi) von Rom nach Wien und der Rückreise von Wien nach Rom. 2 Parts. Vienna, 1782.
- Bäumer, Suitbert,* Geschichte des Breviers. Freiburg, 1895.
- Baumgarten, Herm.*, Geschichte Spaniens zur Zeit der französischen Revolution. Berlin, 1861.
- Baumgartner, A.*, Geschichte der Weltliteratur. Vol. 5: Die französische Literatur. Vol. 6: Die italienische Literatur. Freiburg, 1905 and 1911.
- Bayer, F. J.*, Das Papstbuch. Munich, 1925.
- Beani, G.*, I vescovi di Pistoia e Prato. Pistoia, 1881.
- Beccatini, Franc.*, Storia di Pio VI. Venezia, 1801.
- Beer, Adolf,* Die erste Teilung Polens. 2 Vols. Vienna, 1873.

- Berdtel, Ignaz*, Kirchliche Zustände in den kaiserl. österr. Staaten. Vienna, 1849.
- Benassi, Guglielmo du Tillot*, un ministro riformatore del secolo XVIII. Parma, 1924.
- Bender, Jos.*, Geschichte der philosophisch-theologischen Studien in Ermland. Braunsberg, 1868.
- Benedetti, Aug.*, La diplomazia pontificia e la prima spartizione della Polonia. Pistoia, 1896.
- Benedicti XIV.*, *P. O. M.*, Opera omnia. 17 Vols. Prati, 1842-1856.
- Benedicti XIV.*, *Acta v. Acta.*
- Benigni, U.*, Die Getreidepolitik der Päpste. German trans. by *R. Birner*, ed. by *G. Ruhland*. Berlin, 1898.
- Berger, Hans*, Die religiösen Kulte der französischen Revolution. Freiburg, 1914.
- Beringer, I. A.*, Peter A. von Verschaffelt. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Strassburg, 1902.
- Bernardini, B.*, Descrizione del nuovo dipartimento de' rioni di Roma fatto per ordine di N. S. Papa Benedetto XIV. Roma, 1744.
- [*Biker*], *J. F. J.*, Collecção dos negocios de Roma no reinado de el-Rey D. José I., ministerio de Marquez de Pombal e pontificados de Benedicto XIV. e Clemente XIII. 2 Vols. Lisbon, 1874-5.
- Bildi, K. v.*, Svenska Minnen och Marken i Roma. Stockholm, 1900.
- Bilychnis*, Rivista di studi religiosi. Roma, 1912 *seqq.*
- Bloetzer, Jos.*, Die Katholikenemanzipation in Grossbritannien und Irland. Freiburg, 1905.
- Blume, Fr.*, Iter Italicum. 4 Vols. Halle, 1824 *seq.*
- [*Boero*], Osservazioni sopra l'istoria del pontificato di Clemente XIV. scritta dal *P. A. Theiner*. 2nd ed. Monza, 1854.
- Boehmer, Heinrich*, Die Jesuiten. 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1913.
- Bollettino, d'arte.* Roma, 1907 *seqq.*
- Bonenfant P.*, La suppression de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les Pays-Bas autrichiens. Bruxelles, 1925.
- Boullé, L. J. A. de*, Souvenirs et Fragments pour servir aux Mémoires de ma vie et de mon temps 1769-1812. Published by Kermaingant. 3 Vols. Paris, 1906-1911.
- Boulot, G.*, Le général Duphot 1769-1797. Paris, 1908.
- Bourgin, Georges*, La France et Rome de 1788 à 1797. Paris, 1909.
- [*Bourgoing, Jean-François*], Mémoires historiques et philosophiques sur Pie VI. et son Pontificat, jusqu'à sa retraite en Toscane. 2 Vols. Paris, [1799].
- Boutry, Maur.*, Choiseul à Rome. Lettres et mémoires inédites 1754-7. Introduction par André Hallays. Paris, 1895.
- Boutry, Maur.*, Une créature du card. Dubois. Intrigues du card. Tencin. Paris, 1902.
- Bouvier, Félix*, Bonaparte en Italie 1796. Paris, 1899.
- Brabo*, Colección de los documentos relativos a la expulsión de los Jesuitas de la República Argentina y del Paraguay. Madrid, 1872.

- Braun, Joh. Wilh.*, Die Ehrenrettung Muratoris durch Papst Benedikt XIV. Trier, 1838.
- Braun, Jos.*, Der christliche Altar. 2 Vols. Munich, 1924.
- Bridier, Abbé*, Msgr. de Salamon, Mémoires inédits de l'internonce à Paris pendant la Révolution. Paris, 1890.
- Briefwechsel zwischen Klemens Wenzeslaus und Niklas von Hontheim. Frankfurt a. M., 1813.
- Brigidi, E. A.*, Giacobini e Realisti o il Viva Maria! Storia del 1799 in Toscana. Siena, 1882.
- Brimont, Vicomte de*, Le cardinal de la Rochefoucauld et l'ambassade de Rome 1743 à 1748. Paris, 1913.
- Brinckmann, A. E.*, Die Baukunst des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in den romanischen Ländern. 5th ed. Berlin-Neubabelsberg, 1929.
- Bringmann, Augustin, P.* Florian Baucke, ein deutscher Missionär in Paraguay (1749-1768). Freiburg, 1908.
- Brogie, Le Duc de*, Le secret du Roi. Correspondance secrète de Louis XV. avec ses agents diplomatiques. Vol. 2: 1752-1774. Paris, 1878.
- Brom, G.*, Archivalia in Italië. 3 Vols. 's Gravenhage, 1908-1914.
- Brosch, M.*, Geschichte des Kirchenstaates. Vol. 2. Gotha, 1882.
- Brosses, Ch. de*: Lettres d'Italie, 2 Vols. Paris, 1928.
- Brou, Al.*, Les jésuites de la légende. Paris, 1907.
- Brou, Al.*, Le dix-huitième siècle littéraire. 3 Vols. Paris, 1923-7.
- Brucker, J. [S. J.]*, La Compagnie de Jésus. Paris, 1919.
- Brunner, Seb.*, Die theologische Dienerschaft am Hofe Josephs II. Vienna, 1868.
- Brunner, Seb.*, Die Mysterien der Aufklärung, 1770-1800. Mainz, 1869.
- Brunner, Seb.*, Der Humor in der Diplomatie und Regierungskunde des 18. Jahrhunderts. 2 Vols. Vienna, 1872.
- Buchberger, Mich.*, Kirchliches Handlexikon. 2 Vols. Freiburg, 1907-1912.
- Buchez, Phil. Jos. Benj.*, et *Roux, P. C.*, Histoire parlementaire de la Révolution française. 40 Vols. Paris, 1834-8.
- Bullarii Romani Continuatio SS. Pontificum Benedicti XIV., Clementis XIII., Clementis XIV., Pii VI., Pii VII., Leonis XII. et Pii VIII. Constitutiones . . . complectens. Tom. tertius: Clementis XIII. continens pontificatum. Prati, 1842. Tom. quintus: Clemens XIV. *Ibid.*, 1845. Tom. sextus, Pars. 1-3: Pius VI. *Ibid.*, 1847-9.
- Bullarium Capucinatorum: Michael a Tugio, Bullarium ordinis FF. Minor. s. p. Francisci capucinatorum. 7 Vols. Romae, 1740-1752.
- Bullettin de la Commission Royale d'histoire de l'Académie de Belgique. Bruxelles, 1834 *seqq.*
- Burton, Edwin H.*, The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner. London, 1909.

- Cahen, Léon*, Les querelles religieuses et parlementaires sous Louis XV. Paris, 1913.
- Calà-Ulloa, Pietro*, Di Bernardo Tanucci e de' suoi tempi. Napoli, 1875.
- Calisse, Carlo*, Storia di Civitavecchia. Firenze, 1898.
- Calvi, Fel.*, Curiosità storiche e diplomatiche del sec. XVIII. Milano, 1878.
- Cancellieri, Franc.*, Il Mercato, il lago dell'Acqua Vergine ed il Palazzo Pamfiliano nel Circo Agonale detto volgarmente Piazza Navona. Roma, 1811.
- Cancellieri, Franc.*, De secretariis basilicae Vaticanae veteris ac novae. Romae, 1786.
- Cancellieri, Franc.*, Storia dei solenni possessi dei Sommi Pontefici detti anticamente processi o processioni dopo la loro coronazione dalla basilica Vaticana alla Lateranense. Roma, 1802.
- Cantoni, F.*, Lambertiniana, ossia i motti di Papa Lambertini. Bologna, 1920.
- Cappelletti, G.*, Le chiese d'Italia dalla loro origine sino ai nostri giorni. 21 Vols. Venezia, 1844-1870.
- [*Caracciolo*], Vita del papa Benedetto XIV. Prospero Lambertini con note istruttive. Traduzione dal francese. Venezia, 1783.
- Carayon, Aug.*, Documents inédits, Doc. 9: Le Père Ricci et la suppression de la Compagnie en 1773. Paris, 1869.
- Carayon, Aug.*, Bibliographie hist. de la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris, 1864.
- Carini, Isid.*, La Biblioteca Vaticana, proprietà della Sede Apostolica. Roma, 1893.
- Carlyle, Thomas*, The French Revolution. 3 Vols. London, 1842.
- Carutti, D.*, Storia della diplomazia della corte di Savoia. 4 Vols. Torino, 1875-1880.
- Cavazza, F.*, Le scuole dell'antico studio Bolognese. Milano, 1896.
- Cecchetti, Bart.*, La Repubblica di Venezia e la Corte di Roma nei rapporti della religione. 2 Vols. Venezia, 1874.
- Cerroti, Fr.*, Lettere e memorie autografe ed inedite di artisti. Roma, 1869.
- Champion, E.*, La France en 1789 d'après les cahiers des États Généraux. Paris, 1897.
- Champion, E.*, La séparation de l'Église et de l'État en 1794. Introduction à l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution franç. Paris, 1903.
- Chantre y Herrera*, Historia de las Misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el Marañón español 1637-1767. Madrid, 1901.
- Chossat, Marcel*, Les jésuites et leurs œuvres à Avignon 1553-1768. Avignon, 1896.
- Cibrario, Luigi*, Lettere inedite di Santi, Papi, Principi, illustri guerrieri e letterati. Torino, 1861.
- Civiltà Cattolica. Roma, 1850 *seqq.*
- Colagrossi, P.*, L'Anfiteatro Flavio. Firenze, 1913.

- Colección general de las providencias hasta aquí tomadas por el Gobierno sobre el estrañamiento y ocupación de temporalidades de los Regulares de la Compañía. Vol. 1. Madrid, 1767.
- Colección de los artículos de La Esperanza sobre la historia del reinado de Carlos III., escrita por D. A. Ferrer del Río. Madrid, 1859.
- Collecção dos negocios de Roma v. [*Biker*].
- Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, seu decreta, instructiones, rescripta pro apostolicis missionibus. Romae, 1907.
- Colletta, P.*, Storia del reame di Napoli dal 1734 sino al 1825. Napoli, 1861.
- Collombet, Fr. Z.*, Histoire critique et générale de la suppression des jésuites au XVIII^e siècle. Lyon-Paris, 1846.
- Coloma, Luis*, Retratos de antaño. Madrid, 1895.
- Concina, Daniel*, Theologia christiana dogmatico-moralis. Roma e Venezia, 1749.
- Conforti, Luigi*, I Gesuiti nel regno delle due Sicilie e in Italia. Napoli, 1887.
- Coppi, A.*, Annali d'Italia dal 1750. Vol. I. (1750-1796). Roma, 1824.
- Cordara-Albertotti*, De suppressione Societatis Iesu Commentarii. Padova, 1923-5.
- Correspondance des Directeurs de l'Académie de France à Rome, éd. p. *Anatole de Montaiglon* et *Jules Guiffrey*. Vols. 15-16. Paris, 1907.
- Correspondant, Le. Paris, 1843 seq.
- Corsi, C.*, Fogli volanti. Venezia, 1889.
- Coxe, William*, Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the house of Bourbon from the accession of Philip the Fifth. London, 1813.
- Crétineau-Joly, J.*, Clément XIV. et les jésuites. Paris, 1847.
- Crétineau-Joly, J.*, Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus. 6 Vols. Paris-Lyon, 1851.
- Crousaz-Crétat, P. de*, L'Église et l'État ou les deux puissances au XVIII^e siècle (1715-1789). Paris, 1893.
- Crousaz-Crétat, P. de*, Paris sous Louis XIV. 2 Vols. Paris, 1922-3.
- Ceuvas, Mariano*, Historia de la Iglesia en México. 5 Vols. Tlalpam (Mexico), 1921-8.
- Cupis, C. de*, Le vicende dell'agricoltura e della pastorizia nell' Agro Romano e l'Annona di Roma. Roma, 1911.
- Czoernig, Carl v.*, Das Land Görz und Gradisca. 2 Vols. Vienna, 1873.
- Danvila y Collado, Man.*, Reinado de Carlos III. Madrid, 1892 seq.
- Debidour, A.*, Histoire des rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870. Paris, 1898.

- Deinhardt, Wilhelm*, Der Jansenismus in deutschen Landen. (Münchener Studien zur hist. Theologie 8.) Munich, 1929.
- Delarc, O.*, L'Église de Paris pendant la Révolution française 1789-1801. 3 Vols. Paris, 1895-8.
- Delaunay, L.*, Un ami de Benoît XIV., le prieur Bouget. Angers, 1928.
- Dengel, I. Ph.*, Die politische und kirchliche Tätigkeit des Msgr. Josef Garampi in Deutschland 1761-3. Rome, 1905.
- Denza*, Pubblicazioni della Specola Vaticana. Vol. 1. Roma, 1891.
- Descrizione delle statue, bassorilievi, busti, altri antichi monumenti e quadri de' più celebri pennelli che si custodiscono ne' palazzi del Campidoglio. 3^a ediz. Roma, 1775.
- Deutsche Rundschau. Ed. by *Rodenberg*. Berlin, 1874 seq.
- Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques publié p. *A. Baudrillart, Alb. Vogt et Urb. Rouziès*. Paris, 1909 seq.
- Dictionnaire de théologie catholique. Ed. by *l'acant-Mangenot*. Paris, 1903 seq.
- Diendorfer, I. E.*, Die Aufhebung des Jesuitenordens im Bistum Passau. Passau, 1891.
- Dilgskron, Karl*, Leben des heiligen Bischofs und Kirchenlehrers Alfonsus Maria de Liguori. 2 Vols. Regensburg, 1887.
- Dini, Gius.*, Diario pieno e distinto del viaggio fatto a Vienna dal Sommo Pontefice Pio Papa Sesto. Roma, 1782.
- Diplomatische Korrespondenz aus den Jahren 1759 und 1760 betreffs die Bestrafung und Ausweisung der Jesuiten aus Portugal. Göttingen, 1850.
- Doeberl, Michael*, Entwicklungsgeschichte Bayerns. 3 Vols. Munich, 1916-1931.
- Dohm, Chr. Wilh.*, Denkwürdigkeiten meiner Zeit. 5 Vols. Hannover, 1814-19.
- Dohme, Robert*, Kunst und Künstler der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. 2 Vols. Leipzig, 1886.
- Dolfi, P. I.*, Cronologia delle famiglie nobili di Bologna. Bologna, 1670.
- Döllinger, I. I. I.*, Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Kulturgeschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte. Vol. 3. Regensburg-Vienna, 1882.
- Döllinger-Hortig*, Handbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte. 3 Vols. Landshut, 1827-8.
- Domarus, K. v.*, Pietro Bracci. Strassburg, 1915.
- Droysen, I. G.*, Geschichte der preussischen Politik. 14 Vols. Berlin, 1855-1886.
- Dufourcq, Alb.*, Le régime jacobin en Italie. Étude sur la République Romaine 1798-9. Paris, 1900.
- Duhr, B., S. J.*, Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge. Vol. 4. Regensburg, 1928.
- Duhr, B., S. J.*, Jesuitenfabeln. 4th ed. Freiburg, 1904.
- Duhr, B., S. J.*, Pombal (Stimmen aus Maria Laach. Supplementary Vol. 14, 53rd number). Freiburg, 1892.

- [*Dupac de Bellegarde*], Histoire abrégée de l'église métropolitaine d'Utrecht, principalement depuis la révolution arrivée dans les VII Provinces-Unies des Pays-Bas sous Philippe II. jusqu'à présent. Utrecht, 1765.
- Durand de Maillane*, Histoire apologétique du Comité ecclésiastique de l'Assemblée Nationale. Paris, 1791.
- Échos d'Orient, revue bimestrielle de théologie, de droit canonique, de liturgie, d'archéologie, d'histoire et de géographie orientales. Paris, 1897 *seq.*
- Éguilles*, Mémoires du Président d'Éguilles sur le parlement d'Aix et les jésuites, in *Carayon*, Documents inédits concernant la Compagnie de Jésus. Vol. 8. Poitiers, 1867.
- Ehrenberg, Hermann*, Italienische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Provinz Ostpreussen. Königsberg, 1895.
- Ehrengabe deutscher Wissenschaft, dargeboten von katholischen Gelehrten. Johann Georg Herzog zu Sachsen zum 50. Geburtstag gewidmet. Ed. by *Fr. Fessler*. Freiburg, 1920.
- Eichhorn, Karl Friedr.*, Deutsche Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte. Göttingen, 1808–1823.
- Eisler, Alex.*, Das Veto der katholischen Staaten bei der Papstwahl. Vienna, 1907.
- Endres, Fritz*, Errichtung der Münchener Nuntiatur. (Diss.). Erlangen, 1908.
- Engelhardt, Z.*, The Missions and Missionaries of California. San Francisco, 1908–1913.
- Enrich, Franc.*, Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Chile. Barcelona, 1891.
- Études, publ. par des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus. 6th series. Paris, 1856 *seq.*
- Fanfulla della Domenica. Roma, 1879 *seqq.*
- Fantuzzi, Giov.*, Memorie della vita del Cardinal Aldovrandi. Bologna, 1783.
- Fassbinder, Maria*, Der Jesuitenstaat in Paraguay. Halle, 1926.
- Fea, C. D.*, Storia delle Acque in Roma e dei condotti. Roma, 1832.
- Feller, F. X.*, Dictionnaire historique. Liège, 1797.
- [*Feller*], Coup d'œil sur le congrès d'Ems. [Düsseldorf, 1788].
- Fénelon, Franc. de Salignac de la Mothe*, Œuvres. 8 Vols. Paris, 1851.
- Féret, P.*, La Faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres. Époque moderne. Paris, 1900 *seqq.*
- Ferrer del Rio*, Historia de Carlos III. Madrid, 1856.
- Ferrés, Carlos*, Epoca Colonial. La Compañía de Jesús en Montevideo. Barcelona, 1919.
- Fitte, Siegfried*, Religion und Politik vor und während des Siebenjährigen Krieges. (Programm.). Berlin, 1899.
- Fleury, Claud.*, Historia ecclesiastica. 91 Vols. Augsburg, 1768 *seqq.*
- Focillon, H.*, G. B. Piranesi. Paris, 1918.

- Foley, Henry*, Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. 8 Vols. London, 1875-1883.
- Fontes rerum Austriacarum*. Oesterreich. Geschichtsquellen. 2nd part, Vol. I *seqq.* Vienna, 1855 *seq.*
- Forcella, V.*, Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edifici di Roma dal secolo XI. fino ai giorni nostri. 14 Vols. Roma, 1869-1885.
- Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte*. Vol. I *seqq.* Leipzig, 1888 *seqq.*
- Forst-Battaglia, Otto*, Stanislaw August Poniatowski und der Ausgang des alten Polenstaates. Berlin, [1927].
- Francheu, Pie VI.* dans les prisons du Dauphiné. Montreuil, 1892.
- Franz, H.*, Studien zur kirchlichen Reform Josephs II., mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des vorderösterreichischen Breisgaus. Freiburg, 1908.
- Frédéric le Grand*, (Œuvres de Frédéric II. le Grand. Ed. by I. D. E. Preuss. Berlin, 1846 *seqq.*
- Frediani*, Lettere interessanti di Clemente XIV. Firenze, 1847.
- Frey, Dagobert*, Michelangelo-Studien. Vienna, 1920.
- Friedrich, Joh.*, Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts. Munich, 1876.
- [*Gagarin*], Les Jésuites de la Russie : (1) La Compagnie de Jésus conservée en Russie après la suppression de 1772. Récit d'un jésuite. (2) Un nonce du Pape à la cour de Catherine II. Mémoires d'Archetti. Paris, 1872.
- Galletti, P. L.*, Memorie per servire alla storia della vita del card. D. Passionei. Roma, 1762.
- Gams, P. B.*, Series episcoporum Ecclesiae catholicae quotquot innotuerunt a beato Petro apostolo. Ratisbonae, 1873.
- Gandino, Fr.*, Ambasceria di Marco Foscarini a Torino 1741-2. Venezia, 1892.
- Garampi, G.*, Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie. Con appendice di documenti. [Roma, 1766].
- Gazier, A.*, Une suite à l'histoire de Port-Royal: Jeanne de Boisgnoirel et Christophe de Beaumont. Paris, 1900.
- Gelli, Aganore*, Memorie scritte da Scipione de' Ricci. 2 Vols. Firenze, 1865.
- Gendry, Jules*, Pie VI., sa vie — son pontificat. 2 Vols. Paris, no date of publication [1907].
- Gerard, John*, Stonyhurst College. Its life beyond the seas, 1592-1794, and on English soil, 1794-1894. Belfast, 1894.
- Gerdil, G.*, Opere edite ed inedite. 20 parts in 10 Vols. Roma, 1806-1821.
- Giesecke, Albert*, G. P. Piranesi. Leipzig, 1911.
- Günzel, Joseph A.*, Kirchenhistorische Schriften. Vienna, 1872.
- Giornale ligustico di archeologia, storia e letteratura*. Genova, 1874 *seqq.*
- Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, diretto e redatto da A. Graf, F. Novati, R. Renier. Roma-Torino-Firenze, 1883 *seqq.*
- Giovagnoli, R.*, Leggende Romane. Papa Lambertini. Roma, 1887.

- Gispert, M.*, Historia de las misiones dominicanas en el Tungkin. Avila, 1928.
- Gla, Dietr.*, Systematisch geordnetes Repertorium der katholischen theologischen Literatur. 2 Vols. Paderborn, 1895 and 1904.
- Glasson, E.*, Histoire du droit et des institutions de la France. 8 Vols. Paris, 1887-1903.
- Godlewski, Michael*, Monumenta ecclesiastica Petropolitana. 3 Vols. Petropoli, 1906 *seqq.*
- Gomes, F. L.*, Le Marquis de Pombal. Esquisse de sa vie publique. Lisbon, 1869.
- Gorce, P. de la*, Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française. 5 Vols. 5th ed. Paris, 1919.
- Goethe-Jahrbuch*, ed. by *L. Geiger*. Frankfurt a M., 1880 *seqq.*
- Gothein, Eberhard*, Der Breisgau unter Maria Theresia und Joseph II. Heidelberg, 1907.
- Gothein, Eberhard*, Der christlich-soziale Staat der Jesuiten in Paraguay. Leipzig, 1883.
- Gothein, M. L.*, Geschichte der Gartenkunst. 2 Vols. Jena, 1914.
- Goujet, Éloge historique*. La Haye, 1763.
- Goyau, Georges*, L'Allemagne religieuse. 4 Vols. Paris, 1905-9.
- Grandmaison, Geoffroy de*, Madame Louise de France, la vénérable Thérèse de Saint-Augustin (1737-1787). Paris, 1922.
- Gregorovius, Ferd.*, Die Grabmäler der römischen Päpste. Leipzig, 1857.
- Grimani, Risposte di P. Grimani, Doge di Venezia, ad officii di Ambasciatori ed altri 1751-2*. Venezia, 1856.
- Grünhagen, C.*, Schlesien unter Friedrich d. Gr. 2 Vols. Breslau, 1890-2.
- Guardione, Fr.*, L'espulsione dei Gesuiti dal regno delle due Sicilie. Catania, 1907.
- Guarnacci, M.*, Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium a Clemente X. usque ad Clementem XII. 2 Vols. Romae, 1751.
- Guglia, Eugen*, Die konservativen Elemente Frankreichs am Vorabend der Revolution. Gotha, 1890.
- Guglia, Eugen*, Leopold von Rankes Leben und Werke. Leipzig, 1893.
- Guglielmotti, Alb.*, Gli ultimi fatti della squadra romana, da Corfù all'Egitto 1700-1807. Roma, 1884.
- Guilday, P.*, Life and Times of John Carroll, Archbishop of Baltimore. New York, 1922.
- Guilleaume, D. A.*, Vollständige Sammlung aller Briefe, Unter-richte, Gewaltertheilungen und Verhandlungen Unseres Heiligen Vaters Pius Papst VI. in Betreff der französischen Staatsumwälzung. Veranstalet und nach der Römischen Ausgabe übersetzt. 2 Vols. Münster in Westfalen, 1797.
- Guiot, L.*, La mission de Su-Tschuen au XVIII^e siècle. Vie et apostolat de Msgr. Pottier, son fondateur, évêque d'Agathopolis. Paris, 1892.
- Gurlitt, Cornelius*, Geschichte des Barockstiles in Italien. Stuttgart, 1887.

- Handbuch aller unter der Regierung des Kaisers Joseph II. für die k. k. Erbländer ergangenen Verordnungen und Gesetze, von *Joseph Kropatschek*. 18 Vols. Vienna, 1785-1790.
- Hanisch, Erdm.*, Geschichte Polens. Bonn, 1923.
- Harder, Ernst*, Der Einfluss Portugals bei der Wahl Pius' VI. Königsberg, 1882.
- Hardy, G.*, Le cardinal Fleury et le mouvement janséniste. Paris, 1925.
- Harnack, Adolf*, Geschichte der Kgl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. 3 Vols. Berlin, 1900.
- Harnack, Otto*, Deutsches Kunstleben in Rom im Zeitalter der Klassik. Weimar, 1896.
- Hartwig, Theodor*, Der Uebertritt des Erbprinzen Friedrich von Hessen-Kassel zum Katholizismus. Kassel, 1870.
- Hase, Karl*, Rosen-Vorlesungen kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts. 6 Vols. Leipzig, 1880.
- Hauteœur, C. d'*, Journal d'émigration du comte d'Espinchal. Paris, 1912.
- Hauteœur, L.*, Rome et la renaissance de l'antiquité à la fin du XVIII^e siècle. Paris, 1912.
- Heeckeren, E. de*, Correspondance de Benoît XIV. (with Tencin). 2 Vols. Paris, 1912.
- Hegemann, Ottm.*, Friedrich der Grosse und die katholische Kirche in den reichsrechtlichen Territorien Preussens. Munich, 1904.
- Heigel, K. Th.*, Der österreichische Erbfolgestreit und die Kaiserwahl Karls VII. Nördlingen, 1877.
- Heimbucher, M.*, Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche. 3 Vols. 2nd ed. Paderborn, 1907-8.
- Helbig, W.*, Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom. 2 Vols. Leipzig, 1912.
- Hergenröther, Jos.*, Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte. 4 Vols. 5th ed. Freiburg, 1911-13.
- Hergenröther, Jos.*, Der Kirchenstaat seit der französischen Revolution. Freiburg, 1860.
- Hergenröther, Jos.*, Kardinal Maury. Würzburg, 1878.
- Hergenröther, Jos.*, Piemonts Unterhandlungen mit dem Heiligen Stuhl im 18. Jahrhundert. Würzburg, 1877.
- Hernández*, El extrañamiento de los Jesuitas del Río de la Plata y de las Misiones del Paraguay. Madrid, 1908.
- Herrmann, Ernst*, Geschichte des russischen Staates (Heeren-Ukert, Geschichte der europäischen Staaten. Vol. 5). Hamburg, 1853.
- Herzog-Hauck*, Real-Enzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. 24 Vols. Leipzig, 1896-1913.
- Hessenland, Zeitschrift für hessische Geschichte und Literatur. Kassel, 1887 *seqq.*
- Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft. Münster, 1880 *seq.*
- Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland. Vols. 1-169. Munich, 1838-1921.

- Hittmair, Rudolf*, Der josephinische Klostersturm im Lande ob der Enns. Freiburg, 1907.
- Hock-Bidermann*, Der österreichische Staatsrat, 1760–1848. Vienna, 1879.
- Hofmann, Walther v.*, Das Säkularisationsprojekt von 1743, Kaiser Karl VII. und die römische Kurie. Gotha, 1913.
- Höhler, Matth.*, Des kurtrierischen Rates Heinr. Aloys Arnoldi Tagbuch über die zu Ems gehaltene Zusammenkunft der vier Erzb. deutschen Herrn Deputierten. Mainz, 1915.
- Holzappel, Heribert*, Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens. Freiburg, 1909.
- Holzknacht, G.*, Ursprung und Herkunft der Reformideen Kaiser Josephs II. auf kirchlichem Gebiete. Innsbruck, 1914.
- [*Holzwarth*], Malagrida und Pombal. Regensburg, 1872.
- Hughes, Thomas*, History of the Society of Jesus in North America colonial and federal. Text 2 Vols. Documents 2 Vols. New York, 1907–1917.
- Huonder, Anton*, Deutsche Jesuitenmissionäre des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts. Freiburg, 1899.
- Hurter, H.*, Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae. 5 Vols. 3rd ed. Oeniponte, 1903–1913.
- Immich, Max*, Geschichte des europäischen Staatensystems von 1660 bis 1789. Munich–Berlin, 1905.
- Innocenti, Benedetto*, S. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio O. F. M., Prediche e lettere inedite. Quaracchi, 1915.
- Inquietudini de' Gesuiti*. 4 Vols. [No place of publication], 1764–9.
- Institutum Societatis Iesu*. 3 Vols. Florentiae, 1892–3.
- Isambert, F. A.*, Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises depuis l'an 420 jusqu'à la révolution de 1789. Paris, 1822 *seqq.*
- Isla, José Franc.*, Memorial en nombre de las cuatro Provincias de España de la Compañía de Jesús desterradas del reino a S. M. El Rey Don Carlos III., ed. *J. E. de Uriarte*. Madrid, 1882.
- Ius Pontificium: Iuris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide Pars I*. Vols. 1–7. Romae, 1886 *seq.*
- Jahrbuch der österreichischen Leo-Gesellschaft. Vienna, 1893 *seq.*
- Jansen, Joh. Laur.*, Der hl. Alfons Maria von Liguori und die Gesellschaft Jesu. Freiburg, 1920.
- Janssen, Joh.*, Zur Genesis der ersten Teilung Polens. Freiburg, 1865.
- Jemolo, Art. C.*, Il Giansenismo in Italia prima della Rivoluzione. Bari, 1928.
- Journal von und für Deutschland, ed. by *Goekingk*. Ellrich, 1784–1792.
- Justi, K.*, Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen. 2 Vols. Leipzig, 1898.

- Kaas, Ludwig*, Die geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit der katholischen Kirche in Preussen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. 2 Vols. Stuttgart, 1915-16.
- Karttunen, Lusi*, Les Nonciatures Apostoliques permanentes de 1650 à 1800, in *Annales Acad. Scient. Fennicae*, serie B, Vol. 5, No. 3. Genève (Helsinki), 1912.
- Katholik, Der. Zeitschrift für katholische Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben. Strassburg and Mainz, 1820 *seqq.*
- Katholische Bewegung in unseren Tagen. Würzburg, 1868 *seqq.*
- Katholischen Missionen, Die. Freiburg, 1873 *seqq.*, from 1923. Aachen-M.-Gladbach-Düsseldorf.
- Keusch, K.*, Die Aszetik des hl. Alfons von Liguori. Freiburg i. d. Schweiz, 1924.
- Kiefer, Jos.*, Die deputierten Bischöfe der Nationalversammlung und die Constitution civile du clergé in den Jahren 1790-2. (Diss.). Freiburg, 1903.
- Kink, Rudolf*, Geschichte der kaiserl. Universität zu Wien. 2 Vols. Vienna, 1854.
- Kirchenlexikon (Freiburger) oder Enzyklopädie der kathol. Theologie und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften. Ed. by *H. I. Wetzer* and *B. Welte*. 12 Vols. Freiburg, 1847-1856. 2nd ed., begun by *Joseph Card. Hergenröther*, continued by *Fr. Kaulen*. 12 Vols. Freiburg, 1882-1901.
- Kirsch, I. P.*, Kirchengeschichte. Vol. IV.: Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus, by *L. A. Veit*. Freiburg, 1931.
- Klausung*, Sammlung der neuesten Schriften, welche die Jesuiten in Portugal betreffen. Leipzig and Frankfurt, 1761.
- Knapp, Friedrich*, Die italienische Plastik vom XV. bis XVIII. Jahrhundert. Berlin, [1910].
- Korczok, Anton*, Die griechisch-katholische Kirche in Galizien. (Osteuropa-Institut in Breslau V. 1.). Leipzig-Berlin, 1921.
- Koser, Reinhold*, König Friedrich der Grosse. 2 Vols. Stuttgart and Berlin, 1903.
- Kosmopolis. St. Petersburg, 1887 *seqq.*
- Kraus, Fr. X.*, Briefe Benedikts XIV. an den Canonicus Francesco Peggì in Bologna (1727-1758). 2nd ed. Freiburg, 1888.
- Kraus, Fr. X.*, Roma sotterranea — Die römischen Katakomben. Freiburg, 1879.
- Kuckhoff, Jos.*, Die Geschichte des Tricoronatum. Köln, 1931.
- Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen. Innsbruck, 1904 *seqq.*
- Küntzel, Georg*, Fürst Kaunitz-Rittberg als Staatsmann. Frankfurt a M., 1923.
- Kuentziger, Jacques*, Fébronius et le Fébronianisme. Bruxelles, 1890.
- Kusej, I. R.*, Joseph II. und die äussere Kirchenverfassung Innerösterreichs (Stutz, Kirchenrechtl. Abh. 49-50). Stuttgart, 1908.
- Kwartalnik Historyczny. Vol. 26. Lemberg, 1912.

- Lafuente, Vic. de*, Historia eclesiástica de España. 6 Vols. Madrid, 1873.
- Lanciani, R.*, Storia degli scavi di Roma. Vols. 1-4. Roma, 1902-1913.
- Lanzi, Luigi*, Terni. Bergamo, 1910.
- Lapauze, Henri*, Histoire de l'Académie de France à Rome. 2 Vols. Paris, 1914.
- Launay, A.*, Histoire générale de la Société des Missions Étrangères. Paris, 1894.
- Lavisse, E.*, Histoire de la France contemporaine depuis la Révolution jusqu'à la paix 1919. Paris, 1921.
- Lebret, I. Fr.*, Magazin zum Gebrauche der Staaten- und Kirchengeschichte. 10 Vols. Ulm, 1771-1788.
- Leclercq, Henri*, Les Martyrs. 15 Vols. Paris, 1905-1924.
- Lector, L.*, Le conclave. Paris, 1894.
- Lehmann, M.*, Preussen und die katholische Kirche seit 1640. Vols. 1-9. Leipzig, 1878-1902.
- Lehnerd, Valentin*, Paul vom Kreuz. Innsbruck, 1926.
- Lehtonen, U. L.*, Die polnischen Provinzen Russlands unter Katharina II. in den Jahren 1772-1782. Trans. from the Finnish by *Gust. Schmidt*. Berlin, 1907.
- Lemmens, Leonh.*, Geschichte der Franziskanermissionen. Münster, 1928.
- Leo, H.*, Geschichte der italienischen Staaten. Halle, 1828-1832.
- Lescœur, Louis*, L'Église catholique en Pologne sous le Gouvernement russe. Paris, 1860.
- Letarouilly, P.*, Édifices de Rome moderne. Paris, 1825-1857.
- Letarouilly, P.*, Le Vatican. Paris, 1882.
- Lettere, brevi et chirografi di Benedetto XIV. per la città di Bologna. Bologna, 1749.
- Lettere inedite di uomini illustri *v. Nardinocchi*.
- Lettere di Sant'Alfonso Maria di Liguori. 3 Vols. Roma, 1887.
- Lettres de notre St. Père le Pape et de Sa Majesté l'Empereur. Roma, 1782.
- Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des missions étrangères par quelques missionnaires de la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris, 1707 *seqq.*
- Likowski, Ed.*, Geschichte des allmählichen Verfalls der unierten ruthenischen Kirche im 18. u. 19. Jahrhundert. German version by *Tloczynski*. 2 Vols. Posen, 1885 *seqq.*
- Lindet*, Correspondance de Thomas Lindet pendant la Constituante et la Législative (1789-1792), p. par *A. Montier*. Paris, 1899.
- Lombardi, Ant.*, Storia della letteratura italiana nel secolo XVIII. 6 Vols. Venezia, 1832.
- Lorenz, O.*, Joseph II. und die belgische Revolution. Vienna, 1862.
- Loret, Maciej*, Kościół katolicki a Katarzyna II., 1772-1784. (Monografie w zakresie dziejów nowożytnych, wyd. Szymon Askenazy. Vol. 12.) Warszawa-Kraków, 1910.

- Lübeck, Konrad*, Georgien und die katholische Kirche. Aachen, 1919.
- Lübeck, Konrad*, Die katholische Orientmission in ihrer Entwicklung dargestellt. Köln, 1917.
- Madelin, Louis*, France et Rome. Paris, 1913.
- Madelin, Louis*, La Révolution. Paris, 1924.
- Madelin, Louis*, La Révolution et Rome. Paris, 1913.
- Malamani, V.*, A. Canova. Milano [no date of publication].
- Männer, Ludwig*, Bayern vor und in der französischen Revolution. Berlin-Leipzig, 1927.
- Manzone. S. B.*, Frammenti di lettere inedite di Benedetto XIV. (Nozze-Publ.) Brà, 1890.
- Marini, Marino*, Memorie storico-critiche della città di S. Arcangelo. Roma, 1844.
- Maroni*, Lettere di Benedetto XIV. all'Arcidiacono Innocenzo Storani di Ancona, in Arch. stor. per le Marche e per l'Umbria. Vol. 2. Foligno, 1885.
- Marx, Jakob*, Geschichte des Erzstiftes Trier als Kurfürstentum und als Erzdiözese bis zum Jahre 1816. 5 Vols. Trier, 1858-1864.
- Massi, Pasquale*, Indicazione antiquaria del Pontificio Museo Pio-Clementino in Vaticano. Roma, 1792.
- Masson, Frédéric*, Le cardinal Bernis depuis son ministère, 1758 à 1794. Paris, 1884.
- Mathiez, Albert*, La Révolution et l'Église. Paris, 1910.
- Mathiez, Albert*, Robespierre et le culte de l'Être Suprême. Le Puy, 1910.
- Mathiez, Albert*, Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante. Paris, 1911.
- Matscheg, A.*, Storia politica di Europa dal cominciare del regno di Maria Teresa allo sciogliersi della convenzione di Kleinschnellendorf, studiata sui dispacci dei Veneti ambasciatori. Belluno, 1896.
- Maury, J. S.*, Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire. Paris, 1850.
- Mazzuchelli, G. M.*, Gli scrittori d'Italia. 2 Vols. Brescia, 1753 seq.
- Mejer, Otto*, Febronius. Tübingen, 1880.
- Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire. Paris-Rome, 1881 seqq.
- Mémoires de la Congrégation de la Mission. Vols. 1-9. Paris, 1863-6.
- Memorie di A. Canova scritte da *Antonio d'Este* e pubblicate per conto di *Alessandro d'Este*. Firenze, 1864.
- Memorie di religione, di morale e di letteratura. 79 Vols. Modena, 1822-1854.
- Memorie storiche sulle principali cagioni e circostanze della rivoluzione di Roma e di Napoli. [No place of publication; 1800].
- Menéndez y Pelayo, M.*, Historia de los heterodoxos españoles. 2 Vols. Madrid, 1880-1.

- Mention, L.*, Documents relatifs aux rapports du clergé avec la royauté de 1705 à 1789. Paris, 1903.
- Menzel, K. A.*, Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation bis zum Bundesakt. 12 Vols. Berlin, 1826–1848.
- Mercati, A.*, Raccolta di concordati in materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le autorità civili. Roma, 1919.
- Mergenthheim, L.*, Die Quinquennalfakultäten pro foro externo. 2 Vols. Stuttgart, 1908.
- Merkwürdige Nachrichten von den Jesuiten in Weissreussen 2nd ed. Frankfurt–Leipzig, 1786.
- Meyer, A. G.*, Canova. Bielefeld–Leipzig, 1898.
- Meyer, F. I. L.*, Darstellungen aus Italien. Berlin, 1792.
- Meyer, Hermann*, Der Plan eines evangelischen Fürstenbundes im Siebenjährigen Krieg. Celle, 1893.
- Michelet, Jules*, Histoire de la Révolution française. 7 Vols. Paris, 1847–1853.
- Mignanti, F. M.*, Istoria della sacrosanta patriarcale basilica Vaticana. Roma, 1867.
- Miguel, Manuel F.*, Jansenismo y regalismo en España (datos para la historia). Cartas al Sr. *Menéndez y Pelayo*. Valladolid, 1895.
- Missirini, M.*, Memorie per servire alla storia della Romana Accademia di S. Luca, fino alla morte di Antonio Canova. Roma, 1823.
- Missirini, M.*, Della vita di Antonio Canova. Prato, 1824.
- Mitrofanov, Pavel v.*, Joseph II. 2 Vols. Vienna–Leipzig, 1910.
- Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung. Innsbruck, 1880 *seqq.*
- Möhler, Joh. Ad.*, Kirchengeschichte, ed. by *P. B. Gams*. 3 Vols. Regensburg, 1867.
- Möhrs, Carl*, Friedrich der Grosse und der Kardinal Sinzendorf, Fürstbischof von Breslau. (Programm.) Königsberg, 1885.
- Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft. Leipzig, 1908 *seqq.*
- Monti, G. M.*, Due grandi riformatori del settecento : A. Genovese e G. M. Galanti. Firenze ; no date of publication [1926].
- Morel Fatio, Alfred*, Études sur l'Espagne. 2 Vols. Paris, 1896.
- Morochkin*, Die Jesuiten in Russland seit Katharina II. (Russisch). 3 Vols. St. Petersburg, 1867 and 1870.
- Moroni, G.*, Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica da S. Pietro sino ai nostri giorni. 109 Vols. Venezia, 1840–1879.
- Mortimer-Ternaux, Louis*, Histoire de la Terreur, 1792–4. 8 Vols. Paris, 1862–1881.
- Moschetti, A.*, Venezia e la elezione di Clemente XIII. Venezia, 1890.
- Mourret, F.*, Histoire générale de l'Église. 9 Vols. Paris, 1920–9.
- Mozzi, Luigi*, Storia delle rivoluzioni della chiesa d'Utrecht. Venezia, 1787.
- Muñoz, Ant.*, G. P. Piranesi. Roma, 1920.

- Münzenberger, E. F. A.*, Die Kirchengesetzgebung der französischen Revolution vom Jahre 1790. Würzburg, 1877.
- Muratori, L. A.*, Annali d'Italia dal principio dell'era volgare sino all'anno 1749. 12 Vols. Milano, 1742-9.
- Muratori, L. A.*, Epistolario di L. A. Muratori, edito da *M. Campanari*. 14 Vols. Modena, 1901-1922.
- Murr, Chr. G.*, Geschichte der Jesuiten in Portugal unter der Staatsverwaltung des Marquis von Pombal. New ed. by *I. L. Hafkemeyer*. Freiburg, 1910.
- Murr, Chr. G.*, Journal zur Kunstgeschichte und zur allgemeinen Literatur. 17 Vols. Nürnberg, 1775-1789.
- Mury, Paul*, Gabriel Malagrida de la Compagnie de Jésus. 2nd ed. Strasbourg, 1899.
- Müling, Jos.*, Phil. Gotth. Fürst Schaffgotsch, Bischof von Breslau, als Kirchenpolitiker. Breslau, 1916.
- Nardinocchi, Gregorio*, Lettere inedite di uomini illustri tratte dagli autografi della biblioteca di S. Gregorio al clivo di Scauro. (Estratto dal Giornale Arcadico). Roma, 1842.
- Navarrete, Ioa. Andr.*, De viris illustribus in Castella veteri Soc. Iesu ingressis et in Italia extinctis. Bologna, 1793.
- Navenne, F. de*, Rome et le Palais Farnèse pendant les trois derniers siècles. 2 Vols. Paris, 1923.
- Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift. Erlangen-Leipzig, 1890 *seqq.*
- Nicolai, N. M.*, De' bonificamenti delle terre pontine. Roma, 1800.
- [*Nivelle, J. A.*], Le cri de la foi ou Recueil des différens témoignages rendus par plusieurs facultéz, chapitres, curés, communautés ecclésiastiques et régulières au sujet de la constitution Unigenitus. 3 Vols. No place of publication, 1719.
- Noack, Fr.*, Deutsches Leben in Rom 1700 bis 1900. Stuttgart, 1907.
- Nonell, Jaime*, El V. P. José Pignatelli y la Compañía de Jesús en su extinción y restablecimiento. Manresa, 1893.
- Nouvelles lettres édifiantes des missions de la Chine et des Indes Orientales. Paris, 1818.
- Novaes, Gius. de*, Elementi della storia de' Sommi Pontefici da San Pietro sino al felicemente regnante Pio Papa VII. Vols. 13-16. Roma, 1822.
- Nuova Antologia, Rivista di lettere, scienze ed arti. Firenze-Roma, 1866 *seqq.*
- Nuova Rivista Storica. Milano, 1917 *seqq.*
- Ortolani, Sergio*, Santa Croce in Gerusalemme. Roma [1924].
- Österreichische Rundschau. Vienna, 1904 *seqq.*
- Ozzòla, Leandro*, Gian Paolo Pannini pittore. Torino, 1921.
- Pacca, Barth.*, Memorie storiche... sul di lui soggiorno in Germania... Roma, 1832.
- Pacca, Barth.*, Nachrichten über Portugal mit einem kurzen Bericht über die Nuntiatur zu Lissabon 1795-1802. Augsburg, 1836.

- Pacheco y de Leyva, Enrique*, El conclave de 1774 a 1775. (Junta para ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas. Escuela Española de arqueología e historia en Roma, Obras 2.) Madrid, 1915.
- Pacheco y de Leyva, Enrique*, La intervención de Floridablanca en la redacción del Breve para la supresión de los jesuitas. (Escuela Española de arqueología e historia en Roma, Obras 3.) Madrid, 1915.
- Palmieri, Gregorio*, Spicilegio Vaticano di documenti . . . estratti dagli archivi e dalla biblioteca della Sede Apostolica. Roma, 1890 *seqq.*
- Paolillo, Mariano*, L'espulsione dei Gesuiti dal regno delle Due Sicilie. Napoli, 1901.
- Pasini Frassoni, F.*, Essai d'armorial des Papes. Rome, 1906.
- Passeri*, Mémoires sur la Révolution d'Avignon et du Comtat Venaissin. Rome, 1793.
- [*Patouillet, Louis*], Dictionnaire des livres jansénistes. 4 Vols. Anvers, 1752.
- Paulinus a S. Bartholomaeo*, India orientalis christiana. Romae, 1794.
- Paulinus a S. Bartholomaeo*, Viaggio alle Indie orientali. Roma, 1796.
- Pelesz, Jul.*, Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom. 2 Vols. Vienna, 1878-1880.
- Peluso, B.*, Documenti intorno alle relazioni fra Stato e Chiesa nelle due Sicilie. I.: I progetti del concordato del 1741. Napoli, 1898.
- Peramas, Ios. Emm.*, De vita et moribus sex sacerdotum Paraguayorum. Faventiae, 1793.
- Petrucelli della Gattina*, Histoire diplomatique des conclaves. Vol. 4. Paris, 1864-6.
- Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, G.*, Der Salzburger Kongress und seine Auswirkung 1770-7. Paderborn, 1929.
- Pfűlf, Otto*, Die Anfänge der deutschen Provinz der neu erstandenen Gesellschaft Jesu. Freiburg, 1922.
- Piatti, G.*, Storia de' Pontefici. Venezia, 1768.
- Picot, Émile*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique pendant le dix-huitième siècle. 7 Vols. 3rd ed. Paris, 1853-7.
- Pichler, A.*, Alfons von Liguori. Regensburg, 1922.
- Pierling, P.*, La Russie et le Saint-Siège. Études diplomatiques. Vol. 4. Paris, 1907.
- Pierre, Victor*, La déportation ecclésiastique sous le Directoire. Paris, 1895.
- Pierre, Victor*, 18 Fructidor. Paris, 1893.
- Pierre, Victor*, La Terreur sous le Directoire. Paris, 1887.
- Pigge, Heinrich*, Die religiöse Toleranz Friedrichs des Grossen. Mainz, 1899.
- Piolet, J. B.*, Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle. 6 Vols. Paris, 1901.
- Pirenne, Henri*, Histoire de Belgique. 6 Vols. Bruxelles, 1922-6.

- Pisani, Paul*, L'Église de Paris et la Révolution. 4 Vols. Paris, 1908-1911.
- Platner-Bunsen*, Beschreibung der Stadt Rom, von Ernst Platner, Karl Bunsen, Eduard Gerhard und Wilhelm Röstel. 3 Vols. Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1829-1842.
- Poleni, G.*, Memorie istoriche della gran cupola del tempio Vaticano. Padova, 1748.
- Polybiblion. Revue bibliographique universelle. Paris, 1868 *seqq.*
- Poncelet, Alfr.*, La Compagnie de Jésus en Belgique. Aperçu historique. Bruxelles, 1907.
- Poncelet, Alfr.*, Nécrologe des jésuites de la province flandro-belge. Wetteren, 1931.
- Poncet, Charles*, Pie VI. à Valence, recueil de documents authentiques. Paris, 1869.
- Potter, De*, Vie de Ricci. Bruxelles, 1825.
- Poujoulat, J. J. Fr.*, Le Cardinal Maury, sa vie et ses œuvres. Paris, 1855.
- Pragmatische und aktenmässige Geschichte der zu München neu errichteten Nuntiatur. Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1787.
- Prat, J. M.*, Essai historique sur la destruction des ordres religieux en France au dix-huitième siècle. Paris, 1845.
- Pray, Georg*, Geschichte der Streitigkeiten über die chinesischen Gebräuche. 3 Vols. Augsburg, 1791.
- Préclin, E.*, Les jansénistes du XVIII^e siècle et la constitution civile du clergé. Le développement du richérisme. Sa propagation dans le bas clergé 1713 à 1791. Paris, 1929.
- Professione, A.*, Antonio Felice Zondadari e Bartolommeo Pacca. Milano, 1899.
- Przegląd Powszechny*, Miesięcznik poświęcony sprawom religijnym, kulturalnym i społecznym. (Periodical) Cracow, 1883.
- Quartalschrift, Römische, für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte. · Roma, 1887 *seqq.*
- Quartalschrift, Theologische. Tübingen, 1819 *seqq.*
- Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken. Ed. by the Preuss. Hist. Institut. Rome, 1898 *seqq.*
- Rabbath, Ant.*, Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire du christianisme en Orient. 2 Vols. Leipzig and Paris, 1905 and 1910.
- Ragguaglio della vita, azioni e virtù di Clemente XIV. Firenze, 1775.
- Ranke, L. v.*, Sämtliche Werke. Vols. 1-54. Leipzig, 1867-1890.
- Ranke, L. v.*, Zwölf Bücher preussischer Geschichte. (Vols. 25-9 of the "Sämtliche Werke") Leipzig, 1873-5.
- Ranke, L. v.*, Die deutschen Mächte und der Fürstenbund. (Vols. 31-2 of the "Sämtliche Werke") Leipzig, 1875.
- Ranke, L. v.*, Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten. 11th ed. Leipzig, 1907.

- Räss, A.*, Die Konvertiten seit der Reformation nach ihrem Leben und aus ihren Schriften dargestellt. 13 Vols. Freiburg, 1866–1880.
- Rassegna Nazionale. Firenze, 1879 *seqq.*
- Ravignan, F. X.*, Clément XIII. et Clément XIV. 2 Vols. Paris, 1854.
- Razón y Fe, Revista. Madrid, 1901 *seqq.*
- Recherches de science religieuse. Paris, 1910 *seqq.*
- Recueil des discours d'un des Messieurs des enquêtes au Parlement en toutes les chambres assemblées, prononcés le 17 avril et le 8 juillet 1761. Paris, 1761.
- Régnault, Émile*, Christophe de Beaumont, Archevêque de Paris (1703–1781). 2 Vols. Paris, 1882.
- Reinkens, Jos. Hub.*, Die Universität zu Breslau vor der Vereinigung der Frankfurter Viadrina mit der Leopoldina. Breslau, 1861.
- Renazzi, F. M.*, Notizie storiche degli antichi vicedomini del patriarcio Lateranense. Roma, 1784.
- Renazzi, F. M.*, Storia dell'Università degli studi di Roma, detta comunemente la Sapienza. 4 Vols. Roma, 1803 *seqq.*
- [*Reumont, Alfr. v.*], Ganganelli, Papst Klemens XIV. Seine Briefe und seine Zeit. Berlin, 1847.
- Reumont, Alfr. v.*, Geschichte Toskanas seit dem Ende des florentinischen Freistaates. 2 Vols. Gotha, 1876–7.
- Reumont, Alfr. v.*, Kleine historische Schriften. Gotha, 1882.
- Reusch, H.*, Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. 2 Vols. Bonn, 1883–5.
- Révolution Française, Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine. Paris, 1881 *seq.*
- Revue catholique d'Alsace. Strasbourg, 1859 *seqq.*
- Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique. Louvain, 1900 *seqq.*
- Revue d'histoire des Missions. Paris, 1924 *seqq.*
- Revue historique. Paris, 1876 *seq.*
- Revue pratique d'Apologétique. Paris, 1905 *seqq.*
- Revue des questions historiques. Paris, 1866 *seqq.*
- Ricard, Antoine*, Correspondance diplomatique et mémoires inédits du cardinal Maury. Lille, 1891.
- Ricci, Memorie, v. Gelli.*
- Richemont*, Correspondance secrète de l'abbé Salamon avec le cardinal Zelada. Paris, 1898.
- Richter, Gregorius*, Statuta maioris ecclesiae Fuldaviensis. Fulda, 1904.
- Rinieri, Ilario*, Il Caporale Trasteverino. Roma, 1904.
- Rinieri, Ilario*, Della rovina di una monarchia. Relazioni storiche tra Pio VI. e la corte di Napoli negli anni 1776–1799. Torino, 1901.
- Rivista del collegio araldico (Rivista araldica). Roma, 1903 *seqq.*
- Rivista Europea. 3ª serie. Milano, 1834–1847.
- Rivista d'Italia, Lettere, scienza ed arte. Roma, 1898 *seqq.*
- Rivista storica italiana. Torino, 1884 *seqq.*

- Robidou, Bertrand*, Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française. 2 Vols. Paris, 1889.
- Rochemonteix, Camille de*, Les jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVIII^e siècle. 3 Vols. Paris, 1906.
- Rochemonteix, Camille de*, Joseph Amiot et les derniers survivants de la Mission française à Pékin (1750-1795). Paris, 1915.
- Rochemonteix, Camille de*, Le P. Antoine Lavalette à la Martinique. Paris, 1907.
- Rocquain, Félix*, L'esprit révolutionnaire avant la révolution 1715-1789. Paris, 1878.
- Rodocanachi, E.*, Le Capitole Romain antique et moderne. Paris, 1904.
- Rodolico, N.*, Gli amici e i tempi di Scipione dei Ricci. Saggio sul giansenismo italiano. Firenze, 1920.
- Rohrbacher*, Histoire universelle de l'Église. 13 Vols. Paris, 1877 *seqq.*
- Rosa, Enrico*, I Gesuiti dalle origini ai nostri giorni. Roma, 1914.
- Rosa, Enrico*, Passionei e la causa di beatificazione del ven. card. Bellarmino. Roma, 1918.
- Roscher, Wilhelm*, Geschichte der Nationalökonomie in Deutschland. 2 Vols. Munich, 1874.
- Rossi, De*, Triplice omaggio a Pio IX. Roma, 1877.
- Rottmanner, Max*, Der Kardinal von Bayern. Munich, 1877.
- Rousseau, Fr.*, Le règne de Charles III. d'Espagne. Paris, 1907.
- Rudolphi*, Zur Kirchenpolitik Preussens. Paderborn, 1907.
- Saint-Priest*, Histoire de la chute des jésuites au XVIII^e siècle. 2nd ed. Paris, 1846.
- Sala, G. A.*, Diario di Roma, 1798-9. 3 Vols. Roma, 1882-8.
- Sbornik imperatorskago russkago istoritcheskago obstchestva. 135 Vols. St. Petersburg, 1869 *seqq.*
- Schäfer, H.*, Geschichte von Portugal. 5 Vols. Hamburg, 1836 *seqq.*
- Schelden, Bertrand van der*, La Franc-Maçonnerie belge sous le régime autrichien 1721-1794. Louvain, 1923.
- Schill, Andr.*, Die Konstitution Unigenitus, ihre Veranlassung und ihre Folgen. Freiburg, 1876.
- Schipa, M.*, Il regno di Napoli al tempo di Carlo di Borbone. Napoli, 1894.
- Schlitter, Hanns*, Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI. nach Wien und sein Aufenthalt daselbst. Vienna, 1892.
- Schlitter, Hanns*, Pius VI. und Joseph II. von der Rückkehr des Papstes nach Rom bis zum Abschluss des Konkordats. Vienna, 1894.
- Schlitter, Hanns*, Josephs II. Regierung in den Niederlanden. Vienna, 1900.
- Schlitter, Hanns*, Geheime Korrespondenz Josephs II. mit seinem Minister in den österreich. Niederlanden Ferdinand Grafen Trautmannsdorff 1787-9. Vienna, 1902.

- Schmid, Heinrich*, Geschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands. Munich, 1874.
- Schmidlin, I.*, Katholische Missionsgeschichte. Steyl [1925].
- Schoell, M. S. F.*, Cours d'histoire des États européens, depuis le bouleversement de l'Empire Romain d'Occident jusqu'en 1789. 46 Vols. Paris, 1830-4.
- Schuchardt, Christian*, Goethes italienische Reise. 3 Vols. Stuttgart, 1862-3.
- Schulte, Joh. Friedr.*, Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des Kanonischen Rechts von Gratian bis auf die Gegenwart. 3 Vols. Stuttgart, 1875.
- Sciout, Ludovic*, Le Directoire. 4 Vols. Paris, 1895-7.
- Sciout, Ludovic*, Histoire de la constitution civile du clergé (1790-1801). 4 Vols. Paris, 1872-1881.
- Séché*, Les origines du concordat. Vol. I. Paris, 1894.
- Sentis, F. I.*, Die "Monarchia Sicula". Eine historisch-kanonistische Untersuchung. Freiburg, 1869.
- Shea, John Gilmore*, The Catholic Church in Colonial Days. New York, 1886.
- Shea, John Gilmore*, Life and times of the most Rev. John Carroll. New York, 1888.
- Sicard, Aug.*, L'ancien clergé de France. Vol. I.: Les évêques avant la Révolution. Vols. II. and III.: Les évêques pendant la Révolution. Paris, 1893-1903.
- Sicard, Aug.*, Le clergé de France pendant la Révolution. Vol. I.: L'effondrement. Vol. II.: La lutte religieuse. Paris, 1912 and 1927.
- Silvagni, D.*, La Corte e la Società Romana nei secoli XVIII e XIX. Roma, 1884.
- Simon, H. A.*, Die Verfassung des geistlichen Fürstentums Fulda. (Diss.) Marburg, 1912.
- Sismondi, J. C. L. Simonde de*, Histoire des Français. Bruxelles, 1830.
- Smolka, Stanislas*, L'Europe et la Pologne à la veille et au lendemain de son démembrement. Rome, 1915.
- Sommervogel, C., S.J.*, Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus, p. p. De Backer. Nouv. éd. 10 Vols. Bruxelles-Paris, 1890-1909.
- Sorel, Albert*, L'Europe et la Révolution française. 8 Vols. Paris, 1885-1904.
- Sotomayor, Miguel*, O Marquez de Pombal. Porto, 1905.
- Spicilegio Vaticano di documenti inediti e rari estratti dagli archivi e dalla biblioteca della Sede Apostolica. Roma, 1890 seqq.
- Ssolowjoff, G.*, Geschichte des Falles von Polen nach russischen Quellen, übers. von I. Spörer. Gotha, 1865.
- Staatslexikon, im Auftrag der Görres-Gesellschaft hrsg. von Hermann Sacher. 5th ed. Freiburg, 1926 seqq.
- Stark*, Systematik und Geschichte der Archäologie der Kunst. Leipzig, 1880.

- Steinhuber, Andr.*, Geschichte des Kollegium Germanikum Hungarikum in Rom. 2 Vols. Freiburg, 1906.
- Stettiner, Paul*, Friedrich der Grosse und Graf Schaffgotsch, Fürstbischof von Breslau. (Programm.) Königsberg, 1889.
- Stigloher*, Die Errichtung der päpstlichen Nuntiatur in München und der Emser Kongress. Regensburg, 1867.
- Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*. Freiburg, 1871 *seqq.*
- Stimmen der Zeit*. (Continuation of *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*.) Freiburg, 1914 *seq.*
- Stintzing, R.*, Geschichte der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft. Abt. 3 by *Ernst Landsberg*. 2 Vols. Munich, 1898-1910.
- Streit, Rob., O.M.I.*, Bibliotheca Missionum. Vol. I. Monasterii, 1916.
- Studi e memorie per la storia dell' Università di Bologna*. Bologna, 1921.
- Stümper, Franz*, Die kirchenrechtlichen Ideen des Febronius. Aschaffenburg, 1908.
- Stutz, Ulrich*, Der neueste Stand des deutschen Bischofswahlrechtes (Kirchenrechtl. Abhandlungen 58). Stuttgart, 1909.
- Sybel, Heinr. v.*, Geschichte der Revolutionszeit von 1789 bis 1795. 5 Vols. Düsseldorf-Stuttgart, 1859-1879.
- Synopsis actorum S. Sedis in causa Societatis Iesu. 1605-1773*. Lovanii, 1895. (Printed as a MS.)
- Taccone-Gallucci, D.*, S. Maria Maggiore. Roma, 1911.
- Taine, H.*, Les origines de la France contemporaine. 6 Vols. Paris, 1876-1894.
- Tanucci, Bern.*, Lettere a Ferd. Galiani con introduzione e note di *Fausto Niccolini*. 2 Vols. Bari, 1914.
- Taunton*, The History of the Jesuits in England. London, 1901.
- Tavanti, Giov. B.*, Fasti d. S. P. Pio VI. con note critiche. 3 Vols. Italia (!), 1804.
- Teil, Joseph du*, Rome, Naples et le Directoire, armistices et traités 1796-7. Paris, 1902.
- Terzorio, Clemente da*, Le missioni dei Minori Cappuccini. Sunto storico. Vols. II.-VII. Roma, 1914-1925.
- Terzorio, Clemente da*, Manuale historicum Missionum Cappuccinorum. Isola del Liri, 1926.
- Theiner, Aug.*, Histoire du pontificat de Clément XIV. Paris, 1852.
- Theiner, Aug.*, Geschichte des Pontifikats Klemens' XIV. Leipzig & Paris, 1853.
- Theiner, Aug.*, Clementis XIV. P. M. Epistolae et Brevia selectiora ac nonnulla alia acta Pontificatum eius illustrantia. Paris, 1852.
- Theiner, Aug.*, Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de la France 1790 à 1800 extraits des archives secrètes du Vatican. 2 Vols. Paris, 1857-8.
- Theiner, Aug.*, Die neuesten Zustände der katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland seit Katharina II. bis auf unsere Tage. Augsburg, 1841.

- Theiner, Aug.*, *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita, ex tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta, collecta ac serie chronologica disposita ab A. Th.* Vol. 4: Ab Innocentio PP. XII. usque ad Pium PP. VI. 1697-1775. 2 parts. Romae, 1864.
- Theiner, Aug.*, *Geschichte der geistlichen Bildungsanstalten.* Mainz, 1835.
- Theiner, Aug.*, *Zustände der kath. Kirche in Schlesien von 1740-1758.* 2 Vols. Regensburg, 1852.
- Theologie und Glaube.* (Periodical) Paderborn, 1908 *seqq.*
- Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift.* Linz, 1832 *seqq.*
- Thieme, U.*, and *Becker, F.*, *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart.* Leipzig, 1907 *seqq.*
- Thiers, Ad.*, *Histoire de la Révolution française.* 2 Vols. Bruxelles, 1840.
- Thomas, A.*, *Histoire de la Mission de Pékin.* Paris, 1923.
- Thwaites, R. G.*, *Jesuit Relations.* 73 Vols. Cleveland, 1896 *seqq.*
- Tischbein, Wilh.*, *Aus meinem Leben*, ed. by *Loth. Brieger.* Berlin [1922].
- Tomassetti, Giuseppe*, *La Campagna Romana antica, medioevale e moderna.* Vols. 1-4. Roma, 1910-1926.
- Tononi, A. G.*, *Il prigioniero apostolico Pio VI. nei ducati Parmensi.* Parma, 1896.
- Tortonese*, *La politica ecclesiastica di Carlo Emanuele III. nella soppressione della Nunziatura e verso i Gesuiti.* Firenze, 1912.
- Tripodo, Felicia*, *L'espulsione dei Gesuiti dalla Sicilia. Appunti e documenti.* Palermo, 1906.
- Ukraine, Die, und die Kirchliche Union.* Ed. by the *Katholische Emigrantenfürsorge.* Berlin, 1930.
- Uriarte, E. de*, *Obras anónimas y seudónimas de autores de la Compañía de Jesús pertenecientes a la antigua asistencia española.* Madrid, 1904-1916.
- Vasi, Giuseppe*, *Delle magnificenze di Roma antica e moderna con una spiegazione istorica del P. Gius. Bianchini.* 10 Vols. Roma, 1747-1761.
- Verhaegen, Arthur*, *Le cardinal de Franckenberg, archevêque de Malines (1726-1804).* Bruges-Lille [1890].
- Vernarecci*, *Fossombrone dai tempi antichissimi ai nostri.* Fossombrone, 1914.
- Verrì, Al.*, *Vicende memorabili 1789-1801.* Milano, 1858.
- Vicchi, Leone, V. Monti*, *le lettere e la politica 1781-1790.* Faenza, 1883.
- Vicchi, Leone*, *Les Français à Rome pendant la Convention 1792-5.* Fusignano, 1892.
- Vigener, F.*, *Gallikanismus und episkopalistische Strömungen im deutschen Katholizismus zwischen Tridentinum und Vatikanum.* Munich, 1913.

- Vita di Clemente XIII. in seguito alla storia delle vite de' Pontefici di *G. Piatti*. Venezia, 1769.
- Vita di Clemente XIV. Venezia, 1775.
- Vita Italiana. Roma, 1913 *seq.*
- Vivier*, Status assistentiae Galliae Soc. Jesu 1762-8. Paris, 1899.
- Vogel, Iul.*, Aus Goethes römischen Tagen. Leipzig, 1905.
- Vogt, Niklas*, Rheinische Geschichten und Sagen. 3 Vols. Frankfurt, 1817.
- Voltaire*, Œuvres, ed. *Beuchot*. 72 Vols. Paris, 1829-1840.
- Voltaire*, Œuvres complètes. 70 Vols. Kehl a. Rh., 1785 *seqq.*
- Voss, G. M. Crespi*. Roma, 1921.
- Voss, Hermann*, Die Malerei des Barock in Rom. [Berlin, 1925].
- Wahl, Adalbert*, Studien zur Vorgeschichte der französischen Revolution. Tübingen-Leipzig, 1901.
- Walch, C. W. F.*, Neueste Kirchengeschichte. 9 parts. Lemgo, 1771-1783.
- Walz, Ang. M.*, Compendium historiae ordinis Praedicatorum. Romae, 1930.
- Weech, Friedr. v.*, Römische Prälaten am deutschen Rhein 1761-4. Heidelberg, 1898.
- Weiss, I. B.*, Lehrbuch der Weltgeschichte. 22 Vols. Vienna, 1876 *seqq.*
- Weiss, Jos.*, Die deutsche Kolonie an der Sierra Morena und ihr Gründer Iohann Kaspar von Thürriegel. Köln, 1907.
- Weld, Alfred*, The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions. London, 1872.
- Werner, Carl*, Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Trienter Konzil bis zur Gegenwart. Munich, 1864.
- [*Wernz, F. X.*, and *Schmitt, Lud.*], Synopsis historiae Societatis Jesu. Regensburg, 1914. (Privately printed.)
- Woker*, Hontheim und die römische Kurie. Mannheim, 1875.
- Wolf, A.*, Die Aufhebung der Klöster in Innerösterreich. Vienna, 1871.
- Wolf, A.*, Fürstin Eleonore Liechtenstein 1745-1812. Vienna, 1875.
- Wolf, P. Ph.*, Geschichte der röm.-kathol. Kirche unter Pius VI. 7 Vols. Zurich, 1793-1802.
- Wolfsgruber, Cöl.*, Christoph Anton Kardinal Migazzi, Fürst-erzbischof von Wien. Saulgau, 1890.
- Wolny*, Kirchliche Topographie von Mähren. Brünn, 1855.
- Wollers, F.*, Studien über die Agrarzustände in Frankreich. (Schmollers Staatswiss. Forschungen 22). Leipzig, 1905.
- Wytttenbach et Müller*, Gesta Trevirorum integra lectionum varietate et animadversionibus illustrata. 3 Vols. Treveris, 1836-9.
- Zalenski-St. Vivier, Al.*, I Gesuiti della Russia Bianca. Prato, 1888.
- Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst. Leipzig, 1866 *seqq.*

- Zeitschrift für die Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands.
Mainz and Braunsberg, 1860 *seqq.*
- Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde.
Kassel, 1837 *seqq.*
- Zeitschrift, Historische, begr. von *H. v. Sybel*. Munich-Leipzig,
1859 *seqq.*
- Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie. Innsbruck, 1877 *seqq.*
- Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Missionsgeschichte. Ed.
by *I. Schmidlin*. Münster, 1911 *seqq.*
- Zeitschrift für preussische Geschichte und Landeskunde. Berlin,
1864 *seqq.*
- Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Weimar,
1880 *seqq.*
- Zelis, Raf. de*, Catálogo de los sugetos de la Comp. de Jesus que
formaban la Provincia de México el dia del arresto 25 de
Junio del 1767. México, 1871.
- Zillich, Ioh.*, Febronius. (Hallesche Abhandlungen zur neueren
Geschichte.) Halle, 1906
- Zobi, Ant.*, Storia civile della Toscana dal 1737 al 1848. 5 Vols.
Firenze, 1850-2.
- Zschokke, Herm.*, Die theologischen Studien und Anstalten der
katholischen Kirche in Oesterreich. Vienna and Leipzig, 1894.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXV.

BENEDICT XIV. 1740-1758.

CHAPTER I.

THE CONCLAVE OF THE YEAR 1740—CAREER AND PERSONALITY OF BENEDICT XIV.—THE CARDINAL SECRETARY OF STATE, VALENTI GONZAGA—THE CHURCH'S PEACE POLICY—THE CONCORDATS WITH SAVOY, NAPLES, AND SPAIN.

A.D.		PAGE
1740	Diplomatic preparations for the Conclave	1
	The varying numbers of the members. Coscia	4
	The parties in the Conclave	5
	" <i>Papabili</i> "	9
	Ruffo's popularity	10
	Local preparations	11
	Fruitless activity	12
	Aldrovandi's candidature	17
	Election of Cardinal Lambertini—Benedict XIV.	19
	The antecedents of Prospero Lambertini	23
	His career	24
	His personality	27
	As Archbishop	29
	Opinions of the Pope's character	33
	His outward appearance	34
	Daily habits	36
	Jests	39
	Freedom from nepotism	41
	Distribution of offices : Valenti Secretary of State	42
1756	Archinto Secretary of State	46
1741	Concordats with Savoy and	47
	Naples	51
	Dissatisfaction, disputes, and settlement	54
1753	Concordat with Spain	57
	Difficult negotiations	60
	The confessors Le Fèvre and	63
	Rábago	66
	The Pope's displeasure with Spain	67
	A fresh understanding reached	68

CHAPTER II.

BENEDICT XIV. AND THE WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN
SUCCESSION—HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE ELECTIONS
OF THE EMPERORS CHARLES VII. AND FRANCIS I.—THE
PEACE CONGRESS OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE.

A.D.	PAGE
	Attitude of the Curia towards the Imperial election 76
	Benedict XIV. and Frederick II. 79
1741	The Legate Doria at Frankfort 80
	His support of Charles Albert 84
1742	Charles Albert's election 86
	The States of the Church in the turmoil of war 87
	Rome and the Imperial election 89
	The Pope's neutrality 91
	Tension between Austria and Rome 93
	Charles VII.'s election a disappointment for the Pope 95
	Secularization schemes 97
	The Pope's distress 98
1744	Lobkowitz threatens Naples 104
	The Austrian retreat 108
	Charles III.'s entry into Rome 108
1745	Ravaging of the Papal States 111
	Death of Charles VII. 112
	Saxony and the Imperial Crown 113
	Neutrality of the Holy See 114
	Stoppani at the Diet of Frankfort 115
	Election of Francis I. 118
	Benedict XIV.'s attitude towards the election 119
	Relations between Rome and Vienna 121
	The main obstacles to an agreement 122
1747	Agreement reached 124
	Benedict XIV. and the Elector of Mayence 125
	Parma and Piacenza 126
	Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle 127
	Jacquet at Aix 128
	Papal aims frustrated 129
	Jacquet and the proposed Papal protest 133
1748	Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle 135
	St.-Séverin's tactics 136
	The Papal protest 137
	The Pope's satisfaction with the Peace of Aix 139

CHAPTER III.

THE STATES OF THE CHURCH—THE ENCOURAGEMENT
OF ART AND LEARNING.

	Benedict XIV.'s efforts to restore the finances 141
1743	New demarcation of the Rioni. Nolli's plan of Rome 145

A.D.		PAGE
1746	Reconstitution of the aristocracy	146
	The theatre	147
	The carnival. Ghezzi's caricatures	148
	Vasi's engravings	149
	Piranesi's engravings	150
	Benedict XIV.'s philanthropy and	151
	Economic decrees	152
	Harbour construction and coastal protection	153
	The Pope's generosity towards Bologna	156
	Restoration of S. Maria Maggiore	157
	Of Santa Croce	161
	Of Santa Maria degli Angeli and St. Peter's	163
1743	Completion of the Fontana Trevi	166
1745	Porcelain collection in the Quirinal	168
	Care of ancient monuments	169
	Benedict XIV. and the Colosseum	171
	The Capitoline Museum	173
	As a centre of modern art	178
	The awarding of prizes for art-students	181
	The Roman academies	183
	Encouragement of Church history	185
	Roman places of learning	188
	Encouragement of the profane sciences	189
	Benedict's patronage of the University of Bologna	192
	Its library	193
	Briefs to Cornaro and the Bollandists	195
	Benedict XIV. and Muratori	196
	The question of interest and usury. Maffei	200
	Concina	202
	Benedict's relations with other scholars	203
1745	Voltaire's <i>Mahomet</i>	205
	Maupertuis and Algarotti	209
	Genovesi and Bandel	210
	Amort and Cardinal Quirini	211
1755	Quirini's successor, Passionei	218
	The Museum of Christian Antiquities	219
	Benedict XIV.'s interest in the Vaticana	222
	Its catalogue	225

CHAPTER IV.

JANSENISM IN FRANCE AND HOLLAND.

Benedict's approval of the French Bishops' attitude	226
The Jubilee Bull and the Jansenists	227
Benedict reluctant to take extreme measures	230
Jansenism and the religious Orders	231
Noris	232
Berti	233
The Dominican Viou	235

A.D.	PAGE
	The Jesuit Pichon 236
	Archbishop Beaumont's uncompromising attitude . . . 238
1747	His conflict with the Parliament 239
1749	The case of Charles Coffin 240
1751	The Moisan case 242
1752	The Lemère case
	Parliamentary decree on the refusal of the Sacraments 245
	Confusion in Paris 246
	Weakness of the Government 247
	Further trouble : the nuns of St. Agatha 249
1753	Parliament banished 251
1754	The king gives way 255
	Further encroachments of the Parliament 256
1755	Disagreement among the Bishops 259
	Parliament's dispute with the Sorbonne 260
	A Papal decision sought 261
	The Pope's previous reluctance to intervene 262
	Choiseul's embassy to Rome 265
	The opinions of the Cardinals 267
1756	The king's objections 274
	Draft of an Encyclical on the refusal of the Sacraments 275
	Its reception in Paris 276
	Beaumont's pastoral letter against the misguided love of peace 277
	Archinto's disapproval 278
	The Pope's illness 279
	The Papal Encyclical 280
1760	Its acceptance by the clerical assembly of 1760 281
	Its prohibition by the Parliament 282
1756	The royal manifesto 283
1757	Damiens' attempt on the king's life ; compromise with the Parliament ; the situation of the clergy 285
	Cardinal Bernis 287
	The Jansenist hierarchy in Holland 288
	The ex-Capuchin Norbert in Holland 289
	He wins Broedersen as an ally 290
1748	Nicolini's report on the Catholics of the Netherlands 292

CHAPTER V.

BENEDICT XIV.'S ACTIVITY WITHIN THE CHURCH—HIS
LEGISLATION—THE VENERATION OF THE SAINTS—THE
JUBILEE YEAR OF 1750—THE APPOINTMENT OF
CARDINALS—THE INDEX—THE BEGINNING OF THE
UNDERMINING OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

The Pope's desire to raise the standard of the clergy	294
His legislative activity	297

A.D.		PAGE
	His services to the liturgy	301
	The Pope and the religious Orders	302
	The Pope and the Jesuits	307
	New religious Orders	311
	Canonizations	312
	Beatifications	316
	Maria of Ágreda	317
	Benedict's devotion to the Mother of God	318
	The veneration of the Saints	319
	Beatification of Bellarmine and	320
	Palafox	322
	Diminution of feast days	323
	Preparation for the Jubilee	325
1749	Encyclical and announcement	327
1750	The Jubilee Year	330
	Its extension till 1751	332
1743	Appointment of Cardinals	333
	Dissatisfaction of the Powers	337
1747	The promotion of April 10th	339
	The Cardinal of York	340
1753	The promotions of November 26th	342
1754	April 22nd	344
1756	April 5th	345
	Reorganization of the censorship	347
	Previous complaints against it	348
	The " Jansenist Library "	350
	Condemnation of Pichon and	353
	Stadler	354
1753	The Constitution on the Index, of July 9th	356
	Berruyer	359
	Muratori and Zaccaria	362
	Noris and his doctrine of grace	363
1747	Put on the Spanish Index	364
1758	Removal therefrom	366
	Encyclopedism and the Index	370
	Freemasonry	371
	Undermining of the Society of Jesus. The hatred of the Jansenists	375
	Amort and Bassi	377
	Benedict XIV. and the Jesuits ; the reasons for their unpopularity	379
	The anti-Jesuit party in Rome	381
	Cardinal Passionei and	382
	The Jansenists	384
	The Augustinian General Vasquez	387
	The final aim of anti-Jesuitism	388
	The plan for the suppression of the Jesuits	390
	Literary campaign against the Society	391

CHAPTER VI.

BENEDICT XIV. AND THE MISSIONS.

A.D.		PAGE
1741	Congregation for the missionary colleges	392
	The Pope's interest in them	395
	Abyssinia, the Maronites	396
	Anna Agemi	398
	Cyril Tanas	400
	The Armenians	401
	Copts and Chaldæans	404
	Palestine	403
	The Greek Archipelago	406
	The Slavs in Eastern Europe	408
	The missions in South America	410
	Paraguay	414
1750	Boundary Treaty between Spain and Portugal, accusa- tions against the Jesuits	417
	The ruin of the mission in Maranhão	421
1755	The law against the enslavement of the Indians	425
	Chile, California, and Mexico	426
	North America, Africa	427
	Asia : Persia	428
	Georgia, Tibet, and neighbouring countries	429
	Farther India	430
	S. Asia and the rise of the Protestant maritime Powers	432
	The situation in China ; Mezzabarba's concessions	433
	The Jesuits attacked and defended	436
	Pedrini	437
	The Jesuits charged with disobedience	438
	Benedict XIV.'s attitude	443
	Benedict XIV. and John V. of Portugal	444
	The Jesuit General Retz	446
1742	Benedict's final decision on the ritual dispute	448
	His defence of it in a letter to John V.	449
	The reception of the Constitution	450
	Varying opinions on its implications	454
1744	Souza's objection	455
	The Pope's reply	456
	The effects of his decision	457
	The Chinese under the persecution	458
	The Malabar rites	461
	The Bull on these rites	463
	The Capuchin Norbert	369
	The Pope's opinion of him	473
	His eclipse	474

APPENDIX OF UNPUBLISHED
DOCUMENTS AND EXTRACTS FROM
ARCHIVES

	PAGE
1. Pope Benedict XIV. to King John of Portugal . . .	479
2. Pope Benedict XIV. to Queen Elizabeth of Spain . . .	480
3. Pope Benedict XIV. to Emperor Charles VII.	482
4. Pope Benedict XIV. to King John of Portugal . . .	484
5. The Correspondence between Voltaire and Pope Benedict XIV.	486
6. Documents relating to the Malabar rites	490

BENEDICT XIV. A.D. 1740-1758.

CHAPTER I.

THE CONCLAVE OF THE YEAR 1740—CAREER AND PERSONALITY OF BENEDICT XIV.—THE CARDINAL SECRETARY OF STATE, VALENTI GONZAGA—THE CHURCH'S PEACE POLICY—THE CONCORDATS WITH SAVOY, NAPLES, AND SPAIN.

(1)

THE conclave that followed the death of Clement XII. lasted more than six months and was thus not only the longest of the century but the longest of any that had taken place since the Great Schism.¹ On account of the continuous ill-health of the late Pope diplomatic activity had begun betimes. On

¹ A detailed treatment of the conclave based on the French material in the Archives for Foreign Affairs in Paris is to be found in GABR. DE MUN, *Un conclave de six mois au milieu du XVIII^e siècle et son résultat imprévu*, in the *Revue des deux mondes*, XXIV., Paris, 1914, 490-530. Chapter 4, "Le conclave de Benoît XIV.," of BOUTRY'S *Intrigues et missions du card. de Tencin*, 166 seq., is only a slightly expanded version of his treatise in the *Revue d'hist. dipl.*, XI. (1897), 263 seq., 387 seq. Of the Austrian material some has been published [ROTHMANNER] on the basis of the Cod. lat. 11063 in the State Library, Munich; most of the remainder is in the State Archives, Vienna. The Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican contain the Austrian and Venetian ambassadorial reports: Cod. 260 " *Atti della ambasc. straordin. d. principe d. Santa Croce ", March 5-October 8, 1740, and Cod. 261 " *Conclave sotto l'e. ambasc. Cav. Foscari " fos. 1-93, distinctly informative. Count Thun did not make over his correspondence to these archives. The most important Spanish reports are in the Archives of Simancas; in addition, reference should be made to Legs. 189, 303 in the Archives of the Spanish Embassy in Rome. A number of other reports on the conclave are listed in

the Austrian side ¹ there are memorials extant concerning the eligible Cardinals which were written as early as 1732 and 1737, and on the Spanish side there is one of January 1739.² By October 1739, when the Pope's death seemed imminent, the negotiations of the interested Powers had begun in earnest ; instructions were sent to Rome,³ and the Emperor

EISLER 145. A contemporary print is in the *Acta historico-ecclesiastica*, IV., Weimar, 1740, Part 24, pp. 1040 *seq.* : " Was bey der Sedisvakanz und im Conclave vorgegangen." The following sources have also been drawn on : " *Conclave doppo la morte del Pont. Clemente XII.," a description arranged in weeks, with inserted texts, Cod. ital. 323 in the State Library, Munich, also " Conclave in cui fu eletto papa il s.c.Pr. Lambertini da Bologna, detto poi Benedetto XIV.," reprinted from a MS. in the Library of Count Malvezzi de' Medici, Bologna, in FR. X. KRAUS, *Briefe Benedikts XIV.*, 151-173. This is Otto Hartwig's chief authority for his article in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, XLVI. (1886), 243-258. Cf. also a *Report on the conclave in Cod. 38 G. 20, fos. 249-381 in the Biblioteca Corsini, Rome (with an autograph marginal note by Cardinal Corsini, fo. 361) and " *Narrativa da cui si rileva quanto possono i mezzi umani in promosso al pontificato il Lambertini oggi Benedetto XIV.," in Cod. T. VIII., fo. 260 *seq.*, Fondo Gesuit. of the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele, Rome. An article by J. MARANGONI on the conclave for the Papal election of 1740 is in *Analecta eccles.* VI. (1898) 77 *seq.*

¹ " *Discorso e riflessioni intorno al sistema delle cose d'Italia fino al tutto Marzo 1732 coll'analisi della corte di Roma e sopra tutto ciò che riguarda il futuro conclave," Cod. ital. 58 in the State Archives, Munich, and in a MS. in the Episcopal Seminary, Trent. Also a memorandum of Cardinal Giudice, March 30, 1737, in [ROTHMANNER] 23-27.

² *Cardinal Acquaviva to Quadra on January 22, 1739, Archives of Simancas. The report was made in obedience to a royal command given on December 29, 1738.

³ Thus the Imperial instructions to Giudice and the Minister Count Harrach, dated October 30, 1739 (in [ROTHMANNER] 6-30). On the latter's death at the end of the year Count Thun, Bishop of Gurk, was nominated Imperial Pro-Minister (Charles VI. to Count Thun on December 28, 1739, *ibid.*, 49). On February 17,

appointed Count Thun, Bishop of Gurk, as envoy extraordinary.¹ These feverish preparations, which increased rather than diminished the uncertainty of the situation, were thought to betoken an abnormally long conclave,² and naturally enough, the lengthy vacancy of the Holy See gave rise to a large number of satirical compositions.³

Shortly before the death of Clement XII., which took place on February 6th, 1740, the prescriptive number of the members of the Sacred College had been reduced to sixty-eight by the deaths of Cardinals Davia and Borromei on January 11th and

1740, Santa Croce was deputed as the new ambassador extraordinary (Imperial letter of recommendation to the College, *ibid.*, 69 *seq.*). He was responsible for the report “ *Fogli che danno il vero lume del potere e considerabile autorità della Corte Romana ”, from the Archives of Prince Santa Croce, now in the Archives of the Austrian Historical Institute, Rome. This was preceded by another report on the situation : “ *Stato presente dell’Italia e della corte di Roma da presentarsi a S.M.C. nel principio dell’anno 1740, e trasmesso al marchese de Rialpi nel 1739,” in the State Archives, Vienna, t. 46, and a MS. from the Santa Croce Archives, since 1910 in the possession of L. von Pastor. To the importance of these relations the following reference is made, *ibid.*, 9 : “ la necessità che sopra tutti li altri ha la corte di Vienna di aver l’amicizia de’ sommi pontefici, massime nelle congiunture presenti.”

¹ Rescript of October 28, 1739 in [ROTHMANNER], 5 *seq.*

² *Acquaviva to Quadra on March 10, 1740, Archives of Simancas ; *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323, State Library, Munich, 1st week : “ they are behaving as though the conclave were going to last ten years ” ; BROSSES, *Lettres*, II., 323, 340. Morosini had foretold what would happen in a report made as early as 1730 : “ il nuovo conclave, per l’età e per le indisposizioni del papa non può essere probabilmente lontano, sarà tanto imbarazzato, quanto il decorso ” (from the State Archives, Venice, printed in *Arch. stor. ital.*, 3rd series, VII.).

³ “ *Componimenti poetici usciti in sede vacante di Clemente XII. l’anno 1740,” Cod. Ottob. 2814, Vatican Library ; “ *Satire sopra Clemente XII. e sede vacante 1740,” British Museum, 10835 ; other satires in *MS. Diez 51 in the State Library, Berlin, and in *Cod. Vat. 9373, Vatican Library.

22nd. Nearly half this number, thirty in all, had been raised to the purple during the pontificate which had just expired ; nineteen had been created by Benedict XIII. ; one had survived from the time of Innocent XIII. ; sixteen had been created by Clement XI. ; and the remaining two by Alexander VIII.¹ On the first day of the conclave (February 19th) only thirty-two were present,² most of the others arriving in the course of March and April. Altogether fifty-six members of the supreme council of the Church took part in the electoral proceedings,³ though on the decisive day only fifty-one were present, death or illness having accounted for the absence of the five others.⁴

For the past seven years Cardinal Coscia had been undergoing confinement in the Castle of S. Angelo. Clement XII. had acknowledged his eligibility for the Papal office,⁵ and Coscia now addressed an urgent protest to the Sacred College, repeatedly affirming his innocence and producing exhaustive evidence to prove the invalidity of any electoral action that might be taken without his participation as an active elector.⁶ His appeal was successful. On the evening before the first scrutiny the secretary to the conclave, Livizzani, conveyed to

¹ A list of the Cardinals in the conclave in KRAUS, 171-3 ; BROSSES, *Lettres*, 317-322 ; *Acta hist.-eccl.*, 1040 *seq.* ; [ROTHMANNER], xxx *seq.*

² Scrutiny list in the *report of Count Thun to the Emperor, February 19, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

³ The following Cardinals did not take part : Fleury, Gesvres, Polignac (France), the Infante and Molina (Spain), Da Cunha, Motta, Almeida (Portugal), Schönborn (Germany), Lipski (Poland) ; also, on account of illness, Pieri and Odescalchi (Italy). MUN (497, n. 1) erroneously includes L. Altieri among the permanently absent and omits Pieri and Almeida.

⁴ Ottoboni died on February 28, G. B. Altieri on March 12, Porzia on June 10, Cenci on June 24 ; L. Altieri left the conclave on account of illness.

⁵* Count Thun to the Emperor, February 13, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

⁶ February 6, 1740, " *Protestatio card. Nic. Coscia in arce s. Angeli detenti anni 1740 pro libertate ferendi suffragium in

him the favourable decision of the Cardinals, and after midnight the ex-Secretary of State, escorted by the camerlengo Annibale Albani, entered the conclave.¹ At the same time the remainder of his sentence was remitted.

At first the party groupings in the electoral college presented their usual picture ; but what was novel and peculiar to this conclave was that the numerous factions formed themselves into two large unions of almost equal voting strength, which, with only minor readjustments, counterbalanced each other throughout.² The opposition between them was twofold : that of the Crowns on the one hand and that of the " creatures " on the other.

A year previously Cardinal Fleury had proposed to the Imperial Government in Vienna that they should work together in the coming conclave.³ The negotiations produced provisional lists of candidates favoured by both sides,⁴ but in spite of this, Cardinal Tencin, who appropriated to himself the conduct of French affairs in Rome,⁵ excluded the Germans

comitiis futuri pontificis apost. sede vacante," in F 39, Boncompagni Archives, Rome ; a German translation in *Acta hist.-eccl.*, 1045-1050. Cf. *Conclave* in KRAUS, 153.

¹ *Count Thun to the Emperor, February 20, 1740, *loc. cit.* Foscari's *report of February 20, 1740, Cod. 261 in the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

² This development could have been foreseen at any time during the pontificate of Clement XII. Thus Morosini in his report (*loc. cit.*) : "durando il sacro collegio in due partiti diviso." Cf. *Conclave* in KRAUS, 156 : "restava diviso il conclave non in fazioni, ma in due unioni" ; *Acquaviva to Quadra, March 17, 1740, Archives of Simancas.

³ If all its subjects and nationals had held together, the Imperial party could have counted on 18 votes, which number would have sufficed for an exclusion, but would not, of course, have decided the issue. See Santa Croce, **Fogli*, Archives of the Austrian Historical Institute, Rome.

⁴ Thus, in particular, the Emperor to Count Harrach, October 30, 1739, in [ROTHMANNER], 6-23 ; cf. *ibid.*, 30, 37-42, 51-3.

⁵ For his rivalry with St-Aignan, see BOUTRY, 153-165, 172-6, 185-8, 193 *seq.*

from the preliminary discussions.¹ As, however, at the beginning of the conclave, instructions came from Paris demanding a closer understanding with Austria,² relations improved as time went on,³ though Cardinal Giudice, the leader of the Imperial party, found occasion to complain of Tencin's insincerity.⁴ Contrary to his instructions from Vienna, he went so far as to disassociate himself from the union with the French and even threatened to form a separate group in the electoral college.⁵

The tension between Austria and Spain, on the other hand, was insuperable from the very beginning ;⁶ which circumstance led to curious adjustments. For although instructions from the Government at Madrid to the Spanish Crown Cardinal Acquaviva advised co-operation with France,⁷ and the two Courts were in the closest possible union, an ever-increasing estrangement developed between the parties in the

¹ Charles VI. to Count Thun, February 7, 1740, in [ROTHMANNER], 56.

² *Count Thun to the Emperor, February 20, State Archives, Vienna.

³ *Acquaviva to Quadra, April 7, 1740, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Cardinal Giudice to the Emperor, March 5, and to Sinzendorf and Metsch, March 12, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

⁵ Corsini's *note to S. Croce, March 23, 1740 (supplement to S. Croce's letter to the Emperor of March 25, 1740) : " Io ho risposto che diceva bene, ma ch'erano cose da discorrersi dopo quattro mesi di conclave." *Ibid.*

⁶ The points of dissension between Austria and Spain and the alterations in the situation consequent on the change of ownership in Tuscany are discussed quite fully by Santa Croce in his relation, **Fogli*, Archives of the Austrian Historical Institute, Rome. Cf. Foscarini's *second report of February 20, 1740, Cod. 261 of the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

⁷ *Acquaviva's final report of August 25, 1740, *loc. cit.* Cf. Merenda's *relation, fo. 10, in the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome. The French instructions also advised collaboration with Acquaviva ; see HEECKEREN, I., ix.

conclave, to the advantage of the Franco-Austrian union.¹ Spain, in consequence, allied itself all the more closely with Naples and Tuscany, and the Austro-French party was faced by a Spanish one.

In addition to this, two more opposing bodies were formed within the college of Cardinals. The *nepote* Neri Corsini, whose personal qualities were seldom the subject of praise,² took it upon himself to form a dominant elective *bloc* composed of all the "creatures" of Clement XII. The plan met with only partial success,³ and Corsini's efforts produced an opponent in the person of Annibale Albani, whose experience of former conclaves and undisputed diplomatic ability now stood him in good stead. Firstly⁴ as head of the "Zelanti",⁵ and then by winning over the Cardinals appointed by his uncle, Clement XI., together with many of those of the time of Benedict XIII., he succeeded in setting up in opposition to Corsini's "young" Cardinals a comprehensive union of "old" ones. Subsequent negotiations for a union with France and Spain did not attain so speedy a success.⁶ On the other hand, his old hostility towards his brother, Cardinal

¹ *Acquaviva's reports to Quadra of April 14 and 21, and May 26, 1740, *loc. cit.* This came as a complete surprise to the Germans; v. *Santa Croce to the emperor, April 30, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

² BROSSES, *Lettres*, II., 317 *seq.*

³ **Stato presente*, in the ownership of L. von Pastor.

⁴ See *ibid.*; Mocenigo in his report of November 11, 1737: "il più formidabile conclavista dei nostri tempi . . ., sopra tutto profondissimo conoscitore delle più segrete maniere di questa corte ed artefice maraviglioso di qualsivoglia lavoro di spirito che possa appartenere al conclave." (Venezia, 1864.) Cf. Foscarini's *second report of February 20, 1740, Cod. 261, *loc. cit.*; BROSSES, *Lettres*, II., 319.

⁵ Foscarini's *report of February 20, 1740, *ibid.* In his relation of November 11, 1737, Mocenigo calls the "Zelanti" "quei cardinali che sotto colore di zelo per l'onore di santa Chiesa cercano con tutti i mezzi d'abbattere il partito Corsini" (*loc. cit.*).

⁶ **Stato presente*, *loc. cit.* His efforts failed entirely with the French, but only at first with the Spaniards.

Alessandro Albani, was quickly forgotten by both parties,¹ and with Alessandro the faction of Savoy was also won.

A fusion between the greater political and curial groups was brought about by France's siding with Corsini. The Imperial Government was anxious at first to avoid an open breach with the influential camerlengo Albani²; Giudice, in fact, openly supported his party,³ but, as time went on, the "young" Cardinals formed a common front with the French and German Cardinals.⁴ Consequently, Acquaviva, with his adherents, contrary to instructions from his Government, which favoured Corsini, was forced into Albani's camp.⁵

¹ " *In oggi è certissimo, che questa inimicizia nel fondo è tutta dimersa, rimanendone unicamente una certa apparenza e questo farà sempre sospettare dell'uno e dell' altro." **Stato presente*, fo. 43, *loc. cit.*

² Even as late as June 6 the Emperor, when writing to Liechtenstein, sought to clear Giudice of the suspicion of having supported Albani and demanded the union of the Germans and the French with Corsini so as to form a front against Albani and Acquaviva (in [ROTHMANNER] 141). His instructions to Giudice were in the same vein (*ibid.*, 138). But that the relations between the two powers were still strained on several points is shown by their dispute about the title of honour, "filius primogenitus" (fils aîné de l'Église) which was used also by France on the occasion of an audience to ambassadors (*v. ibid.*, 129 *seq.*, 133); also *Cardinal Giudice to the Emperor on April 24 and *Cardinal Kollonitsch to the same on April 30, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

³ The Emperor condemned this severely in his letters to Giudice, Count Thun, and Santa Croce, of March 19, 1740 (in [ROTHMANNER], 96-109), and again when writing to Giudice on March 25, 1740 (*ibid.*, 119). His instruction of October 30, 1739, however, had demanded that good relations should be preserved with Albani and the "Zelanti" and that Corsini should be treated with a certain suspicion (*ibid.*, 19 *seq.*).

⁴ *Count Thun to the Emperor, May 7, 1740 (*ibid.*). See also above (p. 7) and PETRUCELLI, IV., 21.

⁵ France in consequence held him responsible for everything; see the *relation by Merenda, fo. 10. Biblioteca Angelica, Rome. Cf. also *Santa Croce to the Emperor on July 2, 1740, State

Naturally, in the course of these long preliminaries the prospects of a large number of "papabili" were the subject of discussion, and descriptions of their characters were in considerable demand by the various Courts.¹ In some quarters, moreover, views were expressed as to the considerations which ought to prevail in the coming election.²

Much-discussed candidates such as Aldrovandi, Corradini, Gotti, and Zondadari, had both friends and enemies among the political Powers. Lambertini³ and Firrao⁴ were widely reputed on account of their past experience. Lercari was

Archives, Vienna, and Acquaviva's *final report on August 25, 1740, Archives of Simancas.

¹ For Spain: Acquaviva's *report to Quadra on January 22, 1739, *ibid.*; for Austria: **Discorso e riflessioni*, Library of the Episcopal Seminary, Trent, and Cod. ital., 58, State Library, Munich; **Stato presente*, in the ownership of L. von Pastor; Santa Croce, **Fogli*, Archives of the Austrian Historical Institute, Rome; *anonymous memorandum from the conclave, t. 46 of the State Archives, Vienna. Cf. also BROSSES, *Lettres*, II., 317-322.

² E.g. " *Discorso dell'ambasciatore dello Stato ecclesiastico per la sede vacante di Clemente XII., fatto partitamente in otto distinte udienze a lui date dal sagro collegio ", cod. ital., 26, State Library, Munich. This demanded for the future Pope the "capacità e fermezza" of Sixtus V., the "carità e amor paterno" of Innocent XII., and the "magnanimità e il gran cuore" of Clement XII., and "che regga sul trono" like St. Peter. The economic decadence of the Pontifical State was described, the ruinous Colosseum being selected as "un immagine viva dello stato ecclesiastico".

³ " *Per verità uno de' più plausibili, per l'abilità, per la pratica degl'interessi de' principi e della sede apost., per la sua gran dottrina unita ad un somma quadratura di testa, non attaccato ad alcun principe fuori di qualche prevenzione per il Re di Sardegna, nè in disgusto con alcun di essi." *Stato presente*, fo. 53, *seq.*, *loc. cit.* Fo. 39 (*ibid.*) and **Discorso e riflessioni*, *loc. cit.*, are similarly laudatory.

⁴ " *Ha molta esperienza delle cose pubbliche e tratta qualunque affare con molta distrezza essendo dotato di molto spirito e talento, ha la proprietà di tutti gli altri nunzi . . ." *Discorso e riflessioni*, *ibid.*

credited with a childish confidence in a brilliant personal future.¹ Undoubtedly the greatest measure of popularity was enjoyed by Ruffo, who was spoken of by everyone in Rome as the future Pope.² Albani could name no other of his adherents as having better prospects than he³; Spain had long since bestowed its favour on him⁴; and the Cardinals of Benedict XIII., the "Zelanti", and the French knew of nothing that told against him; only Corsini and the Emperor would have viewed his elevation with disfavour; Giudice, nevertheless, in spite of the Emperor's desire that he should be excluded, was bold enough to give him his support.⁵ As it happened, however, things were to take an entirely different course.

Even before the opening of the conclave it was rumoured that Giudice, acting on Imperial instructions, intended to exclude all the Neapolitan Cardinals,⁶ and it is true that

¹ " *Entra in conclave con una tal persuasione di riuscirne papa che niente più." *Stato presente*, fo. 39, *loc. cit.*

² Together with Aldrovandi he was looked on in Rome as "pater patriae"; see *Conclave* in KRAUS, 155.

³ See especially **Stato presente*, *loc. cit.*, and **Discorso e riflessioni*, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Acquaviva to Quadra, January 22, 1739, Archives of Simancas. Acquaviva was here referring to previous instructions given to Bentivoglio, in which he was already regarded as a desirable candidate. The author of **Stato presente* even presumes that Acquaviva will propose him ("un esperimento reale"): "questo sia il più facile ad essere il nuovo papa." *loc. cit.*

⁵ See the letters from the Emperor mentioned above (p. 8, n. 2).

⁶ " *Giudice vorrebbe escludere e le creature Corsimiane e li nazionali Napolitani," in "Lettere del Fra Luigi M. Lucini, commiss. del s. Offic. di Roma, al card. Lambertini a Bologna", of February 13, 1740, in Cod. Ottob. 3052, Vatican Library. Cf. the Imperial dispatch to Count Thun of March 19, 1740, in [ROTHMANNER] 100. Cardinal Passionei was the first to address an official inquiry to Santa Croce, the answer being " *Io risposi francamente di nò " (Santa Croce to the Emperor, April 2, 1740, State Archives, Vienna).

these instructions from Vienna contained the order to prevent at all costs the election of Ruffo, Corradini, or Pico¹; but an open exclusion was to be avoided by all possible means.² The Emperor accordingly directed that the rumour was to be emphatically denied, without directly paving the way to the Papacy for a Neapolitan.³

Several days were spent in performing the usual preliminary ceremonies in the Congregations.⁴ On the morning of February 19th the Mass of the Holy Ghost was celebrated by Ottoboni, after which the customary address on the Papal election was given by the learned Maronite Assemani.⁵ The Cardinals then

¹ Charles VI. to Count Thun, March 19, 1740, *loc. cit.* For the unheard-of proposal to exclude a whole nation, see Foscarini's reports of March 12 and April 2, 1740, Cod. 261, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

² See the Imperial instruction to Santa Croce of February 17, 1740: "decrevimus nulli publicam aut solemnem aut strepitantem exclusivam dare" (WAHRMUND, 324; [ROTHMANNER], 74); similarly on March 25 (ROTHMANNER, 111). "Questa è la maniera di escludere senza azzardo e senza odiosità, mentre l'altra di presentare un'esclusiva d'autorità è soggetta a diversi incomodi e diversi pericoli." There follows a detailed exposition of the various disadvantages of an open exclusion. Santa Croce, *Fogli*, Archives of the Austrian Hist. Inst., Rome. See WAHRMUND, 227 *seq.*; EISLER, 185 *seq.* Consequently in this long conclave there was not a single formal announcement of an exclusion.

³ Letter to Count Thun of March 19, 1740, *loc. cit.*, 100. As time went on it was possible to suppress the rumour, as Cardinal Giudice informed the Emperor, Sinzendorf, and Metsch on June 22 (State Archives, Vienna).

⁴ See NOVAES, XIV., 6 *seq.* Foscarini's first report of February 20, 1740, Cod. 261, *loc. cit.*, refers to the audiences given to the various diplomatic representatives.

⁵ "Asseman Maronita o del monte Libano, uno de' piu famosi uomini del secolo per la vasta cognizione di tutte le lingue orientali, non così nella latina eloquenza" (Count Thun to the Chancellor Sinzendorf, April 9, 1740, State Archives, Vienna). The address was printed: "Oratio de eligendo summo pontifice

moved into the apartments set aside for them. Of these a contemporary gives us a graphic description,¹ in which it is interesting to note that the two parties were already differing in externals as well as in their views: "All the cells of the Cardinals created by Clement XII. are hung with violet serge, whereas those occupied by members of the "old College" are hung with green serge. . . . The apartment of the Infante, which remains unoccupied, is far more sumptuous than the others, with damask, pier-glasses, marble tables, and windows with panes of crystal."²

In the very first days of the conclave the two parties were formed,³ and it was a bitter disappointment to each to discover that the opposing side was pretty much as strong as itself. This meant that each party would be able to exclude the opponents' candidate but would not be able to secure the election of its own.

Consequently in the second week attempts were made to throw bridges across to the enemy's camp. First, Rivera, a relative of Albani's, was proposed,⁴ but objection was raised to him by most of the Crown Cardinals; then the former Uditore of the Camerlengo, Spinola, was proposed but he found little backing from the "old" Cardinals.⁵

More important were the tactics employed by Acquaviva in support of his candidate, Ruffo. The Imperialists especially

ad Em. et Rev. principes S.R.E. cardinales, habita in ss. Basilica Vaticana a Iosepho Simonio Assemanno, Romae ex typogr. apost. Vat. 1740."

¹ BROSSES, *Lettres*, II., 325-8.

² *Ibid.*, 327. This illicitly rich decoration of the Infante's cell is mentioned also by Count Thun in his *letter to the Emperor of February 20, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

³ *Cardinal Acquaviva to Quadra, March 17, 1740, Archives of Simancas; *Foscarini's report of March 26, 1740, Cod. 261 of the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

⁴ *Foscarini's report of March 5, 1740, *ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.* and the same on April 9, 1740, *ibid.* Spinola had already 15 votes. See *Count Thun to the Emperor, April 9, 1740, *loc. cit.*

were approached,¹ and Giudice actually declared himself in favour of Ruffo.² It was not until the arrival of further messages from Vienna, insisting on Ruffo's rejection, that the French and German Cardinal Ministers issued a joint declaration against him,³ this being the first sacrifice made by the Germans in the interests of the French alliance.

On the failure of these initial moves a pause ensued. Cardinal Ottoboni was removed from the conclave in a dying condition and expired a few days later.⁴ His death was attributed to an encounter with Corsini, who was said to have inveighed against him in the most violent manner—an incident which Albani, Corsini's adversary, was not slow to exploit.⁵ Meanwhile the electors awaited the arrival of the French Cardinals Rohan and De la Tour and the German Cardinals Kollonitsch and Sinzendorf, besides the Imperial envoy extraordinary, Scipione di Santa Croce,⁶ almost all of

¹ Thus Ruffo himself assured the Imperial ambassador, " *ch' egli aveva il cuore austriaco " ; but being a Neapolitan and of a great age, he found no support. See Santa Croce's **Diario*, March 6, 1740, *ibid.*

² Corsini expressed his keen dissatisfaction with this, which was *reported by Santa Croce to the Emperor on March 26, 1740, *ibid.* On the receipt of the Imperial instruction of March 19 (in [ROTHMANNER], 96-109), however, Giudice gave way. See *Count Thun to the Emperor, April 2, 1740, *loc. cit.*

³ *Count Thun to the Emperor, March 12, 1740, *ibid.*

⁴ " Con molto rammarico del collegio vecchio " (*Conclave*, in KRAUS, 158). See also *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (2nd and 3rd weeks), State Library, Munich ; the *letter of Count Thun to the Emperor of March 5, 1740, State Archives, Vienna ; *Santa Croce's report of March 5, 1740, Atti d. ambasc. di Santa Croce, Cod., 260, of the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican ; *Foscarini's report of February 26, 1740, *loc. cit.* Cf. O. HARTWIG, *Deutsche Rundschau*, XLVI., 250 *seq.*

⁵ MUN, 508 *seqq.*

⁶ A full description of the audience given to Santa Croce by the Sacred College on March 23, 1740, in Santa Croce's *report of March 26, 1740, *loc. cit.*, also in MUN, 512 *seq.* A printed account of the audience was sent by Santa Croce to the Emperor

whom were expected to bring with them detailed instructions. Thus the month of March was spent in the occasional proposal of an isolated candidate and in fruitless attempts at agreement.¹ It was about this time that Giambattista Altieri succumbed to the paralytic stroke which he had had in the Sistina.²

At the beginning of April the discussions centred round Porzia. Partly because he had been proposed by Corsini, who hoped thereby to form a connexion with the Cardinals of Benedict XIII., and partly as the result of his own propaganda, whereby he made so bold as to censure the inertia of the College,³ he succeeded on one occasion in securing thirty votes. Only one more vote was needed, and his election was prevented only by intrigues which nearly deprived Corsini and Tencin of the confidence of their adherents.⁴

A certain delay was caused by Holy Week and Eastertide ; and insignificant moves in favour of Gentili, Aldrovandi, and

with his *letter of April 2, 1740, State Archives, Vienna. Cf. Foscarini's *report of March 26, 1740, *loc. cit.* For the French envoy's audience, see " Narrazione della publica udiienza data dagli em. e rev. s. card. in conclave la mattina della domenica 24 Aprile 1740 al Duca di Sant'Aignan . . . , Roma 1740 ".

¹ In Passionei's cell light conversation and various other ways of passing the time were continually indulged in ; thus on one occasion Acquaviva and Albani argued whether one ought to say " tredicim " or " tresdecim ", and a bet was taken on the question (*Santa Croce to the Emperor, March 12, 1740, *loc. cit.*). On May 4 Cardinal Corsini *reported to the Imperial envoy, " La conversazione di Passionei è composta dei cardinali Camerlengo, Acquaviva, Lambertini, Aldrovandi e di altri del medesimo partito " (supplement to Santa Croce's *letter to the Emperor of May 7, 1740, *ibid.*).

² See *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (3rd week), State Library, Munich, also Count Thun's *letters to the Emperor of March 5 and 19, 1740, State Archives, Vienna, Santa Croce's *report of March 19, and Foscarini's *report of March 5, 1740, *loc. cit.*

³ MUN, 516 ; HARTWIG, *loc. cit.*, 251.

⁴ See *Conclave* in KRAUS, 160 ; Santa Croce's and Foscarini's *reports of April 9, 1740, *loc. cit.*

others were merely diversions.¹ Then one morning in the Sistina Porzia found a satirical pamphlet aimed at him.² He immediately flew into a passion, demanded, in spite of all the attempts made by Albani to calm him, a formal inquiry into the authorship and dissemination of the pamphlet, and left the scrutiny in a towering rage. He was already suffering from kidney disease, but when he died, on June 10th, he was generally spoken of as a victim to "Papal fever".³

Meanwhile, a conversation which had an important bearing on further developments had taken place between the leaders Albani and Corsini. In this Albani declared roundly that all his adherents were "papabili",⁴ while Corsini narrowed his pretensions to more definite propositions: of the eldest Cardinals he named as desirable Massei and Cori, of the middle group D'Elce, Firrao, Cenci, and Aldrovandi, and of the young ones Gentili and Spinola.⁵

In May and June the endless conferences and proposals began again. Corsini canvassed for Cori,⁶ who soon gave up of his own accord, then for Spinola, who was voted against by Acquaviva and others.⁷ Next, Albani worked for Gotti,

¹ *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (9th week), *loc. cit.*; Foscarini's *reports of April 16 and May 7, 1740, *loc. cit.*

² On it was printed: "Sino a tanto che non si daranno delle bastonate a quel frate di Porzia, non usciremo noi da questa via." This is the text in *Conclave* in KRAUS, 162, and is very similar in *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (11th week), *loc. cit.* It is also cited, though not word for word, in Cardinal Kollonitsch's *letter to the Emperor of April 25, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

³ "Rabbia papale"; see BROSSES, *Lettres*, II., 393. Cf. MUN, 518; HARTWIG, 251; Foscarini's *report of June 11, 1740, *loc. cit.*

⁴ "Egli rispose, que tutte le sue creature le stimava degne del papato." He and his party also insisted that if not one of the "old ones", at least one of Benedict XIII.'s cardinals should be considered. Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (10th week), *loc. cit.*

⁵ *V. ibid.*; also *Count Thun to the Emperor, April 23 and *Giudice to the Emperor, April 24, 1740, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Foscarini's *report of May 14, 1740, *loc. cit.*

⁷ The repeated attempts to win over Acquaviva were *reported

who also had to be sacrificed in the face of French threats.¹ The opposite side then supported D'Elce,² and after him Cenci, who had just been given the Last Sacraments.³ On June 25th it was presumed that Firrao would be elected for certain, and the people and the workmen were only waiting for the conclave to close,⁴ when again everything miscarried.

So the days and weeks went by. The heat of summer rendered living conditions in the conclave more and more uncomfortable⁵ and yet the general feeling among the

by him to Quadra on April 7, 21, and 28, 1740, Archives of Simancas.

¹ France's objection to him was reported by *Count Thun on May 6 to Sinzendorf and to the Emperor on May 18, 1740 (*loc. cit.*). But since a break with France on that account had to be avoided (see also the later instructions from Vienna, even that of June 6 in [ROTHMANNER], 138, 145, 147), *Cardinal Kollonitsch wrote in his own hand in a postscript to Sinzendorf on May 18, 1740: "Wir haben umb die union zu conserviren mit denen C. Tencin, Rohan, Corsini bis weiteren befelch den C. Gotti sacrificiren muessen, welcher darumb nicht proponirt worden" (State Archives, Vienna). Cf. Santa Croce's *reports of May 14 and 21, 1740, and Foscarini's *report of May 21, 1740, *loc. cit.*

² " *Rappresentando qualmente questo signore [Elce] è un buon ecclesiastico al pari dell'em. Gotti " (Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (15th week), *loc. cit.*). For Gotti, *v. ibid.* (14th week). Cf. *Acquaviva to Quadra, May 19 and June 2, 1740, *loc. cit.*; *Cardinal Kollonitsch to the Emperor, May 28, 1740, *loc. cit.*; Foscarini's *reports of May 28 and June 4, 1740, *loc. cit.*, Cod., 261, in the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

³ *Conclave*, in KRAUS, 164 *seqq.* After recovering for a while he died on June 24 through having caught a chill while watching the Corpus Christi procession from his cell. *Conclave*, Cod. ital., 323 (19th week), *loc. cit.*; *Count Thun to the Emperor, June 25, 1740, *loc. cit.*; Foscarini's *reports of June 25 and July 2, 1740, *loc. cit.*; MUN, 521.

⁴ Foscarini's *reports of June 18 and 25, 1740, *loc. cit.*; *Count Thun to the Emperor, *ibid.*; BOUTRY, 226. BROSSES (*Lettres*, II., 394 *seqq.*) relates how the Cardinals had already congratulated him in his cell and were solemnly escorting him to the Sistina.

⁵ *Count Thun to the Emperor, July 16, 1740, *loc. cit.* Further

Cardinals was that they would have to go on being patient and unyielding.¹ In the city public prayers for the speedy election of a Pope had been suspended, since, notwithstanding the plenary indulgence, the people had ceased to attend the services.² Among the satires that were broadcast was an engraving in which the conclave was represented by the Ark ; a Cardinal was keeping the window closed, lest the dove with the olive branch might come in, and the drawing was accompanied by the words, " It is not yet time." ³

Then happened what was previously thought to be an impossibility : the three political Powers agreed among themselves and with Corsini to favour a candidature of Aldrovandi's, which was enjoying strong support, especially from Acquaviva.⁴ By July 3rd there were already thirty-one Cardinals voting in his favour, and within the next few days this number rose to thirty-three. According to the number of electors present, only one more vote was needed. At this critical juncture Albani, an out-and-out opponent of Aldro-

the numerous employees of the Curia and their families were suffering severe monetary losses through being out of work ; *v. ibid.*

¹ " *Ora si sta nel conclave in un puro equilibrio di discorsi, non azzardandosi nessun capo di proporre, perchè essendo i partiti forti e da una parte e dall'altra ogn'uno teme d'avere in voti una aperta esclusiva." Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (16th week), State Library, Munich. *Cf.* BOUTRY, 220.

² *Acta hist.-eccl.*, IV., 1053.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Thus *Acquaviva to Quadra as early as July 21, 1740, Archives of Simancas. In the event of his election Valenti was to be Secretary of State and Lambertini Datarius ; see *Acquaviva to Quadra on July 11, 1740, *ibid.* On this occasion, at any rate, he must have collaborated with the Germans in order to pass him through ; see *Acquaviva's final report of August 25, 1740, *ibid.* *Cf.* Foscarini's *reports of July 9 and 16, 1740, and Santa Croce's *report of July 9, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

vandi's,¹ had recourse to a ruse by which, with the assistance of the Minorite Conventual Ravalli, the unsuspecting Aldrovandi was tricked into sending a letter to the Camerlengo in which he assured him of his loyal attachment to him.² By this means Albani hoped to expose him as a vote-stealer. Aldrovandi, however, maintained that he was innocent of any simoniacal intention,³ and again obtained thirty-one votes. Day after day, for weeks, the situation remained unchanged, Albani's opposition party, with nearly always seventeen votes, consistently supporting the purely formal candidature of Corradini.⁴ On July 31st, there still being no sign that the game would ever end, Aldrovandi made an announcement in writing, asking his supporters to cease their efforts on his behalf.⁵

In spite of this, Corsini refused to abandon Aldrovandi's cause, so that the first weeks of August brought no change,⁶

¹ *Santa Croce to the Emperor, April 6, 1740, State Archives Vienna.

² For the text, see *Conclave* in KRAUS, 167 *seq.*, and *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323, fo. 85-8, *loc. cit.* *Ibid.*, fo. 93 *seq.* " *Dichiarazione del p.m. Ravalli intorno al biglietto scritto all'em. sig. card. Aldrovandi," which he made in the following week. Cf. Santa Croce's *report of July 9, 1740, *loc. cit.*; HARTWIG, 255.

³ *Count Thun to the Emperor, August 6, 1740, State Archives, Vienna. He had actually been accused of simony; see *Ruele to the Emperor and to Metsch, July 9, 1740, *ibid.*

⁴ *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (22nd-24th weeks), *loc. cit.*; *Count Thun to the Emperor, July 23, 1740, *loc. cit.*; Foscarini's *reports of July 23 and 30, 1740, and Santa Croce's *reports of July 16, 23, and 30, 1740, *loc. cit.*

⁵ " *Ringraziamento in scritto fatto dall'em. Aldrovandi al s. collegio li 31 Luglio " (Conclave, Cod. ital., 323, fo. 103 *seq.*, *loc. cit.*; translated in *Acta hist.-eccl.*, IV., 1054 *seq.*). Cf. Foscarini's and Santa Croce's *reports of August 6, 1740, *loc. cit.*

⁶ *Cardinal Kollonitsch to the Emperor, August 6, 1740, State Archives, Vienna. Thus Petra, for example, was said to have been won over by a *'Biglietto dell'em. s.c. Quirino al s.c. Petra', in which reference was made to " la lunghezza del conclave, quale è al certo un castigo della collera divina ". Archives of

only Carafa being won over.¹ It was hoped to obtain the two votes that were still necessary by asking the Emperor to send a pressing letter of recommendation to the *Capi d'ordine*.²

And then one fine day thirty-three votes were again cast for Aldrovandi. Albani saw a trap in this: it was evidently going to be left to him to turn the scale with his personal vote. He was mistaken, however, for at the evening scrutiny there were again only thirty-one votes for Aldrovandi. No further progress being made on the following day, Corsini finally dropped Aldrovandi after six weeks' striving on his behalf.³

It was now the middle of August, and as far as could be seen the electors might just as well have been at the beginning of their negotiations; but the end was astonishingly near. A triduum had just been celebrated on the feast of the Assumption for a speedy and desirable conclusion,⁴ when, probably at the instigation of Cibo,⁵ attention was centred on Lambertini. His name had already been proposed from time

the Austrian Embassy in Rome and *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323, fo. 111 *seq.*, State Library, Munich.

¹ Through Acquaviva; see his *letter to Quadra of August 4, 1740, Archives of Simancas. These 32 votes were held for a long time; see Acquaviva's *letter of August 11, 1740, *ibid.*

² On August 6, 1740, Cardinal Acquaviva sent a lengthy *petition to the Emperor to this effect, setting out Aldrovandi's particular fitness in virtue of the assent given by all the Crowns and by so many Cardinals; Italian text in the Archives of Simancas. While Vienna was thinking of some way by which this request might be acceded to, the news came of Lambertini's election; see the Imperial communication to Count Thun of August 31, 1740, in [ROTHMANNER], 160.

³ *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323 (26th week), *loc. cit.*; Foscarini's *reports of August 13 and 17, 1740, *loc. cit.*

⁴ NOVAES, XIV., 8.

⁵ Thus *Conclave* in KRAUS, 166, HEECKEREN, I., x, MUN, 525 *seq.*, HARTWIG, 253. Cf. Santa Croce's *report of August 23, 1740, *loc. cit.* MOURRET (VI., 425) speaks of a proposal by Acquaviva.

to time,¹ usually with an insignificantly small number of votes, but now all hopes of salvation were set on his candidature.² The Cardinal Ministers quickly agreed among themselves to give him their support,³ and Albani promised not to form a party to oppose him, if only to avoid the election of Aldrovandi.⁴ The Cardinals of Benedict XIII. agreed without ado, and several of Corsini's followers declared that they too were well-disposed.⁵ Corsini himself still had his doubts, but they were dissipated after a time,⁶ and within the space of a few

¹ Thus, for example, in Santa Croce's **Diario* under date March 6, 1740, *loc. cit.*; also in a talk between Acquaviva and Kollonitsch, see the **letter* sent by Kollonitsch to Sinzendorf on April 2, 1740, *loc. cit.* By the beginning of July he was being spoken of more seriously; see **Count Thun* to the Emperor on July 2, 1740, *ibid.* **Santa Croce* describes him as being particularly capable and reputable on account of his canonical and historical knowledge, his diplomatic ability, and his open-hearted love of justice: "ed il miglior ecclesiastico che possa desiderarsi" (*Fogli*, Archives of the Austrian Hist. Inst. in Rome). Cf. also above, p. 9, n. 3. BROSSES states in his *Lettres* (II., 337, 402) that he thought more of Lambertini than of any other Cardinal and that he voted for him in a mock conclave held at a social gathering.

² Cordara's reminiscences (DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, III., 8): Cardinales longa fatigati mora, cum hominem noscerent lingua illum quidem paulo solutiore, sed vita probum, magna integritate, moribus incorruptis, ad haec aequi bonique cultorem eximium, affabilem, popularem, tanta inprimis humani divinique iuris scientia, ut hac laude doctissimos quosque sui ordinis anteiret.

³ According to Acquaviva's **report* to Villarias of August 18, 1740 (Archives of Simancas), the three Cardinal Ministers and Corsini met together, at Cibo's suggestion, in Rohan's cell, where they came to an agreement. Cf. Foscari's **report* of August 20, 1740, Cod. 261, of the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican; BOUTRY, 231.

⁴ **Conclave*, Cod. ital., 323 (after the 26th week), State Library, Munich; *Conclave* in KRAUS, 170.

⁵ **Conclave*, Cod. ital., 323, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Foscari's **report* of August 20, 1740, *loc. cit.*; MUN, 526 *seq.*

hours the electors attained the unanimity for which they had been labouring in vain for half a year.¹

Lambertini himself knew next to nothing of what was afoot. Later he was able to write² that he had not let slip a word to any living soul that might bring him to the Papacy; on the contrary, he had done all he could to avoid the honour. About two o'clock in the morning he was about to enter Acquaviva's cell in order to take tea there, as was his custom, when the latter urgently requested him to return to his own cell. Lambertini, however, declined to do so and when he was seated more and more Cardinals, from all parties, entered the cell and kissed his hand in homage.³ At the same time notes were sent out into the city announcing his imminent election.⁴

Whereas in the scrutinies of the previous day not a single vote had been cast for Lambertini, in the next scrutiny—it was the morning of August 17th and the 255th scrutiny of the conclave—all fifty votes were given to him.⁵ Departing from one of the traditions of the conclaves, the newly elected candidate gave his vote, not to the Cardinal Deacon, but to the candidate, Aldrovandi, who had been the centre of so much contention. He excused himself by saying that he had given it to him for forty-five days and that he would give it

¹ “*Compita la grand’opera in sei ore, quando non si era potuto adempire in sei mesi di ostinato contrasto e di un penosissimo carcere.” Draft of a letter from Albani, probably to the Chancellor Sinzendorf, of August 20, 1740, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

² To Tencin, March 1, 1743, in HEECKEREN, I., 36.

³ Complete descriptions of the proceedings in: *Santa Croce to the Emperor, August 23, 1740, State Archives, Vienna; *Cardinal Acquaviva to Villarias, August 18, 1740, Archives of Simancas; Foscarini's *report of August 20, 1740, *loc. cit.* Cf. HARTWIG, 256.

⁴ *Conclave, Cod. ital., 323, *loc. cit.*; *Conclave* in KRAUS, 171.

⁵ A reproduction of this scrutiny list in LECTOR, 616 *seq.*

again to the one who had had to withdraw in his favour. In honour of the Pope to whom he owed his promotion, he took the name of Benedict XIV. Thus the great cleavage between the "creatures" of Clement XI. and Clement XII. was bridged by the election of one of the "middle" group.

The joyful news was announced to the waiting populace from the Loggia of St. Peter's by the First Cardinal Deacon, Marini.² Within as well as without the Sacred College great hopes were set on a pontificate which had begun after such difficulties.³ The solemn coronation took place on August

¹ *Santa Croce to the Emperor, August 23, 1740, *loc. cit.*; Foscarini's *report of August 20, 1740, *loc. cit.*; BOUTRY, 237.

² " *Roma si trova in un pieno giubilo nella ferma fiducia de la somma capacità et intelligenza del nuovo pontefice." Cardinal Albani to Chancellor Sinzendorf, probably on August 20, 1740, draft in the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican; MUN, 528.

³ " *Si sperava dal suo gran spirito e capacità un ottimo governo et il restoramento della s. sede assai pregiudicata particolarmente nell'economico." Cardinal Albani to Metsch, August 27, 1740, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican. — *Satires on the election of Benedict XIV. in: Cod. Vatic. 9373, Vatican Library; Cod. XIV. F. 15, Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples; Cod. 10835, British Museum; *Sonetto, dated 6 Agosto 1740: " Che ha a fare il conclave per l'elezione di Bened. XIV. in dialetto Bolognese," *Miscell. XIII.*, Bibl. Comunale, Forlì; RAVAGLI, *Due sonetti nell'elezione di Bened. XIV.*, in *Erudiz. e belle arti*, IV., 1-2; other poems in FRATI, *Opere di bibliografia*, Bologna, I. (1888), 172 *seq.* In a letter of March 1, 1743, the Pope himself expressed his opinion of the conclave in these terms: " Nous avons scandalisé l'Europe par une si longue durée, dont l'unique cause a été l'opiniâtreté du cardinal Corsini à vouloir pour pape une de ses créatures, afin d'avoir un chapeau à sa disposition " (HEECKEREN, I., 36). For the festivities in Bologna on the occasion of this election, see LONGHI, *Il Palazzo Ufani*, Bologna, 1902, and FR. CANTONI, *Lambertiniana*, Bologna, 1920, 12 *seq.* Here, among other sayings, is " Se volete un santo, fate Gotti, se un politico, Aldrovandi, se un buon uomo, scegliete me ". Similarly in HEECKEREN, I., x.

22nd. It was not possible to perform the customary ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran until April 30th of the following year, on which occasion the Papal blessing was given for the first time from the Loggia of Clement XII.¹

(2)

Prospero Lambertini, born in Bologna on March 31st, 1675,² derived from a family, of Guelphic sentiments, mentioned as early as the tenth century, several members of which had distinguished themselves in military service, civil administration, and scholarship; it had also produced two *beatæ*: Imelda (d. 1333) and Giovanna, a pupil of St. Catherine Vigri of Bologna.³ Once wealthy, the Lambertini had lost a large part of their estates through inundations of the Reno.⁴ Marcello, Prospero's father, died at the age of forty-two, and his mother, Lucrezia Bulgarini, contracted a second marriage, with Count Luigi Bentivoglio. She provided Prospero⁵ with

¹ NOVAES, XIV., 9; CANCELLIERI, *Possessi*, 379 *seqq.* Thun *reports the ceremony thus on May 6, 1741: "S. Sta. non avendo mai in vita sua cavalcato se ne andò in lettica." Only ten cardinals looked on. State Archives, Vienna. Contemporary reports also in CANCELLIERI, 380, n. 1 and 2.

² The modest two-storied birth-house (with memorial tablet) in the Via delle Campane, No. 3016 (now Via Benedetto XIV., No. 6), reproduced in F. CANTONI, *Lambertiniana*, 15, now belongs to Senatore Nerio Malvezzi de' Medici.

³ Cf. C. CONTUZZI, S.J., *De Benedicto XIV. Oratio*, Romae, 1741; P. I. DOLFI, *Cronologia delle famiglie nob. di Bologna*, Bologna, 1670; NOVAES, XIV., 3 *seq.*; REUMONT, *Kleine Schriften*, 453 *seqq.*; G. PIETRAMELLARA, *Elenco d. famiglie nobili Bolognesi*, Bari, 1895, 14 *seq.* " *De quibusdam illustr. viris Lambertinae gentis testimonia," Cod. 48, Bibl. dell'Università, Bologna. See also Thun's *report to Charles VI. of August 23, 1740, State Archives, Vienna. For the family crest, see PASINI FRASSONI, 46 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. Thun's *report just mentioned.

⁵ For what follows, see the two Latin "Lives" in KRAUS,

excellent teachers in the persons of Paolo Pasi and Sante Stancari, who knew how to direct their highly gifted pupil's vivacity along the right lines and to increase his zeal for learning. While other boys were playing, Prospero sat at his books. Later on, he attended the aristocratic Convitto Del Porto conducted by the Somaschi.¹ In 1688, at the age of thirteen, he was sent to Rome to continue his education at the Collegio Clementino, which was also managed by the Somaschi.² There he soon made such progress that he outstripped all his fellow-pupils. A speech made by him in 1691 brought his ability to the attention of Cardinal Benedetto Pamfili. The Cardinal recommended him to Innocent XII., who assigned to him a small benefice which brought him in a hundred gold scudi.

On leaving the Collegio Clementino in 1692, Lambertini devoted himself with both diligence and circumspection to the study of theology and of civil and canon law, concentrating more on historical exposition than on scholastic-speculative deduction. He made himself thoroughly acquainted with the Church Fathers, the decisions of the Councils, and the Papal Bulls, and derived great profit from his intercourse with the Dominican Tommaso Ferrari. In his leisure hours he read Dante, Tasso, and Ariosto, to enliven his style and imagination. In 1694 he obtained his doctorate in law and theology at the University of Rome.

In order to prepare himself in a practical manner for the career of advocate, Lambertini became an assistant to a countryman of his, Alessandro Caprara, the Auditor of the Rota. Here he more than proved his worth and was rewarded by a stream of clients coming from all quarters. Under

Briefe, 207 seqq., 235 seqq. Cf. [Caracciolo], *Vita*, 23 seqq., and the "Comment. de vita Benedicti XIV. auctore Ios. Silvestrio", printed as an appendix to the "Opera Benedicti XIV.", vol. XVII., P. 2, Prati, 1847.

¹ Cf. *Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna*, 1921, 67.

² Cf. G. DONNINO, *I convittori del Collegio Clementino*, Roma, 1898, 17.

Clement XI. he was advanced to higher posts: in 1701 he was appointed Consistorial Advocate, in 1708 *Promotor Fidei*. As holder of the latter office he carried through to a successful conclusion the canonization processes of Pius V. and Catherine Vigri of Bologna. To the exhaustive studies he made at this time, which were justly praised by his contemporaries,¹ and which he afterwards pursued with untiring energy, posterity is indebted for his celebrated work "On the Beatification and Canonization of the Servants of God".² "I could have turned to more pleasurable studies," he wrote to the Canon Regular Galli, "to which I was naturally prone by reason of my lively character, but I felt within me that I was called by religion itself to work for its glorification, and having the opportunity of occupying myself with the processes of beatification at an early stage of my career I did not find it difficult to devote myself to this theme. I undertook the work all the more gladly inasmuch as the procedure followed in canonizations was practically unknown to anyone except the persons actually engaged in it. There were very few days when I was not exceedingly exhausted by the investigations I had to make, but just as one fails to notice the discomforts of a long journey when one is travelling in company, so I forgot this fatigue in the joy of having fellow-workers who helped me with my task; I should have been frightened at my isolation, for fear of going astray, had I really been alone. Moreover, when my mind dictates, my pen is guided by my heart, by reason of the lively joy I feel at being able to be

¹ Cf. F. GALIANI, *Delle lodi di P. Benedetto XIV.*, Napoli, 1758, 12 *seqq.* Benedict XIV.'s private library, which was extraordinarily rich in theological, historical, and other MSS., passed to the University Library in Bologna. Cf. the detailed catalogue by L. Frati in *Studi ital. di filologia classica*, XVI., Firenze, 1908 *seqq.*, 103-142. To the same library Benedict presented his collection of over 30,000 valuable engravings and woodcuts, which, owing to several instances of embezzlement, has not been preserved in its entirety (see *Köln. Volkszeitung* of October 27, 1881).

² *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatificatorum canonizatione*, Bononiae, 1734-8, 4 vols.

of use to religion. For a writer to derive full satisfaction from his work he must be heart and soul in it ; if he undertakes it only for some temporary gain or out of vanity, his mind is only half satisfied, and his work is lost for Heaven. The trivialities I wrote in my youth have given me pleasure only in so far as they led to more serious things. I might liken them to stones which are thrown into a torrent that has to be crossed, and which, as we tread on them, serve to bring us to our goal. If the little outbursts of impatience which this voluminous work has caused me were to be denoted by commas and stops, there would be enough of them for a second punctuation and they would cover a great deal of paper. You know my vivacity ; I cannot bear my pen to be hovering in the air while waiting for an inspiration. But religion, in supplying me with brush and colour, has put me in a position to paint in lasting fashion ; there is nothing higher than what it offers us ; even philosophy is beautiful only as long as religion lends it its beautiful side, since it embraces time and eternity. When I saw my work lying before me with its imprint, I said to it, ' Fear not to forge your way through the sophistries, the fooleries, and the depravities of this age. The truth which constitutes your essence will preserve you in spite of your mistakes and weaknesses, and when the fashionable writings which dazzle the public with the splendour of their phrases will have disappeared you will still be living and will be read by persons of intelligence.' This is my last farewell to my work, which is dear to me, not because it is the product of my brain, but because it will be, I trust, my intercessor with God for the forgiveness of my negligence and errors." ¹

On one occasion Lambertini convinced some doubting Englishmen of the strictness with which canonizations were conducted in Rome by showing them the documents relating to a case ; and they were greatly astonished to hear from him that on account of some seemingly insignificant objections raised by the "*Advocatus Diaboli*" the Congregation had refused the canonization in question.

¹ CARACCILO, 169-171.

Clement XI., a warm friend of all scholars, did not fail to show his appreciation of Lambertini's knowledge and diligence. In 1712 he made him a Canon of St. Peter's, in the following year a consultor of the Inquisition, and then a member of the Congregations of Rites, of ecclesiastical immunity, of the residence of the Bishops, and the *Segnatura di Grazia*, and finally secretary to the Congregation of the Council. To all these offices Innocent XIII. added in 1722 the post of canonist to the Penitentiary. "They must take me for a man with three heads," wrote Lambertini to a friend in his jovial fashion, "to have loaded me with so many offices. For each of these posts I should need a separate soul, and mine can hardly look after me."¹

Lambertini was by no means a mere bookworm and red-tapist. The same man who prepared decisions on the most complicated matters for the Congregations was also a most entertaining companion, whose witty sayings amused the whole of Rome. In the evening, after the burden of the day, it was his custom to gather around him a number of "Curiali" and men of letters whom he would entertain with charm and sprightliness in the most attractive manner. In this way he made a host of acquaintances which were of great service to him in later life. He was very often in the company of the celebrated Maurist Montfaucon, who summed up his character with these words: "Lambertini has two souls, one for science, the other for society." It is related that one day when Montfaucon and Lambertini were engaged in a violent dispute about the rights of the Popes, Lambertini brought it to an end by saying good-humouredly, "A little less liberty on the part of the Gallican Church and less pretensions on our part would even things out nicely."²

From this observation it may be gathered that Lambertini had not yet arrived at the conviction which he cherished in his later years, namely that Gallicanism was incompatible with the God-given rights of the Holy See. Otherwise he was careful not to depart from ecclesiastical principles, however

¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

² *Ibid.*, 26.

much, when the Church had to take up a position, he stressed the practical rather than the ideal aspect of a problem.¹ In this respect he worked as far as possible for compromise and conciliation, especially under Benedict XIII., who greatly valued his opinion. "What has our doctor to say on this point?" was a frequent question of the Pope's.² The "doctor's" counsel prevailed in the negotiations with the Emperor over the *Monarchia Sicula* and the concordat with Savoy,³ although in many quarters the excellent reputation he had previously enjoyed suffered in consequence of the great conciliatoriness he showed on this occasion⁴; but with Benedict XIII. he was as much in favour as before.

Titular bishop of Theodosia in 1725, he was appointed by the Pope to the archbishopric of Ancona on January 26th, 1727. It became known at the same time that he had already been reserved as a Cardinal *in petto* since December 9th, 1726. He was not proclaimed as such until April 30th, 1728.⁵ "Rest assured," he wrote to a friend, "with this transformation I am only changing my colour. I am still the same Lambertini in my character, my lightheartedness, and my friendship for you."⁶

As Archbishop of Ancona, Lambertini showed once more that he knew how to appreciate the essential and true significance of every office that was entrusted to him. In the reformatory spirit of the Tridentine decrees, he worked untiringly for the welfare of his diocese by means of visitations, synods, pastoral letters, and instructions. The restoration of

¹ Justly emphasized by SENTIS (*Monarchia Sicula*, 177).

² See the *Vita* in KRAUS, *Briefe*, 247.

³ Cf. our account, vol. XXXIV, 140 *seqq.* Count Thun observes in his *letter to Charles VI. of August 23, 1740: "V.M. si degnerà specialmente di rammentarsi che da Lui fu perfezionato l'affare della bolla della Monarchia di Sicilia, che in quel tempo stava tanto a cuore di V.M." State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ Cf. the observation in the *Vita di Fini, Cod. Vat. 9405, Vatican Library.

⁵ Cf. our account, vol. XXXIV, 186, 188.

⁶ CARACCILO, 30.

several churches and his gift to his cathedral of a magnificent high altar testified to his practical sense and his love for art. He was also keenly solicitous for the material welfare of his flock.¹

With the same zeal and with the same success as in Ancona he devoted himself to the archdiocese of Bologna, to which he was translated as its chief pastor by Clement XII. in May 1731. When informing the Senate of Bologna of his imminent arrival he mentioned his desire to be buried in the Cathedral, in which he had been baptized fifty-six years before and confirmed ten years later; he was coming with his heart full of love for his fellow-citizens and with the desire to bring them every benefit; he asked them for their support in his intentions and their forbearance in his shortcomings.²

The new archbishop brought no large suite with him; his only attendants, a contemporary remarked, were his virtues.³ Conditions in his native city having become a little unfamiliar to him, he refrained at first from taking action and contented himself with acquiring full information on every subject. "I do not wait," he said, "for the truth to come to me but go forth to seek it; it is of too exalted a rank to be kept waiting in an anteroom." Very simple in his mode of living he was generous towards all in need. Once a week he paid a visit to the tomb of the great founder of the Dominicans, whose mortal remains rest in Bologna, in order that through his intercession he might be given the necessary strength to fulfil his weighty office; he would then visit the sons of St. Dominic to discuss with them matters of religion or learning. As in

¹ See the *Vita* in KRAUS, *Briefe*, 249 *seqq.*, and MARONI, *Lettere*, 718 *seqq.* On July 5, 1729, Lambertini presented a MS. in his possession to the Bibl. Casanatense in Rome; it is Cod. 103; GIOV. FERRARESE, **De immortalitate animae* (saec. 15, with miniatures).

² KRAUS, *Briefe*, 142 *seq.*

³ CARACCILOLO, 31. Cf. F. M. PIRELLI, *Delle lodi del S. P. Benedetto XII.*, Prosa detta in adunanza d'Arcadia 17 Sett. 1741, pp. xi *seqq.*

Rome, he soon became the focus of the intellectual *élite*; men such as Manfredi, Beccari, Galeazzo, and Zannotti delighted in his witty and informative conversation, for he possessed the gift of being able to impart a lesson under cover of a joke.¹

But the Archbishop of Bologna had little leisure, since all his energy was devoted to the administration of his diocese, where he is still remembered to this day. When he had found out the needs of the most remote Apennine villages by making visitations to them, he issued the necessary orders to the diocesan synods. Further visitations served the purpose of informing him to what extent the synodal statutes had been carried out and what results they had had.² His ordinances, which were compiled and published in 1733,³ were so excellent that they served as models for many other bishops. He placed great value on the holding of popular missions, for which he found the right man in Leonardo of Porto Maurizio. The restoration of the seminary of Bologna and of many churches was due to him, and he took a particular interest in the completion of the cathedral of S. Pietro. In the cathedral he chose the spot where his bones were to lie, for being devoid of any ambition he was certain of ending his days in Bologna.⁴ Needless to mention, he took great interest in the archiepiscopal library⁵ and the other learned institutions of his native city.

It is amazing how with all this he still found time for considerable literary activity. His great work on canonization was finished in Bologna,⁶ and that on diocesan synods was

¹ TESTONI in *Nuova Antologia*, Gen.—Febb. 1906.

² For the two visitations of his archdiocese, see the *'Atti delle sue visite pastorali' in the Archivio generale arcivescovile, Bologna.

³ *Notificazioni, editti e istruzioni*, Bologna, 1733.

⁴ Letter of Benedict XIV.'s, published by Gualandi in *Studi e mem. per la storia dell'Università di Bologna*, VI., Bologna, 1921, 100.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ See above, p. 25, n. 2.

begun there. It was not without truth that he said that his best friend was his pen.¹

The following incident is typical of Lambertini's way of governing and of his character in general. A parish priest who had been guilty of some grievous offences received an unexpected visit from his archbishop. "I owe it to God's grace alone," he said to the astounded priest, "if I too am not grievously in error. I have come to weep with you, not to cast reproaches at you. The scandal you have given can only be repaired by your leaving the parish, but as I do not want to make your situation worse I offer you another benefice of equal worth. Come, now, sin no more and embrace me as your father who sheds tears over his son, who is always dear to him."² It is not surprising that a man of this clemency should be impervious to personal affronts. A poetaster had written a bitter satire on him; Lambertini improved the composition himself and sent it back with the remark that in that form it would possibly find a better market.³

Lambertini's biographers do not conceal the fact that owing to his lively temperament he occasionally displayed his irritation in a violent manner; but this never lasted long; his good nature quickly gained the upper hand, and he would try to repair the lapse by showing especial friendliness.⁴ Far more difficult for him was to keep his ever sparkling wit within due bounds. Once he even gave free play to his sarcastic vein when writing to the Pope. Clement XII. had remonstrated with him about the behaviour of the Vicar General of Bologna, complaints of whom had reached Rome. Lambertini, considering these complaints to be entirely without foundation, wrote to the Pope, expressing his opinion without reserve, adding, "Loftiness of situation exposes Your Holiness to the danger of deception, to which I am less subject, having time to make careful investigations. I would sacrifice the accused

¹ See, besides CARACCILO, *loc. cit.*, GUARNACCI, II., 492.

² CARACCILO, 34 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 32. Cf. the *Vita* in KRAUS, *Briefe*, 248.

Vicar if he were guilty, but I know him and I pray daily to our divine Saviour that He may be as content with His vicar on earth as I am with mine."¹ Clement took the joke in good part; he knew Lambertini and continued to seek his counsel in all matters of importance. All that the Pope asked was that the learned canonist should always speak his mind, which was not always that of the Curia.

The high repute enjoyed by Lambertini among the diplomats in Rome may be gauged by the opinion formed of him by the Imperial ambassador to the Conclave, Santa Croce. "The Cardinal of Bologna," he wrote on the eve of the conclave, "combines erudition with purity of morals and so many other good qualities that he must be regarded as one of the most excellent members of the Sacred College."² His great erudition was universally recognized. "Not for ages has there been a Pope so versed in *iure et praxi Romanæ curiæ*," reported Kollonitsch to the Emperor Charles VI. "A man of excellent character, he has administered his archbishopric of Bologna in the most commendable manner."³

According to the Abbé Certain, secretary to the Duke Saint-Aignan, the basic features of the new Pope's character were his good nature and his probity. His good nature, he says, was almost excessive; he could never refuse a favour. His elevation to the highest dignity had made no difference to his sentiments, or his discourse, or his way of living; he was as simple and as affable as ever. He had received his friends with incomparable cordiality, even those of the lowest rank. He had reminded them of the past, had joked with them, and had refused to let them kiss his foot, offering them his hand instead, saying, "We shall always remain friends."⁴

¹ CARACCIOLLO, 34.

² *'Stato presente dell'Italia e della corte di Roma da presentarsi a S.M.C. nel principio dell'anno 1740', formerly in the Archivio Santa Croce, purchased by L. von Pastor in 1910 in Rome, from Bocca; see above, p. 2, n. 3.

³ *Kollonitsch to Charles VI., August 17, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ Report of August 19, 1740, in HEECKEREN, I., xxii-iii.

The Imperial Pro-Minister, Joseph, Count Thun, in a report which he made shortly after the election, mentioned as the most prominent characteristics of Benedict XIV. his sincerity and frankness ; any kind of duplicity was abhorrent to him, and he said openly what he felt, while often indulging in witty jests.¹

The Venetian ambassador, Marco Foscarini, in announcing the result of the election, pointed out that the new Pope, having never held a nunciature, had no great knowledge of political conditions, but that his lively temperament, his excellent memory, and his good sense rendered him capable of sound judgment. He is naturally good-hearted, continued Foscarini, pleasant-mannered, eloquent, inclined now and then to indulge in witty sayings, and easily excited, but he soon calms down again. He has had no occasion to occupy himself with public finance ; in his private life he has shown more inclination towards liberality than thrift, providing for the churches and the poor in the manner of the first Christians. Otherwise he has always allowed others to administer his finances ; he is said not to know the value of money. He will see to the good discipline of the clergy, but without being too strict. Although he has devoted himself chiefly to juristic studies, he will encourage all scholars and will pick good officials for himself. Hitherto he has shown no tendency to promote undeserving relatives. If any conclusion can be drawn from his previous conduct as to his management of affairs, he will be more forbearing than severe. With regard to the jurisdictional conflicts of the Holy See, he has always been inclined to be so yielding that it was said of Monsignore Lambertini that he wrote excellently but that he found it too easy to avoid unpleasantness and to wriggle out of a difficulty. This attitude was especially noticeable in the

¹ “ L'indole di S. Stà è specialmente ingenua e sincera avendo orrore alla doppiezza e parlando con la lingua come la senti nel cuore. Perciò fu sempre tenuto come uomo libero e franco nei suoi consigli spiegandosi talvolta con motti faceti che gli sono assai naturali.” Report by Count Thun, August 23, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

time of Benedict XIII., when he was dealing with the troubles with Savoy.¹

Four years later, another Venetian ambassador, Francesco Venier, gave it as his opinion that Benedict XIV. had remained as he had been when a prelate : open-hearted, straightforward, and honest, an enemy to all those arts which are known as " Roman ".²

All things considered, Benedict XIV. may be said to have been the incarnation of the best and the most pleasing side of the Italian character.³ The same may be said of his appearance : of medium height, he was inclined to corpulence ; his full, fresh-complexioned face, beneath his chestnut-coloured, slowly greying hair, was expressive of goodness and benevolence ; his large, blue, and unusually lively eyes radiated prudence and intelligence ; around his mouth lay a line of humour.⁴ Shortsightedness, the bane of scholars,

¹ Report of August 20, 1740, in MATSCHEG, 30.

² RANKE, III., 223.

³ KRAUS, *Briefe*, xiii.

⁴ Benedict's character is excellently portrayed in Pietro Bracci's bust in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin (*cf.* SCHOTTMÜLLER, *Ital. Skulptur*, 193 ; *id.*, *Ital. Bildnisbüsten*, Berlin, 1923, 10, illus. 15). A second bust by Bracci is in the Castello Sforzesco in Milan (*cf.* GRADARA, *Bracci*, tav. XXXIV.). Of two other busts by Bracci, also good, one is in the museum at Grenoble, the other in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (see DOMARUS, 41). Other busts of the Pope in marble are in the Cathedral at Ancona (of 1748) and in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome (Sala delle Muse), by P. Verschaffelt (see BERINGER, 34), in the baptistry of S. Maria Maggiore and the Bibl. Angelica in Rome, in Padua Cathedral (see *Vita di Clemente XIII.*, Venezia, 1769, 13), and at Castel Gandolfo (as Cardinal). For G. B. Maini's over-lifesize marble statue on the staircase of the former Convento di S. Agostino (now the Ministero della Marina), see *Repert. f. Kunstwiss.*, XXXIV., 14 *seqq.* ; it gives a better idea of the Pope's character than the statue on his tomb in St. Peter's. The statue in Trinità de' Pellegrini is a good work (Fot. Moscioni 22388, DOMARUS 37), as is also the half-figure in marble which the Cistercians had executed by Carlo Marchionni in the Convento

di S. Croce in Gerusalemme (reproduced in ORTOLANI, *S. Croce i.G.*). Another excellent work is the marble statue, nearly 7 feet in height, by P. Verschaffelt at Monte Cassino (see BERINGER, 34). The bust set up in 1754 at the entrance to the lower church of S. Francesco at Assisi records the elevation of the church to a patriarchal basilica (see KLEINSCHMIDT, *Die Basilika des hl. Franziskus zu Assisi*, Berlin, 1915, 59); in the treasury at Assisi there is also a gold chalice of the Pope's. For the bust in the Palazzo Civico at Ancona, see MARONI, *Lettere*, 721 *seqq.* — The best-known portrait is that by P. Subleyras (d. 1749) in the Museum at Chantilly (see GRUYER, *Peint. au château de Chantilly*, II., [1898], 302; *cf. Gazette des beaux-arts*, 1925, 70), which Benedict presented to the Sorbonne (see *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 284); it has been repeatedly engraved (see the catalogue published by C. Lang in Rome of the *Ritratti ital. della Raccolta Cicognara Morbio*, 23; here too, "tav. II.," is the reproduction of an unsigned but excellent portrait "en manière noire") By the same artist are the portraits in the Pinacoteca at Ferrara and in the Mansi Collection at Lucca (see Voss, 643). Subleyras' portrait is reproduced also in the first volume of the *Corresp. de Benoît XIV.*, the editor, E. de Heeckeren, remarking (p. xi): "C'est un tableau d'apparat: draperies, fauteuil, costume, tout y est d'une richesse destinée sans doute à donner plus de solennité au personnage, somptuosité bien inutile d'ailleurs, le spectateur étant pris dès l'abord par la physionomie du modèle, d'une ressemblance parfaite, comme on peut facilement le constater par la comparaison des portraits connus." Of these the best-known are by Jacques Gautier Dagoty (*cf. THIEME*, XIII., 291 *seq.*), Et. Desroches, and Laurent Cars (*Galerie hist. de Versailles*; see the Index of Portraits ed. by W. Coolidge Lane and Nina E. Browne, Washington, 1906, 121). Other artists who painted Benedict XIV.'s portrait were P. G. Batoni (see *THIEME*, III. 36; Voss, 645) and L. Stern (see *NOACK*, 46). Further examples of portraits in oils have been noted in the museum at Faenza, in the Museo Piersanti at Matelica, in S. Niccolò at Bari, and in the Hospital at Kues on the Moselle. In the Museo Nazionale at Naples there is a painting by Pannini: "Carlo III. visita Bened. XIV." The Viennese artist G. K. v. Prenner, in Rome from 1743 onwards, opened his series of portrait-etchings of famous contemporaries with that of Benedict XIV. (see *NOACK*, 43). As Cardinal, Lambertini was painted by G. M. Crespi

had been spared him ; in his eighty-fourth year he could read any kind of writing without glasses, even the most difficult.¹ What was more important, he enjoyed the best of health for very many years ; though sixty-five years old at his election, he seemed hardly to be in the fifties, so lively were his movements, so fresh his complexion.²

The preservation of his good health was due in no small measure to his remarkable temperance. For breakfast he took chocolate and biscuits, at midday, soup, vegetables, and roast meat, followed by a pear, in the evening nothing but a glass of water flavoured with cinnamon ; at midday, too, he drank only water ; it was not until the close of his life that he took a little Montepulciano.³

Benedict XIV. had been so much a man of labour that he could justly say that it had become second nature with him.⁴ On being raised to the highest dignity, he exerted himself even more than before, resolved, like a brave soldier, to die fighting.⁵ Rising as early as five o'clock, he was active the whole day long and retired to bed late. The morning was usually so much occupied with audiences that he had to return to his study immediately after the midday meal.⁶

(*cf.* H. Voss, *G. M. Crespi*, Roma, 1921, 13) and by P. Nelli (an engraved copy by G. Massi in *Cod. 1323, 104, of the Bibl. Casanatense, Rome). A drawing of Lambertini by P. L. Ghezzi is in the *Cod. Ottob., 3112, 68, of the Vatican Library. In the Museo d'Arte Industriale in the Palazzo Margellini, Bologna, is an attractive oil-painting of Benedict XIV. at the age of six, with a serious expression (reproduced in F. CANTONI, *Lambertiniana*, Bologna, 1920, 23).

¹ IO. MARIA MERENDA, **Memorie del pontificato di Benedetto XIV.*, Cod. 1613, Bibl. Angelica, Rome.

² **Ibid.* Cf. the beginning of Part 4 of the *Acta hist.-eccles.*, Weimar, 1740, 1050.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 127, 213, II., 539. Cf. the supplement to the *report by Kollonitsch to Sinzendorf of August 23, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., 52, 70.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 45, 52, 112, 142, 229.

In one of his letters to Cardinal Tencin he said that it seemed to him a miracle that he was able to satisfy all the demands that were made upon him ; his first secretary, who had served him for twenty years, had succumbed to the strain and had had to retire for a rest to his home in Ancona ; his second secretary, who had been in his employment for an equal number of years, was asking to be spared, wherefore he had chosen a third one. "Although We," he continued, "are thirty-five and forty-five years older than the aforementioned, We hold out at dictation while they tire at writing." ¹

In order to retain his freshness under the burden of so much labour, Benedict XIV., both before and after his election, moved about as much as possible. In the morning he would often repair to one church or another to say Mass and then take a walk. In the afternoon, two hours before the *Ave Maria*, he would regularly drive out in his carriage, first to a church to visit the Blessed Sacrament, and then for another walk.

The minimum of pomp with which he took these drives did not escape attention,² but greater surprise was caused when, beginning with the autumn of 1743, he extended his excursions through the city in all directions, whereas his predecessors had shown themselves in public only five or six times a year.³ The Pope could be met with in the streets of Rome like an ordinary Monsignore ; his steps supported by a cane, he wandered here and there throughout the city, even penetrating into out-of-the-way, poor-class districts, such as Trastevere, where he would stand talking quite happily in the street with people of low degree.⁴ Another innovation of his was to give

¹ *Ibid.*, 477.

² Thun's *report to Charles VI. of August 27, 1740, State Archives, Vienna. Cf. in this connexion I. M. MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome.

³ CARACCILO, 62.

⁴ Ruele's *report to Uhlfeld of October 19, 1743, and the *report to Maria Theresa of October 12, 1743, State Archives, Vienna. Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 93.

audiences in the garden of the Quirinal,¹ where he eventually had a *casino* built for the purpose. Women were received only in the chapel of a church; they were not admitted to the Vatican or the Quirinal except in the Pope's absence.²

Regularly at the end of May and in October he permitted himself a *villeggiatura* at Castel Gandolfo³, where he was entirely free from ceremonial but not from work.⁴ From here he visited the surrounding churches and villas, conversed with the country folk, and wandered through the woods, refreshing himself with the sight of Nature.⁵ Only once, in the jubilee year 1750, out of regard for the pilgrims to Rome, did he cut short his country holiday, which he had also allowed himself regularly every year when resident in Bologna.⁶

In the seventh year of his reign an alteration in his mode of living was occasioned by the death of his physician, Antonio Leprotti⁷, who was succeeded by the Bolognese Marcantonio Laurenti. The Pope laid little store by doctors, believing that life and death depended on God alone; nevertheless, Laurenti succeeded in depriving him of the conviction that the only way to keep well was to indulge in plenty of walking. Thenceforward, on Laurenti's advice, Benedict took only a moderate amount of exercise in his apartments and then went out for a drive. Laurenti also prescribed a different diet for the Pope,

¹ Mellini's *report to Kaunitz of October 8, 1752, State Archives, Vienna.

² CARACCILO, 62.

³ *To-day, wrote Cardinal Albani on June 3, 1741, His Holiness departed for Castel Gandolfo, "dove è passata senza comitiva non desiderando nessuna e bramando di godere la sua quiete e la piena sua libertà."

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., 58.

⁵ Thun's *report to Maria Theresa of June 10, 1741, State Archives, Vienna, and a Roman *newspaper of June 24, 1747, in the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican. Cf. CARACCILO, 74.

⁶ I. M. MERENDA, *Memorie, Bibl. Angelica, Rome.

⁷ HEECKEREN, I., 240. For Leprotti, see LOMBARDI, III., 139, 223 seq.; for Laurenti, *ibid.*, 202.

in accordance with which wine was completely banished from his table.¹

Every morning Benedict XIV. received his Secretary of State, and then the Datario and the Sottodatario. The other high officials, such as the Auditor and the Secretary of the Memorials, were not admitted until the evening, after which it was the Pope's custom, just as it had been in Bologna, to enjoy a brief hour of relaxation, discussing in an intelligent and witty manner with an intimate group of friends such topics as art, literature, and the latest happenings in Rome or anywhere else in the world. To this inner circle belonged the Maggiordomo, the Maestro di Camera, the physician-in-ordinary Leprotti, the archæologist Bottari², and the learned philologist Bouget, who had been made a privy chamberlain.³

This Frenchman had been a friend of the Pope's for forty years, Benedict having always been strongly attracted towards him on account of his consistently gay and witty character and his highly refined culture ; they frequently competed with each other in quoting from the classics.⁴ The abstemious Benedict was especially amused at Bouget's lack of practical sense and of his weakness (though he was otherwise a good priest) for the pleasures of the table. There are numerous witty allusions to this in the Pope's correspondence with Cardinal Tencin.⁵

In consequence of Benedict XIV.'s fondness for enlivening himself and his *entourage* by cracking jokes, a number of

¹ According to Merenda's *report, *loc. cit.* For the two physicians, see also MORONI, XLIV., 137, and HEECKEREN, I., 241, 249, 251, 268, 285, 477, 499, II., 114 ; praise of Laurenti in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 38.

² *Giornale*, 53, 475.

³ *MERENDA, *loc. cit.* ; CARACCILOLO, 61, 104 ; L. DELAUNAY, *Un ami de Benoît XIV. le prieur Bouget*, Angers, 1918.

⁴ CARACCILOLO, 104.

⁵ Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 47, 102, 226, 280, 464, 471, 476, 483, 488, 493, 499, 511, II., 8, 14, 42, 62, 75, 77, 126.

sayings and anecdotes have been ascribed to him, the authenticity of which it is impossible to guarantee.¹ That Benedict, whose sense of humour had to find expression, no matter what the occasion, sometimes overstepped the mark, can hardly be denied. Even though he was Pope, his ebullient personality was not to be restricted. As he was not always able to keep his tongue in check, sometimes remarks escaped him which were not exactly seemly.² But this weakness was accompanied with so much *bonhomie* that no one took it ill; a false interpretation was precluded by the moral earnestness of his conduct,³ which was never called in question.⁴ To Benedict XIV. a certain unrestrainedness was one of the necessities of life. On it being suggested to him that now he was Pope he should refrain from using the coarse expressions of the Bolognese

¹ R. GIOVAGNOLI (*Leggende Romane. Papa Lambertini*. Roma, 1887) publishes uncritically *motti* based on oral tradition as well as on literary evidence. Probably the most authentic jokes are those retailed by Caracciolo. In the course of time Benedict XIV. became a legendary figure in this respect, and among the sayings attributed to him many were of a most outspoken nature. The only truth there is in the matter is that he usually expressed himself with the naturalism characteristic of Italians. In 1826 (!) Count Carlo Rangone of Bologna drew up a list of his jokes that were still in circulation in that city. This collection, preserved in *Cod. B. 2868 of the Bibl. dell'Archiginnasio di Bologna, has been published, with a copious commentary, by F. CANTONI (*Lambertiniana ossia i motti di Papa Lambertini*, Bologna, 1904). They have, of course, no claim to authenticity.

² According to a private *letter of Count Thun's, of August 18, 1742, Benedict XIV. attested the truth of a statement he had made to him with the protestation, "Se ciò non era vero, che il diavolo lo portasse via subito" (State Archives, Vienna). Thun, however, who soon became ill-disposed towards Benedict XIV., is unable to report any other unseemly utterance.

³ " *Ha sempre manifestato una piena integrità di costumi," writes Santa Croce on August 23, 1740, to Charles VI. State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ Not even the frivolous President De Brogues; see his *Lettres*, II., 401.

dialect, his reply was that he was now in a position to ennoble the parlance of his homeland.¹

Not infrequently Benedict used his humour as a weapon in diplomatic conversations. More than once, he said, he had extricated himself from an embarrassing situation by means of a joke, and if he had to compile a manual for statesmen he would advise them to follow his example. In this way questions which one was anxious to avoid could be put well into the background, and the threads of a conversation which one would rather not pursue could be broken off quite easily.²

Benedict XIV.'s characteristic clemency and magnanimity were manifested at the very beginning of his reign, when he released Cardinal Coscia from his confinement in the Castel S. Angelo³ and overloaded with benefices Cardinal Corsini, who had been so hostile towards him.⁴

What, more than anything, won universal recognition was that he kept himself entirely free from nepotism. His brother Egano, secretary in Bologna, received the order not to show himself in Rome until he was summoned by him—which summons was never issued. The Church was his family, he said, and the Lord's coat was not to be divided.⁵ All the distinctions which Spain offered to his family he refused.⁶ On sending his nephew to be educated at the Collegio Clementino he strictly forbade the rector to treat him differently from the other pupils. He let it be clearly understood that no member of his family would rise to a higher position through him. His family was to continue in the same simple, modest circumstances as before.⁷

¹ CARACCILO, 88.

² *Ibid.*, 113.

³ Cf. *MERENDA, *loc. cit.*; CARACCILO, 42.

⁴ The Venetian ambassador Foscarini says that this was "il più eroico di S. Stà". See GANDINO, *L'ambasceria di M. Foscarini*, 73.

⁵ CARACCILO, 70, 160. Benedict disapproved of Innocent X.'s nepotism; see HEECKEREN, I., 326.

⁶ HEECKEREN, I., 205.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I., 505, II., 213, 226, 232 *seq.*, 560. Cf. also KRAUS,

Even before his coronation, which took place in August, 1740, Benedict XIV. proceeded to fill the most important offices.¹ That of Secretary of State was entrusted to Cardinal Valenti Gonzaga, that of Prodatarius to Cardinal Aldrovandi, a Bolognese,² who at first exerted great influence on the Pope and persuaded him, generous and good-hearted as he was, that it was sometimes necessary to say "No".³ Francesco Mario Spannochi was confirmed in his office of Sottodatario, Passionei and Gian Vincenzo Lucchesini in the Secretariat of Briefs. Giuseppe Livizzani was made Secretary of the Memorials, Antonio Rota the Secretary of the Cipher, Prospero Colonna di Sciarra the Maestro di Camera, Girolamo Colonna the Maggiordomo, Teodoro Boccapaduli the Elemosiniere, Mario Bolognetti the Tesoriere, and Ludovico Merlini the pro-Uditore, but only until the arrival of Count Melara from Bologna, where he had already been a confidant of Lambertini's.⁴ In September Benedict XIV. invited Cardinal Gotti

Briefe, 92, and GUARNACCI, I. Praef. vi. " *La sua famiglia molto antica in Bologna apena aveva mille scudi d'entrata, et in 18 anni di pontificato apena si conta che possa adesso averne cinquemila e forse non averebbe neppur questo, se il card. Millo non avesse usata tutta l'industria," writes MERENDA, *loc. cit.*

¹ See Cardinal Acquaviva's *letters to M. de Villarias of August 18 and 20, 1740, Archives of Simancas, and Thun's *report to Charles VI. of August 23, 1740, *loc. cit.*; also *MERENDA, *loc. cit.* Cf. MORONI, XLI., 136, 271.

² Cf. FANTUZZI, *Mem. d. vita del card. Aldrovandi*. In his native city he built the magnificent palace in the Via Galliera, No. 8 (now the Palazzo Montanari). See F. CANTONI, *Lambertiniana*, 12, and the monograph by RICCI, Bologna, 1886. Aldrovandi afterwards lost his influence and resigned the Dataria in 1743.

³ Thus Santa Croce *reports to Charles VI. on September 19, 1740. On November 23, 1741, Thun *announces to Maria Theresa: " Il card. Aldrovandi vedendosi decaduto del credito e confidenza del papa s'astiene dal parlargli d'altre cose se non beneficiali e qualche camerale, rendendosi in oltre inaccessibile." State Archives, Vienna. On Aldrovandi's death in 1756 Benedict XIV. characterized him as a restless person; see KRAUS, *Briefe*, 91.

⁴ Count Melara, who, according to Thun's *report of August 23,

to take up his residence in the Papal palace, as he wished to retain his services as theological adviser, as Clement VIII. had done with Bellarmine and Innocent XII. with Gabrielli.¹

Silvio Valenti Gonzaga was born in 1690 in Mantua, where the great palace still stands as a witness to the importance of his family. Coming to Rome when still a youth, he was already employed in important affairs under Clement XI. Made Consultor of the Inquisition by Benedict XIII., he rose to still higher offices under Clement XII. He was nuncio in Brussels from 1731 to 1736, and from then until the end of 1739 in Madrid, where his prestige was of the highest.

Versatile, untiring, and keen-witted, Valenti acquired during his nunciatures the policy which was described by a contemporary as knowing everything without appearing to know anything.² Clement XII. had raised him to the purple on December 9th, 1738, and had then nominated him as legate of Bologna.³ On his being promoted Secretary of State his post at Bologna was filled by Alberoni, at the instigation of Cardinal Acquaviva, who at first commanded considerable influence,⁴ but to the scant joy of the Bolognese. With

1740, had already pleased the Pope in Bologna with his "umore faceto", retained his influence in Rome (*Letter from Thun to Maria Theresa, November 19, 1740, *loc. cit.*). The former Maggiordomo, Capponi (d. 1746), was given a fine monument, designed by Fuga and executed by R. M. Slodtz, in S. Giovanni de' Fiorentini; see *Bollet. d'arte*, 1913, 181. For G. Colonna, see RENAZZI, *Storia de' Vicedomini del Pal. Lat.*, 160 *seqq.* For Gian Vincenzo Lucchesini, see MORONI, LXIII., 273, and LOMBARDI, III., 242. He compiled the **Epist. ad princ.* 109-111, Papal Secret Archives, from 1740 till October 28, 1744, when his place was taken by Gaetano Amato (**Epist.*, 111-121, *ibid.*). For the "sostituto dei brevi ad princ. Fil. Maria Bonamici", see MAZZUCHELLI, II., 4, 2316 *seqq.*; RENAZZI, IV., 332.

¹ *Thun's *letter to Charles VI., September 3, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

² CARACCILO, 44 *seq.*

³ Cf. *Elogio del card. S. Valenti Gonzaga*, Roma, 1776.

⁴ MERENDA, **Memorie*, *loc. cit.* Merenda relates that the "segretario di brevi Passionei che colle sue maniere sprezzanti

Cardinal Lambertini, Valenti Gonzaga had long been on friendly terms, a bond between them being their love for learning and art.¹ These interests Cardinal Gonzaga continued to manifest when Secretary of State.

Chairs of chemistry and physics were founded by him in the University of Rome, and he instructed the Jesuits Boscovich and Maire to undertake the measurement of the degrees and the making of a detailed map of the Pontifical State.² Well away from the hubbub of the capital, near the Porta Pia, in the vineyards of the Florentine family Ciciaporci, he built for himself an elegant country seat (afterwards the Villa Bonaparte), in the park and gardens of which he grew exotic plants and fruits, including the first pine-apples. The two-storied Casino, built by the French architect Maréchal to designs by Gian Paolo Pannini, contained a choice library, antique and other works of art, scientific instruments, and Chinese porcelain.³ Here, on Sundays and holidays, the highly cultured Cardinal gathered around him a coterie of scholars and artists. Among them were not only political economists

aveva disgustato molto il card. Corsini, di cui era creatura, dovera nei primi giorni secondo il consueto supplire alle veci di segretario di stato." Corsini is said to have tried to remove Passionei, who with Acquaviva's help had kept his position, without, however, enjoying the Pope's favour.

¹ Even as a simple *abate* Valenti had sufficient knowledge of art to be entrusted by Prince Eugene with the purchase of various works (ARNETH, III., 72). In 1750 Valenti undertook the restoration of S. Urbano a Campo Carleo (FORCELLA, IX., 503, 507), and he helped towards the restoration of S. Paolo fuori le Mura (*ibid.*, XII., 25). For his interest in Raphael's Loggie, see our account, vol. VIII., 317, n. The engraver Paolo Fidanza da Camerino dedicated several of his works to him, and Venuti did likewise with his *Numismata Rom. Pont.*, Romae, 1744.

² Cf. RENAZZI, IV., 236 *seqq.*, 288.

³ F. CANCELLIERI, *Descrizione delle carte cinesi che adorano il palazzo della villa Valenti*, Roma, 1815, 3; MORONI, LXXXVII., 248, C214 *seq.*; HEECKEREN, II., 350, 381. Cf. " *Versi sciolti della villa del card. S. Valenti scritti dall'Ab. Bettinello ", in Fondo Gesuit. 107, 227 (Bibl. Vittorio Emanuele, Rome).

and literati, but also mathematicians, such as the learned Jesuit Boscovich and the commentators of Newton, Le Seur and Jacquier, of the Order of Minims; another visitor was Winckelmann.¹ It was in such company that Valenti, who had something about him of the Cardinal Princes of the Renaissance,² sought relief from the heavy burden of governmental business. This "unique man", as Benedict XIV. called him, was untiring in the execution of his official duties and earned the Pope's approval so completely that he spoke of him as being not so much a minister as a master of the thorny problems of the Pontificate.³ The collaboration of the two men was never disturbed by any discordant note; it was so close indeed that it is impossible to separate the Pope's work from that of his Secretary of State.⁴

Other men who were influential in matters of State besides Valenti were the Uditore Argenvilliers and Millo, who was appointed Datarius on Aldrovandi's dismissal in 1743; but Valenti always remained the chief adviser of the Pope, though the latter was highly independent and often made decisions on his own account.⁵ When Valenti had a seizure at the end of December 1751, Benedict considered it a most serious misfortune. "May God," he wrote to Cardinal Tencin, "yet preserve for Us this excellent minister, whose devotion to Us is as great as his knowledge of affairs."⁶

¹ Cf. JUSTI, *Winckelmann*, II., 104; NOACK, *Das deutsche Rom*, Rome, 1912, 160 seq., with a reproduction of the villa.

² Merenda (**Memorie*; Bibl. Angelica, Rome) tells us that Valenti had a "piccolo nano" who was well-known as being "mirabile et straordinario nella piacevolezza". Cf. also "**Lettere private del card. S. Valenti Gonzaga a Luigi Gualterio arcivesc. de Myra a. 1744*", Cod. 20615, British Museum.

³ CARACCIOLIO, 127.

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., xviii., lxx., with a successful attack on the *Mémoires de Choiseul*.

⁵ Relation of Mocenigo, of 1750, in RANKE, III., 223* seqq. Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 88. In spite of Valenti's determined opposition, Benedict XIV. made Argenvilliers a Cardinal; see below, pp. 343, 344.

⁶ HEECKEREN, II., 158. Cf. CIBRARIO, *Lettere*, 277, 279.

A delicate regard for the stricken Cardinal induced the Pope to postpone the nomination of his successor, though the names of the most varied candidates were already being suggested by the diplomats.¹ For the time being he entrusted current business to the Secretary of the Cipher, Rota,² for whom he had a high regard, while the more important questions were reserved for personal discussion between himself and Valenti, whom he visited for this purpose twice weekly in his villa by the Porta Pia.³ A second seizure, at the end of December, 1754, put an end to the hopes that had been cherished that Valenti might at least partially recover. When Rota fell ill too, the Pope had to shoulder nearly all the work alone, but hard as this was for him and though he too was repeatedly unwell, he still would not hear of nominating a successor to Valenti. "We must bow to the will of God," he insisted, "and accept whatever He sends Us."⁴ With the utmost patience he continued to deal with every question single-handed until, at last, on August 28th, 1756, Valenti was released from his sufferings at Viterbo, where he had been vainly seeking a cure from the baths.⁵

Only three days later, Cardinal Alberico Archinto, whose unswerving love of justice as Governatore of Rome had gained the respect of everybody and the especial approbation of the Pope,⁶ was appointed the new Secretary of State.

¹ Cf. Mellini's *letter to Uhlfeld of December 22, 1751, in which Cardinals Doria, Paolucci, Spinelli, Landi, Lanti, Oddi, Barni, Crescenzi, and Stoppani are mentioned as candidates. On July 2, 1752, *Mellini is able to report to Kaunitz that Valenti had been corresponding with France and Frederick II. and that his first thought on recovering from his stroke had been to seal this correspondence and hand it over to a nunnery for safe-keeping. State Archives, Vienna.

² HEECKEREN, I., 104, II., 234. Unfortunately Rota had been bought by France; *ibid.*, I., 104, n. 5.

³ MERENDA, **Memorie*, *loc. cit.*

⁴ HEECKEREN, II., 383; *cf.* 381.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II., 524.

⁶ Cf. MERENDA, **Memorie*, *loc. cit.*, and JUSTI, *Winckelmann*, II., 10.

Benedict wrote at the time that he had made this choice because Archinto had acquired a deep knowledge of diplomatic affairs as nuncio in Florence (1740-46) and Poland (1746-54) and because he was a man of excellent character.¹

The appointment of Archinto, who, incidentally, was as much a lover of art as Valenti,² proved so successful that the Pope was able to say of him, " I should have to have ten eyes to follow all his actions, they are so deft and rapid. He works as another would play, with astounding ease ; and serious as he is, he laughs at my jokes, good and bad alike. I let him do everything, merely scribbling my paraph at the foot of all his documents ; I am quite certain that all that he suggests is excellent. Sometimes I regret that our Government has not the brilliance of the Prussian King's, so that my Cardinal's talent might show to better advantage ; but when I think of the repose that we enjoy I say to myself, Why wish for storms when we have so beautiful a calm ? " ³

For the more important ecclesiastico-political questions Benedict XIV. was his own Secretary of State. He who under Benedict XIII. and Clement XII. had already played a decisive part in the negotiations undertaken with the object of settling the manifold ecclesiastico-political differences with the Catholic Powers, now, as Pope, set himself the task, by means of skilful mediation and well-timed concessions, of steering the bark of Peter between the Scylla of State absolutism and Gallicanism and the Charybdis of " enlightenment " and rationalism. Keeping clear of any curialistic subtlety or harshness, he directed all his energy towards the restoration of peace with the Catholic Governments, knowing full well

¹ HEECKEREN, II., 525 ; *cf.* 532. Cardinal Portocarrero had declared his opposition to Cardinal Doria as Secretary of State ; see the former's *report to R. Wall of September 2, 1756 (Archives of Simancas).

² One artist he encouraged was Raphael Mengs ; *cf.* NOACK, *Deutsches Kunstleben*, 71.

³ CARACCILO, 147.

that any disturbance in this sphere would bring great profit to the enemies of religion.¹

The negotiations for a settlement with the Court of Turin had been interrupted by the death of Clement XII.² Benedict XIV. immediately renewed them in no half-hearted fashion and supplied his Secretary of State with precise information of the course taken by the conflict with Savoy since the time of Innocent XII.³ Then, excluding any kind of intermediary, he put himself in direct correspondence with the leading personages, the Marchese d'Ormea and King Emanuele III.⁴

Thanks to the marked spirit of conciliation shown by the Pope, it was possible, as early as January 5th, 1741, for two agreements to be signed by Cardinals Valenti and Alessandro Albani on the one hand and the Sardinian plenipotentiary, Count Rivera, on the other, with the approval of a Congregation of Cardinals.⁵ The first agreement concerned the long-disputed question of the Papal feudal territories in Piedmont, and arranged for the transference of the Vicariate Apostolic to the King of Sardinia, with the obligation of paying a feudal tribute. The second, while confirming the enactments of Benedict XIII, regulated the difficult question of benefices. With regard to the administration of the revenues of vacant benefices it was laid down that only a cleric should be entrusted with the task.⁶

Nothing more remained to be settled but the differences of

¹ Cf. HERGENRÖTHER, *Piemonts Unterhandlungen*, 60.

² Cf. Acquaviva's *letter to M. de Villarias, February 6, 1740, Archives of Simancas.

³ This *report is in Cod. 1210, p. 229 *seqq.*, Bibl. Corsini, Rome.

⁴ " *Inventando una nuova specie di brevi epistolari in Italiano col suo picciolo sigillo nella qual forma scriveva continuamente molte lettere in Italia e fuori," writes MERENDA (**Memorie, loc. cit.*). Letters to D'Ormea in CARUTTI, *Carlo Emanuele III.*, t. I, doc. 344 *seqq.*, 347 *seqq.*, 352 *seqq.*; *ibid.*, 254 *seqq.* to the King. Cf. SEMERIA, *Vita di Carlo Emanuele III.*, II. (1831), 30.

⁵ MERENDA, **Memorie, loc. cit.*

⁶ MERCATI, *Concordati*, 330 *seqq.*; *ibid.*, 437 *seqq.*, the cession of the rights over the principality of Masserano on July 13, 1753.

opinion regarding ecclesiastical immunity and jurisdiction. For this purpose the Titular Archbishop of Athens, Ludovico Merlini, was sent forthwith to Turin, where, however, he met with such difficulties, especially at the hands of the President of the Senate, Count Caissoti, that the Pope, who was usually so mild, wrote a letter of bitter complaint to D'Ormea on June 5th, 1741.¹ In the hope of obtaining a better hearing from D'Ormea, with whom he had been on friendly terms in former times, and from the King, the Pope drew up another proposed agreement, which, before he dispatched it, he submitted to Cardinal Gotti. In this document local immunity, which had not been touched upon in the Concordat of Benedict XIII., was regulated entirely in accordance with the wishes of the Turin Government. Nevertheless, the proposal met with no acceptance.²

Nothing, he wrote to the King on September 9th, 1741, had so saddened him since the beginning of his Pontificate as this attitude on the part of Turin. He asked for his proposal to be reconsidered, but not by those who hoped to bring about a rupture with the Holy See.³ Thereupon the King showed his readiness to engage in fresh negotiations, and after the Pope had again exposed the situation frankly and sincerely to the King and D'Ormea, an agreement was finally reached. It was contained in an instruction to the Sardinian Bishops, dated January 6th, 1742, which had already been contemplated in the Concordat of 1727. The arrangements made in that agreement Benedict confirmed and amplified. It was made a duty for the foreign Bishops to appoint their own Vicars General for their portions of the Sardinian dioceses; ecclesiastical jurisdiction and right of sanctuary were reduced; and the Church property acquired after 1620 was made liable to the usual State taxes. The inspection of Papal ordinances

¹ CARUTTI, 355 *seqq.* The project of sending an agent to Turin had already been reported by *Acquaviva on January 12, 1741 (Archives of Simancas).

² Cf. HERGENRÖTHER, *Unterhandlungen*, 83.

³ CARUTTI, 357 *seqq.*

by the State authority, without the affixture of a mark or decree (*semplice visura*; already tolerated by Benedict XIII.), was not to apply to dogmatic Bulls in matters of faith, to disciplinary Briefs, Jubilee Bulls, and Bulls of Indulgence, nor to the decrees of the Penitentiary and the other Roman Congregations.¹

Benedict XIV.'s hope that by this instruction peaceful relations between Church and State would be totally restored² was substantially realized. The nunciature in Turin was reopened and was handed over, on February 14th, 1742, to Ludovico Merlini, who had conducted the negotiations.³ The good relations which subsequently prevailed between Rome and Turin were manifested in the issue of a Bull concerning the military Order of SS. Maurice and Lazarus (1744), the erection of the bishopric of Pignerol (1748),⁴ the great consideration paid to the King's wishes in the bestowal of benefices,⁵ and finally in a new agreement of June 24th, 1750, whereby the Holy See renounced the right to spoils and to the loading of benefices with pensions for the benefit of foreigners.⁶ Through its being sent a gift of consecrated swaddling clothes for the heir to the throne, in 1751, the royal house of Piedmont was indirectly placed on an equal footing with the other Catholic dynasties of Europe⁷; but not content with this, the Government of Turin then coveted the privilege enjoyed by the Courts of Vienna, Paris, and Madrid, of having

¹ MERCATI, *Concordati*, 365 seqq.; HERGENRÖTHER, *loc. cit.*, 86 seqq.

² Letter to Carlo Emanuele of June 6, 1742, in MERCATI, *loc. cit.*, 364.

³ KARTTUNEN, 250.

⁴ *Bull.*, XVI., 218 seq.; GAMS, *Series*, 821.

⁵ Cf. CIBRARIO, *Lettere*, 253 seqq., 274, 280 seq.

⁶ MERCATI, *loc. cit.*, 410 seqq.

⁷ Cf. G. CARBONELLI, *Benedetto XIV. al battesimo di Carlo Emanuele IV. di Savoia*, Torino, 1906, where the Pope's letters to the King are reproduced. As is clear from the letter of June 12, 1751 (16 seqq.), the matter was put before a Congregation of Cardinals. Cf. also HEECKEREN, II., 121 seq., 209.

their nuncios raised to the purple on retirement. The Pope was willing to accede to this demand but was prevented by the opposition raised elsewhere, especially Poland.¹ On Merlini being passed over in the promotion of November 26th, 1753, the Government of Turin replied by closing down the nunciature.² Benedict consoled himself with the thought that it was better to lose one nunciature than three, as would certainly have happened had Merlini been made a Cardinal.³ But if he thought that the measure taken by Turin was only temporary, he erred. How dangerous were the currents that were gaining strength in Turin was seen by the proposal of the Minister Ossorio to prohibit appeals to Rome,⁴ and by a decree of June 20th, 1755, which attacked the rights of the Congregation of the Index. In the case of the Turin Professor Chionio, however, who had been teaching false doctrines, the King sided with the Archbishop of Turin, Cardinal Rovero, so that the Pope was able to commend him on his pious attitude.⁵

In the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies the relations between Church and State were in far worse case. Here, too, as soon as he had ascended the throne, Benedict held out the hand of peace. The negotiations were conducted at first by Cardinal Acquaviva,⁶ who left for Naples in November, 1740, the Pope hoping that he would return as a messenger of peace.⁷ More definite proposals regarding an agreement were brought to

¹ G. DEMARIA in the *Rev. stor. ital.*, XII. (1895), 62 *seqq.*
Cf. TORTONESE, 32 *seqq.*

² DEMARIA, 62.

³ HEECKEREN, II., 311. MERENDA (**Memorie, loc. cit.*) makes the interesting statement that "In questa congiuntura da molti savi si rifletteva che in molti luoghi, come allì Svizzeri, in Colonia, Torino, Napoli, Fiaundra, Firenze etc., potrebbe risparmiarsi la spesa di mandare li Nunzii, bastando per il decoro della S. Sede tenerli nelle Corti primarie".

⁴ DEMARIA, 89 *seq.*

⁵ HERGENRÖTHER, *loc. cit.*, 91 *seqq.*

⁶ Cardinal Acquaviva's *report to Villarias of August 25, 1740, Archives of Simancas.

⁷ " *Accusiamo una sua lettera dei 15 nella quale con nostro

Rome in December by the competent Abate Ferdinando Galiani.¹ A little hunchback, full of intelligence and wit, Galiani had won to a high degree the confidence of Charles III. and the Minister Tanucci.² In Rome too he was soon at his ease. In view of the Pope's conciliatory character, not only Acquaviva but also the Imperial envoy, Count Thun, had hopes of a speedy settlement.³

Already, in fact, by January 1741, it was possible for Cardinal Aldrovandi to present the Pope with a complete plan of agreement,⁴ but despite the latter's peaceful inclina-

distinto contento abbiamo intesa la nuova del suo felice arrivo a Napoli e le benigne espressioni colle quali coteste Reali Mtà si sono degnate di parlare della nostra miserabile persona. Potrà Ella assicurarle che nutriamo per esse un affetto paterno non disgiunto dalla profonda stima che ne habbiamo e che ne avranno i rincontri anche coll' opera se crederanno che siamo in grado di servirle. La sua lettera non sarà veduta da veruno perchè letta è stata subito consegnata alle fiamme. Ci restano bensì impressi nell' animo i sentimenti ed i savi consigli ch'ella ci ha accennati ed assolutamente ci conformeremo ad essi sapendo quant' ella per sua bontà ci ami e quante sono le memorie che abbiamo dell'affetto e della beneficenza della casa Acquaviva verso di Noi. Subito ch'ella può ritorni a Roma e venga come Mercurio araldo di pace e di buona armonia come sommamente desideriamo fra la S. Sede e cotesto benedetto regno di Napoli." Letter of Benedict XIV. to Cardinal Acquaviva, of November 18, 1740, Archives of Simancas.

¹ Acquaviva's *letter to Villarias of December 18, 1740, *ibid.*

² For Galiani, see JUSTI, *Winckelmann*, II., 192 *seq.* Most of Galiani's correspondence is still unpublished; cf. ADEMOLLO in *Opinione*, 1879, No. 297, and *id.*, *Bartol. Intieri, l'abate Galiani e Msgr. Bottari nel 1754*, Firenze, 1879.

³ Thun's *letter of December 10, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ Acquaviva's *letter to Villarias, January 9, 1741, *loc. cit.* Cf. B. PELUSO, *Docum. intorno le relazioni fra Stato e Chiesa nelle due Sicilie. I.: I progetti del Concordato del 1741* (including the period from 1734 onwards), Napoli, 1898. See also the letters written by Benedict XIV. and Charles III. in CARIGNANI, *La politica italiana nei sec. XV. al XIX.*, Napoli, 1864.

tions¹ the negotiations, conducted on the one hand by Cardinals Valenti, Aldrovandi, Gotti, and Corradini, and by Acquaviva and Galiani on the other, dragged on for another four months.² Much difficulty especially was caused by the unyielding attitude taken up by Corradini.³ Finally, however, a result was arrived at, and on June 2nd the concordat with Naples was signed by Valenti and Acquaviva and was ratified forthwith.⁴

On all points the agreement presented a compromise, in which the Holy See made important concessions with regard to personal, real, and local immunity. The right of sanctuary especially was restricted. By the setting up of a "mixed" court of clerics and laymen (provided for by Article 8) laymen were authorized to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and not only to decide disputes about ecclesiastical competence but also to sit in judgment on clerics in a higher court. This stipulation, together with the exclusion of foreigners from benefices and pensions in the Neapolitan realm, which affected principally Curialists, not unnaturally aroused ill-feeling in Rome.⁵ In Naples, too, neither the people nor the clergy were contented.⁶ In an appendix, six further, secret, articles were

¹ Acquaviva's *letter to Villarias, February 16, 1741, *loc. cit.*

² Cf. Acquaviva's *letters of March 23, April 13, May 11, 18, and 25, 1741, *ibid.* See also SCHIPA, 223 *seq.*

³ Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 297.

⁴ MERCATI, *Concordati*, 338 *seqq.*, 359; in manuscript, for example " *Piano intorno le controversie vertenti fra la S. Sede e la Real Corte di Napoli composte 1741 ", Cod. ital., 55, State Lib., Munich. For the ratification, see Acquaviva's *reports of June 22 and 29, 1741, *loc. cit.* The concordat was valid only for Naples, not for Sicily; see SENTIS, *Monarchia Sicula*, 200. The official publication (without the secret articles), Naples, 1741, with the documents of ratification. " Trattato di accomodamento tra la S. Sede e la corte di Napoli 1741," in Cod. ital., 189, No. 40g. State Lib., Munich. *Correspondence dealing with the concordat in ' Aff. esteri ' No. 1177, State Archives, Naples.

⁵ SENTIS, *Monarchia Sicula*, 19 *seq.*

⁶ According to the *report made to Maria Theresa on August

agreed upon, dealing with the execution of the treaty and the unification of certain small bishoprics. According to the second article, the King, "with his well-known piety," was to see to the carrying-out of Papal Bulls, Briefs, and other ordinances¹; this article was dangerous inasmuch as it afforded the crafty counsellors of Charles III. an opportunity of exercising the *placet*.² The new Bulls of July 6th, 1741, and August 11th, 1745, which extended the powers of the royal chaplain-in-chief, were also regarded with misgiving.³

Like that with Savoy, the concordat with Naples had not been first submitted for approval to the Sacred College, and the Cardinals showed great dissatisfaction at not having been consulted in two such important matters.⁴ What was much more painful to Benedict was that the beneficial results which he hoped the concordat would obtain failed to materialize. He had granted the Neapolitan Court far more than Clement XII. had been willing to concede in his time,⁵ and still satisfactory relations were not established, owing to the Government's failure to carry out the stipulations which were inconvenient to it and the continual recrudescence of the old State Church spirit.⁶

In his interview with Charles III. in Rome at the beginning

26, 1741 (State Archives, Vienna), by Thun, who carefully noted every sign of dissatisfaction in Naples.

¹ MERCATI, 259 *seq.* Bull of confirmation for this "tractatus secretus", dated mid-June 1741, in Cod. 1210, 177, Bibl. Corsini, Rome.

² B. PELUSO, in *Il diritto di placitazione nelle due Sicilie* (Napoli, 1898, 24), accordingly vaunts this article as a "trionfo della politica Borbona".

³ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, ed. R. de Martinis, I., 75 *seqq.*, 130 *seq.*, 269 *seqq.*

⁴ MERENDA, **Memorie*, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Cf. " *Confronto del Concordato (1741) e del piano stabilito nel pontificato di Clemente XII.", Cod. 1210, 119 *seq.*, Bibl. Corsini, Rome.

⁶ See the examples in *Cod. 41, A.5, p. 39 *seqq.*, *ibid.* Cf. also SENTIS, 191; *Acta Benedicti XII.*, I., 394; RINIERI, *Rovina*, 5.

of November 1744, the Pope had already had to complain of the erroneous interpretations of the concordat, and in June 1747 he found himself compelled to repeat his protests in an urgent letter, with especial reference to the extension of the *placet* to purely ecclesiastical matters. Only the stipulations which were favourable to the Government had been carried out, he wrote, but not those which brought advantage to the Church and the Holy See.¹

A serious conflict had already developed by 1746. A false rumour that the Archbishop Spinelli intended to introduce the Spanish Inquisition into Naples, threatened to cause disturbances. The badly advised King tried to forestall this by issuing a decree which made it impossible for the Bishops to intervene in any way in matters of faith. In the face of this the Pope could not keep silent, but he proceeded in the most considerate and careful manner possible.² The King's weakness and his Prime Minister's ignorance caused him as much perturbation as embarrassment.³

MERENDA writes in his **Memorie, loc. cit.*: "Si accorse poi il Papa, ma tardi (e si pentì inutilmente), d'essere stato circonvenuto dal frate Galiani nel Concordato con Napoli in molti gravi punti, come nel Tribunale misto e nella riserva di 20^m scudi di pensione da potersi distribuire a sudditi Pontificii, perchè non ebbe effetto in questa parte e nel punto del Tribunale misto l'ebbe soverchiamente eccessivo, perchè si arrogò tutta l'autorità sopra li Vescovi, che più non ricorrevano alle Congregazioni; e sebbene nel Concordato si dica che il Re debba nominare tre sogetti, tra li quali il Papa possa scegliere il Presidente di questo Tribunale misto, con tutto ciò per un accordo segreto fu accordato che sempre sarebbe il Cappellano Maggiore." For **correspondence* of the year 1747 relating to the dispute following on the concordat of 1741, see also in 'Aff. esteri' No. 1178 in the State Archives, Naples.

¹ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 386 *seq.*

² HEECKEREN, I., 297 *seq.*, 321; AMABILE, II., 86 *seqq.* Numerous **documents* bearing on the matter in Cod. E 129 and 130, Boncompagni Archives, Rome.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 348. *Cf.* the sharply worded **Cifra al nunzio* G. B. Barni of January 11, 1748, Nunziat. di Spagna 430, Papal

Benedict XIV., who was perfectly well acquainted with conditions in Naples, and especially with the Minister Tanucci's hostility to the Church, wrote in April 1750 to Cardinal Tencin that there was no lack in Naples of evil counsellors and of persons who from time to time spat out their venom and that the King was in want of a good spiritual adviser.¹ It was not surprising, therefore, that innovations were continually being made to the detriment of the ecclesiastical authority.² There was no end to the disputes about the exequatur, the censorship of books, and the execution of various stipulations of the concordat.³ The Neapolitan ambassador accredited to Rome since 1750 in the person of Geronimo Sersale, Duke of Cerisano, had the best possible intentions but was frustrated by the unsteadiness and heedlessness of the Neapolitan Court.⁴ In these circumstances there was no hope of success for the various projects that were being formed for a new concordat.⁵ In 1753 conditions in Naples were characterized by the Pope as being such that the numerous enemies of the Holy See were only looking for an excuse to remove the nuncio.⁶ "You cannot imagine," wrote Benedict to Cardinal Tencin, "what we are continually having to endure at the hands of the Neapolitan Government. The Ministers that surround the King are as bad as they could be."⁷

An arrangement by which Cardinal Spinelli retired from the Archbishopric of Naples on the plea of old age was negotiated

Secret Archives. For Cardinal Landi's unsuccessful mission to Naples in the spring of 1747, see AMABILE, II., 104 *seq.*

¹ HEECKEREN, II., 22.

² *Ibid.*, 28, 225.

³ Cf. PELUSO, *Documenti*, II., 25 *seqq.*, 34 *seqq.*, 36 *seqq.*; SCHIPA, 515.

⁴ HEECKEREN, II., 261.

⁵ PELUSO, II., I: *I progetti di un nuovissimo concordato durante il Ministero di B. Tanucci 1747-1756*, Napoli, 1898. Cf. also SCHIPA, 515 *seq.*

⁶ *Letter to the King of Sardinia of August 15, 1753, State Archives, Turin. See *Riv. stor.*, XII. (1895), 75.

⁷ Letter of June 27, 1753, HEECKEREN, II., 276.

by the young Roman prelate Gianangelo Braschi, who was afterwards to ascend the Papal throne as Pius VI.¹ There was considerable difficulty at first in filling the vacant See of Naples, but, thanks to the sagacity of the Pope, a suitable occupant was found at last in the person of Antonio Sersale, Archbishop of Taranto, who was even approved of by the Government.² That Benedict XIV. was also able to say "No" was discovered by Charles III. in 1754 on his applying for the granting of the *Cruzada* to Naples. This request was firmly rejected by the Pope on the grounds that this favour had not been granted even to the Emperor during his occupation of the Kingdom of Naples and that such a concession had never been made where there was no tribunal of the Inquisition.³

Far surpassing in importance the agreements made with Sardinia and Naples was the concordat with Spain of 1753. Its prehistory is interesting.

The main endeavour of the Spanish Government was to extend the royal patronage as it already existed in Granada and America to every bishopric and benefice in the realm. This desire had not been granted by Clement XII. in the concordat of 1737; over eleven articles conflicts had arisen, over others friendly negotiations were in prospect. Already in Clement XII.'s lifetime complaints about the methods of the Dataria and nunciature were continually coming in from Spain, particularly with regard to provisions and bank-bills.⁴ Of Benedict XIV., who as Cardinal had been on the best possible terms with the Spanish Government and had warmly espoused its interests,⁵ it was expected in Madrid that he would

¹ [F. BERATTINI], *Fasti di Pio VI.*, I., 18.

² HEECKEREN, II., 300, 305, 312, 328, 336.

³ *Ibid.*, 328.

⁴ Cf. Benedict XIV.'s confidential letter to Tencin of February 28, 1753, published by P. A. Kirsch in *Archiv f. Kirchenrecht*, LXXX. (1900), 320 *seqq.*

⁵ Cf. Bentivoglio's *reports of April 21 and June 30, 1731, Archives of Simancas. It is to be gathered from a *letter of Acquaviva's to Villarias of January 26, 1741 (*ibid.*), that

remedy these grievances, and indeed on December 22nd, 1740, the Pope expressed to the Spanish ambassador, Cardinal Acquaviva, his readiness to issue briefs concerning the execution of the concordat of 1737 and to contribute to the comprehensive settlement of all outstanding questions.¹ The negotiations, begun in 1741, were conducted simultaneously with those concerned with the Neapolitan concordat. In a letter dated April 25th, 1741, Philip V. assured the Pope of his pacific intentions.²

During the negotiations the Pope displayed his almost excessive conciliatoriness in a matter which the Spanish monarch had very much at heart. On September 18th, 1741, he bestowed on the Infante Luis, who was barely fifteen years of age and who was already a Cardinal Deacon and the lay administrator of Toledo, the civil administration of the archdiocese of Seville; the spiritual affairs of the diocese were put into the hands of the Archdeacon Gabriel de Torres y Navarra.³

Lambertini had been granted a yearly pension by Spain of 1,000 doubloons since 1730 but that it had been paid only two years. "Nunca me ha hablado S.B. cosa alguna sobre este particular," observes Acquaviva, and advises the payment of the eight years' deficit.

¹ " *El Papa me ha asegurado que se dara facultad a ese nuncio para publicar el censurado concordado y los breves concernientes a el [cf. PORTILLO in *Razón y Fe*, XVIII., 319 seq.] y tambien para ajustar las controversias de patronato y fenezer todos los puntos pendientes acerca del mismo concordado." Acquaviva to Villarias, December 22, 1740, Archives of Simancas.

² Cf. Acquaviva's *reports to Villarias of April 6, May 11 and 18, 1741, *ibid.*

³ Cf. Acquaviva's *reports to Villarias of May 25, June 1, 15, and 29, July 6, 13, 20, and 27, August 3 and 31, September 7, 14, 18, and 28, 1741, *ibid.* Cf. RIGANTIUS, *Nota in reg. XXIV.*, fo. 2, II., 373; *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 346 seq. The evil consequences of this concession were afterwards described in frank terms by Enriquez, the nuncio in Madrid, in a coded *report of June 23, 1745: " Il Marchese Scotti amministra despoticamente le due chiese di Toledo e di Siviglia, senza pensare

In November 1741, to accelerate the negotiations for a settlement, in which the question of patronage occupied the foremost place, the ambassador Acquaviva was given as assistant the excellent Cardinal Belluga.¹ As a basis for the negotiations, the fiscal of the Council of Castile, Gabriel de Olmeda, drew up, on behalf of the Government of Madrid, a treatise on the extension of the patronage.² At the beginning of August 1742 the Pope caused to be handed to the two Cardinals a detailed reply to these expositions,³ but it met with so little success that in a note written by Cardinal Valenti in November a protest was raised against the Spanish pretensions in the question of patronage.⁴ In the course of

e sapere che le amministri. Tutta questa torta si maneggia da un suo segretario e da altri subalterni di esso, tutte genti venali. Costoro dispongono a loro senno della giustizia e delle tante entrate ecclesiastiche, ed il Marchese è solo reo di omissione. Se anche volesse, non avrebbe tempo, siccome non ha lume proporzionato da prender cognizione di tali cose. Dico tutto ciò perchè non si reputi lui autore di quelle ingiustizie che si fanno nella spedizione de Benefizii di dette due Chiese. Molto resta pure scusato dalle massime troppo regaliste del Confessore e de' Consiglieri della Camera di Castiglia, dai quali in parte deve dipendere nel particolare di giurisdizione. In somma egli ci fa male senza saper di farcelo e senza sapere il modo di non farcelo. Em^o Padrone, questo è un vero mistero, nel quale forse si potrebbe conoscere ciò che si deve da noi conoscere, ove si danno a fanciulli e secolari l'amministrazione della Chiese." Nunziat. di Spagna, 250 A, 186, Papal Secret Archives. The Infante, not feeling himself called to the ecclesiastical state, renounced his archbishopric in 1754 (see HEECKEREN, II., 366 *seqq.*) and the cardinalate in 1755. Benedict XIV.'s judgment was that "il poverino era nato per fare il prete, ma l'etichetta spagnuola di fare, che i loro principi nulla studino e nulla imparino, ha reso giustificato il suo passo". KRAUS, *Briefe*, III.

¹ For Belluga, see HEECKEREN, I., 44.

² Cf. HERGENRÖTHER in *Archiv f. Kirchenrecht*, XI. (1864), 254.

³ It was sent by Acquaviva to Madrid together with a *letter on August 2, 1742 (Archives of Simancas).

⁴ Acquaviva's *report to Villarias, November 2, 1742, *ibid.*

these fruitless negotiations the aged Cardinal Belluga died on February 22nd, 1743.¹ On Barni, the nuncio at Madrid, being made a Cardinal, in June 1743, the immediate necessity arose of agreeing on a suitable successor. This was no light task,² and the nunciature remained unoccupied until the appointment of Enrico Enriquez in January 1744.³

The state of relations between Rome and Spain at this time were described by the Pope to Cardinal Tencin with considerable frankness. There were a number of points at issue, he said, between the Holy See and the Government of Madrid, in which right was undoubtedly on the side of Rome. They had written and written, and negotiated and negotiated, but without obtaining a decision; they could not even obtain a reply. All the tokens of goodwill offered to the Court in Madrid and to its representative in Rome had availed nothing; fresh demands, accompanied by threats, were made daily, no attention being paid to the Pope's inability to grant many of them owing to the continued presence in the Pontifical State of Austrian troops and his fear of their allies, the English.⁴

The chief obstacle to a favourable development in negotiations on ecclesiastico-political affairs was the baneful influence of the regalists at the Court of Madrid; Cardinal Molina, in particular, was indefatigable in pouring oil on the flames.⁵ This misguided prelate, in support of the contention that the royal patronage should be extended over the whole of Spain, had had collected a number of Papal Bulls and had sent them to Rome. The compilation, however, had been made without

¹ " *En gran concepto por sus virtudes y con universal dolor de los pobres," writes Acquaviva on February 28, 1743, *ibid.*

² Cf. Acquaviva's *reports of August 29, September 19 (in which Tempi, Stoppani, Imperiali, and Enriquez were proposed), October 14 and November 14, 1743, *ibid.*

³ KARTTUNEN, 143, 243.

⁴ Letter to Tencin of January 3, 1744, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV., 550, n. 1. For the situation in the Pontifical State, see below, Ch. II., pp. 103 *seqq.*

⁵ Benedict's opinion in the letter of February 28, 1753, mentioned above (p. 57, n. 4).

any sense of discrimination, and the learned Pope had little difficulty in utterly confuting it in a treatise which he wrote unaided in 1742. An attempt at a reply by Olmeda provoked only ridicule, even among pronounced regalists, such as Gregorio Mayans.¹ It was realized that it was out of the question to present such arguments in Rome.

In October 1744 the nuncio was instructed to press for a reply, long overdue, to the Papal exposition²; but nothing of the kind appeared; instead, the concordat of Clement XII. was flagrantly violated. Lest infringements of the rights of patronage be afterwards defended on the plea of custom, Enríquez was given further instructions on August 12th, 1745, to demand an expression of opinion on the arguments of Benedict XIV.³ Again the Spanish Government held its peace.

The death of Cardinal Molina on September 1st, 1744, brought no relief to the Pope, for Molina's closest friend,⁴ Cardinal Acquaviva, was abusing his privileged position in Rome so outrageously that his attempts at intervention were making it more and more difficult even to maintain public

¹ MIGUELEZ, 187 *seq.*; *cf.* HEECKEREN, I., 140.

² “*Dica pure V. S. Ill. francamente che mai è comparsa la risposta alla dissertazione del Papa sopra il Padronato fatta da S. Stà per confutare tutte quelle bolle apocriefe che il card. Molina mandò sul principio del pontificato.” Cipher of October 17, 1744, Nunziat. di Spagna 430, 35^b, Papal Secret Archives.

³ “*Vedendosi che l'affare del Padronato va imperversando a misura che cade in mano di ministri trasportati e troppo politici, vuole N^{ro} Sig^{te} che non lo perdiamo di vista nè lasciamo correre tanti atti di pregiudizio; sicchè, per non restare in un assopimento come codesti Togati ci vorrebbero, faccia V. S. Ill^{ma} una valida et autentica istanza, corroborata con la di Lei più sagace industria, affinchè venga comunicata la replica fatta alla risposta di N^{ro} Sig^{te}, la quale sta costì da tanto tempo soppressa. Questa domanda è fondata sulla giustizia della causa e sulla convenienza, che si deve alla dignità del Papa, non meno che all'amorevolezza del di lui cuore.” Cipher of August 12, 1745, *ibid.*, 59.

⁴ Thus Enríquez's *report of September 1, 1744, *ibid.*, 250A.

order. In consequence, the situation had become extremely tense.¹ Even in Madrid the Cardinal's behaviour was viewed with disapproval, for it was only making Spain hated in Rome; nevertheless he was still left at his ambassadorial post.² "It is clear," wrote Cardinal Valenti to the nuncio in Madrid on October 21st 1745, "that whatever affairs pass through Acquaviva's hands will never go well."³ In these circumstances it must be considered fortunate that at this juncture the Cardinal was attacked by an incurable disease from which he was finally released by death in March 1747. The Pope did no more than his duty in admonishing the dying man and his confessor to make good all the injustice which he had done to the Holy See during his term as ambassador by the advice he had given to the Spanish Court and the plots he had hatched with Molina.⁴

Before this, at the beginning of March 1746, Benedict had made a fresh attempt to bring about an agreement on the disputed questions of patronage and coadjutors, for the absolutely one-sided procedure which had been adopted by the Spanish Government was becoming more and more

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 29, 87, 91, 100 *seqq.* Cf. the *ciphers to Barni of September 12, October 4 and 29, December 5 and 12, 1743, *ibid.*, 430.

² " *La condotta di Acquaviva nel consaputo intrigo tra l'ufficiale e soldato spagnuolo e cotesto Ministro di Sardegna è stata qui disapprovata dal primo all' ultimo. Si tiene qui il buon Cardinale per un ignorante capriccioso e capace di metter fuoco all' erba verde, e di far più odiare in Italia questa nazione. Scotti al suo solito va gittando mezze parole di vicina mutazione in cotesto Ministero, ed Ensenada la bramerebbe. Ma questo, a mio credere, non sarà mai finchè vive il Duca d'Atri, bensì, morto lui, lo sarebbe incontanente. Iddio dunque tiene in vita questo buon mezzo cadente, per esercitare con le violenze di cotesto fanatico la pazienza di Nostro Signore e di V. E." Cifra of Enriquez, January 5, 1745, *ibid.*, 250A, 124.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 217, 222, 247, 257, 263, 283 *seqq.*, 285, 298, 300 *seqq.*, 310, 311 *seq.*, 313.

intolerable. To a Brief addressed to the King and couched in general terms the nuncio was to attach a memorandum in which a sharper note was struck. Cardinal Valenti had little hope of this step being of any use, but at least it served the purpose of affirming that the infringements were not assented to and kept the way open for subsequent reclamations.¹

A large, if not the chief, portion of the blame for the failure of Rome and Madrid to come to an understanding was ascribed by Benedict XIV. to Philip V.'s confessor, the Jesuit Le Fèvre, an impetuous Frenchman, who was even advising the King to repudiate the concordat of 1737.²

The nuncio Enriquez had to contend with Le Fèvre from the beginning but neither by severity nor friendliness could he manage to get on satisfactory terms with the influential priest.³ In vain he represented to him, in accordance with Valenti's instructions, that the Pope was ready to redress all of Spain's legitimate grievances; in vain he pointed out that the slight offences against the concordat which had been committed in Rome were not to be compared with the violations of the Spanish Government, which continually ignored those parts of the articles of the treaty which were favourable to the Holy See. It was Cardinal Valenti's belief that the root cause of Le Fèvre's hostility was his conviction that Benedict was unfavourably disposed towards the Society of Jesus. The Cardinal Secretary of State emphatically denied that this was so, citing in support of his contention the excellent relations that existed between the Pope and the General of the Jesuits. Le Fèvre, he said, was utterly mistaken if he feared that a blow was about to be struck against his Order,

¹ *Cifra al Enriquez of March 3, 1746, Nunziat. di Spagna 430, *loc. cit.* The Brief to the King, of February 23, 1746, in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 308. *Re* the coadjutors, *cf. ibid.*, I., 360, and HEECKEREN, I., 270.

² Benedict XIV.'s letter to Tencin, of July 27, 1746, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV., 551, n. 2.

³ *Cifre al Enriquez of August 15 and 22, 1744, Nunziat. di Spagna 430, *loc. cit.*

whose services for the Church and the Holy See were recognized in Rome.¹ To all these assurances the hot-blooded Frenchman refused to give any credence ; even when Valenti sent him, on October 3rd, a note, dictated by the Pope, affirming the

¹ “ *Resti pertanto persuaso il Padre Confessore che qui non seguirà se non quello è convenuto, tale essendo l'animo e l'indole di Sua Santità, la quale dice ad ogni modo che, se mai alcuna cosa sfugge di qua, che sia contraria al concertato o pure al gusto di cotesta Corte e nazione, vorrebbe che per atto di buona intelligenza se ne facesse qui la rimostranza et un amichevole ricorso, perchè certamente vi si apporterebbe rimedio, senza che si venisse costì al fatto con prepotenza, perchè un tal modo inasprisce e non agevola il rimedio e dimostra piuttosto alienazione d'animo che confidenza : tanto più che, esaminando imparzialmente e cumulativamente gli articoli tutti del Concordato, vedrà Sua Paternità quanti non si osservano, che sono a nostro favore, e che la legge distributiva vorrebbe che si ponessero in osservanza, e non si lagnassero, se in qualche piccola parte per accidente scorre dal canto nostro un qualche mancamento, quando dal canto altrui si commettono giornalmente tante trasgressioni... La restringo per tanto ad assicurare Monsignore che la cosa non è essenzialmente quale si apprende per quanto toccò alle disposizioni generali de Padri Gesuiti. Nei fatti poi particolari può darsi il caso che li principii e sentenze di Nostro Signore non s'incontrino con quelli della Compagnia ; ma ciò non merita la definizione che Sua Santità sia d'animo contrario. Il Padre Generale, che è l'unico che tratta con Sua Santità degli affari riguardanti il loro ceto, mi pare resti più appagato degli altri che non trattano con Sua Santità, e conviene in alcune virtù che non si possono comprendere sì facilmente da quelli che giudicano dal loro tavolino. Aggiungerò, se bene eccedo in ciò il mio dovere, che, per quanto a me, ho fisso e fermo non solo in rendere giustizia alla considerazione che si deve fare d'un Corpo tanto illustre, ma al merito ancora di molti soggetti particolari, e sono persuaso che non nascerà novità alcuna, che sia, come si suol dire, un colpo capitale contro la Compagnia, che conosco e confesso essere tanto vantaggiosa alla Chiesa et alla Santa Sede. Sappia però il Padre Confessore che alcune cose sono causate dalle circostanze o ancora per difetto di qualche particolare, che bisognerebbe vedere cogli occhi proprii per

benevolent intentions of the Holy Father towards the Jesuit Order,¹ he would not budge from his preconceived opinion. An attempt to influence him through the French ambassador² likewise failed. Valenti advised the nuncio on October 31st to concentrate on winning over "the dangerous man" at least in particular cases.³ Valenti admitted that the Dataria had made mistakes when dealing with Spain but insisted that Le Fèvre exaggerated them.⁴

The attachment of the Father to his Order and his fear that an anti-Jesuit Bull was being prepared in Rome, were so great, reported the Spanish nuncio Enriquez in February 1745, that he was capable of anything.⁵ In August the nuncio

esserne ben istruiti; et a tali casi non è facile dar providenza. A me basta poter' asserire, che il male in tali occasioni non viene dalla massima generale." Cifra al Enriquez of September 5, 1744, Nunziat. di Spagna 430, Papal Secret Archives.

¹ *Cifra al Enriquez of October 2, 1744, *ibid.*, 250A, 93.

² *Cifra al Enriquez of October 17, 1744, *ibid.*

³ *Cifra al Enriquez of October 31, 1744, *ibid.*

⁴ *Cifra al Enriquez of September 30, 1745, *ibid.*

⁵ *Cifra di M. Nunzio di Madrid, February 16, 1745: "Il Padre Confessore del Re, di cui ora più che mai abbiamo di bisogno, mi disse ier l' altro con voce appassionata e con viso acceso, che egli aveva notizie sicure lavorarsi ora in Roma una nuova Bolla contro i Gesuiti. Io le risposi che non ne sapevo nulla. Quando ciò non fosse vero, come lo bramerei, sarebbe opportuno che V. E. scrivesse una lettera al detto Padre per metterlo in calma ed assicurarlo che non siamo nemici del suo Ordine, pregandolo con tale occasione di dare cortese orecchio a tre istanze di somma importanza e di piena giustizia, che da me in breve gli saranno fatte. Se poi il di lui timore fosse vero, mi dica ciò che devo fare acciò che il colpo gli riesca men duro. Per iscarico de'miei doveri, devo dire a V. E. che questo buon Padre nella condotta della sua carica mi sembra un uomo tutto giustizia senza privati risguardi e senza proprio interesse. Ma per contrario nell' attaccamento al suo Ordine è impastato di tanta e tale passione, che per ciò sicuramente è capace di non farci bene e più che probabilmente di farci male." *Ibid.*, 143.

referred to him as a "mortal enemy".¹ On the death of Philip V. on July 9th, 1746, the Pope took further steps to obtain a settlement with Spain in ecclesiastico-political affairs.² But Le Fèvre immediately influenced the new king, Ferdinand VI., against the Holy See, so that Benedict XIV. was obliged to protest to the General of the Jesuits. "This Father," so ran his opinion of him, "thinks himself a great canonist, he wants to introduce the French liberties into Spain, and he designates the lawfully acquired rights of the Holy See in Spain as swindles on the part of Roman priests."³

Benedict XIV. sighed with relief when in the spring of 1747 Le Fèvre suddenly lost his position as royal confessor and was replaced by the Spanish Jesuit Francisco Rábago. Having received the most favourable assurances regarding the new confessor from the General of the Jesuits, he immediately sent him a complimentary Brief.⁴ Of a similar tenor were the reports from the nuncio in Madrid, who at the same time was able to inform him of the favourable intentions of the Queen.⁵ The Pope now had strong hopes of an improvement in his relations with the Spanish Government, though he would not hear of a new concordat, experience having shown him that the Spanish Ministers observed only the stipulations that brought them advantage.⁶

Quite apart from the persistent discord in the field of politics, a factor which worked against a settlement was the

¹ " *Il nostro mortale nemico è il velenoso confessore del Re." Cifra of August 31, 1745, *ibid.*

² Briefs of August 23, 1746, on the patronage and the coadjutors in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 360 *seqq.*

³ Letter to Tencin of November 16, 1746, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV., 551, n. 3.

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., 326.

⁵ *Cifra al Enriquez of July 13, 1747, *Nunziat. di Spagna* 430, *loc. cit.*

⁶ " *Egli è d'avvertire però che oramai a nostre spese abbiamo provato che non conviene far trattati formali perchè alla fine si osserva la parte meno favorevole a noi e va la più favorevole in oblivione." *Ibid.*

attitude adopted by the Government in the conflict between the Pope and the Spanish Inquisitor General, who had put on the Spanish Index the work by Cardinal Noris on the Pelagians and had adhered to this decision despite the contrary one that had been taken by the Pope.¹

Cardinal Portocarrero, who had succeeded Acquaviva, reported in the autumn of 1750 how deeply the Pope resented the Government's attitude in this affair and the violation of the concordat of 1737 in respect of the stipulations regarding the coadjutors. His Holiness was therefore most averse to granting the favours asked for by the King, nor were the circumstances favourable for concluding a new agreement concerning the matters in dispute. In making his report the Cardinal drew attention to the fact that they had to deal with a Pope who was not only very learned but who had a particularly deep knowledge of the matters in question.² At the end of September three requests of the Spanish Government met with a flat refusal.³ In an audience given to Portocarrero in November the Pope complained bitterly that former important favours granted by him to Spain had not been reciprocated; the attitude adopted in the affair of Cardinal Noris was a personal affront to him; and doubtless his early decease was hoped for in Madrid. The Pope's language was so emotional that Portocarrero feared a rupture with Spain.⁴

But already there was resident in Rome the man who was

¹ For this *cf. infra*, Ch. IV. The question of the character of the Spanish Inquisition (see our account, Vol. IV., 398) was thoroughly discussed at the time in a *Relazione del S. Offizio, compiled by the assessor Ric. Giul. Guglielmo, dated April 15, 1749 (Nunziat. di Spagna 253,90 *seqq.*, *loc. cit.*), in which it was historically demonstrated that the Inquisition in Spain, as in other countries, was subject to the Pope.

² Portocarrero's *letter to Carvajal of September 17, 1750, Archives of Simancas.

³ Portocarrero's *letter to Carvajal of October 1, 1750, *ibid.*

⁴ Portocarrero's *letter to Carvajal of November 12, 1750, *ibid.* For the favours to which the Pope referred in the conversation, see HERGENRÖTHER in *Archiv. f. Kirchenrecht*, XI., 254 *seq.*

to cause affairs to take an entirely different course. Manuel Ventura Figueroa, the new Uditore of the Rota for Castile, had arrived in the Eternal City in the middle of July and had made an excellent impression on the Spanish Embassy.¹ There no one had the slightest knowledge that the Minister Marquis de la Ensenada had given the Uditore the secret mission of negotiating a new concordat. The only persons who knew of the proposal, Ensenada wrote to Figueroa on July 14th, 1750, were the Pope, Cardinal Valenti, the King, his confessor Rábago, and they two. Sufficient money—which could do so much in Rome—had been placed at his disposal to enable him to obtain a concordat even more advantageous than that of 1737; the favourable opportunity was to be made the most of, especially with regard to the royal patronage.²

The differences with Sardinia having been settled by direct negotiation, of which only a few persons had been aware at the time, Benedict XIV. readily agreed to the proposal to seek an understanding with Spain by the same method. Previous experience had shown him only too well that the exchange of notes and polemical treatises, so far from composing differences, only complicated them by resurrecting questions already settled.³

The exclusion of the Spanish ambassador Portocarrero, in whom Madrid had lost all confidence, was most welcome to Cardinal Valenti, who was on bad terms with that diplomat,⁴ and the Pope made no demur, having discovered from previous relations with Portocarrero that his scanty credit in Madrid

¹ Portocarrero's letter to Carvajal of July 16, 1750, in MIGUELEZ, 191.

² MIGUELEZ, 192 *seqq.* For the intimate connection between Ensenada and Rábago, who both fell at the same time, see HEECKEREN, II., 451.

³ Cf. the note on the introduction to the concordat of 1753 in MERCATI, *Concordati*, 423. See also the letter to the Spanish nuncio of July 28, 1751, in *Razón y Fe*, XVII. (1907), 22.

⁴ MIGUELEZ, 193.

and his inexperience in affairs brought forth nothing but empty speeches and promises.¹

Figuerola, who had already, in October 1749, drawn up a memorial on the questions of patronage,² at the order of Ferdinand VI., was very well informed in the subjects under consideration; but although he showed great skill in the negotiations and was not above bribery,³ the discussions went on for two and a half years, for much was demanded on the Spanish side. The decisive factor that finally induced the Pope to give way on all important points was his fear of a complete break with Spain. He wrote himself in a confidential letter to Tencin that he had seen the flashing of the sword as it hung above his head and that there was a fear of the King being carried away by his impetuous counsellors and of settling the matters in dispute in arbitrary fashion by a single stroke of the pen. So as not to lose everything and to save what was to be saved, he had concluded the new concordat.⁴

In the Quirinal, on January 11th, 1753, Valenti, in the name of the Pope, and Figuerola, in the name of the King, set their signatures to the document.⁵ It settled the most important of the questions on which for more than a generation five Popes and two Kings had been unable to agree, entirely in favour of

¹ Thus in the letter to Tencin mentioned above, p. 66, n. 3.

² Reproduced in TEJADA, VII., 113 *seq.*; the memorial probably resulted from Benedict XIV.'s statement to Portocarrero, who wrote from Madrid to Ravago on June 17, 1749: "El día antes de partir yo de Roma, me dijo el Papa: Ya que va a Madrid, sería bien que dijese algo sobre la conveniencia de ajustar con tratado las cosas de Patronato y otros derechos que el Re juzga tener; porque de mi parte facilitaré cuanto pudiere" (MIGUELEZ, 189).

³ *Ibid.*, 195, 198 *seq.*, 443 *seqq.*

⁴ *Archiv. f. Kirchenrecht*, LXXX. (1900), 321 *seqq.* The preamble to the concordat also stresses the danger of an "infelice rottura".

⁵ Best text in MERCATI, *Concordati*, 422 *seqq.* Excellent abstract by HERGENRÖTHER in *Archiv f. Kirchenrecht*, XI. (1864), 255 *seqq.*, a shorter one *ibid.*, VII., 365. For earlier printed copies, cf. PORTILLO in *Razón y Fe*, XIX. (1907), 295 *seqq.*

the Spanish Government, which hereby obtained the ardently desired universal patronage of the Catholic King in the fullest measure. The Pope was left with only 52 ecclesiastical posts (mostly archdeaconries, precentorships, scholasticates, and treasurerships to chapters) wherewith to reward distinguished or meritorious clerics, whereas the King received the right of presentation to 12,000 benefices formerly contested.¹

To this general agreement were annexed eight articles containing detailed stipulations concerning the occupation of vacant benefices. In accordance with these the Bishops retained their former right of presenting prebends in the months of March, June, September, and December, by the Tridentine method of *concursum*. Special patronages, whether clerical or lay, were not affected by the concordat. Apart from the 52 benefices reserved to the Holy See, the nomination and presentation to all the others throughout the kingdom were to be made thenceforth by the Crown. Now included therein were all higher dignities below that of bishop, canonries in cathedral and collegiate churches, abbasies, and secular and regular benefices with or without cure of souls, in cases where the founder had not reserved the right of presentation. This universal patronage of the King was not to be prejudiced in any way and no one was to be given an indult to assign ecclesiastical posts in the formerly Papal months.

To maintain episcopal authority undiminished, firstly the Ordinaries were enabled to impart the canonical institution to the persons "provided" by the King, without it being necessary to issue a Papal Bull, except in cases concerned with the confirmation of elections or with dispensations or pardons which the Bishops were not empowered to grant. Further, the Bishops were to remain in possession of their jurisdiction, since no sort of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over churches and ecclesiastical persons was to accrue to the King from his rights of nomination and patronage.

¹ HERGENRÖTHER, *loc. cit.*, 256, to whose excellent analysis I am indebted for what follows.

Together with the indulgences, reservations, and, in great part, exemptions, which were thus abolished, the spoils, which had hitherto fallen to the Apostolic Camera, and the so-called bank-bills¹ were also done away with.

By way of compensation for the very heavy financial losses suffered by the Holy See and its officials as a result of these stipulations, the following provisions were agreed to:—

1. Under the title of a compensation for the rights of collation transferred to the King, Ferdinand VI. pays once for all for the benefit of the Dataria and Cancellaria a capital sum of 310,000 Roman scudi, which at 3% yield 9,300 scudi annually.

2. As a substitute for the abolished pensions and bank-bills and for the benefit of the Roman officials of the Curia, the King pays 600,000 scudi, which at 3% produce 18,000 scudi annually.

3. As a substitute for the abolished spoils the King pays 233,333 scudi, which at 3% bring in 7,000 scudi annually.

4. As indemnity for the receipts from the intercalary fruits the Court of Madrid sets apart from the revenue of the *Cruzada* an annual sum of 5,000 scudi for the maintenance of the nuncio and his officials.²

The concordat was ratified by King Ferdinand VI. as early

¹ Of these Benedict gives this explanation in his Bull of confirmation: "Consuetudo a longo tempore vigens, ut in beneficiorum collationibus et provisionibus, quae per S. Sedem fierent, quaedam pensiones annuae super eorundem beneficiorum fructibus et proventibus reservarentur, et pro earum certiori solutione publicorum Argentariorum cautiones seu cedulae Bancariae a provisio Beneficiatis exigenterentur."

² HERGENRÖTHER, *loc. cit.*, 260. Hergenröther thinks it improbable that the continued application of the "Pase Regio" (Exequatur) was permitted by an additional secret article in the concordat, but he cannot definitely deny it (*ibid.*, 261 *seq.*). PORTILLO produces documentary evidence to show that no such secret article existed; see *Razón y Fe*, XIX. (1907), 209 *seqq.*

as January 31st, 1753,¹ by Benedict XIV. on February 20th.² After the payment of the indemnity the agreement was further confirmed and explained in a Bull of June 9th.³ Enriquez, the nuncio in Madrid, whose first circular letter to the Spanish Bishops had given the Government cause for complaint, was made to replace it by another.⁴ Enriquez had been bitterly mortified by his exclusion from the negotiations for the new concordat and remained an opponent of it until his death, in spite of Benedict XIV.'s and Valenti's assurances that it was precisely his reports that had prompted them to give way to the Spanish demands.⁵

Seldom has a secret been kept so well as on the occasion of this new concordat with Spain. It was not until its actual

¹ *Ibid.*, 294.

² *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 125 *seqq.*

³ MÜNCH, *Konkordate*, I., 468 *seqq.*, where, however, "June 5" should read "June 9". See *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 437 *seq.*, and PORTILLO, *loc. cit.*, 295 *seq.*

⁴ HERGENRÖTHER, *loc. cit.* The date of the Brief in MÜNCH (I., 483 *seqq.*) is also wrong; it is not December 10, but September 10; see *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 451 *seq.*, and PORTILLO, *loc. cit.*, 295, 297.

⁵ MERENDA (**Memorie*) relates of the year 1756: "Alli 26 del mese di aprile si ebbe l'avviso della morte del cardinale Enriquez in Ravenna, dopo lunga penosa malattia, alla quale credesi contribuì un poco la passione dell'animo. Poichè, parlando esso con molta libertà in biasimo del Concordato con la Spagna, come fatto senza saputa e intelligenza, e continuando a parlare nella medesima maniera, benchè avvertito per ordine del Papa a moderarsi et a parlare con più riserva, perciò Sua S^{ta} et il card. Valenti avevano fatto cavare un estratto delle sue lettere, tanto in cifra che in piano, su questa materia, dalle quali risultava la spinta che vi aveva data con le sue rappresentanze, e si stava sul punto di dar fuori un manifesto contro di lui e far palese la parte che vi aveva avuta, e ne restò sospesa la pubblicazione per la malattia sopraggiuntali, per cui dopo un mese e mezzo è morto. Era egli rimasto il solo della sua famiglia, e da Governatore di Macerata era passato Nunzio in Spagna, con speranza ancora di salire più alto. Il Papa, intesa la di lui morte, mandò ordine per staffetta a Msgr. Onorati V. Legato di prendere e sigillare

publication that anything was known of the negotiations that had preceded it.¹ In Rome the general public first got wind of the matter by the excitement caused by the arrival in the middle of February of a huge consignment of money—1,300,000 *scudi*—which was taken to the Castel S. Angelo.

There can be no gainsaying that this indemnity was far from being an adequate compensation for the revenues yielded by the benefices which had now come under royal patronage. The surprise and indignation of the Curiali was accordingly very great. We are told by a contemporary that their outbursts of wrath and their vehement expressions of opinion were indescribable.² The older members related how Benedict XIII. in his time had refused to make such a concession to Spain, although he had been offered an indemnity of 5 millions, besides another million for Cardinal Coscia—an offer which Lambertini, then Secretary to the Congregation of the Council, had approved of.³ It was feared also in many quarters that similar concessions would now be demanded by other Governments.⁴

Cardinal Valenti endeavoured to justify the new agreement by a more exhaustive exposition of the circumstances,⁵ but when it was known that he had received a second present from the King of Spain of 50,000 *scudi*,⁶ in addition to one of 45,000 *scudi* already received, he became the chief object of attack.

tutte le scritture del defunto e tenerle a disposizione di Sua Santità." Biblioteca Angelica, Rome.

¹ Cordara in DÖLLINGER, III., 16. Cf. MIGUELEZ, 206. The conclusion of the concordat was first reported by Albani on March 3, 1753, to Colloredo. More detailed information was sent by Stadion, the Auditor to the Rota, on April 4, 1753, State Archives, Vienna.

² See MERENDA, **Memorie*, *loc. cit.*, and the report in HEECKEREN, I., *lv seq.* A venomous *satire of the time in Cod. Vat. 9020, 101 *seq.*, Vatican Library.

³ *Merenda, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Ibid.* Cf. MIGUELEZ, 206.

⁵ *MERENDA, *loc. cit.*

⁶ MIGUELEZ, 444, and PORTILLO, *loc. cit.*, XX. (1908), 197.

It was said of him that he had already promised to make an agreement of this nature when he was nuncio in Madrid.¹

If the concordat of 1753 brought about a fundamental change in the discipline of the Church in Spain,² it also altered conditions in the Roman Curia. The number of the applicants for Spanish benefices who now departed from the Holy City is said to have been as high as 4,000. It was entirely in the interests of the Church that Rome should be freed of these elements, but it was not at all to the liking of those who had derived a living from them. Not only inn- and lodging-house-keepers but a countless number of agents and procurators now found themselves deprived of their source of income. In a similar plight was the numerous personnel of the Dataria which now became superfluous. Many a man who had lived very comfortably on Spanish money was now suddenly impoverished.³

Thus a storm of abuse rained down on Benedict XIV.⁴ But calm observers admitted even then that there was much to be said on his side. Those who came to Rome seeking benefices were not of the best type, and their arrogant demeanour often led to disturbances. Many of them were given well-endowed positions, not in virtue of their services but because they had persisted in their application for years on end. In a city of the size of Rome they were able to elude the surveillance of the ecclesiastical authorities. Some of them were so poor that to keep themselves alive they had to resort to quite unworthy occupations, donning their clerical robes—which they often lent to one another—only once a month, when they had to present themselves at the Dataria.⁵ These abuses were now brought to an end.

Another consideration which had equally affected Benedict's decision was the danger of the situation; for the Spanish regalists, pointing to the influence wielded by the rulers of France in the filling of ecclesiastical offices since the concordat

¹ *MERENDA, *loc. cit.*

² GAMS, III., 2, 348.

³ CORDARA, *loc. cit.* Cf. CARACCILO, 121.

⁴ MIGUELEZ, 207.

⁵ CORDARA, *loc. cit.*

of 1515, were advising Ferdinand VI. to claim similar rights for himself, without reference to the Holy See.¹

The Pope himself maintained to Cardinal Tencin that much had been saved by him which would otherwise have been lost. They had striven, he wrote, not to burden the Papal treasury with fresh debts, which would unavoidably have happened had they lost the yearly revenues without obtaining any compensation. They had seen to it that on the one hand the Bishops should suffer no injury, and that on the other the vast host of Spanish aspirants, who were like "bees without a queen" and who were leading scandalous lives, should be removed from Rome. They had got rid of the most obnoxious phenomenon of the bank-bills, which were more the property of a bank than of the Dataria. And the Pope had no need to threaten a fresh closure of the Dataria, which had already happened four times in his lifetime.²

Nevertheless the complaint is still being made that Benedict XIV. was too conciliatory in his dealings with Spain. Nor is this to be wondered at, for the loss to the Holy See was great,³ while the advantage gained by Caesaro-papalism was immense.⁴ There was, however, in Benedict's favour the circumstance that grave abuses were undoubtedly being committed, which according to the description of them given by the negotiators, threatened to provide a pretext for a complete rupture. This Benedict was determined to avoid, even though it meant his going to the uttermost limit of what was possible for him to do.

¹ *Ibid.* Cf. MIGUELEZ, 201, 209.

² *Archiv f. Kirchenrecht*, LXXX. (1900), 321; HEECKEREN, II., 247 seq.

³ "Irreparable" is the term used by SPITTLER in *Vorlesungen über die Gesch. des Papsttums*, pub. by Gurlitt, 1st Appx., 1st Continuation, Hamburg, 1827, 27.

⁴ MIGUELEZ, 211 seq., PORTILLO, *loc. cit.*, 198. Not content with what it had already gained, the Government lost no time in claiming the annates about which so many complaints had been lodged with the Popes. By Briefs of April 6 and May 10, 1754, there was ceded to the Crown half of the annates from all the benefices subject to its right of presentation; see HERGENRÖTHER, *loc. cit.*, 263.

CHAPTER II.

BENEDICT XIV. AND THE WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION —HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE ELECTIONS OF THE EMPERORS CHARLES VII. AND FRANCIS I.—THE PEACE CONGRESS OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE.

(1)

BENEDICT XIV. had hardly been on the Papal throne for two months when the death of Emperor Charles VI. on October 20th, 1740, and the outbreak of the war of the Austrian Succession placed him in a highly difficult situation. While Maria Theresa was making every effort to secure the election, as emperor, of her husband, Francis Stephen of Lorraine, Grand Duke of Tuscany, the Elector Charles Albert of Bavaria was raising claims to the inheritance of the Habsburgs, and the Spanish Queen, Elizabeth, who held the reins of government in the place of her melancholy husband, was planning to endow her second son, Philip, with Austrian possessions in her Italian homeland. Both Charles Albert and Elizabeth hoped for the support of the French Cabinet, which had decided in advance to prevent the election of Francis Stephen and to obtain this honour for Bavaria.¹

In a letter written in his own hand on November 26th, 1740, Benedict XIV. expressed his condolence with Maria Theresa on the death of her father,² but on other matters he reserved his opinion. Cardinal Aldrovandi, who was still influential, was for the immediate recognition of Maria Theresa as Charles VI.'s inheritress; Cardinals Passionei and Valenti, on the other hand, advised the Pope to be silent for the nonce and to await developments. After a month's delay the Pope decided, in spite of the opposition of the French and Spanish

¹ IMMICH, *Staatensystem*, 304 seqq.

² *Original of this letter in the State Archives, Vienna, Hofkorrespondenz.

ambassadors, Cardinals Tencin and Acquaviva, to recognize Maria Theresa's right of succession.¹

At the same time the question arose as to the attitude to be adopted by the Holy See towards the impending imperial election. Though the Pope's influence in the appointment of a new head of the Empire had long been considerably less than it had been of old, it still seemed strong enough to the interested parties for them to vie with one another in enlisting the support of the Curia.²

Foreseeing that he would soon be assailed by advice, suggestions, and demands, in the form of prayers, coming from all quarters, Benedict XIV. sought enlightenment from above. For this purpose he announced a jubilee to invoke the divine assistance and instructed the famous Franciscan preacher Leonardo da Porto Maurizio to hold missions in Rome. In the procession for the obtaining of the jubilee indulgence, which went from S. Maria degli Angeli to S. Maria Maggiore on November 20th, 1740, he took part in person.³

As nuncio for the electoral diet in Frankfort the Genoese Giorgio Doria was appointed, with the full powers of a *Legatus a latere*.⁴ He was instructed not to give his support to any particular candidate but to work generally for a result that

¹ See MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome, and the Venetian reports in MATSCHEG, 79 *seqq.*, 131. The *original of the letter to Maria Theresa, which was written on parchment under date December 20, 1740, and implicitly recognizes Maria Theresa as Charles VI.'s inheritress, is in the State Archives, Vienna, *loc. cit.*

² Cf. MATSCHEG, 45 *seqq.*

³ Thun's *report to Maria Theresa, November 19, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ *Thun reports Doria's appointment on November 12, 1740, and his departure, fixed for the following day, on December 17, 1740, *ibid.* Merenda (**Memorie*, *loc. cit.*) refers to Doria as a "degnissimo prelato". Benedict XIV. also was highly laudatory; see HEECKEREN, I., 20, 30. Doria's *Cifre to Valenti (Nunziat. di Germania, Papal Secret Archives) begin with a report dated Bamberg, February 1741, and Frankfurt, February 17, 1741.

would be to the advantage of the Catholic religion and the Holy See. Similarly the Briefs sent by Benedict to the Catholic electors contained only the general exhortation to choose a candidate who would be able to protect the interests of the Church.¹

This impartial attitude was not to the liking of any of the candidates, and remonstrances were made in Rome by all the parties. To the complaint made by the French ambassador, Cardinal Tencin, that the desire for a powerful emperor, as expressed in the Briefs, was tantamount to favouring Maria Theresa's husband, the Pope simply replied that he was convinced that he had acted rightly.² Early in the year 1741 the Spanish ambassador, Cardinal Acquaviva, also remonstrated with the Pope for having, as he said, sided with the Grand Duke Francis of Tuscany. Benedict assured him that he was far from having any such intention and he told him in confidence that for him the Lorrainer was the least desirable of all the candidates, on account of the usurpation of Parma and Piacenza; in strict confidence he added that he did not know how much reliance could be placed on that prince's religious sentiments.³

The Pope succeeded in convincing both Acquaviva and Tencin that he had no desire to intervene in the electoral

¹ The *Briefs to Charles Albert of Bavaria of the 14, to Cologne and Trèves of the 20, to Mayence of November 25, 1740, in the *Epist. ad princ.* 109, Papal Secret Archives.

² Thun's *report to Maria Theresa, December 31, 1741, *loc. cit.*

³ " *El santo Padre que ciertamente es incapaz de decir una cosa por otra mi dixo que yo le conocia y savia la amistad que tenia conmigo y mi jurava que no havia ni menos pensado de ayudar al Duque de Lorena, antes mi dezia con toda la confianza que de todos los principes catholicos que podian ser elegidos era este el unico que le disgustaria que fuese et tenia toda la razón para con Dios porque ninguno convendria menos que este para la Sede Apost. mientras mantenia la usurpacion hecha de los estados de Parma y Plasencia y de la Carpeña y en fin me añadio con la maior reserva que no savia como este principe estava en materia de religion." Acquaviva to Villarias, January 19, 1741, Archives of Simancas.

negotiations on Francis Stephen's behalf. When Tencin reported this to Paris he added that no doubt the Pope was obliged to tread warily as the proximity of the Lorrainer as Grand Duke of Tuscany might be dangerous to the Pontifical State.¹

The more acute the electoral struggle at the diet in Frankfort became, the more difficult became the position of the Papal legate, Doria. In Rome it was impressed upon him to exercise the greatest care in all directions and not to commit himself too far with anyone, not even with the French delegate.² At the same time he was advised to pay as much consideration as possible to the Protestants, whom he was to mollify.³ But above all he was to bring about a settlement between Bavaria and Austria in the dispute about the succession.⁴ If he succeeded in this, the balance between the two great Catholic Powers in Germany would be restored, the papal influence in that country would be considerably increased, and the Catholic Church would have a firm bulwark against the Protestants. Actually the plan was wrecked by the old opposition between the houses of Wittelsbach and Habsburg proving insurmountable.⁵

As in the case of the Imperial election, the Pope allowed himself to be affected by no other interests than those of the Catholic religion in his attitude towards the Prussian king and his invasion of Silesia.

Already by the end of 1740 the Pope had said of Frederick II. that he was a man to be feared, being in control of considerable forces and having no religion.⁶ Immediately he heard the news

¹ Tencin to Fleury, January 6, 1741, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 43.

² *Cifre al Doria, January 21 and February 18, 1741, Nunziat. di Germania, 570, Papal Secret Archives.

³ *Cifra al Doria, March 4, 1741, *ibid.*

⁴ *Cifra al Doria, March 18, 1741, *ibid.*

⁵ Cf. W. VON HOFMANN, 215 *seqq.*

⁶ "che questo era un principe da temersi, perchè aveva molte forze e niuna religione." Thun to Maria Theresa, December 31, 1741, State Archives, Vienna.

that the Prussian king was trying to obtain possession of the duchy of Berg, Benedict XIV., on December 20th, 1740, called on the Electors of Bavaria, Cologne, and Pfalz-Neuburg to resist.¹ And when the unexpected invasion of Silesia followed, the indignation in Rome was very great.² For lack of means, the Pope had to refuse a request for monetary aid put to him by Maria Theresa's envoy, Count Thun,³ but on January 25th and February 11th, 1741, he turned to the Catholic princes of Germany, both ecclesiastical and lay, and urged them to support Maria Theresa in her struggle for her heritage.⁴

Meanwhile fresh complaints were coming in from France about Doria's behaviour in Frankfort, formulated in such a way that one might have supposed, as the Cardinal Secretary of State, Valenti, wrote, that Doria had been sent to further party interests rather than as the representative of the Holy See, with the mission of promoting the welfare of religion and of preserving the peace of the Empire. Accordingly Valenti, on April 14th and 21st, 1741, pointed out to the French nuncio that the aims of the Pope as the common Father of all Christians were very different from those of the French statesmen; the Holy Father, he said, was bound by his position to maintain an impartial attitude towards all the candidates.⁵ But

¹ **Epist. ad princ.*, 109, Papal Secret Archives.

² *Letter from Cardinal Albani to Sinzendorf, January 21, 1741, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

³ *Thun to Maria Theresa, January 7, 1741, *loc. cit.* Cf. MATSCHEG, 168 *seqq.*

⁴ **Epist. ad princ.*, 109, *loc. cit.* Cf. Thun's *reports of January 25 and February 11, 1741, *loc. cit.*, and MATSCHEG, 134.

⁵ *Cifra al nunzio Crescenzi, April 14, 1741: "Non occorre che si lagnino davantaggio costì di Msgr. Doria, perchè non hanno a pretendere che egli parli il linguaggio loro: così differenti sono le intenzioni ed i fini. Non basta che smentischino le dichiarazioni dei loro ministri nell'Imperio, quando quelle sono costanti e comuni a tutti i loro rappresentanti. Si contentino adunque di tollerare che il nostro Nunzio mostri tanta propensione pel Gran Duca quanta ne può mostrare per lo elettore di Baviera e quello

how far from peaceful were the intentions of the Powers was shown by the treaty of alliance of June 4th, 1741, between France and the King of Prussia, whereby the latter, in secret separate articles, in return for the guaranteeing of Lower Silesia, promised his electoral vote to the French candidate for the Imperial Crown, Charles Albert, while France promised the Bavarians armed support for an attack on Austria. Through this treaty, in which Austria's old and new enemies joined hands, the Silesian War developed into a European one.¹ Charles Albert, conscious of his own powerlessness, threw himself entirely in the arms of France and, turning a deaf ear to all Doria's exhortations to make peace, attacked Passau on the last day of July and entered Upper Austria. The Pope most strongly disapproved of this violation of the peace, but the Briefs which he addressed on the subject to Charles Albert and Cardinal Fleury² had no effect. Acutely distressed, not only by the harm that would accrue to the Church in Silesia but by the prospect of the weakening of Austria and the consequent strengthening of the Protestants in Germany, he wept at Maria Theresa's desperate position

di Sassonia. Poi il Papa dice da dovero, quando si protesta d'essere imparziale e però il suo contegno è paterno ed amorevole inverso tutti i concorrenti..." *To the same, April 21, 1741: "Non cessa questo Sigr. cardinale di Tencin di dolersi di Msgr. Doria, come se egli fosse stato mandato in Francfort per opporsi a qualcuno dei candidati; e non come un ministro Apostolico unicamente interessato a procurare il bene della religione e la pubblica tranquillità. Diversi fini e diverse mire si hanno dalla Francia, che non compatiscono con quelle del Padre comune. Deve egli essere imparziale e, per mostrarsi tale in effetti, non deve desiderare più uno che l'altro. Il di lui ministro se dice che sentirà con piacere eletto il Gran Duca, opera coerentemente al sistema di Nostro Signore, perchè con equal piacere si sentirà che la provvidenza abbia scelto l'elettor di sassonia o quello di Baviera." Similarly again on April 28, 1741. Nunziat. di Francia, 442, pp. 11 *seqq.*, Papal Secret Archives.

¹ IMMICH, 308; *cf.* DROYSEN, V., 273 *seqq.*

² Thun's *report of August 19, 1741, *loc. cit*

and again commissioned Doria to mediate for peace.¹ But in Munich the Papal envoy was referred to the Elector Palatine in Mannheim—a clear proof how hopeless it was to attempt to check the outbreak of war.²

In Paris the Papal mediation was viewed as a selfish intervention on behalf of Maria Theresa's husband. This interpretation was energetically denied by Cardinal Valenti. The fall of Austria, he wrote to the Paris nuncio, would destroy the bulwark against the Turks and at the same time ensure the predominance of the Protestant Powers in Germany. If the Pope sided with Maria Theresa it was not because he favoured any party in the Imperial election nor because he opposed the claims of other Powers to the Austrian territories; his sole motive was his dutiful desire to protect Catholic interests. This was the only standpoint from which the matter was viewed by Rome.³

¹ *Cifra al Doria of August 26, 1741, Nunziat. di Germania, 572. Cf. *Cifra al Nunzio di Francia of August 18, 1741, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, *loc. cit.*

² Thun's *reports of September 16 and 23, 1741, *loc. cit.*

³ In the *Cifra al Nunzio Crescenzi of August 25, 1741, Valenti expatiated on the Pope's fear for Maria Theresa: "questo è il vedere talmente annichilata la regina di Ungheria che non potrà mai tenere in soggezione le potenze eretiche dell'Imperio nè far fronte al Turco. Questa non è parzialità per far riuscire il Gran Duca nè contrastare le pretensioni, le quali giustificatamente possono avere altri principii sul patrimonio della casa d'Austria; ma questo è un timore che si risveglia in tutti i cattolici disappassionati e che agita specialmente Sua Santità." On September 15, 1741, Valenti returned to the question: "*Queste [premere e riflessioni di N. S.] si riducono a prescindere onninamente dall' elezione dell' Imperio, che cada in uno o in altro soggetto, e compiacendosi quando cada nell' elettore di Baviera; ma trema di veder posta tutta la Germania e quasi l'Europa in fuoco con tanta effusione del sangue cristiano, e di vedere un sicuro estermio di vari paesi cattolici, con accrescimento di forze e di autorità per le potenze eretiche e con l'annichilamento di quella potenza, che si trova essere per necessità la barriera del Turco..." On September 20 Valenti wrote: "*Finalmente si contentino di non prendere

When at first the fortunes of war seemed to be going against Maria Theresa it was feared more than ever in Rome that the Austrian monarchy would be utterly destroyed and that Protestant Prussia would acquire still greater influence in Germany at the cost of the Catholic Church.¹ Valenti accordingly let it be known in Paris how great a mistake it was to help increase the power of a prince who would very soon shake the foundations of Germany and the whole of Europe.²

In the meantime, however, everything had gone as the French Cabinet desired. The French army's passage of the Rhine on August 15th had an immediate effect on the electoral negotiations. On August 27th, 1741, Doria reported that Frederick II. had declared himself in favour of the Bavarian

a male la parte che N. S. va replicando in favore della regina d'Ungheria, poichè altro fine non ha la Stà Sua se non quello di non veder distrutto un principato tanto utile in Germania contro l'eresia, ed ancor più contro gl'infedeli ai quali fa barriera. Le cose sono ridotte a un punto che non solamente sono per apportarse utile alla casa di Baviera, ma per necessità di questa combinazione deve smembrarsi per impinguare altri principi dell' Imperio e particolarmente il Prussiano. Ecco quello che ferisce l'animo di Sua Stà e che bramerebbe fosse preso in considerazione del sigr. cardinale di Fleury." Nunziat. di Francia, 442, pp. 26, 30, 32. Papal Secret Archives.

¹ *Cifre al Nunzio Crescenzi of October 6 and 27, 1741, *ibid.* In the latter it is said: "Guai, se un giorno o l'altro, o casualmente, o maliziosamente, si risveglia in Germania un qualche movimento che interessi i religionari. Veda V. S. Ill^{ma} che sbilancio, avere da una parte Prussia, Hannover con tutti gli altri acattolici, tra i quali forza è annoverare anche la Sassonia, e dall' altra parte porvi i pochi cattolici che rimangono, i quali non formeranno che un bujo di gente collettizia. Dica quello che vuole l'umana politica, sarà sempre vero che la nostra religione v'ha a soffrire un fortissimo colpo, che non so come si potrà riparare, ancorchè Sua Em^{za} abbia la migliore intenzione."

² " *Fa male la Francia ad ingrandirlo [Frederick II.] e farebbe bene riguardarlo come il mal fermento che deve un giorno l'altro sconvolgere la Germania e l'Europa." Cifra al Crescenzi of November 3, 1741, *ibid.*

candidature, which seemed to make the choice of Charles Albert all the more certain, especially as the Elector of Mayence, Philip Charles of Eltz, who had hitherto been favourably disposed towards Austria, had now crossed over to the Bavarian side and, Doria added, would persist in this attachment even were Frederick II. to change his mind.¹ At the beginning of September, Doria, who was now quite certain that Charles Albert would be promoted Emperor,² betook himself to Munich, where the Elector scouted the idea of making peace with Austria but held out favourable prospects with regard to his attitude when Emperor.³ The nuncio now openly took his side and promised him his assistance in procuring a unanimous election. From Würzburg, where he was visiting the Prince Bishop Frederick Charles of Schönborn, a man experienced in politics and a faithful servant of the Holy See,⁴ he was able to report on September 16th that the Prince Bishop's brother, Francis George of Schönborn, the Elector of Trèves, intended to give his vote to the Bavarian Elector.⁵ On his return to Frankfort, Doria reported on September 23rd that Charles Albert's election might be regarded as an accomplished fact, as Saxony and Hanover also intended to vote for him.⁶ And in fact, Augustus of Saxony, although he had thought of securing the Imperial

¹ *Cifra of August 27, 1741, in which Doria asserts that he has always said that everything depends on Prussia (Nunziat. di Germania, 546, *ibid.*). Frederick's instructions to his delegates at the diet, which won over the Electorate of Mayence, were dispatched on August 22, 1741; see DROYSEN, V., I, 335.

² " *L'affare si può dire fatto." Cifra of August 27, 1741, *loc. cit.*

³ *Cifra di Monaco of September 5, 1741: " The Elector considers himself to be nearly Emperor already. I told him that the Pope would rejoice at his election. Formerly I never did more than forward the interests of religion and peace. It was not until I saw the way things were going that I altered my tone." *loc. cit.*

⁴ Cf. the Pope's praise in HEECKEREN, I., 265.

⁵ *Cifra of September 16, 1741, *loc. cit.*

⁶ *Cifra of September 23, 1741, *ibid.* In the *Cifra of September

crown for himself, placed his vote at the disposal of Bavaria. Even George II., King of England and Elector of Hanover, found himself constrained by French and Prussian troops to withhold his support of Maria Theresa. On September 27th he concluded a treaty of neutrality with France, binding himself not to vote for the Lorrainer.¹

The Bavarian Elector, surrounded by French and Bavarian

27, 1741 (*ibid.*), Doria reports that Charles Albert is certain of eight votes; "il Prussiano è stato il fundamento e causa di tutto"; Bavaria now acknowledges the treaty concluded with Prussia on June 11. In the *Cifra of October 7, 1741, Doria announces that Hanover has gone over to Bavaria and claims that Vienna has no grounds for complaining ou his (Doria's) conduct. He defends his conduct in these terms: "Mostro è vero tutta la compiacenza di vedere prossima l'elettione del sigr. Duca di Baviera, ma questo non è contrario, anzi conforme al carattere dichiarato da N. S. padre comune, che non può non compiacersi del bene che tocca ad uno di suoi figli, il quale si è spiegato di non amare [uno] meno degl'altri. Non potrà però mai dirsi ch'io abbia portato alcun elettore a dar il voto più all' elettore di Baviera che al Duca di Lorena. Già di Hannover e Sassonia abbiamo saputo le intenzioni da altri che da loro. Per Magonza me parlò il conte Eltz già risoluto. È vero che mi sono esibito col Maresciallo e al Duca di Baviera di cooperare all' unanima elettione e di trattare ancora con msgr. vescovo di Bamberg, ma in sostanza nulla ho fatto. Treviri già aveva la sua risoluzione e msgr. vescovo tanto per suo fratello quanto per Vienna aveva già formato le sue idee prima del mio arrivo." Valenti commended Doria's procedure in Munich in a *Cifra of September 22, 1741: "We will see how things turn out; but there seems to be no hope for Maria Theresa." In the *Cifra of September 30, 1741, he returns to the subject of Maria Theresa's desperate position: "N. S. ha cercato di salvarla dall' ultimo precipizio, ma pare la providenza abbia disposto altrimenti, si che senza voltarle le spalle conviene che andiamo secondando le traccie dell' odierna probabilità tanto più che cadendo questa in un principe così degno e in una casa così cattolica come quella di Baviera potiamo sperare vantaggio alla religione." Nunziat. di Germania, 570, *ibid.*

¹ "What else could he do at such a time," asks HEINEMANN

generals, had made his entry into Linz on September 10th. As he was now only a few days' march from the Austrian capital, where all was in confusion, a speedy advance would have brought him the most brilliant successes. Frederick II. was all for the march on Vienna, but instead of this Charles Albert crossed the Danube and entered Bohemia. For this step he has long been blamed, but recent researches have shown that this all-important alteration in the plan of campaign, which was of the greatest possible service to Austria, was forced on Charles Albert, entirely against his wishes, by the French, lest an out-and-out success might make Bavaria great and strong and put a spoke in the wheels of the French policy. As Charles Albert realized too late, the aim of this was to weaken both Bavaria and Austria by setting them at each other's throats and then to step in and take the lion's share.¹ Instead of Vienna, therefore, Prague became the allies' objective, and here Charles Albert was crowned king with unwonted pomp on December 19th.² From Prague the protégé of France moved to Mannheim, there to await his election as Emperor. In Frankfort, where the electoral delegates had been sitting in conference the last two months, the decision was finally taken on December 20th, after lengthy deliberations and on the insistence of Prussia, to hold the election on January 24th, 1742. Charles Albert was elected without a single vote being cast against him, and on February 12th he was crowned Charles VII.³

(2)

Meanwhile, Spain was arming with all speed, intending to take advantage of Maria Theresa's predicament to set up a kingdom of Lombardy for the Infante Philip. In the latter

(*Gesch. von Braunschweig und Hannover*, III., Gotha, 1892, 253), "but give his vote too to the Bavarian Elector?"

¹ HEIGEL, *Der österr. Erbfolgekrieg und die Kaiserwahl Karls VII.*, Nördlingen, 1877.

² *Ibid.*

³ OHLenschLÄGER, IV., 312; DROYSEN, V., 1, 390.

half of November 1741, troops and war material were dispatched from Barcelona and Naples to fortified places on the Tuscan coast which were already in Spanish occupation. On December 9th the commander-in-chief of the army, the Duke of Montemar, landed in Orbetello, where he was to be joined by Spanish troops from Naples, to the number of 12,000. Already in early October the Pope had feared that they would attempt to pass through the Pontifical State,¹ and in the middle of November the Spanish ambassador, Cardinal Acquaviva, sought his permission for them to do so.² Benedict had declared in June 1741 that he would forbid the passage of troops through his territory, no matter whence they came,³ but defenceless as he was he was now unable to carry out this intention. On November 18th, 1741, Cardinal Albani wrote to Sinzendorf that the Pope had not the power to defend his territory; his enemies had a free hand; even the French would not lift a finger to protect Tuscany, although they were guarantors of its integrity.⁴

Benedict placed no trust in Acquaviva's assurances that the inhabitants of the Pontifical State had nothing to fear, but towards the end of December he was forced to permit the passage of the army from Naples.⁵ In any case, the neutrality of the Papal territory had already been violated by Austria, which had sent troops through the Bolognese district. This was not the only complaint which Benedict had to make to

¹ Acquaviva's *report to Villarias, October 9, 1741, Archives of Simancas.

² Acquaviva's *report to Villarias of November 18, 1741, *loc. cit.* Benedict's anger at Acquaviva's request is shown in the *Cifre al Crescenzi of November 17 and 24, 1741, *loc. cit.*, Papal Secret Archives.

³ Thun's *letter to Maria Theresa of June 14, 1741, State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ Albani's *letter in the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

⁵ Acquaviva's *letter of December 21, 1741, Archives of Simancas. Cf. Thun's *reports of December 10 and 17, 1741, *loc. cit.*

Count Thun ; there was also the non-recognition of his feudal right over Parma and Piacenza,¹ to the maintenance of which he had drawn attention as far back as March 6th, when he had demanded the oath of fealty from Maria Theresa.²

Relations between Rome and Vienna had been good at first—the Pope, for instance, had consented to stand godfather to Maria Theresa's eldest son, the Archduke Joseph, born on March 13th, 1741³—but already by June 1741, heated words had passed between Thun and Valenti as a result of the former having accused the Cardinal of Spanish leanings.⁴ Austria's enemies, on the other hand, were far more tactful in their dealings with the Pope. In order to obtain his recognition of Charles VII. as quickly as possible, the French ambassador and the representatives of Bavaria and Cologne upheld in Frankfort the rights of the Catholics and the Holy See.⁵ This was acknowledged with gratitude in Rome, together with the fact that Bavaria and Mayence had frustrated an attempt by the Elector of Trèves, Francis George of Schönborn, to abolish appeals to the Pope and his nuncios.⁶ Further, Cardinal

¹ Thun's *report of October 14, 1741, *ibid.*

² See the allocution in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, Vol. I., 44.

³ In a *letter of February 18, 1741, Thun reports to Maria Theresa the Pope's acceptance of the sponsorship and his nomination of Cardinal Kollonitsch as proxy. On April 22, 1741, Thun reports the audience given to Count Kaunitz as the bearer of the news of Joseph's birth. "Al conte fu permesso per grazia di ritinere la spada"; but permission to remain covered could not be obtained. As a present he received a rosary "in pietra dura", set in gold. The difficulties about the *cappello cardinalizio*, which was given only to the first-born son of the Emperor, but not of kings, were resolved by the Pope in Maria Theresa's favour. State Archives, Vienna. Cf. MATSCHEG, 207 *seqq.*

⁴ Cf. Thun's *report of June 24, 1741, *loc. cit.*

⁵ The Paris nuncio Crescenzi received instructions on December 22, 1741, to thank Fleury for this; cf. *Cifra of January 26, 1742, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, Papal Secret Archives.

⁶ *Cifra al nunzio Crescenzi, January 19, 1742, *ibid.*: "Ci avvisa msgr. Doria che per parte dell' elettore di Treveri si era tentato di sottoporre all' esame della Dieta l'articolo delle

Fleury announced his desire to protect the Papal suzerainty over Parma and Piacenza.¹

When the news arrived in Rome on the night of February 2nd that the Bavarian Elector had been chosen Emperor, it was received with joy.² On Doria's visit to Munich, Charles Albert had made him far-reaching promises anent his devotion to the Holy See,³ and his electoral capitulation also seemed quite satisfactory.⁴ Despite Thun's remonstrances, therefore, the recognition of the election took place as early as February 28th, 1742, in a solemn allocution to the Cardinals assembled in consistory.⁵ Before taking this step, the Pope had consulted

appellazioni alla S. Sede ed ai nunzi, reclamando contro le medesime e pretendendo farle abolire; ma che non gli era riuscito, opponendosi vigorosamente i ministri di Magonza e di Baviera, ai quali si sono uniti quelli ancora del marchese di Brandebourgh e di Hannover. Vuole però N. S. che V. S. Ill^{ma} ne parli col sigr. cardinale di Fleury e lo preghi a voler vivamente raccomandare al sigr. maresciallo di Belisle di assistere msgr. Doria e per l'articolo suddetto delle appellazioni, se caso mai tornasse a parlarsene, e per l'altro di Risvich, che deve premere anche alla Francia."

¹ *Cifre al Crescenzi of October 26, 1740, and January 19, 1742, *ibid.*

² *Cifra al Nunzio Crescenzi, February 2, 1742, *ibid.* " Questa notte abbiamo avuto il corriere di Francfort che porta l'elezione dell'Imperatore. N. S. ne è sommamente contento, sì per essere questo grave articolo perfezionato, sì per la stima grande che nutrice delle qualità personali dell' eletto, e finalmente perchè spera con questo considerabile avvenimento si farà strada a calmarsi le turbolenze d'Europa. La nostra santa religione è stata protetta nella capitolazione e dagli uffici zelantissimi de' ministri francesi e dalla pietà del nuovo eletto."

³ *Cifra al Crescenzi of September 22, 1741, *ibid.* Cf. above, p. 84, n. 3.

⁴ For the electoral capitulation, see *Acta historico-ecclesiastica*, VI., 481 *seqq.*; MENZEL, X., 423 *seqq.*

⁵ HEIGEL, *Osterr. Erbfolgekrieg*, 284. Cf. Thun's *reports to Maria Theresa of February 12 and 24, 1742, State Archives, Vienna. Here also is a *copy of Charles VII.'s letter to Benedict

ten of his Cardinals (Valenti, Ruffo, Annibale Albani, Rivera, Lercari, Aldrovandi, Corsini, Passionei, Gentili, and Corradini),¹ as Clement XI. had done at the election of Charles VI., when the votes of Bavaria and Cologne were lacking.²

Maria Theresa declared the election of Charles VII. to be null and void³; but what was more important than this

XIV., dated Mannheim 1742 Jan. 25: Announcement of the election, "quod singulare domus meae incrementum haud exigua ex parte bonis Stis Vrae officii adscribendum habeam." A second *letter from Charles VII. to Benedict XIV., of January 31, 1742, in *Nunziat. di Germania*, 604, Papal Secret Archives. For the proceedings in the *Anima*, see SCHMIDLIN, 607 *seqq.* In *Acta Benedicti XIV.* (II., 358 *seq.*) the *Confirmatio* of the Imperial election is dated August 6.

¹ Thun's *report of February 3, 1742, State Archives, Vienna. According to his *report of January 20, 1742, Benedict XIV. had already stated that he would do nothing "senza il consiglio d'una buona parte del s. collegio equivalente alla consistoriale". *Ibid.*

² Benedict XIV. pointed this out to Maria Theresa in a *letter of justification (*di proprio pugno*) of April 7, 1742, remarking "Il trattenere di fare il solito nulla avrebbe servito per gli altri interessi ed avrebbe pregiudicato a Noi et alla massima della nostra condotta". State Archives, Vienna, Hofkorresp.

³ RANKE, in his *Preuss. Gesch.* (III., 20), cites a statement taken from the records of the Imperial Diet, that on February 3, 1741, on the arrival of the news of the Imperial election, Maria Theresa assembled the Estates in the throne room of the palace of Favorita, where, in the presence of the clergy, headed by the Papal nuncio, she made them renew their oath of loyalty before a crucifix. ARNETH (II., 464) has pointed out that this account is out of place in the year 1741 and that in any case it is hardly credible. "How did the Papal nuncio," he asks, "come to be among the ranks of the Austrian Estates? How is it that there is not the faintest reference to the event either in the Imperial Archives, or in the archives of the Austrian Estates, and that not a word of the affair is to be found in Capello's reports, which are extant in their entirety, or in the Viennese 'Diarium'?" In spite of these weighty objections, Ranke, in the new edition

protest was the success of her arms in Bavaria, whose capital was occupied by Austrian troops on February 13th, 1742.¹

In Rome, the two belligerent parties levelled similar accusations against each other. Thun, Maria Theresa's representative, launched the most violent invectives against Cardinal Fleury for inciting the Protestant king of Prussia and even the Turks against Catholic Austria. The French party no less violently accused the sovereign of a barbarous people of ravaging a Catholic country with fire and sword in the inhuman fashion of the Turk.² The Pope deplored the war between two

of his *Preussische Geschichte*, insists that the event is shown to be "irrefutably certain" by the sources to which he has had access. In reply to this, HEIGEL (*Österr. Erbfolgestreit*, 384) observes that as the authorities which are usually the best informed are significantly silent, the truth is to be obtained only from the records of the Viennese nunciature. But in these *records (Nunziat. di Germania, 325, 342, and 345; Papal Secret Archives) there is not a word of the whole affair. Nor is there any mention of it in the **Lettere confidenziali* of the Viennese nuncio Paolucci to the Cardinal Secretary of State Valenti (*ibid.*, 337). It would be in complete contradiction to all the other declarations made by the Holy See.

¹ In the Carnival the sarcastic Romans depicted Charles VII. as the King of the Beggars, and the following couplet was circulated:—

Gallia vicisti, profuso largiter auro,
armis pauca, dolo plurima, iure nihil.

Santa Croce's *report to Sinzendorf of February 3, 1742, State Archives, Vienna. *Ibid.* a *report by Thun of March 10, 1742, on a pasquinade on the "corsa fatta dal Papa nella ricognizione del Bavaro in imperatore". A most interesting, anonymous, proposal of a reconciliation purporting to be made by Francis of Lorraine to Charles VII. in the early part of 1742 has been discussed and edited by SCHWERDFEGER in *Archiv für österr. Gesch.*, LXXXV., 2, 359 *seqq.*

² See Thun's memorandum of May 25, 1742, in DUDIK, *Iter Romanum*, I., Vienna, 1855, 346 *seq.*; HEIGEL, *Erbfolgekrieg*, 284 *seq.*

Catholic Powers, but declined to act as judge between them and exhorted them to make peace. On April 27th, 1742, he led on foot a procession to invoke peace, from the Minerva to the Chiesa Nuova.¹ He longed for the war to end, especially as since the end of February 1742, the defenceless States of the Church, notwithstanding Papal neutrality, had had to be thrown open for the passage of the armies of both parties. It was a particular grief to Benedict XIV. that his beloved homeland of Bologna should have to suffer the most at the hands of the Spaniards, Austrians, and Sardinians. On his complaining of this, both the Austrians and the Spaniards accused him of taking sides—as though, as he wrote to Cardinal Tencin, they had not both loaded themselves with the guilt of abusing the patience of a defenceless Pope.²

In Vienna, in the spring of 1741, it was hoped that an Italian league might be formed under the presidency and direction of the Pope, to counter the superior forces of the Bourbons. To Benedict XIV., however, such a position was incompatible with that of the Father of all Christians; he knew, too, that the States of the Church, in their defencelessness, would be the most exposed to an attack by Neapolitan and Spanish troops. He rightly, therefore, declined to allow

¹ Ruele's *letter to Uhlfeld of April 28, 1742, State Archives, Vienna, and Albani's *letter to Uhlfeld of the same day, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican. Cf. " *Modo che ritenne [the Pope] nella solenne processione fatta gli 12 Aprile 1742," in Cod. Vat. 8545, pp. 37 *seqq.*, Vatican Library.

² HEECKEREN, I., 6 (*cf.* 7, 12); Garampi's letter from Rimini, of February 1742, on the calamities caused by the war, in Spicil. Vat. 554 *seqq.*, and Albani's *reports to Sinzendorf of March 10, 24, and 31, to Uhlfeld of April 28, 1742, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican. For Benedict XIV.'s violent indignation on hearing of the wrecking of his garden and the plundering of his family's palazzo by the Spaniards who had invaded Bolognese territory, see Ruele's *letter to Uhlfeld of May 26, 1742, State Archives, Vienna. The Pope showed his displeasure quite clearly to Acquaviva; see the latter's *letter of June 9, 1742, *ibid.*

the Holy See to take an active part in the war.¹ The ill-feeling caused thereby in Vienna was increased by the recognition of Charles VII.'s election as Emperor. Maria Theresa complained not only of this but also of the favour which she alleged was being shown to Charles's French and Spanish allies. Her relations with the Pope deteriorated to such an extent that she charged him with actual hostility towards her and her house.²

While the Pope's pain and indignation at the devastation of the Papal States by the belligerents was ever increasing,³

¹ This view is supported by ARNETH (*Maria Theresia*, IX., 2 [cf. II., 151, 496]) and by MATSCHEG (133, 199, 356). Benedict XIV. wrote to Tencin on August 3, 1743: "La spada non sta bene in mano a chi benchè indegnamente è vicario di Gesù Cristo." *Miscell.*, XV., 154.

² ARNETH, IX., 2 *seq.* In a *Brief of March 9, 1742 (apparently not yet printed) Benedict explained to Maria Theresa that in spite of his goodwill he was not able "fatali quadam necessitate" to concede all her demands. "Non ea sunt tempora, quando e sacrorum canonum legibus pontifici maximo iudicandum erat de legitima Caesaris electione. Tunc enim insidebat in Germanorum principum mente, non alibi quam apud summum sacerdotem de tanta re iudicium residere posse... Postmodum suae falso timentes auctoritati nihil magis studuerunt, ac ab husiusmodi negotio divertere pontificem maximum eosque ipsi agendi in hac re fines designare, ut confirmet ratamque habeat imperatoris electionem tantamque illi mandatam dignitatem agnosceret, qui ab electoribus creatus in eiusdem possessionem venerit et ab aliis principibus hoc nomine consalutatus fuerit catholicamque inprimis religionem profiteatur." By this We shall have to abide. "Servandus praeterea Nobis est indifferens erga suos filios patris amor." *Epist. ad princ.*, 109, Papal Secret Archives.

³ Cf. especially the letters to Tencin (not included in Heckeren's edition) of July 13 (of the complete compensation which had been agreed upon "nè si è pagato nè si paga se non quello che si vole e corre il sesto mese di una orribile permanenza"; the Austrian Hussars were taking everything that had been left by the Spaniards in the districts of Bologna and Ferrara), of July 19 (similar contents), and of August 3 and 25, 1742 (further complaints about the devastation of the Papal

the Austrian envoy, Thun, although he was an Auditor of the Rota, went so far in June 1742 as to adopt a disrespectful attitude towards the Head of the Church, so that for some time the Pope refused to receive him in audience.¹ Benedict afterwards declared that never again would he accept as an envoy an Auditor of the Rota.² Thun put the blame for everything on the advice tendered by the Cardinal Secretary of State, Valenti, whom he represented as the Pope's evil genius.

Maria Theresa trusted Thun completely and in August 1742, to show her displeasure with Valenti in the most tangible manner possible, she took the forcible step of confiscating all his ecclesiastical benefices on Austrian soil.³ In an autograph letter of September 7th, 1742, Benedict protested against such an unwonted measure, which had not been taken even in the war with Clement XI.⁴ Maria Theresa replied angrily that she could not understand how the cause of religion and the rights of the Holy See demanded the ignoring of complaints made by the party which had been attacked and oppressed and the favouring by every possible means of the authors of scandalous injustices. To give point to her ill-humour, she did not reply in her own hand but added only a few words to the official communication, pleading her insufficient knowledge of Italian and her dislike of copying someone else's composition.⁵

States; "disgrazie indecibili"); see *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI.' 48 *seqq.*

¹ Ruele's *letter to Uhlfeld of June 23, 1742, which contains the following: "Si querela la Stà Sua primo che Monsignore gli abbia parlato con poco rispetto sino con alzare seco lui la voce, secondo che egli abbia representato cose non vere." It was Ruele's belief that Thun had been listening to the counsel of a false friend. State Archives, Vienna.

² HEECKEREN, I., 5.

³ ARNETH, *Maria Theresia*, II., 180, 503.

⁴ *Original in the Hofkorrespondenz of the State Archives, Vienna.

⁵ ARNETH, II., 181, 503.

It is significant of Benedict's love of peace and of the effect produced in Rome by the military successes that on October 13th, 1742, he addressed another long letter to the Queen in his own hand, in which he did his best to justify not only himself and his behaviour with regard to the Imperial election and the passage of the troops, but also Cardinal Valenti's attitude.¹ Maria Theresa demanded as a condition for the raising of the sequestration that her affairs should be dealt with without reference to Valenti.² The Pope was ready to agree to this,³ but the sequestration was not raised. At the end of 1742 the Pope wrote to Tencin that conditions in the Papal States were going from bad to worse, for the Spaniards had taken up their winter quarters in the plain of Bologna, the Austrians in the neighbouring mountains and in the district of Ferrara.⁴

The Pope's cares were further increased by the failure of the hopes which he had placed in the new Emperor. The first discordant note was struck when, on the Holy See insisting on its right to confirm the Imperial election, Charles VII. let it be known that for this purpose he would keep strictly to the formality observed by the Austrian ambassador De Prié on the accession of his predecessor Charles VI.⁵ The Pope referred the matter to the congregation of Cardinals which he had appointed immediately after the election to discuss the questions appertaining thereto; at the same time Cardinal Tencin acted as mediator; but it was not till six months after the election, in August, that the affair was closed. A secret consistory held on August 6th, 1742, gave its approval to the indult of the *primae preces* and to everything relating to the

¹ *Original in the Hofkorrespondenz, State Archives, Vienna. The Pope is complaining here of the quartering of troops in the Papal States.

² ARNETH, II., 185, 505.

³ Thun's *letter to Maria Theresa of December 22, 1742 (presented January 5, 1743), State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., 19; *cf.* 13, 17.

⁵ *Cf.* our account, Vol. XXXIII, 93.

election, but this latter document was to be kept secret and was not to be referred to except in case of necessity.¹

In his letter of congratulation to Charles VII. the Pope had stressed the fact that the elevation of the House of Wittelsbach had been well deserved by reason of the devotion to the Catholic cause which had been shown by his ancestors, and at the same time he had expressed the hope that their descendant would prove himself to be an equally zealous champion of the Church.² It was soon seen, however, how little there was to be hoped for in this respect from a monarch who in a confidential letter written to Törring immediately after his election compared himself to "Job, the man of sorrows, sick in body, with no country and no money".³ He showed no sign

¹ P. A. KIRSCH in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 46 *seqq.* Besides the sources drawn upon there are Thun's *reports of July 28, 1742 (the congregation of Cardinals decided to confirm the recognition of the election, with the usual clauses, and to receive Cardinal Borghese, nominated by Charles VII. protector of the Empire, as the envoy deputed to perform the rite of obedience), of August 4 (the "obedience" was carried out without ceremony; Borghese delivered the address, as the old Bavarian envoy, Scarlatti, was on his death-bed; the "primae preces" were not granted), of August 11 (from the decree of confirmation Thun picks out the following: "confirmantes, supplettes et sanantes etiam in essentialibus electionem"; cf. *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 358 *seq.*). "Si è poi divulgato che gli atti di questo concistoro si tenevano così gelosamente segreti, affinché i ministri di V. M. in Germania non rendessero ai principi protestanti odioso il presunto imperatore et che il Papa medesimo aveva adotta questa ragione." Valenti told Thun that this was untrue. State Archives, Vienna. Acquaviva *reported on August 9, 1742, that Borghese stayed away from the consistory because he disagreed with the wording of the Bull. He could not say more on account of the pledge of secrecy. Archives of Simancas.

² *Geschichte und Thaten Karls VII.*, 120 *seqq.* Besides the *Brief of March 3, 1742, Benedict sent another *letter to Charles Albert the same day, written in his own hand and of a similar purport; see *Nunziat. di Germania*, 604, Papal Secret Archives.

³ HEIGEL, *Österr. Erbfolgekrieg*, 283.

whatever of the energy which Rome had expected of him. Indirectly he had a share in the loss of Catholic Silesia to Protestant Prussia, while for the recovery of Parma and Piacenza for the Pope he did nothing ; only in ecclesiastico-political questions was there any prospect of a favourable solution.¹ All things considered, it became clear as early as October 1742, that the elevation of Charles VII. was to prove a bitter disappointment. The only consolation was that the new Emperor, who since September had been in correspondence with the Pope on all difficult questions, seemed to have the best intentions so far as he himself was concerned. This impression was confirmed by Doria.²

Great, then, was the consternation of the nuncio and the Pope when it became known at the beginning of 1743 that at the peace negotiations in London, Charles VII.'s envoy had proposed the secularization of the bishoprics of Salzburg, Passau, Freising, Regensburg, Eichstätt, and Augsburg, to indemnify Bavaria, and that the plan had been supported by Prussia. The plan had been originated by Frederick II., acting in conjunction with England³ ; but Charles VII. was imprudent enough to flirt with the idea and to imagine that the Holy See would give its consent to it.

The matter was broached by Doria in an audience with the Emperor on January 5th, 1743, when he learnt to his most painful surprise that the Emperor was far from being entirely averse to the dangerous project. In a second audience, on January 8th, the Emperor attempted to justify the plan on the plea that several ecclesiastical princes had abused their worldly power. In a third audience, on the 21st, he said that he thought that in these circumstances the Holy See might give its consent. In vain Doria explained that this was out of the question, as it would be the first step towards a universal

¹ W. VON HOFMANN, *Das Säkularisationsprojekt*, 216.

² *Ibid.* 217. For the autograph correspondence between the Emperor and the Pope, cf. Doria's *report from Frankfort on October 9, 1742, *Nunziat. di Germania, loc. cit.*

³ Cf. VOLBEHR, *Forsch. zur deutschen Gesch.*, XXVI., 275 *seqq.*

secularization and would lead to the predominance of the Protestants in Germany. In vain he appealed to the Emperor's sense of honour and to his duty as protector of the Church. Charles VII. persisted in saying that the Pope could give his consent.¹

When Benedict XIV. heard of the plan for secularization, at the end of January, and of the support given to it by the Emperor, he was horrified. He would rather die, he said, than agree to such shameful proposals, which would have the very worst effect on the Church in Germany and would bring about the triumph of Protestantism. It was suggested to him that the loss of worldly power would force the German bishops to live as spiritual princes, but to this reasoning too he refused to listen. He observed bitterly that if the Emperor complained that the heads of the German clergy lived more like worldly than spiritual princes, he was possibly correct but that he seemed to forget that his brother, the Elector Clement Augustus of Cologne, not content with his archbishopric, had managed to obtain for himself the bishoprics of Münster, Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Osnabrück. If the abuses in Germany were to be corrected, the first step to take was to put a stop to the practice of individuals gaining possession of a number of dioceses, a practice to which the Holy See had given its unwilling consent only as the result of the pressure put upon it by the German princes.² The Cardinal Secretary of State also considered the position to be most serious; in his view it only needed an energetic policy on the part of Prussia and England for the project to be realized.³

Immediately on receipt of the alarming news the Pope took steps at the French court to induce it to use its great influence

¹ W. VON HOFMANN, 223, 226 *seqq.*

² HEECKEREN, I., 27 *seqq.* Cf. K. SOMMER, *Die Wahl des Herzogs Klemens August von Bayern zum Bischof von Münster und Paderborn 1719, zum Koadjutor mit dem Recht der Nachfolge im Erzstift Köln 1722, zum Bischof von Hildesheim und Osnabrück 1724 u. 1728* (Diss.), Münster, 1908.

³ W. VON HOFMANN, 223, 225.

with Charles VII. to divert him from his baneful purpose.¹ Both Doria and the Pope supposed that Maria Theresa was in agreement with the secularization plan, but in this they were entirely mistaken. Austrian diplomacy saw at once that the plan was a weapon that could be used against Charles VII. It was therefore published, with the observation that the Emperor toadied those who were stronger than himself and bullied those who were weaker; so as to make Bavaria a monarchy he intended to suppress those who were immediately subject to him and to abolish the most distinguished ecclesiastical ranks, whereas the Queen had no desire to burden her conscience with the abolition of ecclesiastical bishoprics. These proclamations produced a deep impression over the whole of Southern Germany. The storm of indignation that rose against Charles VII. was so violent that, for fear of losing his closest adherents, he was forced to take the humiliating course of denying that he had ever approved of the plan.²

In Rome, too, Count Thun, who was eagerly collecting satires directed against the Cardinal Secretary of State, Valenti,³ attempted in early March to use the plan to turn opinion against the Emperor. Benedict XIV., who at the time was particularly embittered by the quartering of Austrian troops in the legation of Ferrara,⁴ answered curtly that the supposed secret had long been known to him and that the Emperor had been warned against such a step by a Papal letter in

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 28, 37. Cf. *Cifre al Nunzio Crescenzi of March 8 and 15, 1743, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, Papal Secret Archives.

² ARNETH, II., 211; W. VON HOFMANN, 232 *seqq.*

³ *Reports to Uhlfeld of January 19 and March 7, 1743, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

⁴ Ruele *reported on February 23, 1743, that a courier from Ferrara had brought news of the Austrian request for permission to quarter troops. "Certo è che il Papa dopo che l'ebbe lette, si vide tutto il giorno infuriato contro di noi prorompendo alle volte in parole poco misurate." State Archives, Vienna.

autograph, to which no reply had yet been received.¹ On its receipt the Pope, on March 30th, 1743, expressed his joy to the Emperor that the rumours which had been spread about him were now declared to be false.² Nevertheless, suspicion still attached to Charles Albert. Not till the Last Day, wrote Benedict in a confidential letter to Cardinal Tencin, would it be known whether the Bavarian envoy in London had actually proposed the secularization plan.³ The Cardinal Secretary of State was of the opinion that the question of how far the Emperor had committed himself had better be left unplumbed.⁴

Though Charles VII., on receiving the Papal admonition, no doubt took good care not to pursue the dangerous project any further, Frederick II. continued to make propaganda for it. In consequence, Doria, and with him the Pope, viewed the future with anxiety. It was not till September 1743 that Rome considered the project to be finally dead and buried,⁵ but it was precisely at this juncture that the bogey came to life again. Another campaign of publicity against the threatened plan of secularization was opened by the Cabinet in Vienna, in which suspicion was cast on both the Emperor and the Pope, the former being accused of wanting to impose Gallican-French conditions on the Empire. How unwise the Emperor had been in dallying with the proposal for secularization in its inception was shown by the revival in Rome at the end of the year of the suspicion that he was still in favour of it.⁶

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 37 *seq.*

² *Copy of this letter written "proprio pugno" in the Hofkorrespondenz, State Archives, Vienna.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 46.

⁴ Instruction to Doria of March 23, 1743; see HOFMANN, 238.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 239 *seqq.*, 242 *seqq.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, 244 *seqq.*; also the Brief in answer to the German Bishops' appeal of February 15, 1744 (*Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 176 *seqq.*, to Cardinal Lamberg). According to the *Epist. ad princ.*, 110 (Papal Secret Archives), similar *Briefs were sent to the ecclesiastical electors and the Bishops of Salzburg and Würzburg concerning the plans for secularization, one of the authors of

(3)

All the time these disturbing questions were in the air, the effects of the war were causing ever greater injury to the Papal States. In 1743 both Austrian and Spanish troops made their way across Papal territory without the least regard for its neutrality, transferring thither the theatre of war. What was lacking in their military supplies they took from the unfortunate inhabitants and carried off goods and money as though they were in enemy country. As early as March 20th, 1743, the Pope complained in a letter to Maria Theresa written in his own hand that in the territory of Ferrara, General Traun was behaving in so arbitrary a fashion that one might think the Pope did not exist.¹ What little attention was paid to this complaint may be seen in the confidential letters sent by the Pope to Cardinal Tencin, which are full of lamentations about

which was said by malicious persons to be the Pope (HEECKEREN, I., 143). The Briefs were regarded as a vote of censure on Charles VII., which deeply offended him; see HOFMANN, 249 *seqq.* Here also are further particulars of the counter-action taken by the ecclesiastical princes of Germany. Among those who suspected the Pope was Cardinal Passionei, with regard to which Ruele *reported to Uhlfeld on April 4, 1744: "Il detto cardinale dunque trovandosi nell'anticamera del Papa, con uno dei suoi soliti furiosi entusiasmi si lasciò uscire da bocca di essergli finalmente riuscito di togliere dall'animo del Papa l'orrore, che aveva concepito contro il progetto della secolarizzazione con fargli comprendere, che abusandosi i vescovi di Germania delle loro grosse rendite con far bagordi e mantenere il lusso e le caccie, non era che ben fatto il ridurli poveri, perchè così sariano stati migliori ecclesiastici ed avrebbero meglio adempito le loro obbligazioni vescovili." Uhlfeld had been *told of the real state of affairs by Albani as early as January 11, 1744: "The chief supporter of the secularization plan is Prussia; it is not true that the Curia agrees to it." State Archives, Vienna.

¹ In this *letter (State Archives, Vienna; Hofkorresp.) Benedict instances the support given on various occasions by Innocent XI. and Clement XI. to Germany and the House of Habsburg in particular.

the ravaging of his country by the belligerents.¹ In September Civitavecchia was threatened with bombardment by the English fleet because some Spanish troops had taken refuge in that harbour.² In addition to this, there was the danger of there being brought to Rome the plague which had broken out in Messina. Although every precaution was taken by the Papal Government it was accused of negligence by those who wished it ill.³

The Pope's agitation was further increased when it became known in the autumn that the Spanish troops intended to settle for the winter in Pesaro and Rimini, the Austrians, despite the intervention of Portugal on the Pope's behalf,⁴ in the districts of Ferrara and Bologna.⁵ Hostility towards the Court of Vienna, whose representative, Count Thun, never ceased to annoy the Pope, was steadily increasing, and the situation was not improved by Maria Theresa's obstinate refusal to grant her *placet* to Pozzobonelli's nomination as Archbishop of Milan. In October Benedict declared that the prospect of a definite rupture with Maria Theresa caused him little concern, for at least it would rid him of Count Thun, who did nothing but sow the seeds of discord.⁶ On October 25th the most senior in rank of the Cardinal Bishops, Priests, and Deacons addressed a letter of protest to Maria Theresa, assert-

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 33, 34, 41, 42, 44, 50, 56, 58, 59, 69. Cf. the *Cifre al Nunzio Crescenzi of March 22 and 29, April 5 and 19 1743, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, Papal Secret Archives.

² HEECKEREN, I., 84, 86, III. Cf. MURATORI, *Annali*, 1743.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 72, 77, 78. Cf. FRESCO, *Lettere*, XVIII., 65, 69.

⁴ Cf. Benedict's autograph *letter of thanks to King John, which is reprinted in the Appendix (Ia) as an example of the way in which the Pope corresponded with princes.

⁵ HEECKEREN, I., 88.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 89 seq.; cf. 95. In a *Brief addressed to Lobkowitz on October 9, 1743, Benedict admonished him to spare Bologna and remarked that if the States of the Church were ruined the Holy See would not be able as before to render assistance against the Turks. *Epist. ad princ.*, 239, p. 127, Papal Secret Archives.

ing that the Papal States were being ruined by the military occupation and urgently demanding redress. On the following day the Pope wrote to her in a similar strain, adding that he had also demanded from Madrid the withdrawal of the Spanish troops.¹ These representations went unheeded, and the Pope continued to be the victim of the bloody struggle. As he had feared in October, the Austrian army remained in the district of Bologna, the Spanish in that of Rimini. The latter, he complained, leave us very little, the former nothing at all. Only a miracle could relieve the situation.² The Marches and Romagna having been bled white by the foreign troops and rendered incapable of paying taxes, an extra tax for 1744 had to be imposed by the Pope on Rome and its environs.³

The new year brought with it the old tribulations for the Papal States, increased to such an extent that Benedict declared that he could write a treatise on “ The Martyrdom of Neutrality ”. The war was conducted with such bitterness that with the best will in the world it was impossible to satisfy either of the parties.⁴ While waiting for the coming of better weather these foreign armies, the Austrian under Lobkowitz, the Spanish under Gages, sat facing each other on Papal territory and ravaged it as though it belonged to the enemy. In a letter to his old friend Innocenzo Storani the Pope described the afflictions which his country had had to endure for two years—the robberies, the murders, the devastation of the country—by which the estates of the archiepiscopal see of Bologna and of his nephew had also been affected. He said resignedly that his sins had brought this punishment upon him and there was nothing more that he could do but commend himself to the Almighty, that He might avert still greater scourges.⁵

¹ The originals of both *letters in the Hofkorrespondenz of the State Archives, Vienna.

² HEECKEREN, I., 93, 97.

³ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 114; cf. 115, 120, 128 seq., 131; also the *Cifra al Nunzio di Francia of April 15, 1744, Papal Secret Archives.

⁵ Letter of March 18, 1744, in MARONI, *Lettere*, 733 seq.

On April 21st Lobkowitz received a definite order from Maria Theresa to put an end to the inactivity that had reigned thitherto and to attempt the capture of Naples. On Thun's suggestion, the Austrian commander decided to proceed southward through the Roman Campagna instead of through the Abruzzi. After increasing his force to 26,000 men, he struck his camp at Macerata on May 4th and took the road for Foligno. He reached Spoleto on the 10th and Civita Castellana on the 15th, and on the 18th he moved into camp at Monterotondo, a few hours north of Rome.¹ This in itself was enough to make the Pope's position most unenviable,² but it was now made even worse by the approach of an army from the south: Charles III., not wanting his territory to be the theatre of war, advanced at the head of 24,000 men and halted in Valmontone. In a letter to the Pope of May 20th the King attempted to justify his invasion on the score of strategical necessity.³ Lobkowitz, whose hussars had been scouring the Campagna since the beginning of the month and had shortly afterwards occupied the approach to the Ponte Molle,⁴ was bold enough to ask the Pope for an audience. It was granted him, but only as a private person.

On Whitsunday, May 24th, Lobkowitz, accompanied by his officers, entered the Holy City, where the unprincipled Romans received him with enthusiasm.⁵ After dining with Cardinal

¹ ARNETH, II., 359 *seqq.* Cf. *Arch. stor. Napol.*, VI., 37, with Maria Theresa's proclamation to the Two Sicilies of April 14, 1744.

² " *Ci troviamo in situazione la più dolorosa che si possa pensare." Cifra al Nunzio di Francia, of May 16, 1744, *loc. cit.* Cf. also the *Cifra of May 20, 1744, *ibid.*

³ HEECKEREN, I., 237.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 135 *seqq.*

⁵ To counterbalance the one-sided Austrian reports in ARNETH, II., 363, 543, see the *Cifra al Nunzio Durini of July 11, 1744: " Non so se le querele, che costì fanno per le tante dimostrazioni usate da questo popolaccio verso il principe di Lobkowitz sieno giuste, ma i fatti sono veri. Sono stati eccessivi gli applausi et immenso il concorso verso questo signore, ma non è vero che prorompessero gli eviva verso la regina d'Ungheria, se non che

Alessandro Albani, he was received by the Pope, who exhorted him to maintain a strict discipline among his troops.¹ Benedict XIV. wrote to Cardinal Tencin on May 27th that his position between two armies both of which treated the Papal States as though they were no man's land was almost too bad to imagine.²

In order to bar the Spaniards' passage to Rome, Lobkowitz, on May 29th, took up a strong position on the heights of Frascati, whence two routes to Naples stood open to him: the road via Velletri and Terracina, and that via Frosinone and San Germano. On the Austrians showing signs of pushing on to Velletri, the Spanish-Neapolitan force was concentrated in and around that town. Lobkowitz now advanced as far as Marino and on June 2nd pitched his camp on the heights lying to the south-east of Lake Nemi.³ The havoc wrought by both armies was immense. The Spaniards did indeed offer to pay for the damage they had caused, but the Pope was under no delusion that they would be able to replace a fifth part of what they had destroyed. The Austrians, he related on June 3rd, 1744, laid their hands on everything; in Marino their soldiery had got drunk, had let the wine run out, and had robbed the

nel cortile del cardinale Alessandro Albani. Non si potrà dire però che il Governo sia stato della medesima tempera e che vi abba data la mano, poichè qui si tentò ogni strada per impedire la venuta di questo Signore, il quale era stato posto nei sbalzi pretendendo mille distinzioni nel cerimoniale. Nulla si volle accordare e ad ogni modo egli venne come qualunque altro particolare. Li fautori austriaci vollero fare questa scena di commedia, in cui i fanatici del paese fecero così indegna comparsa. Se ciò merita l'indignazione di costà, il Ministero certamente et il Principe nostro meritano piuttosto compassione, essendo questi posti come bersaglio alle cieche passioni di questa gente forsennata." Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 116, Papal Secret Archives.

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 138; MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome.

² HEECKEREN, I., 138.

³ ARNETH, II., 363.

inhabitants not only of their money but even of their furniture.¹ The Holy City itself was blockaded, and there was a threatened lack of food. As Lobkowitz was assuming a provocative attitude, the gates were carefully guarded.²

Instead of launching a surprise attack on the army which barred his way to Naples, Lobkowitz gave the enemy time to strengthen his position. On the night of June 16th-17th the Spaniards felt themselves to be strong enough to deliver a sudden attack on the Austrians and forced Lobkowitz to withdraw his camp to Genzano.³ The Austrian attempts to induce the Pope to prevent the payment of tribute by the representative of Charles III. on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul were unsuccessful, and the ceremony took place without disturbance.⁴

Determination and courage were as lacking in Charles III.'s camp as in the Austrians'. He rested content with the minor success won on June 17th and until August 10th the two armies stood inactive on Papal soil,⁵ facing each other across a deep valley.⁶ On the Neapolitans gradually becoming

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 139.

² Acquaviva's *report to Villarias of June 13, 1744, Archives of Simancas.

³ ARNETH, II., 366.

⁴ Acquaviva's *reports of June 27 and July 1, 1744, *loc. cit.* The elaborate festivities which usually accompanied the offering of the tribute were not resumed until 1749; see FERRARI, *Bellezze architettoniche per le feste della China in Roma nei secoli 17 e 18*, Torino, 1921, 12 *seqq.*; *Macchine pivotecniche della China 1731-1785* (no place or year of publication) tavv. 5 (1744; Giove sublimato agli onori divini), 6 (1745: Il ritorno del Re in Napoli), 7 (1749: La scoperta del teatro di Ercolano), etc.

⁵ *Letter of complaint from Benedict XIV. to Cardinal Tencin of July 7, 1744 (missing from the Paris edition, copy in the State Archives, Vienna), with the passage: "Si contraddistingue il Card. Aless. Albani nell'attacco alla regina d'Ungheria andando pubblicamente al campo Austriaco in compagnia di msgr. Thun."

⁶ On July 6, 1744, there was a procession in Rome, from S. Maria Maggiore to S. Giovanni in Laterano, to implore the

careless, Lobkowitz made up his mind to risk an attack on Velletri. In the night of August 10th–11th his troops forced their way into the town and almost captured the King of Naples as he lay in bed in the Palazzo Ginetti. He owed his escape solely to the fact that the Austrians, diverted by the prospect of a rich spoil, entered the houses, loaded themselves with money and other valuables, and drank deeply of the town's delicious wine. This gave the Neapolitans and Spaniards time to recover, and after a furious street-battle they drove the Austrians out again.¹ For a long time after this episode both armies reoccupied their old positions, to the great misfortune of the luckless inhabitants of the Papal States, on whom, as Benedict declared, even the Turk would have taken pity.² The Pope's only hope was in God; he trusted firmly, he wrote to a friend on August 15th, 1744, in Him who had come to Peter's rescue in the storm on the lake of Genesareth.³

Meanwhile Austria's ally, the King of Sardinia, was being very hardly pressed by the Spaniards and French in his own country. Consequently, in the middle of September, Maria Theresa was forced to give Lobkowitz the order to abandon

intercession with God of the two Princes of the Apostles, that the States of the Church might be freed from the two armies. See *Cod. Vat. 8545, pp. 105 *seqq.*, Vatican Library.

¹ For the unsuccessful attack on Velletri, which is depicted in the castello at Nemi (see TOMASSETTI, II., 277), *cf.* BONAMICI, *Castrucii de rebus ad Velitras anno 1744 gestis commentarius*, Lugd. Batav. 1749 (also Dresdae 1779); *Osterr. milit. Zeitschrift* 1830, I, 3 *seqq.*; ARNETH, II., 373 *seq.*; F. SFORZA-CESARINI, *La guerra di Velletri (1744). Note storico-milit. con nuovi doc.*, Roma, 1891; *Arch. Napolet.*, XXX., 339 *seqq.*; SCHIPA, 437 *seqq.*; HEECKEREN, I., 152; M. GALDI, *Un poemetto maccheronico inedito sulla battaglia di Velletri*, Napoli, 1925. Reports by Lobkowitz and Acquaviva have been published by Pasquali and Pasini (Velletri, 1893); other *correspondence on the subject in Cod. E., pp. 132–6, of the Boncompagni Archives, Rome.

² HEECKEREN, I., 147; *cf.* 145, 149, 152 *seq.*, 157 *seq.*

³ MARONI, *Lettere*, 741. For Portugal's further attempts at mediation, see Appendix Ib.

the attempt on Naples. Benedict XIV. sighed with relief when, on October 23rd, the retreat was begun by the Austrian vanguard.¹ On November 1st Lobkowitz left his headquarters in Genzano, and his whole army, marching past the walls of Rome, crossed the Tiber by the Ponte Molle and by a bridge-of-boats which had been thrown across the river hard by. Two hours later it was followed by the Spanish-Neapolitan army, which took up a position in the vineyards between the Porta Pia and the Ponte Molle. Their attempt to cross the Tiber was prevented by the Austrian artillery, and Lobkowitz was enabled to continue his retreat unhindered, by way of Viterbo and Orvieto, through Umbria, to the Romagna.²

On November 3rd Charles III., with a brilliant escort, entered Rome, where the Pope welcomed him with salvos as his liberator. A famous painting by Pannini shows the king's reception in the coffee-house in the garden of the Quirinal.³ The king remained one and a half hours with the Pope. After this meeting, which was to both parties' satisfaction, Charles III. visited St. Peter's, the Vatican, where a banquet was held in his honour, and the Lateran. In the evening he returned to Velletri.⁴

¹ On September 26, 1744, Valenti expressed his hope of a speedy release from the Austrian army (*Cifra al Nunzio Enriquez, Nunziat. di Spagna, 430, Papal Secret Archives); on October 30 he *wrote that owing to Lobkowitz's want of organization this hope had not been realized. *On October 10: "'Stenta quest' armata a partire perchè si trova nella maggior confusione del mondo,' but we shall soon be free." *On October 24: "Ecco finalmente in marcia questa armata Austriaca, la di cui vanguardia . . . è passata questa mattina sotto queste mura." *Ibid.*

² HEECKEREN, I., 159 *seqq.*

³ The Museum in Naples contains Pannini's "The reception by the Pope in the Quirinal garden" and "The procession of Charles III. to St. Peter's". The former painting is reproduced in RICCI, *Kunst in Oberitalien*, 404, and both in OZZOLA, *Pannini*, Torino, 1921, tav. 6 and 7.

⁴ Cf. *Relazione della venuta in Roma della M^{te} di Carlo Re delle Sicilie*, Roma (Chracas), 1744; SCHIPA, 443 *seqq.*; Thun's

A few days later the Pope addressed to the Spanish Queen Elizabeth a letter in his own hand in which he described her son's visit as the only consolation that had hitherto been granted him in his arduous pontificate. It was, he added, the first visit of a king to Rome since the time of Charles V., and although the Neapolitan monarch had come incognito and a few days earlier than had been arranged with Cardinal Acquaviva, he flattered himself that he had treated him as he would the Emperor and had given him satisfaction. The Pope was lavish in his praises of Charles's qualities, especially his heroic modesty.¹ In a confidential letter to the Marchese Camillo Caprao Bentivoglio he said jokingly that the royal visit, short as it was, had cost him as much as three *villeggiature* at Castel Gondolfo.²

As the bad season of the year approached, Benedict was horrified to see that what he had feared as far back as July³ was coming true; the two commanders of the armies had again decided to take up their winter quarters in the States of the Church, there to continue the struggle when the better weather came.⁴ A special Congregation of Cardinals met in

*report of November 7, 1744, State Archives, Vienna. Cf. ARNETH, II., 545; HEECKEREN, I., 160 seqq.

¹ Appendix 2.

² B. MANZONE, *Frammenti di lettere inedite di Benedetto XIV.* (pubblicazione per nozze), Brà, 1890, IV., n. 2.

³ *Cifra al Durini of July 8, 1744, in which it is said: "La guerra vi fu unicamente contro di Noi desolando il paese e gli abitanti." Nunziat. di Francia, 442. Papal Secret Archives.

⁴ On December 3, 1744, Valenti addressed the following *Cifra to Valenti: "Un altro articolo molto afflittivo di questa Corte e di questo Stato è il vedersi imminente un quartiere d'inverno. Li Spagnuoli più vicini già ce lo fanno capire, e gli Austriaci più lontani ce lo fanno temere. Sono tre anni che tutta la batosta della guerra sta sulle nostre spalle. Avevamo giusta speranza di vedercene liberati, et ora all'improvviso, contro ogni apparenza e contro quello che pareva diritto et interesse di guerra, vediamo arrenati li Spagnuoli, i quali, dopo essere stati sul confine della Toscana, ripiombano sopra di noi, con dare motivo agli Austriaci

the presence of the Pope to deliberate the matter,¹ but no solution presented itself. The protests issued by the Cardinal Secretary of State in all directions² were of as little avail as the exhortations to peace addressed at the end of November to the Kings of Spain and France, to Maria Theresa, and to the Emperor Charles VII.³ The Austrian army, which on its retreat had laid waste to a portion of the Papal States which had hitherto been spared, settled down again in the territories of Ferrara and Bologna and in the Romagna, the headquarters being moved to Imola. The Neapolitan troops, after pursuing the Austrians to Viterbo and Perugia, turned back and spread themselves over the countryside around Corneto, Viterbo, and Bolsena; and not content with their quarters and the usual requisitions of hay, straw, wood, and lighting, they levied monetary tribute to the amount of 26,000 *scudi*

di far lo stesso, aspettandomi ad ogni momento che piglino questo pretesto, a cui non si saprà che rispondere. Mi perdonino se io le dico che niuno può capire una simile risoluzione, quando stava in mano loro di fare entrare gli Austriaci nello Stato del Gran Duca e seguirarli. Questo è un danno così pesante che abbatte l'animo del Papa e de' suoi sudditi e che vorrei poter io alleggerire col sangue mio, mentre da questo sorgente mille altre cruci e mille altre male contentezze saranno sempre per derivare." Nunziat. di Spagna, 430, fo. 43, Papal Secret Archives.

¹ *Thun to Uhlfeld on December 12, 1744; even Thun admits here: "La verità è che questo stato andrà certamente all' ultima rovina se deve sostener il quartier d'inverno di queste due armate e molto più se dovesse proseguirsi la guerra all' apertura della campagna nel medesimo." Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

² *Cifre al Nunzio di Francia of December 19, 1744, and al Nunzio di Spagna of December 10, 1744, *loc. cit.* Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 162, 165 *seq.*

³ See the Briefs in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 251, II., 378 *seqq.*, and the autograph *letter to Charles VII., *Epist. ad princ.*, 175, p. 10, Papal Secret Archives (reproduced in Appendix 3). *Ibid.*, 173, p. 217, a similar *letter to King John of Portugal, also of November 28, 1744. The proclamation of the jubilee for peace, of November 20, 1744, in *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 254 *seq.*

per month.¹ The Austrians' demands were far greater : as in the previous year, they demanded natural produce and money to the value of 100,000 *scudi* per month, although their numbers had shrunk from 30,000 to 10,000.²

Needless to say, there was no question of extracting further taxes from the provinces on which these foreign troops had been quartered, and there was no source from which the resulting deficit could be recovered, especially when in addition 200,000 *scudi* had to be found for provisions against the plague and 16,000 *scudi* for the guarding of the city of Rome. It was no wonder, then, that it was found impossible to produce a budget which was in any way satisfactory.³

"The two armies," wrote the Pope at the beginning of 1745, "are ruining the States of the Church. The Spaniards are the authors of our misfortune, but the Austrians expect to live entirely at our expense. Unless God has mercy on us, Our Pontificate will be famous for the injuries we suffer."⁴ On the whole, the attitude of the Spanish generals seemed to the Pope to be far more tolerable than that of the Austrians, and besides this there were continual provocations coming from the Viennese Court. Further still, the confiscation of Cardinal Valenti's benefices in the Milanese province was still being maintained by Maria Theresa, although it was considered by the Pope as a personal affront to himself.⁵ The Pope's anger with Austria had already found its full expression in November 1744, on the occasion of Thun's farewell audience. In telling his bitter adversary the truth Benedict had not minced his words. He reproved him for paying no attention either to his bishopric of Gurk or to his duties as auditor of the Rota, while as an envoy he had stirred up his Court against the Holy See and had blown on the flames instead of quenching them.⁶

¹ MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome.

² HEECKEREN, I., 168.

³ *Ibid.*, 169, 170.

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., 172.

⁵ *Cifra al Enriquez, of January 7, 1745. Nunziat. di Spagna, 430, Papal Secret Archives.

⁶ HEECKEREN, I., 173.

With his irascible nature Thun had fallen foul also of Austria's supporters in Rome. After his departure the management of current business was undertaken by Cardinal Alessandro Albani, who had already been nominated Crown Protector of the Austrian patrimonial dominions by Maria Theresa in March 1743, on the death of Cardinal Giudice. The celebrated art-collector, however, performed this new duty very slackly, paying far more attention to his own interests than to those of the country he was representing.¹ The best policy he could devise in dealing with the Pope and his Secretary of State was to instil fear into them.²

Thus the situation in Rome was not at all propitious from Maria Theresa's viewpoint when Charles VII., broken-hearted at the misfortunes which had befallen his country, died after a short illness on January 20th, 1745.

The wearer of the Imperial crown and the claimant to the patrimony of Charles VI., who, as soon as he ascended the throne, had been aptly described by the Pope as "an illustrious but needy gentleman",³ thus quitted the arena of European politics, and his departure was as pregnant in important consequences as it was unexpected. The first news of his death arrived in Rome on January 27th. Cardinal Valenti saw it as a dispensation of Providence, which plays havoc with human scheming. He was in no doubt that Maria Theresa would now cherish fresh hopes of raising her husband, the Archduke Francis* of Tuscany, to the Imperial throne, and if France intended to impose its views on others sword in hand, it would have considerable difficulty in doing so in the present state of affairs.⁴ As for the attitude to be adopted by the Holy See,

¹ ARNETH, IX., 4.

² In his *letter to Uhlfeld of January 23, 1745, Albani sneers at the Pope's efforts to make peace and proposes "con poche e forti parole mettere il card. Valenti ed il Papa in qualche soggezione e timore". State Archives, Vienna.

³ Letter of August 10, 1742, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 48.

⁴ *Cifra al Enriquez, January 28, 1745: "Eccoci dunque da capo la Casa d'Austria ripiglierà gran vigore e grandi speranze."

the Cardinal Secretary of State informed the French nuncio Durini that, as before, Rome would demand the nomination of a Catholic candidate and would have to declare itself in favour of the one who would be most easily elected. The nuncio was to inform himself of the intentions of the French Cabinet through Cardinal Tencin, whom the Pope trusted as a special friend.¹

Durini was soon able to report that France was striving with every means at its disposal to put on the Imperial throne the Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, Frederick Augustus II. But Frederick Augustus, with his innate laziness and unconcern, had little inclination to shoulder the burden inseparable from such a dignity, and he feared, too, that his candidature would endanger, for himself and his house, the possession of the Polish crown, to which he had become attached. To the influential Queen, however, and the Minister Brühl the splendour of an emperor's crown seemed most desirable. Their remonstrances left the King irresolute; on the one hand

Se la Francia vuol fare come per lo passato, volendo le cose a modo suo colla spada alla mano, difficilmente, secondo la presente providenza, può riuscirgli. Alla Spagna, secondo il mio corto intendimento, niuna cosa può giovar più che intrecciare un maneggio che le porti la sicurezza dello stabilimento che essa ricerca, ma senza ingolfarsi in un nuovo mare di spesa e di casualità." Nunziat. di Spagna, 430, fo. 52, Papal Secret Archives.

¹ *Cifra al Durini, January 27, 1745: "Per quanto a noi, credo che ripiglieremo sempre il medesimo metodo di bramare un principe cattolico ed aderire a quello che sarà più facile ad eleggersi. Questo contegno non dovrebbe dispiacere a chiunque avrà influenza nell'elezione; ma pure abbiamo provato il contrario nell'elezione del defonto. Onde il zelo di Sua St^a avrebbe di bisogno di essere questa volta meglio rispettato che non fu l'altra. Ciò resti per di lei primaria istruzione. Veda poi secondariamente ciò che può ricavare da cotesta Corte, ma singolarmente dal sigr. Card. di Tencin per lume nostro ed indirizzo. N. S. confida in Lei come in un particolare amico, e V. S. Ill^{ma} deve su questo piede regolarsi con lui." Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 136, Papal Secret Archives.

he endeavoured to use the proffered candidature as a lever wherewith to obtain from Maria Theresa a territorial indemnity in Silesia ; on the other, he continued to treat with France. To gain time, he let it be known in Paris that he would only put forward his candidature on condition that the Pope intervened on his behalf.¹ But Benedict XIV. and Cardinal Valenti thought it more advisable to adopt a waiting policy.

The Venetian envoys, it is true, were able to report that for a moment the idea was entertained in Rome of setting up against Austria the candidature of the deceased Emperor's son, Max Joseph, who was not yet eighteen years of age² ; but this was hardly probable. What is certain is that any such plan was rendered purposeless when Max Joseph accepted Maria Theresa's offer of peace and at the Peace of Füssen, April 22nd, 1745, renounced his claims on Austria and promised his vote at the imperial election to the Grand Duke of Tuscany. The news of the Austro-Bavarian settlement also induced King Frederick Augustus to announce that he would not oppose the election of the Grand Duke.³

" We have strong reasons," Cardinal Valenti had written to Durini on May 19th, " for not intervening in the election and for showing no partiality whatever, although France would like

¹ ARNETH, III., 33 *seqq.*

² See Andrea da Lezze's dispatches in BROSCHE, II., 101, n., who believes in them entirely. On March 20, 1745, the Pope wrote to Cardinal Tencin that malicious Austrians were complaining of his partiality for Max Joseph, " comme si nous étions assez fou pour nous risquer à ce jeu sans connaître les intentions de la France " (HEECKEREN, I., 186). The French *chargé d'affaires* De Canillac boasted of having persuaded the Pope to encourage the Polish King Augustus to accept the candidature ; see KIRSCH in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 49 *seqq.* But this is contradicted by the *Cifre al Durini, to whom Valenti wrote on March 27, 1745 : " The Polish envoy says that his king does not want to be emperor, nor does the Bavarian Elector," and on April 14 : " In the question of the election the Pope intends to be impartial." Nunziat. di Francia, 442, Papal Secret Archives.

³ ARNETH, III., 39, *seqq.*

us to support the Polish King.”¹ Subsequently the Pope repeatedly declared that he intended to preserve a strict neutrality towards the various candidates, even at the risk of the Holy See having to expect even greater afflictions at the hands of Francis of Lorraine, when Emperor, than he was already meting out to it as Grand Duke of Tuscany.² At the same time Valenti wrote to Durini that the Imperial crown would assuredly fall to the husband of Maria Theresa, so that to support other aspirants would be useless and contrary to the impartiality of the Holy See.³

Already by the end of February 1745 the Papal delegate to the diet in Frankfort had been appointed in the person of Giovanni Francesco Stoppani, a Milanese, who had been the nuncio in Florence in 1735–39, the nuncio in Venice in 1739–43, and thereafter the representative of the Holy See at the Court of Charles VII.⁴ Stoppani’s intention was to pay his first official visit to the Elector of Mayence, John Charles of Ostein, but the latter persuaded him, under all manner of pretexts,

¹ *Cifra al Durini, *loc. cit.* Albani had stated in his *letter to Uhlfeld of March 27, 1745: “Questa corte di Roma aderendo alle massime della Francia fatte fare al Papa pel mezzo del card. Valenti cerca di excitare sempre più nel animo del Re di Polonia il desiderio e l’ambizione del imperio.” On June 5, 1745, he reports that when the Pope saw that the Polish king had not wanted to accept the candidature he refused to allow Valenti to persuade him to encourage the king again. State Archives, Vienna.

² Letter to Tencin of June 2, 1745, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 52.

³ *Cifra al Durini of June 2, 1745, *Nunziat. di Francia*, 442, fo. 161 (Papal Secret Archives): “Vedo ancor io che la corona imperiale andrà a cadere sulla testa del Gran Duca, non essendovi competitore. I nostri maneggi sarebbero inutili e contrari inoltre a quell’ indifferenza et imparzialità con cui dobbiamo condurci. V. S. Ill^{ma} su questo punto non poteva parlare più saviamente come ancora su l’altro del Berrettino.”

⁴ MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome. Cf. the Brief to the Elector of Cologne of February 28, 1745, in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, ed. De Martinis, I., 254. Similar *briefs to the other Catholic Electors; see *Epist. ad princ.*, 111, Papal Secret Archives.

to make a beginning with the Elector of Bavaria. Max Joseph received the Pope's representative in a fitting manner, and the attitude of the Elector Palatine was similarly respectful. King Augustus of Poland, as Elector of Saxony and the Grand Marshal of the Holy Roman Empire, allotted to him the same lodging in Frankfort as had been occupied at the last election by the nuncio Doria. The Elector of Mayence, however, who knew of Austria's aversion to Stoppani,¹ cited a decree of 1711 in support of his contention that a foreign envoy should not be allowed to remain in the place of election. Benedict XIV., in reply, pointed out very rightly that the decree had not been observed in the last election, of 1741-42, and that the Papal nuncio was not to be included among the foreign envoys, seeing that he was appearing as the representative of the person whose authority, according to the ancient stipulations, was necessary in every case of an imperial election.² Nevertheless the Elector of Mayence insisted on Stoppani's exclusion, and he was joined in this by the Electors of Cologne and Trèves.³

Benedict XIV. was indignant at his representative being treated with such hostility, not by Protestants, but by the three ecclesiastical electors. Of the Elector of Mayence he said quite bluntly that his behaviour towards the Holy See was that of a hired assassin in the pay of Vienna; he ascribed it to the Elector's annoyance at not yet having been raised to the rank of Cardinal.⁴ For some time he refused to receive the Elector's agent.⁵ Cardinal Valenti took the matter more calmly. The scanty respect paid to the representative of the Holy See was, he said, unfortunately nothing new; in the

¹ One of Stoppani's worst persecutors was Albani. In a *letter to Uhlfeld of February 27, 1745, he referred to Stoppani as a "creatura venduta del card. Valenti e de Francesi" and worse than Doria. State Archives, Vienna.

² Letter to Tencin of June 30, 1745, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 53, n. 1.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 211, 212.

⁴ See the letter mentioned above, n. 2.

⁵ MERENDA, *Memorie*, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 53, n. 2.

circumstances, however, it was just as well that Stoppani had not to take part in the proceedings. The conflicting passions and the influence of the Protestant Powers were too great for Papal mediation to be of any use, and it was for this reason that the Pope had decided from the beginning to be strictly impartial. If in spite of this he incurred the suspicion of every party, it made no difference so long as peace was obtained.¹ On July 14th the Paris nuncio was again instructed not to meddle in the business of the election but only to report.² The Pope's impartial attitude was deeply resented in Paris, where Stoppani was accused of partiality towards the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Valenti immediately and energetically defended the envoy against this charge, and later the Pope, too, in a letter to Cardinal Tencin, protested strongly against the accusations which had been made in Paris. With regard to the complaint that Stoppani had not used the language common to all the diplomatic representatives of the foreign and belligerent Powers, the Pope retorted that the representative of the Holy See was obliged to speak Italian, but not French or Spanish. Moreover, the nuncio was the plenipotentiary of a prince who had no power in war and was the common

¹ “*Non è nuova l'indifferenza che si ha per i Ministri della S. Sede et il poco conto che se ne fa ; ma nelle circostanze in cui siamo, credo che dobbiamo piuttosto riguardare come una buona sorte il venir trascurati et il tenerci lontani da ogni ingerenza. Troppo animate sono le parti e troppo di connessione passa tra le medesime e le potenze eretiche per farci sperare utile la nostra mediazione ; ond'è che sin dal bel principio si fece N. S. un sistema di tenersi in una perfetta neutralità et imparzialità, non ostante la quale, ci siamo resi sospetti a tutti, come V. S. Ill^{ma} ben sa. Poco però importa quando si faccia la pace, ch'è l'unico oggetto della S^{ta} Sua et alla quale si dirigono tutti i suoi voti, purchè non ne risenta pregiudizio alcuno la religione. Questa viene raccomandata al zelo di V. S. Ill^{ma} e deve fare tutto il suo pensiero, intendendosela col Cardinale di Tencin, a cui dovrà anche ricordare l'obbligo che gli corre di pensare agl'interessi della S. Sede in Italia.” Nunziat. di Francia 442, fo. 162 seq., Papal Secret Archives.

² *Cifra al Durini of July 16, 1745, *ibid.*

father of all. He described as sheer madness the accusation of partiality towards the husband of Maria Theresa, who had done such harm to the States of the Church and was always ready to perform some hostile act towards them.¹

Already by the beginning of July the election of the Grand Duke of Tuscany was reckoned as a certainty in Rome,² and subsequent events amply verified this forecast. Even Frederick II., on August 26th, 1745, in the convention with England and Hanover, declared his readiness, in return for the recognition of the Peace of Breslau, to vote for Francis of Lorraine, but to this proposal Maria Theresa would not consent.³ The day before, Valenti had written to the French nuncio in Paris that to prevent the election of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, which was France's object, was impossible and that the most that could be done was, by raising difficulties, to incline the Viennese Cabinet towards peace.⁴

The official electoral proceedings had begun in Frankfort on July 31st, after the arrival of the Elector of Mayence, who then used every means at his disposal to win over Bavaria and Cologne for the Grand Duke of Tuscany. In this task he was assisted in the promise made by England of considerable subsidies. The delegate of Saxony did not arrive in Frankfort until August 28th. The day following Saxony bound itself still more closely to Maria Theresa with a new treaty. Only the delegates of Brandenburg and the Palatinate were still recalcitrant. Their efforts, even to postpone the election, were unsuccessful, whereupon they left the city. Consequently Maria Theresa's husband was elected emperor without their participation, by seven votes, on September 13th, 1745, and was duly crowned on October 4th.⁵

By the time that the result of the election was brought to

¹ Letter to Tencin of September 29, 1745, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 59, n. 3.

² *Cifra al Durini of July 7, 1745, *loc. cit.*

³ ARNETH, III., 92 *seq.*; IMMICH, 326.

⁴ *Cifra al Durini of August 25, 1745, *loc. cit.*

⁵ ARNETH, III., 102 *seqq.*; DROYSEN, V., 2, 541 *seq.*

Rome by a courier of Stoppani's, on September 20th,¹ the Pope had already made a definite statement regarding the position he intended to adopt. In a coded letter to the Paris nuncio Durini of September 8th he explained that it was not the hostility of France and Spain towards the Lorrainer, but solicitude for the rights of the Holy See and religion that made it a duty to exercise extreme care towards a prince who had shown himself to be far from well-disposed towards the head of the Church and who was surrounded by suspicious counsellors.² After the treatment which Stoppani had received in Frankfort, the Pope naturally feared that the new Emperor would attempt to impair his old-established rights. And this fear was soon to be increased. It was not until the middle of October that

¹ Letter of Benedict XIV. of September 22, 1745, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 62, n. 2.

² “ *Questo principe pur troppo si è mostrato sinora prevenuto contra di Noi, di modo che non abbiamo che motivo di temerne, e come imbevuto di massime a noi contrarie, e per le persone che lo circondano e alle quali egli confida. Dio voglia che c’inganniamo, ma le difficoltà che si fanno al Nunzio, tanto rispetto alla sua ammissione alla Dieta che al trattamento dovutogli, ci fanno molto temere per tutti gli altri atti, che il nuovo eletto deve fare verso la S. Sede et in favore della religione ; in difetto de’ quali ben vede V. S. Ill^{ma} che N. S. sarà giustamente imbarazzato nel partito che dovrà sciogliersi. Qualunque sia, non sarà mai per le istanze, che già prevediamo veranno fatte con tutto il calore da chi sarà opposto all’ elezione e specialmente dalle due Corti di Francia e di Spagna. Sono questi motivi estranei per un Papa, il quale non ha preso nè prende parte alle querele, alle mire et agl’interessi delle Potenze guerreggianti. La S^{ta} Sua non deve avere in veduta che di far mantenere i diritti della S. Sede et illesa la religione da ogni pregiudizio.” *Cifra* of September 8, 1745, *Nunziat. di Francia*, 442, fo. 172, *loc. cit.* Similarly in the **Cifra* of October 13, 1745: The recognition of Francis I. depends on whether he fulfils his duty to the Holy See ; our interests are not the same as those of the belligerents. We are waiting to see whether the Emperor will do what he should ; after that we will take up our position. *Ibid.*

Francis I.'s emissary, the Marquis of Pontcallier, arrived in Rome with an Imperial communication, in which the newly elected Emperor expressed himself in only general terms and in quite a different manner from that used on a similar occasion by Charles VII., different even from that used by Charles VI. After carefully deliberating with his Cardinals, the Pope demanded with the greatest firmness another letter, which at the very least was to be composed in the manner of that written by Charles VI. and which was to authorize its bearer to present the customary declaration of obedience to the Holy See and to sue for a Brief which would accord the right of the "first prayers" (*primae preces*). Impressed by the firmness of the Pope's attitude, Vienna agreed to comply with these demands.

The news of this reached Rome on December 8th, and on the 10th the Congregation of Cardinals declared itself unanimously in favour of recognizing Francis I. as Emperor. The recognition was solemnly announced by the Pope in a consistory held on December 15th.¹ The representatives of France and Spain, La Rochefoucauld and Acquaviva, did all they could to prevent it, but the Pope, to Valenti's regret, was not to be dissuaded.²

¹ P. A. KIRSCH in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXVI., 66 seqq., 70 seqq., 73 seqq., where the allocution of December 15, 1745, is reproduced.

² *Re Valenti*, v. *ibid.*, p. 76, n. 2. Cf. the full *reports by Acquaviva to Villarias of September 9 (the French envoy informs Acquaviva of his instructions with regard to the imperial election), October 28 (consultation of the Cardinals; "temo saldrà S.S. con algun temperamento y medio termine que no guste ni a l'una ni a la otra parte"), November 11 (conference of the Congregation of Cardinals), November 18 (Acquaviva asks for the recognition to be postponed), December 2 and 9 (the demands of the Curia), December 16, 1745 (in an hour's audience the Pope explains to me that now that all his demands have been fulfilled by Vienna he cannot put off the recognition any longer; the French envoy also did his best with the Pope but had no more success than I). Archives of Simancas. Cf. the reports of the French ambassador in DE BRIMONT, *Le card. de la Rochefoucauld et l'ambassade de Rome 1743-8*, Paris, 1913.

But at this juncture Vienna delayed taking the steps which, according to the promises made to Cardinal Albani, should have followed at once on the formal recognition. To the joy of the French, the negotiations that ensued dragged on for a whole year; but finally, as the Pope would not give way, the Emperor was forced to do so. On November 25th Cardinal Albani was received as the envoy extraordinary of Francis I. for the performance of the act of obedience. Two days later, after the Pope had explained the whole course of events to the Cardinals in a secret consistory and had had read the instrument of election, the Bull of confirmation was signed by the Pope and the Cardinals, and the Brief on the "first prayers" was executed.¹

The settlement of this affair paved the way for the resumption of good relations between Rome and Vienna. How seriously they had been disturbed may be gauged by the refusal of the Holy See to appoint another representative in Vienna when the nuncio Paolucci was raised to the purple on September 9th, 1745, and shortly afterwards left the Imperial city.² This was the Holy See's rejoinder to Austria's refusal to fill the vacant post of envoy in Rome. Finally, however, it seemed to the Pope that estrangement from one of the greatest Catholic Courts was too serious a matter to be allowed to continue, and he stretched out the hand of peace.³ In February 1746 the nunciature in Vienna was reoccupied, the choice for

¹ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 386 *seqq.*; KIRSCH, *loc. cit.*, 79 *seqq.* The end of the affair was *reported by Acquaviva to Villarias on November 17, 1746, *loc. cit.* *Reports on the negotiations conducted by Cardinal Albani in *Nunziat. di Germania*, 604, Papal Secret Archives.

² Paolucci left Vienna in the middle of October 1745; see **Nunziat. di Germania*, 343, *ibid.*

³ As early as April 10, 1745, Santa Croce had *reported to Uhlfeld: "Io notifico per fine all' E. V. che dopo la morte del fu elettore di Baviera tanto il Papa che il segretario di Stato son venuti nella deliberazione di compiacere la nostra regione in tutto . . . e di togliere di mezzo tutti i motivi delle passate amarezze." State Archives, Vienna.

the post falling on Gian Francesco Stoppani, who, the Pope knew, would be welcome to Maria Theresa.¹ The Queen-Empress responded by sending to Rome as the German auditor of the Rota Count Christoph Anton Migazzi, who, as soon as he arrived, on April 2nd, 1746, set about the task of effecting an agreement.²

His was no light undertaking, especially as the question of the recognition of the imperial election had not yet been settled. On both sides there was a feeling of resentment, which found expression in a series of mutual recriminations.

There were two main obstacles in the way of an agreement ; on the one hand the sequestration of the Secretary of State Valenti's benefices in Lombardy had not yet been raised, and on the other, the Pope declined to comply with Austria's desire that a cardinalship should be conferred on the auditor of the Rota, Mario Mellini.³

In Migazzi's first audience with the Pope, on July 27th, 1746, these two grievances came under discussion. The Pope's opinion was that even were he to do everything in his power to please the Court of Vienna, the enmity towards him would still go on because Maria Theresa listened to calumnious reports about him. Migazzi replied that the Pope was misinformed ; if Mellini were to be given the red hat, Maria Theresa would certainly show her gratitude. Benedict's objection to this was that though he had long considered the matter he could not think of any way by which the Queen-Empress's desire might be fulfilled. Finally he confided to Migazzi that the root cause of the misunderstandings with Vienna was the behaviour of Cardinal Albani, who said one thing and wrote another ; by these methods they would never arrive at a settlement.⁴ The Pope expressed himself in similar fashion in confidential letters to Cardinal Tencin.⁵ In Vienna

¹ ARNETH, IV., 55. Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 245.

² WOLFSGRUBER, *Migazzi*, 29 *seqq.*

³ Cf. below, Ch. V.

⁴ See Migazzi's report in WOLFSGRUBER, 30 *seqq.*

⁵ HEECKEREN, I., 258 ; *cf.* 180.

the chief cause of the trouble was ascribed as before to Cardinal Valenti's hostility to Austria and his attachment to Spain and France. But the Pope's confidence in his Secretary of State remained unshaken ; in March he made him Camerlengo and Prefect of the Propaganda.¹

Meanwhile a fresh cause for dissension had arisen between Rome and Vienna. The Elector of Mayence had been largely instrumental in securing the election of Francis I. as Emperor, and after the death of the Bishop of Bamberg and Würzburg, Frederick Charles of Schönborn (d. July 25th, 1746), he was hoping that Austrian influence in Rome would obtain for him a Brief which would render possible his election to Würzburg.² The Pope, however, declared that there was no question of his conferring such a favour on him, Prince of the Church though he was, on account of his hostility towards the Holy See.³ The Emperor took this ruling of the Pope's as a serious affront to himself, asserting that such a refusal was unheard of. " We could refute him with several examples," wrote Benedict to Cardinal Tencin, " but it would only be a waste of time." ⁴

At the time when the recognition of Francis I. as Emperor was still under consideration, Portuguese diplomacy, at the instigation of Queen Marianne of Portugal, an aunt of Maria Theresa's, had rendered services of mediation. The Portuguese envoy in Vienna, Marquis Sebastião José de Carvalho e Mello, worked hard for an agreement between Rome and Vienna,⁵ and it seemed likely that this would come about when Maria Theresa promised to raise the sequestration of Valenti's benefices. At the last moment, however, the putting of this concession into effect was made dependent on the issue of

¹ *Ibid.*, 309, 314.

² A so-called " breve eligibilitatis ".

³ HEECKEREN, I., 265.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 269.

⁵ The Pope at first did not set much store by Carvalho's mediation, for, as he said in an *Instruction to the Viennese nuncio Paolucci of October 24, 1744, he saw " purtroppo ogni giorno che non v'è altra mira che di strapazzare il Papa e la S. Sede

the Brief for the Elector of Mayence.¹ The Pope refused to bargain in this way, but he gave a definite proof of his conciliatory attitude by making Mellini a Cardinal on April 10th, 1747. Taking advantage of the favourable impression produced in Vienna by this appointment,² Carvalho redoubled his efforts to bring about a settlement,³ though pointing out that threats were not the right way to obtain favours.⁴ After lengthy deliberations it was finally decided in Vienna, in May, to put an end to the sequestration which Valenti had so bitterly resented.⁵ The Cardinal expressed his thanks to Maria Theresa on June 1st.⁶ A few days later the ageing Pope acknowledged with gratitude the interest taken in his health by the Queen-Empress, who had sent him some Tokay wine.⁷

Outwardly, therefore, good relations between Rome and Vienna seemed to have been restored, but a really cordial agreement was still a long way off. So soon afterwards as

in compensazione di quel molto che più troppo si è fatto e si sta facendo in beneficio e sollievo degli offensori." Moreover, the Pope had not sought the mediation of the Portuguese as if he were in the wrong. State Archives, Vienna. See Appendix 4, *Benedict XIV. to King John of Portugal. Papal Secret Archives.

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 309, 329, 340.

² *Cifra di Serbelloni, dated Vienna, April 22, 1747, Nunziat. di Germania, 366, Papal Secret Archives.

³ *Cifra di Serbelloni of April 29, 1747, *ibid.*

⁴ *Cifra di Serbelloni of May 6, 1747, *ibid.*

⁵ Albani's *letter to Colloredo of May 27, 1747; in a *letter to Colloredo of April 10, 1747, Albani had recommended the measure in return for the appointment of Maria Theresa's Crown Cardinal. State Archives, Vienna.

⁶ *Original in the Hofkorrespondenz, *ibid.*

⁷ In his *letter of June 3, 1747, the Pope remarks: " Il nostro predecessore Clemente XII., per quanto ci vien detto, negli ultimi anni della sua vita per consiglio de' medici usava colla dovuta discretezza il vino Toccai. Noi senza consiglio del medico facciamo lo stesso ed al titolo di nostra benefattrice, che ben volentieri diamo alla Maestà Vostra, aggiungeremo l'altro di regina interessata per la nostra salute." *Ibid.*

July, Benedict XIV. had to complain to Francis I. of the occupation by Tuscan troops of Carpegna and Scavolino.¹ Meanwhile the Mayence affair became more involved, partly because too many persons were taking a hand in it : Albani, Migazzi, and the Portuguese envoys in Rome and Vienna. Migazzi pointed out to the Empress how difficult it was to settle an affair when several channels had to be explored at once.² He had also proposed to her in April 1747 that the management of the ambassadorial affairs in Rome should be withdrawn from the incompetent Albani and entrusted to Cardinal Mellini.³ In May 1748 the suggestion was put into action⁴ and it proved to be as much to the advantage of the Austrian cause in Rome as it was welcome to the Pope, who had a very high opinion of Mellini.⁵

With regard to the Mayence affair Benedict XIV. insisted with the greatest firmness that the required favour could not be granted to the Elector until he had made a binding declaration as Vice-Chancellor of the Empire that the Papal nuncios would be admitted as before to the elections and that Stoppani's exclusion from Frankfort should not constitute a precedent. For a long time the Elector refused to comply with these conditions, but it was not until he had made the declaration in a completely satisfactory form that he obtained the required Brief, in April 1748 ; and this did not make possible his election to five bishoprics, as he had demanded, but only

¹ See Benedict's *letter of July 5, 1747, in which he refers to the friendly settlement made between Clement XII. and Charles VI. An attached memorandum describes the historical development of the quarrel. State Archives, Vienna.

² WOLFSGRUBER, *Migazzi*, 36.

³ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁴ Cf. *Cifra di Serbelloni of May 8, 1748, *Nunziat. di Germania*, 366, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Migazzi had already *reported to Vienna on June 24, 1747 : " Cardinal Mellini is much thought of here. The Pope has a high opinion of him, and even his enemies cannot deprive him of his reputation of an able, zealous, and absolutely disinterested servant of Your Majesty." State Archives, Vienna.

to Worms and Würzburg, with the qualification that after one of these bishoprics had been obtained the Brief ceased to be valid for the other.¹

(4)

With the same firmness with which he held fast to his time-honoured rights when dealing with the Elector of Mayence, Benedict maintained his resolution throughout the vicissitudes of the war of the Austrian Succession not to cede any of the rights of ownership inherent in his temporal sovereignty. This attitude was clearly shown in the old controversy concerning the suzerainty of the Holy See in respect of the duchies of Parma and Piacenza. "The Pope is Spanish by inclination and French through fear," was Migazzi's opinion.² It was fear of France's power that induced Benedict to set his diplomatic compass by Paris, and in so doing he experienced several unpleasant surprises. In a Brief of June 2nd, 1745, he foresaw that sooner or later a general peace would be made, when he looked to France to represent the rights of the Papacy, for he held unflinchingly to his claim to Parma and Piacenza.³ His love for Spain inclined him to view with sympathy the ceaseless efforts made by Queen Elizabeth to win back for her family her beloved cities of Parma and Piacenza, but he would not allow the right of the Holy See to be impaired thereby.

When in the summer the tide of war in Italy turned in favour of the Spaniards, who occupied Parma and Piacenza, the Pope endeavoured to win the support of the Cabinets of

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 340, 355, 393, 401. Numerous reports touching on this matter in the *Cifre di Serbelloni, Nunziat. di Germania, 366, *loc. cit.*

² WOLFSGRUBER, *Migazzi*, 29.

³ *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV., 530, n. 3. An analysis of the foundation of the claims made by the Pope in the protest of March 6, 1741 (see above, p. 88) is to be found in NIC. ANTONELLI, *Ragioni della Sede Ap. sopra il ducato di Parma e Piacenza esposte a' sovrani e principi d' Europa, con documenti*, 4 vols., Roma, 1741.

Madrid and Paris for the formal recognition of his suzerainty over the two principalities. The difficult negotiations over the enfeoffment of the Spanish queen and her family were already far developed when, in the spring of 1746, the tide of war turned again and Parma was retaken by the Austrians. The Pope now considered it inadvisable to take any further steps towards the realization of his project of enfeoffment, fearing that in the event of the publication of the negotiations, which had hitherto been kept secret, the victors would take their revenge on him.¹ The question of the enfeoffment with Parma and Piacenza came up again, however, when the universal need of peace led to a congress of all the belligerents at Aix-la-Chapelle. To protect the interests of the Holy See, Pier Luigi Jacquet, Suffragan Bishop and Vicar General of the Prince Bishop of Liège, Theodore of Bavaria, was instructed in December 1747 to attend the congress, not, however, in the capacity of an official envoy but only as a semi-official representative.² To forestall objections on the part of Protestant

¹ See the detailed account by P. A. KIRSCH in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV., 530 *seqq.*

² The proposal was first made to Jacquet in a *letter of Valenti's of October 14, 1747: "Correndo voce possa in Liegi o nelle vicinanze radunarsi un congresso oppure un equivalente per le negoziazioni della pace generale bramarebbe la S^ta quando ciò sussista avere una persona savia ed avveduta, la quale potesse ragguagliarsi quelle cose più sostanziali che ivi si trattassero e che specialmente accudisse a quelle che possono interessare la S. Sede. Egli è facile avervi uno che faccia il novellista, ma non è così facile avervi uno che sia sagace e ben inteso." On December 2: "*Ho ricevuto ordini positivi di accertarla della risoluzione presa sopra la di lei persona in occasione del congresso. Tutte le circostanze rendono questa scelta plausibile ai pochissimi che qui la sanno"; takes for granted Jacquet's acceptance. "Si prevede che non sarà ottenibile che vada non dico come rappresentante de primo ordine perchè sarebbero infiniti gl'imbarazzi ma nè tampoco uno quale V. S. Ill. vidde in Utrecht, perchè allora vi furono delle casualità e qualche altra cosa che non è espediente in oggi di rammemorare." There would be time to discuss details when the congress was fixed (GARAMPI, 94).

delegates or delegates not friendly towards Rome, it was impressed upon him that his attitude should be that of a non-political personage and that he should bring into the foreground his position as the Vicar General of the Prince Bishop of Liège, to whom Aix-la-Chapelle was subject.¹

The instruction sent to Jacquet on March 9th, 1748, directed him, apart from the question of the suzerainty over Parma

On December 23, 1747, Valenti *informed him of his mission to Aix-la-Chapelle, "per accudire privatamente agli interessi della S. Sede" (Nunziat. di Germania, 609, Papal Secret Archives). For Jacquet's personality, see, besides the encomium in HEECKEREN, I., 409, the information given by MERENDA (**Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome). In the *Cifra al Durini of February 21, 1748, he is spoken of as a "uomo capace". Nunziat. di Francia, 442, *loc. cit.*

¹ " *Le corti che hanno promesso a N. S^{re} di secondare al congresso gli affari della S. Sede ed assistere la persona che ne sarebbe incaricata, insinuano con premura che questa tale persona tenga un contegno il più privato e che dia meno negli occhi che sia possibile per non eccitare nelli rappresentanti acattolici qualche strana opposizione fomentata ed accalorita da quelle potenze, che sebbene cattoliche non vedono ad ogni modo di buona voglia gl'interessi nostri o li nostri maneggi. Da questi suggerimenti così pressanti e dal borbottare che fanno quelli d'una certa corte, che V. S. può ben figurarsi, ha presa N. S. deliberazione di regolare il contegno di V. S. in modo che semplicemente apparisca che monsignore suffraganeo di Liegi in qualità di superiore spirituale del luogo del congresso vi abbia libero e franco accesso senza che gli estranei possano dirgli contro, ma che si possa egli servire di tale opportunità per rendere servizio alla S. Sede . . . sempre in aria privata e senza ostentare la minima apparenza di ministro." What follows is in DENGEL, *Garampi in Deutschland*, 13, n. 1. Jacquet's mission has been agreed to, definitely by France, in a general way by Spain. "Da Vienna poi si sono spiegati tra i denti mostrando desiderio che il nostro rappresentante non favorisca le parti di Spagna e di Francia. Al che risponde S. S^{ta} che ci fanno troppo onore." Cifra al Jacquet of April 6, 1748, Papal Secret Archives. Cf. *ibid.*, *Cifra of May 11, 1748; GARAMPI, 94.

and Piacenza, to bear in mind the Papal rights to Castro, Ronciglione, and Carpegna, to press for a guarantee of the actual state of political possessions in Italy, and to prevent any attempt at secularization in Germany.¹

Several weeks went by after the plenipotentiaries had assembled in Aix in the second half of March before regular negotiations began, and they were conducted only by the representatives of the principal Powers. So far as the smaller States were concerned, even in matters which affected them directly, their plenipotentiaries had no choice but simply to accept whatever had been decided.²

Jacquet's position, which was difficult in any case, was rendered more so by the failure of the two Powers which were supposed to be most in sympathy with the Pope to fulfil his expectations.³ The French delegate, Count St-Séverin, left nothing undone in the way of exquisite courtesy towards Jacquet,⁴ but kept him in ignorance of the actual negotiations. Maria Theresa's envoy, Count Kaunitz, who was inclined to hold Voltairian views, treated him to hypocritical disquisitions on the exclusively spiritual interests which the Pope should have had at heart, the Church being not of this world. From all accounts it was the astute Prussian envoy who was the most friendly disposed towards the Papal representative.⁵

¹ The *instruction, with accompanying letter, of March 9, 1748, in Nunziat. di Germania, 609, *loc. cit.*

² BEER, *Gesch. des Aachener Friedens*, in *Archiv für Österr. Gesch.*, XLVII., 13 *seqq.* Cf. BROGLIE, *La paix d'Aix-la-Chapelle*, Paris, 1892.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 392 *seqq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 399.

⁵ Jacquet became so intimate with the Prussian delegate that Valenti advised him to be careful, as the Viennese Court regarded the Pope as favouring Frederick II. " *A. V. E. sono ben noti i riguardi che dobbiamo avere oltre di che, come ella può ben comprendere, ogn'uno ci darà buone parole, le quali poco costano " (Cifra of July 6, 1748). November 2, 1748: " *Mostri pure tutta la gratitudine al ministro de Prussia, ma con quella riserva che è necessaria per non dar gelosia ad alcuno " (Nunziat. di

Despite all his efforts Jacquet could glean no information of what was being finally decided, and when on April 30th, 1748, the peace preliminaries were concluded between France, England, and Holland, the nuncio at Cologne knew of them before the Suffragan Bishop in Aix.¹ Article four of the preliminaries provided that the Spanish Infante Philip was to receive the duchies of Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla; in the event of his dying without male issue or of his obtaining the throne of Naples, they were to revert to their present possessors, viz. Parma and Guastalla to Austria, Piacenza to Sardinia. The Pope's pleasure at the conclusion of the preliminaries was marred by the fact that once again the question of the Holy See's suzerainty over the duchies had been passed over in silence.² He hoped, nevertheless, that this offence against the rights of the Papacy might be remedied by Philip being obliged by the peace stipulations to sue for the Papal enfeoffment.³ The Spanish Government, he thought, would support him when it was pointed out that the provision in the preliminaries for the reversion of the duchies would be detrimental not only to his rights but to those of Queen Elizabeth and her children.⁴ Jacquet accordingly was instructed to

Germania, 609, Papal Secret Archives). In his report of November 16, 1748, Jacquet mentioned that he had declined the English delegate's invitation to a dinner in celebration of George II.'s birthday. *GARANZI*, 94.

¹ See the *Cifra to Jacquet of May 18, 1748, which contains the announcement of the arrival of a courier from the Cologne nuncio with the news of the peace preliminaries and expresses the impatience with which news on this subject was awaited from Jacquet. *Nunziat. di Germania, loc. cit.*

² *Cifra al Durini of May 22, 1748, *Nunziat. di Francia*, 442, *ibid.*

³ P. A. KIRSCH in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV., 545.

⁴ *Cifre al Enriquez of June 6, 13, and 26, 1748, *Nunziat. di Spagna*, 430, Papal Secret Archives. In the first message the following occurs (fo. 98): "Parma e Piacenza si assegna al sigr Infante con il patto riversivo alla Casa d'Austria. Ciò è lo stesso che approvarlo per feudo imperiale e continuare l'ingiustizia

bring this viewpoint to the attention of the Spanish envoy in Aix.¹

In Rome the hope that the project would succeed was strengthened by the knowledge that the French Cabinet had secretly given its consent and approval.² In the event, however, Madrid was definitely against the Pope's plan and was in favour of accepting the preliminaries as they were.³

verso la Santa Sede. Vi è di più l'ingiuria che si fa al Cardinale Infante et alla successione della Regina Madre. Questa Principessa tre o quattro anni sono promosse qui di volere l'investitura per se e suoi figli. Stimò il Papa che, considerandola come ultima del sangue Farnese, l'equità voleva che si distinguesse e si considerasse non come semplice femina della Casa, perchè queste sono escluse dal papa Paolo III., ma come rappresentante la famiglia intiera. Non si concluse questo affare perchè Sua M^{ta} et il Marchese Scotti volevano che questo titolo d'equità si rendesse titolo di giustizia perpetuo a tutte le femine in avvenire. Vi ripugnò il Papa, perchè fuori del caso presente non credeva doversi derogare alla Bolla della prima investitura, e ritornando un'altra volta il caso nei termini suoi, parevagli di dare bastantemente uno esempio da potersi fare altrettanto. In somma la cosa non si concluse. Veda ora V. S. Ill^{ma} se mai e colla Regina vedova e colla Corte regnante si potesse fare qualche cosa di buono — in questo proposito. Ciò sarebbe certamente d'utile alla Regina Madre."

¹ Cifre al Jacquet of June 8 and 15, 1748; GARAMPI, 94.

² "Sappia ella che l'insinuazione ce n'è stata fatta segretamente dalla Francia medesima, anzi ne siamo stati eccitati, onde ella vede che potiamo sperare tutto il buon successo." Cifra al Jacquet of June 8, 1748, *ibid.*

³ In his *Cifra al Jacquet of July 4, 1748, Valenti propounds the following interesting argument: "Ritrovandomi io del 1719 in Vienna in tempo della ratifica di questo infame trattato di Londra e riclamandosi per parte nostra per l'aggravio di Parma e di Piacenza al ministro inglese, non ebbe questi difficoltà di dire francamente esser vero e confessare egli medesimo che Parma e Piacenza appartenevano al Papa, ma che era espediente al ben publico che non gli appartenessero più. Quando tali massime predominano, non resta che di fare uso della destrezza per non perdere maggior terreno e per tenersi in guardia di riguadagnarlo

When the news came of their actual acceptance Benedict was bitterly indignant.¹

But perhaps another piece of news was still more painful to him. It was learnt that the French envoy to Aix, St-Séverin, was directly working for the frustration of the Pope's plan of enfeoffment and, what was even worse, was endeavouring to bring it about that Philip should sue for enfeoffment not the Pope, but the Emperor.²

quando una provida occasione si presentasse. Presentemente dunque tutto il nostro studio deve essere di procurare che cotesta Corte, vedendo irreparabile il torto, che le vien fatto in questi preliminari, s'induca ad abbracciare il solo partito che le resta di voltarsi a noi e di desiderare e cercare che l'Infante riceva dalla Santa Sede l'investitura degli Stati suddetti, con che aiuterebbe nello stesso tempo anche noi altri. Ecco quanto è di comune tanto ai suddetti Ministri di Sua S^{tà}, che a V. S. Ill^{ma}. — Non mi aspettavo di più da cotesto primo Ministro intorno alla proposizione da Lei fattagli, nè mi sorprende la di lui indolenza e freddezza, perchè conosco troppo cotesta Corte, e poco però mi lusingo di vederla ridotta al segno che da noi si vorrebbe. Si aspetti Ella pure che, dopo qualche tergiversazione, accederà semplicemente ai preliminari, quando non sia ciò già seguito. Ciò non ostante non dobbiamo noi tutti tralasciare di fare quanto possiamo, per non avere rimorso d'essere stati indolenti in una congiuntura che dimandava tutto il zelo di Sua S^{tà} e la cooperazione de' suoi Ministri. — Non si stanchi dunque V. S. Ill^{ma} d'insistere con cotesti Ministri affinchè arrivino a conoscere l'interesse che ha la loro Corte di non rendere un suo Infante ligio dell' imperatore e dell' imperio, e che viceversa ve lo troverà tutto nel ricercare e prendere l'investitura dalla Santa Sede. — A Msgr. Nunzio di Francia si scriva in particolare di procurare che quella Corte se l'intenda con cotesta, giacchè Ella medesima ci ha eccitato ed insinuato a fare i passi che facciamo con cotesta Corona." Nunziat. di Spagna, 430, 103. Papal Secret Archives.

¹ See, besides the *Cifra* to Jacquet of July 6, 1748 (GARAMPI, 94), *that to Enriquez of July 18, 1748, Nunziat. di Spagna, *loc. cit.*

² Benedict XIV.'s letter to Tencin, in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV., 544, n. 1 and 2. The following sentence occurs in the **Cifra* to

The Pope had now definitely to abandon any hope of his original plan being realized, and was forced to direct all his efforts to preventing the right of investiture being conferred on the Emperor, a project for which the Viennese Cabinet was working. The fear that this would happen, in spite of the Pope's opposition, caused the Curia the greatest anxiety until September.¹ It was not till then that Benedict was somewhat reassured by a message from Cardinal Tencin² that there would be no imperial investiture so long as Spain maintained its opposition, which, however, was a matter of extreme uncertainty for a considerable time.³ The Pope's anxiety was not entirely dispelled until October, when he was informed that Louis XV. had instructed his envoy in Aix to see, when the peace treaty was being framed, that Philip was not obliged to seek investiture from the Emperor.⁴ In these circumstances Benedict considered it advisable to pay some regard to French wishes concerning a protest against the infringement of his feudal rights to Parma and Piacenza.

Originally Jacquet had been given instructions to raise the protest in as solemn a form as possible,⁵ a necessary condition being the co-operation of Spain and, above all, France, on which the Pope was relying with complete confidence.⁶

Jacquet of July 20, 1748: "È pure troppo vero che dobbiamo più temere che sperare dal contegno del conte de Sanseverino." Nunziat. di Germania, 609, Papal Secret Archives.

¹ See the *Cifre to Jacquet of July 27 and August 3, 1748, *ibid.*; Durini's reports in CALVI, 132 *seq.*, 136 *seq.*, 139; HEECKEREN, I., 425, 428.

² Letter to Tencin, *loc. cit.*, 547, n. 2.

³ *Cifre to Jacquet of August 24 and 31, September 7, 14, and 21, 1748, *loc. cit.*

⁴ Letter to Tencin, *loc. cit.*, 547, n. 1.

⁵ " *nel più solenne modo che sia possibile " are the words used in Jacquet's instruction, Nunziat. di Germania, 609, *loc. cit.* The Briefs (" Breve facultativo ") for the protest, dated 1748, March 8, in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 501 *seqq.*

⁶ Cf. the *Cifra al Durini of June 5, 1748: " Già pur troppo comprendo che il grave affare di Parma e Piacenza finirà per

Jacquet had advised against a protest being made immediately after the publication of the peace preliminaries¹ and had pointed out that it ought to include all the separate protests made by the Holy See since the Treaty of Cambrai. The relative documents were accordingly sent to him from Rome.² To obtain Rome's approval of the form of the protest, he submitted three drafts to the Secretariate of State, which rejected all of them, insisting on the wording of the document dispatched on July 6th, which contained an historical exposition of the events leading up to the present situation and cited the protests made by Clement XI., Innocent XIII., Benedict XIII., Clement XII., and Benedict XIV.³ On August 10th Jacquet was instructed to have the protest printed, so as to be able to produce it at the opportune moment and to hand it to all the delegates, including the Protestant ones, and to send it to the nuncios in Vienna, Madrid, Paris, and Warsaw.⁴ The intention of having the protest recorded in the protocol of the congress⁵ had to be abandoned, as no general protocol was kept in Aix as in former congresses, each delegate having his own.⁶ To overcome the difficulty it was decided to

noi con una bella e solenne protesta, ma toccherà almeno ai nostri buoni amici d'aiutarci perchè la protesta sia ricevuta e registrata e non abbiassi a farci il violento aggravio di chiuderci la bocca: cosa che non si suol negare a chiunque soccombe.' Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 237. Papal Secret Archives.

¹ " *Per non offendere li ministri de' principi che in altri capi d'interesse della S. Sede avessero voluto favorirla e fu in fatti sperimentato assai utile questo pensiero, perchè si tolse così una nuova occasione ai plenipotentiarîi Austriaci di fare un maggior impegno per l'investitura imperiale," says the Ristretto mentioned below.

² Cf. " Ristretto di tutto il negoziato di Msgr. Jacquet nel congresso di Aquisgrano ", GARAMPI, 94.

³ *Ibid.* The text of the *protest issued on July 6, 1748, in Nunziat. di Germania, 609, Papal Secret Archives.

⁴ *Cifra to Jacquet, August 10, 1748, *ibid.*

⁵ *Cifra to Jacquet of June 1, 1748, *ibid.*

⁶ Jacquet's report of July 27, 1748, in GARAMPI, 94.

have the document filed in the Elector Palatine's court in Aix.¹

Of the necessity for a protest Rome was convinced, though the French were not in favour of such a step, even after the danger of an imperial investiture had been averted.² In October, in view of the expected counter-protests on the part of Austria, their wishes were met with to the extent of instructing Jacquet to keep his protest a complete secret for the time being.³

On October 18th, 1748, after long and difficult negotiations, the peace treaty in its final form was signed by the French, English and Dutch delegates. On October 20th they were joined by the representatives of Spain, and on the 23rd by those of Austria. In its principal terms the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle corresponded to the preliminaries of April 30th : all claims from all quarters were to be dropped. The articles of the treaty of 1718 concerning the guaranteeing of the Protestant succession in England and the expulsion from France of the Pretender James Stuart and his family were confirmed ; Francis of Lorraine was recognized as Emperor, and the Pragmatic Sanction, with the exception of the cessions to Prussia and Sardinia, was guaranteed by all the Powers. The King of Prussia was specially confirmed in his possession of the duchy of Silesia and the county of Glatz. The Emperor retained Milan, Mantua, and Tuscany, the King of Sardinia his hereditary States, enlarged by portions of Lombard territory ; the House of Este retained Modena, with the right of succession to Massa-Carrara ; Venice, Genoa, and Lucca retained their possessions, and the House of Bourbon the

¹ *Cifra to Jacquet of August 10, 1748, *loc. cit.* According to Professor Dr. Lauchert, the court in question was the aldermen's court of the " gran Pretore ". Its political documents are now housed in the Landesarchiv in Düsseldorf ; in the Municipal Archives in Aix-la-Chapelle there is only a small bundle which is of no importance for our purpose.

² *Cifre to Jacquet of September 14 and 21, 1748, *loc. cit.*

³ *Cifre to Jacquet of October 5, 10, and 19, 1748, *ibid.*

Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, also Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla, on the conditions laid down in the preliminaries.

There was no mention in the treaty of imperial investiture for these territories, and Rome sighed with relief at one danger being thus averted¹ but could not understand why the French were urging the abandonment of any kind of protest. The behaviour of the French envoys was rendered all the more suspicious by their inability to offer any good reason for their request or to explain what harm could be done now by a protest.² Jacquet and the nuncios in Paris and Madrid were asked to find out the cause of this curious attitude,³ and it was then learnt that it was St-Séverin who was opposing the protest, having promised the Austrians to do so in return for their agreement not to raise the question of the Imperial investiture.⁴

St-Séverin's tactics were disapproved of by the French envoy in Rome. The Pope, having feared from the very beginning that no good would come of St-Séverin's anti-Roman views,⁵ was not in the least surprised at his conduct, but rather at Du Theil's support of his colleague. As for St-Séverin's talk against Jacquet, Cardinal Valenti wrote to the latter not to take any notice of it, as the Pope was wholly satisfied with his representative.⁶

Shortly before Christmas, Rome was informed by its nuncios in Paris and Madrid that there too St-Séverin's conduct was

¹ *Cifre to Jacquet of October 26, 1748, *ibid.*

² Cf. the "Ristretto" mentioned above, p. 134, n. 2.

³ *Cifre to Jacquet of November 10, 1748, to Durini of the 6th and 13th, to Enriquez of the 7th.

⁴ Cf. the above-mentioned "Ristretto".

⁵ HEECKEREN, I., 382, 387.

⁶ " *Non deve ella far caso alcuno di quello abbia scritto o potuto scrivere il Conte de Sanseverino; N. S. è rimasto sodisfattissimo della di lei condotta e tanto basta. Neppure il ministro di Francia si capisce per qual motivo siasi opposto il suddetto conte alla nostra protesta. Di lui veramente non mi meraviglio, ma bensì di Monsieur du Theil, uomo savio e giudizioso, ma forse avrà voluto secondare il capriccio dell' altro."

*Cifra to Jacquet of December 14, 1748, *loc. cit.*

in disfavour. After further deliberations, instructions were sent to Jacquet on December 21st to publish the protest, but without any special solemnity, immediately after the ratification of the treaty, to file it in one of the archives in Aix, and to send it to the nuncios. Other protests would be made, added Valenti, so that Rome's should not attract undue attention.¹ These instructions were repeated on December

¹ " *Nostro Sign. dopo aver sentito il parere dei due Nunzi di Francia ed di Spagna, ed esaminato maturamente il pro ed il contra intorno al farsi o no la nostra protesta, è venuto in risoluzione, che V. S. all' arrivo di questa dovendosi credere che saranno allora giunte le ratifiche del trattato, venga alla pubblicazione della medesima, dopo averla fatta deporre, e registrare, o in uno di cotesti pubblici archivi, o in qualche magistrato et insomma dove troverà ella più facilità. Anche il ministro di Francia conviene che sia necessario il farsi da noi un tal atto, e V. S. avrà potuto sentire da Mons. Nunzio di Spagna che non sarà per dispiacere neppure a quella Corte di Vienna, tanto venendo il caso del patto di riversione, quanto nell' altro di molestie, che potessero venirgli inferite dalla Corte sudetta. Qualunque sia stato il motivo che abbia avuto il Conte di Sanseverino per consigliare di non protestare, viene in oggi a cessare, essendo già consumato il trattato, e questo ancora ratificato da tutte le potenze, onde resta fissa e invariabile, nè abbiamo luogo a temere variazione alcuna, qualunque strepito che facessero i ministri di Vienna, e qualunque promessa che avesse potuto fare loro il Conte di Sanseverino, alla quale indubitatamente deve attribuirsi il consiglio datoci di non protestare. Si aggiunge che non sarà sola la nostra protesta, essendovene delle altre, come V. S. sà, onde non può nè deve fare un maggior strepito la nostra. V. S. dunque la faccia pure lasciandosi in di lei libertà di cogliere il tempo della pubblicazione, che si farà della pace o prima o dopo, com' ella giudicherà meglio. Solo se le raccomanda, che nell' esecuzione e nella distribuzione degli esemplari si proceda con tutta la riserva, e senza farne pompa. Si lascia anche il carico di mandarne qualche esemplare ai Nunzi, affinchè possano distribuirne nelle rispettive Corti, e solo si avverta quella di Vienna di non darla fuori." Cifra al Jacquet of December 21, 1748, *loc. cit.* Cf. Durini's report to Valenti of March 18, 1748, in CALVI, 118.

28th, 1748, and on January 4th, 1749, with the additional one that the document was to bear the date of the day of publication, to obviate any doubt of its having been issued after the dissolution of the congress. Once the treaty had been finally concluded there was no danger of any subsequent addition being made concerning the Imperial investiture. This view was shared by the French and Spanish envoys in Rome. "Let Vienna make its complaints and counter-protests," said Valenti, "it is enough for us to make known our divergent viewpoint." Nothing was to be added to the document, as the Pope intended to announce it to the next consistory.¹

On January 25th, 1749, Jacquet reported that the instructions had been carried out.² The filing of the protest had presented difficulties as, Aix being an imperial city, the filing could not be done in the municipal archives. There was no other course open to him but to file it in the court of the Elector Palatine in Aix and in the episcopal archives in Liège. Valenti adjudged that the latter was sufficient, for whatever

¹ *Cifre al Jacquet of December 28, 1748, and January 4, 1749, *ibid.* In the latter it is repeated that: "La pubblicazione venga fatta senz' alcuna formalità bastando che ella dopo averla inserita in qualche archivio la distribuisca costà et ai ministri che resteranno in Aquisgrana come un atto semplice et estragiudiziale." With regard to this the writer of the "Ristretto" remarks: "Questa protesta non fu giudiziale . . . perchè il congresso era stato senza conferenze pubbliche, senza mediatore, senz' archivio e senza protocollo e senza luogo pubblico ove li plenipotenziarii si radunassero, e così ancor all' atto della nostra protesta dovette passare in forma stragiudiziale, giacchè nè i ministri del congresso volevano riceverla nè avrebbero potuto per non avere ove registrarla, e delle altre proteste degli altri principi seguì la medesima cosa" (GARAMPI, 94). Cf. in this connexion the *Cifre al Durini of January 1 and 22, 1749, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, Papal Secret Archives. The Pope did not have his consistorial allocution on the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle printed, but he communicated it in confidence to his friends in Bologna. See KRAUS, *Briefe*, 54 seq.

² The *letter is in Nunziat. di Germania, 609, *loc. cit.*

was lacking had been made up by the inclusion of the protest in the Papal allocution of November 27th, 1748.¹

No mention at all had been made at the congress of the disputed questions of Castro, Ronciglione, and Carpegna. With regard to these and to the possession of Comacchio and Ferrara the Pope was somewhat reassured by article 15 of the treaty, which guaranteed the *status quo* of all the Italian states.² He was no less gratified by France's steadfast opposition to the Bavarian elector's demand for compensation in the form of secularization and by its prevention of any discussion of the subject.³ The Curia's apprehensions on this score had been very great at first.⁴ Keenly as Rome resented the lack of respect towards the Papal suzerainty over Parma

¹ *Cifra al Jacquet of February 8, 1749, *loc. cit.* Pennachi *reported to Uhlfeld on January 25, 1749, that on communicating his protest to the Cardinals the Pope expressed his pleasure "dal non essersi eseguito il divulgato progetto della secolarizzazione de' vescovati in Germania". State Archives, Vienna.

² The "Ristretto" mentioned above (p. 134, n. 2) remarks that "Si usò molta destrezza principalmente in tener segreti i timori del Papa d'essere perturbato nel possesso de' suoi domini, e siccome si trovò molta facilità nel ministero di Francia per condiscendere alle premure di S. St^a, così fu facile l'inserzione nel medesimo articolo, approvato anche dalle corti di Spagna e di Sardegna".

³ "Inquanto alla secolarizzazione di alcuni vescovati di Germania, benchè fosse questa promossa dal duca di Baviera, il quale bramava di così avere un compenso de' danni sofferti dalla guerra, nondimeno la Francia non vi volle mai aderire, quantunque avesse a cuore gl'interessi di quell' elettore, anzi diede ordine al Conte di San Severino di tagliar curto su questo articolo, acciochè nel congresso non se ne facesse discorso, conoscendo benissimo esser questa una cosa di pessimo esempio, e che rovescierebbe tutto il sistema dell' impero." Ristretto, *loc. cit.* Hanoverian plans for the secularization of Osnabrück, in DROYSEN, V., 3, 485.

⁴ Cf. Durini's report of January 15, 1748, in CALVI, *Curiosità*, III; *Cifra al Durini of February 7, 1748, *loc. cit.*; MERENDA, *Memorie, Bibl. Angelica, Rome; HEECKEREN, I., 441.

and Piacenza,¹ it was nevertheless a consolation that no right of investiture had been given to the Emperor. On the whole, Benedict considered that he might well be satisfied with the "general pacification", in that it had wrought no great damage to the Church or the Holy See.²

¹ HEECKEREN, 411.

² Cf. *ibid.*, 440 *seq.* Jacquet's position during the congress was very difficult. " *Nel fondo," he wrote on July 27, 1748, " non vi è ministro alcuno che si curi di noi e delle cose nostre, pochi sono informati, di modo che bisogna masticar lor la pappa e le insinuazioni in voce a nulla servono, e quante se ne faranno tante se ne porterà il vento." This last remark is an attempt to justify himself for having put forward some arguments *in writing*, concerning the cession of Parma, which step he had been advised not to make in a *Cifra of July 13, 1740. In the end the Pope was completely satisfied with his conduct; see the Cifra of February 8, 1744, in GARAMPI, 94. With regard to Parma and Piacenza the Pope, in 1752, protested also against the treaty of Aranjuez concluded on June 14 between Austria and Spain. Cf. *Millini to Uhlfeld on November 18, 1752, State Archives, Vienna, and HEECKEREN, II., 227.

CHAPTER III.

THE STATES OF THE CHURCH—THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF ART AND LEARNING.

ON ascending the Papal throne Benedict XIV. had every intention of improving the condition of his subjects to the best of his ability. First and foremost he directed his attention to the improvement of the financial situation, which had become deplorable. The State debt had mounted to 56 million *scudi*, and in 1743 the deficit for the year was 200,000 *scudi*.¹ The Pope straightway reduced expenditure on food and drink, lessened the number of domestics, and cut down the pay of the officers (by half) and the soldiers, which was abnormally high. He abstained from reviving the *Monti vacabili*, which had become extinct through the deaths of the beneficiaries, and urged the greatest possible thrift in all departments.² Among the many important measures of economy which he carried out the most outstanding was the reduction in the number of the troops. Of these there were not very many even before the reduction,³ and they usually failed in an emergency.

¹ MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome.

² Thun's *report to Charles VI. of August 30, 1740, in which it is noted that Benedict XIV. intends "formare la sua corte sul piede di quella d'Innocenzo XII. ch'è la ristretta dopo l'abolizione del nipotismo, toltone però quella di papa Benedetto XIII., che non volle nel roto del palazzo apostolico neppure le otto lancie spezzate o siano cavalieri di cappa e spada che aveva papa Innocenzo". The reduction in the soldiers' pay is *reported by Thun on September 24, 1740, State Archives, Vienna. See also M. Foscarini's report of September 3, 1740, in BROSCHE, II., 92, n. 2. Cf. NOVAES, XIV., 14. A " *Discorso per un' economico regolamento della Camera Apost.", composed by the Marchese Girol. Teodoli in 1740, in Cod. Vat. 8677, pp. 253 *seqq.*, Vatican Library.

³ Thun's *report of December 24, 1740, State Archives, Vienna.

In 1741, his expenditure showing no decrease, he took the advice of Cardinal Aldrovandi and endeavoured to create a fresh source of income by introducing stamped paper for legal documents, as had been done by the Governments of France, Spain, and Sardinia.¹ But as this measure failed to have the desired effect² he abolished it in 1743, on Argenvilliers' advice. The taxes on imported cattle, oil, and raw silk had been reduced on the introduction of the stamped paper, but this concession had now to be withdrawn and new taxes imposed on lime, china clay, salt, wine, straw, and hay.³

As early as 1741 the Pope had discovered irregularities in the accounts of the Dataria, and to put a stop to them he ordered the accounts to be submitted direct to him, month by month.⁴ Later on he gave instructions that the accounts of all the communes in the Papal States were to undergo examination and that debts found to be owing to the Camera were to be collected.⁵ This measure, however, was impossible of execution, as the Papal States were too sorely stricken by the storm of war in which every European Power was successively involved. Unable to defend himself, the Pope was forced to look on while his neutral territory was used by the Spaniards, the Austrians, and the Neapolitans as a passage, a theatre of war, and winter quarters. In these circumstances it was impossible to put the State finances on a sound footing. By the end of 1743 the deficit had risen from 180,000 to 200,000 *scudi*.⁶

Consequently the Pope found himself obliged to raise the taxes for 1744 in Rome and district on land, house-rents, the

¹ Cf. Thun's *report of March 4, 1741, *ibid.*; MORONI, LXXIV., 313.

² MERENDA, **Memorie, loc. cit.*

³ "Muratori ad ann. 1741"; NOVAES, XIV., 22; BROSCHE, II., 94; HEECKEREN, I., 78. For Argenvilliers' influence, see MERENDA, **Memorie, loc. cit.*

⁴ Thun's *report to Maria Theresa of July 8, 1741 (*loc. cit.*), according to which Aldrovandi was offended by the measure.

⁵ BROSCHE, II., 94.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 95.

feudal benefices of the barons, and pensions derived from prebends.¹ In 1745 a tax which was expected to produce 400,000 *scudi* was imposed on the Monte creditors, though only for one year.² Even then it was found impossible to balance the budget. The Pope sought to remedy the situation by lessening administrative costs and by reducing his military expenses by 110,000 *scudi* annually, but neither now nor at any future time in his pontificate did he manage to free himself from financial trouble.³ In a confidential letter to his old friend Innocenzo Storani of Ancona, of October 13th, 1751, he said that apart from the sums that were necessary for his upkeep he had not taken a bajocco from the Camera, and that if his predecessor had acted likewise there would not be a debt of millions causing a perpetual deficit.⁴ Even

¹ Edict of December 18, 1743; see NOVAES, XIV., 71 *seq.*

² "Motu proprio" of January 16, 1745; see BROSCHE, II., 95.

³ BROSCHE, II., 96, where there is further information about the deterioration of military power in the States of the Church. In these circumstances, MERENDA's complaints in his **Memorie* (Bibl. Angelica, Rome) about Benedict XIV.'s "neutralità disarmata" seem to be unjustified. Once the Great Powers had developed their military strength to a degree corresponding to their vast extent, it was impossible for the diminutive States of the Church to protect their neutrality, even if no expense had been spared for the development of the army. BROSCHE (II., 97) rightly judges that the only means of protection for the States of the Church lay in the political situation, not in the army, which no longer commanded respect. This being so, it is also easy to understand how Benedict XIV. was more conciliatory towards the Neapolitans and Spaniards, who were closer at hand, than towards the Austrians. The ineffectiveness of the Papal troops was demonstrated in 1752 at the uprising in Subiaco against Cardinal Spinola, who was commendatory abbot there; see COPPI, *Annal. ad ann. 1752*; BROSCHE, II., 97 n. After Spinola's death, Benedict XIV. separated the Abbot of Subiaco's judicial powers in the ecclesiastical sphere from those in the civil sphere, and he intended to repeat this measure in other places; see MURATORI, *Annal. ad ann. 1752*.

⁴ MARONI, *Lettere*, 791.

his severest critics could not deny that he deserved the compliment paid him at the beginning of his reign by the Venetian ambassador Marco Foscarini, namely that it was fortunate that they had a Pope who was free from ambition and self-seeking, for otherwise the States of the Church would have fallen into irreparable decay.¹

In the sphere of political administration, too, the Pope had many unpleasant experiences, for doubtful elements had crept in here since Coscia's time which were not easily removed.² Wherever improvement was possible, Benedict did not shirk his duty, and many abuses he ruthlessly removed.³ Innovations of a radical nature, however, especially in the administration of the States of the Church, he could not bring himself to make. "I am too old," was his excuse, "and it is impossible for me to say whether my successor would continue so laborious and costly an undertaking."⁴

From every point of view the "general pacification" agreed to at the congress of Aix-la-Chapelle brought considerable relief to the ruler of the Papal States, for it freed him of the fear that the "tragedy" of the first years of his reign would be repeated.⁵ The whole of Italy now began to enjoy a period of peace which was to last for forty years and which has not yet been granted to the peninsula a second time. It made it possible, after a long period of warfare, to attend to the healing of grievous wounds with some prospect of success.

¹ M. Foscarini's report in BROSCHE, II., 98, n. 3.

² Benedict remarked sardonically to Cardinal Tencin in a letter of August 1, 1753, that unfortunately he had to plough with his predecessor's oxen. HEECKEREN, II., 82.

³ SPITTLER, *Gesch. der europäischen Staaten*, II., 105; BROSCHE, II., 99. An order of October 30, 1756, was directed against the clipping of coins; see *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 262. For Benedict XIV.'s coinage, see MARTINORI, *Zecca*, 21.

⁴ CARACCIOLO, 135; cf. 143.

⁵ "Gran peso," Benedict had written to Cardinal Tencin on July 28, 1742, "è quello del pontificato, ma intollerabile quando fra i principi cattolici non si è pace." *Miscell.* XV., 154, Papal Secret Archives.

Of this epoch, which was of particular benefit to the city of Rome,¹ the peace-loving Benedict was a true representative. In his reign the population of the city rose from 145,580 (in the year 1740) to 154,058.²

One improvement made in the Eternal City was the new demarcation of the Rioni, which had been increased to fourteen under Sixtus V. The project was announced in 1742 and put into effect the following year under the direction of the Cardinal Camerlengo Albani. Formerly the boundaries had been so ill defined that it was uncertain to what district many a house belonged, a case in point being the Palazzo Conti, about which a dispute arose in the time of Innocent XIII.³ The manifold irregularities thus occasioned were now removed.

The instigator of this reform was the Prior of the Caporioni, Count Bernardino Bernardini, who in 1744 published an exact description of the fourteen Rioni, with their churches, convents, hospitals, hospices, colleges, palaces, ancient monuments, piazzas, and streets.⁴ The boundaries were marked by marble tablets bearing names and coats of arms,⁵ many of them being still extant. With their aid, both residents and visitors could find their way about without difficulty. The basis of the whole work was a large plan of ancient, mediaeval, and modern Rome made by the famous surveyor and architect, Giovanni Battista Nolli, of Como. Drawn and engraved in accordance with the researches made by the learned Jesuit Contucci and the Papal chaplain Antonio

¹ Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 656 *seqq.*

² *Monografia d. città di Roma*, II., 354. According to CORRIDORE, *La popolazione dello Stato Romano*, Roma, 1906, the total population of Rome in 1742, including the city districts, was 622,535.

³ See the work by BERNARDINI (pp. 8 *seqq.*) mentioned below. Cf. *Baracconi*, 26.

⁴ B. BERNARDINI, *Descrizione del nuovo ripartimento de' Rioni di Roma fatto per ordine di N. S. Papa Benedetto XIV.*, Roma, 1744. Cf. FORCELLA, I., 83.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

Baldani, it was published in 1748.¹ Nolli, turning to account the invaluable work done by the Roman topographer Leonardo Bufalini, edited the latter's plan (which had been published in 1551)² with a new orientation and at the same time produced a new plan showing ground-plans and sites with great distinctness. Orientation east and west which had formerly been the rule, was here abandoned altogether in favour of that by north and south. In addition to this, Nolli's plan, in twelve sheets, marks an important advance in that it provides, not a bird's-eye view, as did its predecessors, but an exact and detailed ground-plan, including those of the churches and palazzi, public grounds, and the villas and their gardens, also the conformation of the ground. This work, which was incidentally a remarkable example of copper-engraving, became the prototype of modern Roman cartography. More recent plans are improvements on it only in point of technical production.³

The constitution of the Roman aristocracy was regularized by a decree of Benedict XIV.'s dated January 4th, 1746, and it thenceforward remained essentially unaltered until the dissolution of the Papal States.⁴ Benedict's decree, which was known by its opening words, "*Urbem Romam*," restricted the title of "*nobilis Romanus*" to 187 families, whose names were entered in a golden book. The right to bear the title was granted only to those whose ancestors, or they themselves, had taken part in the administration of the city of Rome,

¹ Cf. DE ROSSI in *Studi e docum.*, IV. (1883), 153 *seqq.* See also JUSTI, II., 122. A new and reduced copy of Nolli's large plan, which is no longer easy to obtain, was given in the last volume of REUMONT's *Gesch. der Stadt Rom*.

² Cf. our account, Vol. XIII, 363.

³ PETERMANN'S *Geograph. Mitteilungen*, LVII. (1911), 311; GNOLI, *Mostra di Topografia Romana*, Roma, 1903, 10, 16; BRINCKMANN, *Stadtbaukunst*, 52, 57, who remarks that with the exception of Verniguet's large plan of Paris nothing on this scale had ever been done for any other city. A rectification of Nolli in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XXIX., 538 *seqq.*

⁴ Decrees of only a supplementary nature were issued by Pius IX. on May 2, 1853; see REUMONT, III., 2, 657.

either as "*conservatori*" or "*caporioni*". To perpetuate the memory of the ancient Senate, sixty of these families were accorded the special title of "*Cives nobiles conscripti*". Applicants for admission to this latter circle were subject to examination by a heraldic commission presided over by the Senator, while plain nobility was granted by a communal council composed of families which had distinguished themselves in public service; the Pope's relatives were *ipso facto* plain nobles. From their ranks were to be chosen the holders of the most important posts: the *Conservatori*, the Prior of the *Caporioni*, the consuls of the guild of land workers, the superintendents of roads and buildings, and the fifty councillors of the Roman people—the last relic of the Senate—who were to officiate during the vacancy of the Papal See.¹

The Pope, while coming to the aid of impoverished nobles, strongly advocated the diminution of the immoderate luxury which had brought many of them to ruin.² The incomes of most of the Roman notables were insufficient because of the bad management of their estates and the considerable expense attached to their exalted positions. Large sums were spent in repairing their vast palazzi and in performing social duties.

The "*Conversazioni*", as receptions were called, were continued in the theatre, where music held first place. An ordinance of Benedict XIV.'s published in 1742 shows his solicitude lest the bounds of propriety be exceeded on the stage.³ Every noble owned a box in the public theatres (Alibert, Argentina, Tor di Nona, Valle, Capranica), and here the ladies received their visitors, paying no regard to the beginning of the melodrama, in which, as before, women were

¹ *Ibid.*; *Bull.*, XIV., 337 *seq.* Cf. the inscription in FORCELLA, I., 85. In this connexion it is worth noting also the "**Ristretto di notizie di famiglie nobili esistenti in Roma sotto il pontificato di Innocenzo XII. raccolte dagli Archivi particolari, dall' istorie etc. sino all' Anno Santo 1750*", in the Costaguti Archives, Rome.

² NOVAES, XIV., 14.

³ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 116 *seq.*

forbidden to appear. The expenses of the Carnival were borne by the aristocrats ; it was they who drove in the gala carriages and showered sweetmeats on the populace, and it was their horses which ran in the Barberi races.¹ Though the Carnival festivities had now lost much of the roughness with which they had been accompanied even in the foregoing century, outbreaks of licence were not unknown. Against these excesses Benedict XIV. set his face as sternly as he did against public immorality²: the wearing of masks was forbidden on Fridays, Sundays, and holidays in Carnival time and the practice was not to be extended into Ash Wednesday.³

An excellent notion of the Roman Carnival in the first half of the eighteenth century, when numerous visitors were attracted to it from abroad, especially England,⁴ may be gained from the drawings of Pier Leone Ghezzi.⁵ The portraits, mostly caricatures, of this amusing artist have immortalized the inhabitants of Rome of his time, from the Pope and the Cardinals down to the beggars, charlatans, and cooks. The ecclesiastical world was not spared thereby, but this did not prevent Benedict XIV. from enjoying the caricatures.⁶ In the same way he tolerated the free criticism of the Government, the Secretary of State, and even himself, at social gatherings and in the cafés. He even listened with a placid

¹ NAVENNE, II., 53 *seqq.* For the prohibition of women on the stage, see MARONI, *Lettere*, 754 *seq.*

² Cf. the *report from Rome, dated November 29, 1747, in the Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican, and CARACCILOLO, 159.

³ For the decrees of 1748 and 1751, which applied to the whole of the States of the Church, see BARBIER, VII., 83 *seqq.*, 85 *seqq.*, 90 *seqq.*; BANDINI, *Roma al tramonto del settecento*, Roma, 1922, 123.

⁴ Cf. *Report from Rome of December 21, 1748, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

⁵ HERMANIN, in *Bollet. d'Arte*, 1907, I., 2, 17 *seqq.*

⁶ Cf. *Arch. Rom.*, II., 430 *seq.*; HERMANIN, *loc. cit.*, 19; TIETZE, *Handschriften der Rossiana*, 165.

content when this kind of talk was reported to him.¹ The prevailing atmosphere in Rome at this period was one of gaiety and unrestraint, an unbelievable freedom as Winckelmann expressed it.²

In conjunction with Ghezzi's coarsely realistic drawings, the files of the contemporary Roman journal *Cracas* provide an unusually vivid picture of daily life in Rome. Every event was fully reported: firstly the ecclesiastical functions, then the academic disputations, the illuminations and fireworks on public holidays, the new plays and works of art, and even the sacred music performed in the Oratories. In the matter of dress the Spanish fashion of the preceding period had been ousted by the French,³ though in some other respects the influence of the Iberian peninsula was still perceptible, one instance being the bull-fights in the Mausoleum of Augustus.⁴

The setting in which this unique world lived and moved—a world to which its numerous foreign visitors and residents imparted an international flavour—may be seen in the ten volumes of engravings by Giuseppe Vasi, published in 1747–61, with an historical explanation by Giuseppe Bianchini. In 250 small folio engravings Vasi depicts the Rome of his time—its gates, piazzas, basilicas, and streets, its most famous palazzi, its bridges, parish churches, convents, schools, villas, and gardens. Never delving beneath the surface he presents a faithful picture of the exteriors of buildings and

¹ CARACCILO, 158.

² JUSTI, II., I, II, and OTTO HARNACK, *Deutsches Kunstleben in Rom im Zeitalter der Klassik*, Weimar, 1896, xiv. By reason of the Romans' lighthearted way of living, the pilgrimages to the church "Del Divino Amore", near Castel di Leva, on the Via Ardeatina, built in 1744, also took on the character of popular festivals, which has continued to the present day. See G. ZAMBONI, *Ist. del santuario del D.A.*, Roma, 1872; PEZZANI, *La Madonna del D.A.*, Roma, 1908; TOMASSETTI, II., 430 seqq.

³ NAVENNE, II., 55.

⁴ Cf. BERTELOTTI, *La giostra dei tori nel mausoleo d'Augusto 1755*, in *Rassegna settim.*, III., Roma, 1879, No. 78.

localities, but his uniform and unimaginative style soon becomes wearisome.¹

On an immeasurably higher level of artistry are the engravings of his pupil Giovanni Battista Piranesi, a native of Venice who was living in Rome in 1740–43 and permanently settled there in 1745. No other exponent of reproductive art has produced so powerful an impression of the characteristic magnificence of ancient and modern Rome. His etchings, most of which appeared in the largest folio size, are perfect in technique and illustrate in the manner of a genius the imposing bulk and overawing effect of the ancient ruins.² The passionate enthusiasm with which he drew easily compensates for a few exaggerations and artistic licences.³ His *Antichità Romane*, published in four volumes in 1756, won for him a European reputation.⁴

To some extent as a relief from this work, which inaugurated the systematic study of the Roman ruins, Piranesi began to produce in 1748 a series of *Vedute di Roma*, which eventually totalled 137 sheets.⁵ A comparison with his teacher Vasi is wholly favourable to Piranesi. Though Vasi's Roman picture may be more comprehensive, his pupil's is infinitely more impressive, colourful, romantic, and lifelike. The effects produced by his distribution of light and shade were so magical that he was known as the Rembrandt of the ancient ruins. Another distinctive feature of his earlier sheets is the originality

¹ GIUS. VASI, *Delle magnificenze di Roma antica e moderna con una spiegazione istorica del P. Gius. Bianchini*, Roma, 1747–1761, 10 vols.

² Cf. MISSIRINI, 238; JUSTI, 342 seq.; VOGEL, *Goethes römische Tage*, 67 seqq.; GIESECKE, *G. B. Piranesi*, Leipzig, 1911, 41 seqq.; SULGER-GEßING in *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, XVIII., Frankfurt, 1897, 221 seq.; H. FOCILLON, *G. B. Piranesi*, Paris, 1918, 51 seqq., 145 seqq.

³ VOGEL, 68 seq.; FOCILLON, 218 seqq.

⁴ GIESECKE, 86 seqq.; FOCILLON, 204 seqq. Benedict showed his approval of Piranesi by allowing him to import for his "Antichità" 200 bales of paper free of duty, which was equivalent to a substantial sum of money; see FOCILLON, 72.

⁵ GIESECKE, 41 seqq.; FOCILLON, 122 seqq.

of his accessory figures. At the foot of his buildings, both ancient and modern, the whole of Roman street life is seen in action: carriages and sedan chairs, gallants, ladies in bustles, priests, monks, beggars, soldiers, cooks, bakers, hawkers, and artisans, succeed each other in animated sequence. Piranesi has created a picture of the Rome of Benedict XIV. the like of which has not been drawn for any other city in the world.¹ In his work there lives still the city through which the light-hearted Pope was so fond of wandering.

Hand in hand with Benedict's good spirits went his readiness to relieve distress. Thrifty where his own person was concerned, he was extraordinarily generous to all in need.² So as to be able to support the poor, he refrained from revisiting his beloved home-town.³ In times of widespread disaster his assistance was on a lavish scale. In 1741 he spent 100,000 *scudi* in relieving the grave distress caused by an earthquake in Urbino, the Marches, and Umbria. Generous alms were given by him at the great flooding of the Tiber in December 1750⁴ and on the occasion of further earthquakes which wrought much damage in Umbria in the latter part of his reign.⁵

¹ JUSTI, II., 342 *seq.*; GIESECKE, 47 *seqq.*; FOCILLON, 123 *seqq.*; ANT. MUÑOZ, *G. B. Piranesi* (1920), 28 *seq.*

² Benedict XIV. displayed his charity so promptly and in so high a measure that Thun *reported it to Charles VI. on August 23, 1740, adding: "essendo di sua natura portato a far del bene." State Archives, Vienna.

³ MARONI, *Lettere*, 746.

⁴ For these subsidies, see the *Avvisi of August 21 and 28, and December 18, 1751, February 12, September 9, and November 28, 1752, and May 25, 1754 (Cod. ital. 199, State Library, Munich).

⁵ NOVAES, XIV., 34; CARACCILOLO, 148 *seq.* Rome was visited by another natural misfortune in Benedict XIV.'s reign; in 1749 occurred a violent storm which caused great damage (*cf.* BOSCOVICH, *Sopra il turbine che la notte tra gli XI. e XII. Giugno MDCCXLIX. danneggiò una gran parte di Roma*, Roma, 1749). For the overflowing of the Tiber, see *Lettere di uomini illustri*,

The many ordinances issued by Benedict XIV. for the reform of civil and criminal jurisdiction were highly beneficial,¹ and the enlightened spirit shown by the learned jurist in this sphere was also manifest in his decrees affecting economic administration. As early as March 30th, 1741, he ordered ecclesiastical penalties to be revived for anyone who impeded the import of foodstuffs into Rome. No one was to be exempt, not even Cardinals and princes.² In the same year, during his stay at Castel Gandolfo, there came to his ears the complaints of the poor peasants who had been forbidden to glean what was left of the crops after the harvest. Moved by true Christian charity, he opposed this harshness in an ordinance of May 22nd, 1742.³ The great landowners, however, being too selfish to observe this ordinance, it was later renewed under pain of penalty and at the same time the custom of gleaning was so regulated that no harm could come to the landowner's property.⁴

For the better provisioning of their inhabitants the Pope ordered granaries to be built in every town and village of the Papal States, and various reliefs were granted to the bakers in Rome, who were groaning under the burden of the taxes laid upon them.⁵

A Motu Proprio of July 8th, 1748, contained a particularly wise measure by which the Pope permitted the free export

128 ; ARMELLINI in *Triplice Omaggio a Pio IX.*, Roma, 1877, 89. Benedict XIV. had previously commissioned two engineers to make a thorough study of the whole course of the Tiber, which became the basis for the famous work : *Della cagione e dei rimedii delle inondazioni del Tevere, della somma difficoltà d'introdurre una felice et stabile navigazione da Ponte Novo sotto Perugia e del modo di renderlo navigabile dentro Roma*, Roma, 1746. See also the periodical *Buonaroti*, 1871.

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 268 seqq., XVII., 205 seqq., XVIII., 41 seq. ; *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 161 seqq., 188 seqq., 202 seqq.

² DE CUPIS, 309.

³ *Ibid.*, 310.

⁴ ARDANT, *Papes et paysans*, 165.

⁵ See BENIGNI, *Getreidepolitik*, 83, and, for a *memorial by

of grain, vegetables, cattle, and wood, not only from place to place, but also from province to province and from legation to legation. Those districts, however, which were subject to the *Annona*, Rome's provisioning authority, were excepted.¹ Speculation in oil, an indispensable commodity for Rome, the Pope had already countered by allowing it to be imported free of duty.² Two edicts issued in 1749 had as their object the prevention of harm being done to shepherds by speculation in pastures.³

An ordinance of December 30th, 1748, specified the measures to be taken for the repair and upkeep of the roads of the Papal States, which had been badly damaged by the passage of the troops.⁴ Attempts were made to encourage industry, cotton-spinning in particular, by the granting of privileges, but unfortunately they were not successful.⁵

As the Mediterranean was still being made unsafe by the Barbary pirates, Benedict provided corresponding protection for the coasts of the Papal States. These measures, which

the Prefect of the Roman *Annona* in *Arm. XI.*, *Miscell.* 202 of the Papal Secret Archives, see CANALETTI-GAUDENTI in *Corr. d'Italia*, 1921, No. 3.

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 233 *seqq.*, *cf. ibid.*, XVIII., 38 *seqq.*; MORONI, LXXIV., 312.

² *Reports by Mocenigo of March 30 and April 6, 1748, State Archives, Venice. *Cf. BROSCH*, II., 98.

³ DE CUPIS, 663 *seqq.*, 667 *seqq.*

⁴ *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 300 *seq.* According to the *Avviso of February 1, 1755, the chief streets of Rome were to be bordered with elms (*Cod. ital.*, 199, State Library, Munich). In 1749 the cleaning of the city's streets was regularized; see *reports from Rome of January 4 and 11, 1749, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

⁵ CARACCILOLO, 66; MERENDA, **Memorie*, *Bibl. Angelica*, Rome. The latter reports for the year 1745 the invention of a new cannon by an engineer of Rieti. It was tried out in the presence of the Pope, but no order for casting ensued. For the project of utilizing mineral products near Tolfa, see HECKEREN, I., 319.

profited also the English and Dutch merchantmen, helped to make the name of the learned Pope respected in the Protestant as well as in the Catholic world. Evidence of this is the praise offered him by Vattel in his work on international law published at Neuchâtel in 1758.¹

To guard the coast against the pirates Benedict commissioned a new galley, named after himself, to be built in the yards of Civitavecchia, and later two frigates were bought in England and named after the Princes of the Apostles.² At the end of April 1745 the Pope went to Civitavecchia to attend the launching of the *Benedetta* and to christen the vessel himself.³ In the May of the previous year he had visited Porto d'Anzio from Castel Gandolfo,⁴ having in mind the modernization of the old harbour on the plan drawn up by the French engineer Maréchal,⁵ who was also inspecting the dykes of Fiumicino and the harbour of Ancona.⁶ But, like Innocent XIII., he was unable to realize his design; in March 1752 the work, which was very costly, had to be abandoned.⁷ The Pope then devoted all the more attention to Civitavecchia. He confirmed and

¹ N. VATTEL, *Le droit des gens*, I., 266. Cf. also the inscription in FORCELLA, II., 502.

² GUGLIEMOTTI, *Ultimi fatti*, 139 seqq., 163 seqq.

³ *Ibid.*, 138 seqq.; CALISSE, 552 seqq.

⁴ GUGLIEMOTTI, 137.

⁵ See the *Nova sent to Vienna by A. Albani on June 29 and August 17, 1748, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican. Cf. MERENDA, **Memorie*, loc. cit., and HEECKEREN, I., 412. One of Maréchal's three plans is preserved in the State Archives, Rome.

⁶ HEECKEREN, I., 412.

⁷ Cf. the detailed information in the *Avvisi of June 6, 1750, March 13, April 24, July 10 and 24, 1751, January 29, February 5 and March 18, 1752, where there is talk of building a harbour in Stagno di Maccarese instead of in Anzio. The Pope, however, still thought of building a harbour in the latter place; see *Avvisi of August 12, November 4, and December 30, 1752, and November 23, 1754; Cod. ital. 199, State Library, Munich.

extended its privileges as a free port,¹ so that its maritime trade, which was already considerable, was greatly increased. He had more granaries built there, also a new church and, by the harbour, a handsome fountain designed by Vanvitelli. Improvements were made to the harbour walls, the harbour itself, and the landing place. In the town he saw to the erection of better dwelling-houses. The church at the Porta Romana was enlarged, and outside the gate a fine new suburb arose.² Similarly the harbour of Ancona was freed of its old deficiencies.³

Other benefactions made by Benedict to the States of the Church were the embellishment of the pilgrimage-church of Loreto⁴ and of the palazzo at Castel Gandolfo,⁵ the restoration of S. Maria della Piazza at Ancona,⁶ and the assistance

¹ GUGLIELMOTTI, 122 *seqq.*; CALISSE, 564 *seqq.* Thun notes in his *report of August 12, 1741, that in spite of this Civitavecchia would hardly compete with Leghorn, "perchè il governo dei preti è poco atto a cattivare il commercio," as was evident in the case of Ancona. State Archives, Vienna.

² CALISSE, 568 *seqq.*, 572 *seqq.*

³ MERENDA, **Memorie, loc. cit.*

⁴ The church was given a new campanile and portico; for the arms of Benedict XIV. over the door leading from the palazzo to the campanile, see *Guida di Loreto*, 163. In the palazzo the Pope had the great Salone restored, and here his portrait has been hung; further information in the *Avvisi of October 3, 1750, and October 27, 1752, *loc. cit.*

⁵ "Il Maggiordomo durante l'estate aveva fatta accomodare la galleria del Palazzo di Castello et allestire altre piccole stanze con pitture a guazzo del Ghezzi, il quale vi dipinse diverse caricature, nelle quali era eccellente, di diversi familiari e fra gl'altri Msgr. Reali primo Maestro di Cerimonie che scaccia un asino," reports MERENDA (**Memorie, loc. cit.*) for the second year of the Pope's reign. Benedict had built here a clock tower and a vaulted gallery (called the "Galleria del bigliardo" after the billiard table it contained) with beautiful landscapes in fresco, of the surrounding country, and an open view of the sea. I also found two coats of arms in the palazzo.

⁶ MARONI, *Lettere*, 793.

given towards the rebuilding of the cathedral at Fossombrone.¹ But the town which profited most from the Pope's generosity was his native city of Bologna. On becoming Pope he remained its archbishop and paid the See especial honour by conferring on it the Golden Rose.² The sum of 200,000 *scudi* was spent on completing the cathedral church of S. Pietro (a sumptuous façade and two new chapels being designed by Alfonso Torregiani) and the adjoining seminary.³ The cathedral also received many handsome gifts in the form of church utensils; the silver altar-frontal, with cross and candlesticks, were valued at 20,000 *scudi*. On relinquishing the archiepiscopal dignity in 1756 to Cardinal Malvezzi, the ageing Pope sent to the cathedral, to commemorate the new archbishop's consecration, two silver candlesticks costing 13,000 *scudi*.⁴ A still more handsome present was the set of large tapestries woven to the designs of Raphael Mengs in the factory attached to S. Michele a Ripa in Rome. They were hidden away when the cathedral was plundered by French revolutionary troops and are used to this day to decorate the church on high festivals.⁵ The church of S. Petronio in Bologna received a large and

¹ *Avviso of October 19, 1754, Cod. ital. 199, State Library, Munich.

² *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 195 *seqq.*; KRAUS, *Briefe*, 80.

³ Cf. G. GATTI, *Descrizione delle più rare cose di Bologna*, Bologna, 1803, I *seqq.*; M. GUALANDI, *Tre giorni in Bologna*, Bologna, 1850, 31 *seqq.*; G. ZUCCHINI, *Bologna*, Bergamo (no date), 134 *seq.*, 138; BERINGER, 31 *seqq.*; L. MANARESI, *La cattedrale di Bologna*, in *Bollet. d. dioc. di Bologna*, I., 198 *seq.*

⁴ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 254, II., 135; HEECKEREN, II., 309; NOVAES, XIV., 225, 255. Cf. *Atti d. Emilia*, II. (1877), 196 *seq.* The second consecration of the cathedral did not take place till 1756; see *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 222.

⁵ The tapestries are marked "Petrus Ferloni fecit in Hospitio". Benedict XV. had them photographed; illustrations in C. CANTONI, *Lambertiniana*, 27 *seq.* Cf. *Diario Benedettino che contiene una ampia serie di beneficenze fatte da Benedetto XIV. alla sua patria*, Bologna, 1754.

richly ornamented reliquary,¹ and costly gifts were made to the church of S. Caterina.² The Pope's first episcopal church, that of Ancona, was richly rewarded every year,³ but the churches which received his chief attention were those of the Eternal City.

The approach of the jubilee year 1750 afforded a particular incentive for the restoration of various churches.⁴

An extensive scheme of this nature had been undertaken at the Pope's command in the first year of his reign, and the cost of it he had partly borne himself. At S. Maria Maggiore, the glorious church of the Virgin crowning the summit of the Esquiline, the south-east portico, a work of Pope Eugene III., was threatening to collapse.⁵ The task of erecting in its

¹ A. GATTI, *Catalogo del Museo di S. Petronio*, Bologna, 1893, 30 *seqq.*, for the "reliquario detto della passione". Cf. KRAUS, *Briefe*, II, and *ibid.*, 88, for Aldrovandi's plan for a façade for S. Petronio.

² *Report from Rome of October 21, 1747, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

³ MARONI, *Lettere*, 727 *seqq.*, 737, 742 *seqq.*, 744, 749, 753, 763 *seq.*, 772, 777, 781, 783 *seq.*, 786 *seq.*, 788 *seq.*, 790, 792.

⁴ Cf. *Avviso of October 4, 1749, Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich; MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome. For the complete rebuilding by Cardinal Quirini of his titular church, see ZAMBARELLI, *SS. Bonifacio e Alessio nell' Aventino*, Roma, no year of publication, 141. For the later restoration of S. Luigi de' Francesi, see HEECKEREN, II., 523.

⁵ See Thun's *report of 1741, mentioned below, p. 158, n. 1. On December 26, 1740, Thun had *reported: "Ascenderanno a 20,000 scudi le propine che per le dette chiese [in Portugal] appartengono al papa, il quale ha ordinato, che si depositino, volendo formare un capitale per metter mano alla fabbrica della facciata della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore." State Archives, Vienna. Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 205, according to whom a further 30,000 scudi were set aside for S. Maria Maggiore. Cf. also *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 281 *seqq.*, and *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 447 *seqq.* In a letter to the Marchesa Camilla Caprara Bentivogli of December 23, 1744, the Pope reckoned that 80,000 scudi had already been spent on S. Maria Maggiore and that 50,000 more

place a new façade consisting of two galleries, one above the other, was entrusted to Ferdinando Fuga, who until his departure for Naples in 1750 held the position of Papal architect to which he had been appointed by Clement XII. The foundation stone of this new structure was laid by Benedict XIV. on March 4th, 1741.¹ In the lower gallery the eight fine antique columns of granite were re-erected. In order to preserve in the façade as far as possible the valuable mosaics of the early fourteenth century, Fuga created the upper gallery, with the loggia from where the Pope was to give his blessing on the feast of the Assumption, this being placed in such a position in front of the old façade as to preserve the old mosaics. For the embellishment of the façade and porch, statues and reliefs were commissioned by the Pope from the best-known sculptors of the day: Giuseppe Lironi, Filippo della Valle, Carlo Marchionni, Agostino Corsini, Carlo Monaldi, Giambattista Maini, Pietro Bracci, the Frenchman Michelangelo Slodtz, and the Fleming Peter Verschaffelt. Simultaneously with these works, which were completed in 1749,² the ancient basilica underwent a thorough restoration, in the course of which the pavement was renewed in places, the ceilings of the aisles were decorated with stucco work, and, unfortunately, the choir was lowered and the tabernacle of the high altar, a gift of Cardinal Estouteville's, was replaced by a new one.³ On the roof of the baldacchino, which is borne

would be necessary. See B. MANZONE, *Frammenti di lettere inedite di Benedetto XIV.*, Brà, 1890 (Nozze Publ.), IV., n. 2.

¹ *The Pope proceeded in state to S. Maria Maggiore "e vi ha fatta la funzione di porre la prima pietra al nuovo portico che vi si fa a spese di S. S^{ta} essendosi demolito l'antico da' fundamenti perchè minacciava rovina." Thun's report of March 4, 1741, State Archives, Vienna. For the ceremony, see *Cod. Vat., 8546, pp. 1 seq., Vatican Library.

² D. TACCONE-GALLUCCI, *S. Maria Maggiore*, Roma, 1911, 83. Over the principal entrance in the portico is a tablet inscribed: "Benedictus XIV . . . 1753," and over the inner portal another: "Bened. XIV. . . . 1750."

³ Cf. LETAROUILLY, *Édifices*, text, 613 seq., 617 seq., 624 seq.;

by four ancient columns of porphyry wound around with garlands of gilded bronze, rise four angels sculptured in marble by Pietro Bracci, with palms and lilies in their hands. Above them is a gilded crown held aloft by two putti.¹ The high altar itself was also renewed by order of the Pope; his marble table rests on a bronze-gilt porphyry basin that was thought to be the sarcophagus of the patrician Johannes, the founder of the church.²

Finished in 1750,³ this restoration is said to have cost over 300,000 *scudi*. The character of antiquity formerly possessed by the Basilica Liberiana has undoubtedly been impaired, if not actually obliterated by it. This was realized by many observers at the time,⁴ including the Pope himself, who imparted his opinion to his architect with his customary

LAVAGNINO-MOSCHINI, *S. Maria Maggiore*, 41; FORCELLA, XI., 92 *seqq.*; ADINOLFI, *Roma*, II., 178 *seq.*; JOZZI, *Storia di S. Maria Maggiore*, Roma, 1904, 16; TACCONE GALLUCCI, 90 *seqq.*, 117; *Boll. d'arte*, 1915, 22, 140, 147 *seqq.*; BRAUN, *Altar*, II., Munich, 1924, 240. For the sculptures in the decoration of the vestibule, see TITI, 250 *seq.*; MORONI, XII., 125 *seqq.*; NIBBY, *Roma moderna*, I., 384; DOMARUS, 8, n. 2. For Bracci's statue of Humility and Maini's companion piece, Virginity, see DOMARUS, 28 *seqq.*; *cf. ibid.*, 31 *seq.* for Bracci's marble relief representing the Council which was held in S. Maria Maggiore in 465. See also C. GRADARA, 48 *seq.*, 53 *seq.*, 103. For Verschaffelt's putti, see BERINGER, 27 *seqq.*

¹ DOMARUS, 36; GRADARA, 62 *seqq.*, 105, and *tav. XIX. and XX.*

² LETAROUILLY, 625. *Cf. Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 176. Later, Bianchini submitted his history of S. Maria Maggiore, in manuscript, to the Pope, who advised him to have it printed; see Cardinal Albani's *letter of May 17, 1755, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

³ *Cf.* the inscriptions in FORCELLA, XI., 95 *seqq.*

⁴ “ *Nel giorno di S. Tomaso, il Papa volle consagrar la gran Tribuna di S. Maria Maggiore fatta di nuovo, sostenuta da quattro gran colonne intiere di porfido coll'urna compagna. In tale congiuntura fu scoperto il soffitto e le navate laterali terminate di abellire di stucchi et indorature e di motivi in simetria. Fatto

frankness.¹ Nevertheless he not only entrusted him with the designing of a new wing and cemetery for the hospital of S. Spirito,² but saw to it that he was given the task of erecting

un calcolo della spesa fatta dal Papa in rinovare questa Basilica nella facciata e palazzo laterale, nel spiccolire e ridurre a simetria le colonne, capitelli e basi, nel sbassare e rifare il coro, pavimento, ara massima, navate et altri infiniti lavori, si trova che passano li 300^m scudi. Molti però desideravano e piangevano quella venerabile e santa antichità così scomposta e sproporzionata come era, de tanti magnifici abbellimenti et ornamenti." MERENDA, *loc. cit.*

¹ According to CARACCIOLLO, 84, Benedict's words were " Non abbiamo motivo di gloriarci troppo di quest' opera; potrebbe credere taluno che noi fossimo impresari di teatro: giacchè sembra essere una sala da ballo ". See MAGNI, *Storia dell'arte ital.*, III., Roma, 1901, 603; BIASIOTTI, *La basilica Esquil.*, Roma, 1911, 22.

² See MERENDA, **Memorie*, who relates that " Considerando poi che l'Ospedale di S. Spirito in tempo di influenze e specialmente nell' estate non haveva luogo per ricevere tanti infermi, li quali perciò dovevano porsi nei granari con incomodo degl'infermi e dei serventi, per consiglio del card. Gentili, che n'era visitatore, ordinò la fabrica del nuovo braccio sontuoso, e nello scavare le fondamenta fu trovata una cassa nella quale si contenevano due corpi vestiti, l'uno d'huomo più grande del naturale, e l'altro di donna ben piccola, senza alcun segno di cristianesimo, et avendosi voluti estrarre, andarono in polvere le vesti e le ossa, restando una catena d'oro con alcune gioie al collo della donna e sopra il coperchio dell' urna le lettere G. I. P. IIII. in caratteri romani, che diedero molto esercizio alli belli ingegni per interpretarli ". *Bibl. Angelica*, Rome. Cf. the inscriptions in FORCELLA, VI., 448 *seqq.*, 452 *seqq.*, which mention also the restoration of the Palazzo del Commendatore. The cost amounted to 100,000 *scudi*; see HEECKEREN, I., 241. For the laying of the foundation stone of the new building by the Pope, see **Cod. Vat.*, 8545, pp. 245 *seqq.*, Vatican Library. The wing erected by Benedict XIV. was pulled down in 1908, when the new Ponte Vittorio Emanuele was being constructed; nothing remains but the portal with its inscription. Cf. CANEZZA in *Atti d. Accad. "Arcadia"*, I. (1917), 164, and in the *Corr. d'Italia* of June 5, 1928.

a new church, S. Apollinare, for the German College. To this church too the Pope presented a splendid high altar at his personal expense.¹ In the valley between the Cœlius and the Esquiline, not far from the Lateran, was the church of SS. Petrus and Marcellinus, who were martyred in the reign of Diocletian ; it was on the point of collapse, and Benedict had it rebuilt by the Marchese Girolamo Teodoli.² The old church of S. Michele in Borgo was restored in 1756.³

The restoration of his old titular church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme was entrusted by the Pope to Domenico Gregorini. This Romanesque basilica, notwithstanding various improvements and additions made in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, had retained in the main its ancient character, but it was now to lose it almost entirely. Only the picturesque campanile was left untouched. The interior was embellished in the latest fashion by Gregorini, assisted by Pietro Passalacqua. Of the twelve stately columns of granite which stood in the nave, four were converted into piers ; the ceiling was replaced by a new one, with a painting by Corrado Giaquinto ; and the character of the apse was completely

¹ FORCELLA, VII., 523 ; STEINHUBER, II², 144 *seqq.* ; HEECKEREN, I., 397 ; GURLITT, 526 ; BRINCKMANN, *Baukunst*, 113. Ant. Pennachi *reported to Uhlfeld on April 20, 1748, that on the following day the Pope would consecrate S. Apollinare, " ch'è riuscita bella, ma non a proporzione della spesa, perchè Sua Beat. di propria borsa ha spesi 50,000 scudi per incrostare l'altare maggiore di fini marmi e di metalli." State Archives, Vienna. In the church are the Pope's coat-of-arms and an inscription on red marble with bronze-gilt keys.

² *Avvisi of April 11, May 2 and 30, 1750, Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich, according to which the cost amounted to 30,000 scudi. An *Avviso of July 22, 1752, records the completion of the exterior of the church, and *one of December 16, 1752, records the completion of the whole (*ibid.*). Cf. FORCELLA, XII., 398. To the church of S. Lorenzo in Damaso Benedict XIV. presented a new altar ; see *Cod. Vat., 8545, pp. 85 *seqq.*, Vatican Library.

³ FORCELLA, VI., 273.

altered by stucco decorations and the erection of an altar-ciborium in the manner of Bernini. The old portico was replaced by Gregorini with an oval vestibule with a surrounding passage and a curved and boldly projecting front, which comprised an order of large pilasters and was crowned with statues,¹ including one of John the Evangelist, of classic simplicity and dignity.² The work was commenced in 1741 and was finished in 1744. The Cistercian abbot of S. Croce, Raimondo Besozzi, presented the Pope with a history of the basilica in which he observed that a majesty and splendour had been given to the building which would astound anyone who had known it in its former condition.³

Paolo Posi's various works of restoration in the interior of the Pantheon were unsuccessful,⁴ and still more unfortunate

¹ BESOZZI in the work mentioned below (n. 3), 42 *seqq.*, 48 *seqq.*; S. ORTOLANI, *S. Croce in Gerusalemme*, Roma, no year of publication, 22, 28, 35 *seq.*, 45 *seqq.*; BRASIOTTI in *Bollet. Parroch. A.*, II. (1913), No. 18; BRAUN, *Allar*, II., 240. Cf. also JUSTI, *Winckelmann*, II., 143; GURLITT, *Barockstil*, 534; THIEME, XIV., 578.

² BERINGER, 30. Here also (28 *seqq.*) are illustrations of Verschaffelt's relief in stucco, four putti with the instruments of the Passion, in the interior of the church.

³ R. BESOZZI, *La storia della basilica di S. Croce in Gerusalemme*, Roma, 1750, in the preface. According to MERENDA (**Memorie*) Benedict XIV. was not of the same opinion: "terminata l'opera con spesa eccessiva ne fu assai mal contento avendo guastata la venerabile antichità di quella chiesa con una porcaria moderna come si diceva" (Bibl. Angelica, Rome). According to the letter to the Marchesa C. Caprara Bentivogli mentioned above (p. 157, n. 5), the cost amounted to 100,000 scudi.

⁴ JUSTI, II., 140; EROLI, *Iscrizioni del Pantheon*, 277. Cf. *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 271. CARACCILO (130) praises the restoration of the Pantheon: "Il di fuori divenne più maestoso e di dentro più lucido," and the many English visitors to Rome had congratulated the Pope on this restoration! Details of the works are recorded in the **Avvisi* of September 27, 1755, and October 9, 1755 (plan for a "cupolino sopra il Pantheon" to protect it against the weather!), Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich.

were the alterations made in 1749 to S. Maria degli Angeli. It was the Pope's desire to build a chapel there to the memory of Blessed Niccolò d'Albergati; Luigi Vanvitelli selected for its site the former entrance, which was therefore walled up. In consequence, the arrangement of this magnificent structure, a work of Michelangelo's, was completely distorted. The imposing nave, originally the central apartment of the Baths of Diocletian, Vanvitelli turned into a transept; the choir was made into a chapel of St. Bruno; and the entrance was moved to the west side. For the sake of symmetry eight columns of brick and stucco were set up in the new nave which were supposed to resemble the eight antique columns of red syenite in the central apartment of the baths.¹

In 1735, in the reign of Clement XII, there had been a recrudescence of the rumour originally started in the time of Innocent XI.,² that the cracks which had appeared in the dome of St. Peter's would lead to the collapse of this architectural marvel. At the end of 1740, Benedict XIV., very soon after his accession, set up a commission composed of Cardinals Amadori, Lanfredini, and Rezzonico, for the purpose of making a minute examination of the whole structure. Their opinion was that no danger threatened Michelangelo's work.³ Since, however, the disquieting talk went on, the manager of the Fabbrica di S. Pietro, Monsignor Olivieri,⁴ had a fresh

¹ NIBBY, *Roma moderna*, 331 *seqq.*; LETAROUILLY, *Édifices*, 657 *seqq.*; GURLITT, 538. For Michelangelo's building, see our account, Vol. XVI., 443 *seqq.*

² Cf. our account, Vol. XXXII, 35.

³ MIGNANTI, II., 133 *seqq.*; the periodical *Roma*, II. (1924), 402.

⁴ MERENDA (**Memorie*) records for the year 1752: "Era morto in Pesaro Msgr. Olivieri, Canonico di S. Pietro et Economo della Fabbrica. La Basilica di S. Pietro deve molto e molto alla affezionata attenzione di questo Prelato, il quale, oltre varie spese fattevi del proprio, fece serrare molti buchi e spiragli d'aria e porte, rendendola calda l'inverno e commoda l'estate, dove prima era impraticabile in ogni tempo, a fece ornare, dipingere et ordinare le grotte nella maniera che ora si vedono come una galleria." Biblioteca Angelica, Rome.

examination made, under the direction of the architect of the Fabbrica, Luigi Vanvitelli, which resulted in the same conclusion. In spite of this, Benedict XIV. was still apprehensive, and in the autumn of 1742 the stability of the colossal structure was tested yet again by the architects Domenico Gregorini, Ferdinando Fuga, Pietro Ostini, Nicola Salvi, and Vanvitelli. They reported with absolute assurance that there was no cause for alarm and that the cracks meant nothing more than that the structure had settled; the same effect had been produced in other domes, in that of Florence Cathedral, for example. This opinion was confirmed by the highly reputed mathematicians Ruggero Boscovich, the Jesuit, and Thomas le Seur and François Jacquier, of the Order of Minims, who were consulted by the Pope in the early part of 1743. Desirous of taking every possible precaution, Benedict then sought the advice of the famous Professor of Mathematics at Padua, Giovanni Poleni, making him acquainted with all the consultations and the numerous reports which had previously been published and which differed as to the measures to be taken for the future security of the structure.¹ In the end the Pope decided to take the advice of Poleni, for whom he had a very high regard and who demonstrated with considerable perspicacity that the cracks were caused by the lateral pressure of the upper components.² His proposal was that the dome should be strengthened by more of the iron rings which had been affixed to it in the time of Sixtus V. This work was accordingly carried out under Vanvitelli's supervision in 1743-44.³

¹ MIGNANTI, II., 134 *seqq.* Cf. GURLITT, 534; FREY, *Michelangelo-Studien*, Vienna, 1920, 99 *seq.*

² G. POLENI, *Memorie istoriche della gran Cupola del Tempio Vaticano*, Padua, 1748, who cites all the writings on the dome of St. Peter's that had appeared up to his time but consistently ascribes the damage to a structural defect. Cf. NAVIER, *Mechanik der Baukunst*, translated by Westphal-Föggl, Hanover, no year, 176. Praise of Poleni in FRESCO, *Lettere*, XVIII., 64.

³ MIGNANTI, II., 136; VOSS, 631, 651; DURM, *Renaissance in Italien*, 72; E. PUCCI in the periodical *Roma*, II. (1924), 402

It was also Vanvitelli who was responsible for the enrichment with gilded stucco of the vaulting of the three tribunes in St. Peter's.¹ In 1746-47 new copies in mosaic of paintings by Pietro Bianchi and Pierre Subleyras were made under the superintendence of the painter Pier Leone Ghezzi for the altars of SS. Basil and Chrysostom.² Afterwards, other altarpieces were replaced by mosaic copies, the originals in every case being transferred to S. Maria degli Angeli.³ As the bells installed by Innocent VI. had cracked, Benedict XIV. presented the church with a new one, which he consecrated himself.⁴ Other gifts made by the Pope to the basilica of the Princes of the Apostles took the form of gorgeous vestments, several costly antependia, six silver candlesticks and a cross, and the same gilt urn which is still used for laying before the Confessio the newly blessed pallia.⁵

Maria Clementina Sobieski (d. 1735), the wife of the pretender to the English throne, James III., was given a particularly handsome monument in St. Peter's, at the beginning of the left aisle, over the door leading to the dome.

seqq.; FREY, 100 *seq.*; PLATNER, II., I, 208. Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 52 (for the costs).

¹ MIGNANTI, II., 121, with information about further works of restoration.

² THIEME, XIII., 540.

³ KRAUS, *Briefe*, 57. An *Avviso of October 15, 1757, relates that "as the famous picture by Batoni, 'The fall of Simon Magus,' could not be executed in mosaic, as the Pope would have wished, he presented it to S. Maria degli Angeli." Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich.

⁴ *Cod. Vat., 8545, pp. 161 *seqq.*, Vatican Library. MERENDA (*Memorie*) notes for the year 1753: "Msgr. Costanzo nuovo economo della fabrica fece in questo tempo levare la balaustrata di marmo posta d'intorno alla guglia della piazza di S. Pietro postavi in tempo di Papa Innocenzo XIII." *Loc. cit.*

⁵ The vestments and *paliotti* are kept in the treasury of St. Peter's. One of the *paliotti* is illustrated in *Annuaire Pontif.*, 1913, 565. The museum at Parma has a "palmetta pasquale" of Benedict XIV.'s. His famous altar-veil with embroidery in relief is still used on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul.

It cost the Pope 18,000 *scudi*. The memory of so pious a queen, her good husband, and their worthy children deserved to be cherished, wrote Benedict to Cardinal Tencin.¹ The imposing monument was designed by Filippo Barigioni ; its sculptures were executed by Pietro Bracci. Maria Clementina was the third woman to be given a tomb in St. Peter's, the two former being Matilda of Tuscany and Christina of Sweden. This honouring of the queen, whose faith had been the cause of her dying in exile, was indirectly a protest against England's falling away from the Church.²

It was also under Benedict XIV. that St. Peter's acquired some of its finest statues of saints : in 1744, St. Bruno, perhaps the best sculpture ever made by the Frenchman Michelangelo Slodtz ; in 1745 and 1754, St. John of God and St. Teresa, by Filippo della Valle ; in 1755, St. Vincent de Paul, by Bracci, and St. Joseph Calasanctius, by Maini's pupil, Innocenzo Spinazzi ; in 1756, St. Girolamo Miani, also by Bracci.³

A noble work which Clement XII. had left his successor to finish was the construction of the Fontana Trevi. The sculptors Salvi and Maini failing to agree on the decorative statues and reliefs, the Pope commanded the fountain to be made without them for the time being.⁴ By June 1742 the marble

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 175.

² DOMARUS, *Bracci*, 26.

³ See *Cracas* in the respective years ; DOMARUS, 2, 7, 8, 38, 40 ; JUSTI, II., 135. Actuated by a sense of duty, Benedict XIV. saw to it that Cardinals Davia and Tanara had monuments erected to them in S. Lorenzo in Lucina and S. Maria della Vittoria respectively.

⁴ The decorative statuary was completed in the reign of Clement XIII. ; see GRADARA, *Bracci*, 78 *seq.* For the work done under Benedict XIV., see the series of sketches beginning with the year 1740 in *Arte e storia*, 1912, 271 *seq.* According to the letter to the Marchesa C. Caprara Bentivogli mentioned on p. 157, n. 5, the cost was 60,000 *scudi*. It was only for this structure and for the rock-monument in the garden of Montecavallo that the Pope drew on the funds of the Apostolic Chamber ; in every other instance he defrayed the cost himself. (*ibid.*)

surround of the basin and the steps ascending to it had been finished, and on a blazing day in August of the following year, before a dense concourse of spectators, the waters of the Aqua Virgo, brought from the hills many miles away, flowed for the first time over the massive blocks of stone piled up as if by the hands of Titans, and fell foaming into the lower basin.¹ After the inscription *Perfecit Benedictus Pont. Max.* had been affixed, in July 1745, the Pope paid a visit of inspection to this, the largest and most famous of all the Roman fountains,² from which it is the custom to drink when leaving Rome, in accordance with the old tradition that to do so ensures the traveller's eventual return to the Holy City.³

In the garden of the Quirinal, which was still the official residence, Benedict XIV. had a casino built, where he could entertain his learned friends without restraint.⁴ It was a building remarkable for its dignified simplicity and was decorated with paintings by Batoni and Pannini.⁵ In the

For the restoration of the fountain, see FEA, *Acque*, 10 seq. A fountain in the Via Collatina bears an inscription of Benedict XIV.'s dated 1753.

¹ *Cracas*, 1742, No. 3882, 1743, No. 4068.

² *Cracas*, on July 4 and 11, 1744; cf. DOMARUS, 50. JUSTI (II., 143), in reply to those who found the inscription too emphatic, rightly observes: "Nowhere else should we assent with such goodwill to the Popes' self-praise in lapidary style as here, where following the example of their unbaptized predecessors, even those patriarchs who founded empires, by sinking wells they pour out 'rivers of living water'." Cf. JUSTI, *Briefe aus Italien*, 249.

³ There is no written evidence until the nineteenth century of the custom (still practised, especially by German visitors) of drinking from the Fontani Trevi on leaving Rome, but there is an earlier Roman tradition; see NOACK, 357.

⁴ Cf. CARACCILO, 91.

⁵ A picture of the Casino, which cost 12,000 scudi (see Benedict's *letter to the Marchesa C. Caprara Bentivogli mentioned above, p. 157, n. 5), is included in the painting (in the museum at Naples) of the meeting of Benedict XIV. with Charles III.; see *L'Arte*, XII., 21; OZZOLA, *Gian Paolo Pannini*,

gallery of the Quirinal was displayed the costly porcelain presented by King Charles III. as the first products of the factory which he had established at Capo di Monte, near Naples, in 1743.¹ They were considered by experts to be

Turin, 1921, tav., 7. *Ibid.*, tav., 4 and 5, illustrations of the lunette and façade of S. Maria Maggiore on the walls of the Casino at the Quirinal. The ceiling-paintings by Batoni depict two scenes from the New Testament; see BARBIER, *Les Musées et Galeries de Rome*, Rome, 1870, 81; cf. M. DE BENEDETTI, *Palazzi e Ville Reali d'Italia*, 21, 64, 68 *seqq.*; FORCELLA, XIII., 163.

¹ The first consignment was accompanied by an autograph letter from Charles III. (dated Naples, 1745, July 27; see *Princ.*, 172, p. 21, Papal Secret Archives), to which the Pope replied on August 10. With reference to Charles's statement that he was sending these "primizie" as "tributo", he observed: " *Questa è una specie di primizie, non dissimile da quella, che Moisè intimò al popolo eletto che dovesse fare al sacerdote, dopo esser entrato nella Terra assegnatagli per sua abitazione da Dio; imperocchè Vostra Maestà ci favorisce delle prime produzioni della sua fabbrica di porcellane poco dopo il suo ritorno più glorioso del primo ingresso, ed assai più specioso per la visibile assistenza del Signore, alla Terra destinatale e mantenutale da Dio per sua abitazione e dominio. Noi siamo benchè indegnamente il Sacerdote, e riconoscendo di non dover ricevere le primizie senza adempire l'obbligo annesso ad esse, che era di pregare Dio per gli offerenti, promettiamo a Vostra Maestà di continuare ad aver memoria di Lei e della sua reale famiglia ne' nostri benchè tepidi sacrifici anche per il sopradetto titolo aggiunto " (*ibid.*, 22). On receiving from Charles in 1746 a "bellissima tazza di porcellana e un bastone col manico pure di bellissima porcellana", the Pope wrote in acknowledgment on January 27: " *È ritornando al regalo che non ci può uscire di mente per la finezza con cui ci è stato fatto, diremo a V. M. di riconoscere in esso, che se Noi amiamo lei come padre, ella ama Noi come figlio, pensando il buon figlio ai bisogni del padre, e conoscendo ancor Noi che la nostra avanzata età ci conduce a poco a poco all'uso del brodo, per cui sarà opportuna la tazza trasmessaci, ed a non lasciare il bastone per poter camminare: per lo che, o bevendo o camminando, saremo necessitati a ricordarci di V. M." (*ibid.*, 45).

superior even to Dresden ware, and the collection here was reputed to be the best in Europe.¹

In the course of time Raffaello da Montelupo's marble statue of the Archangel Michael on the Castel S. Angelo had been badly damaged by weathering and lightning. This conspicuous addition to the huge Mausoleum of Hadrian the Pope had replaced by a bronze statue cast in 1752 by Francesco Giardini from a model made by the Flemish sculptor Peter Verschaffelt.²

¹ " *Non vi è principe che ne abbia altrettanto," Benedict XIV. was already writing to the Marchesa C. Caprara Bentivogli (*loc. cit.*) on December 23, 1744. Vases with the arms of Benedict XIV. were preserved in 1870; see BARBIER, *Les Musées*, 77.

² BORGATTI, *Castel S. Angelo*, Roma, 1890, 159, which also see for the completion of the " Appartamento per il Castellano " begun by Clement XII. For Benedict XIV.'s alteration of the amphitheatre in the Court of the Belvedere, see FREY, *Michelangelo-Studien*, 48. See also NOACK, 45 *seq.*; RODOCANACHI, *St-Ange*, 233; BERINGER, 31. Benedict lent his support to the rebuilding of the convent of S. Agostino (see *Repert. für Kunstwiss.*, 1911, 11 *seqq.*), the fountain in its courtyard being his gift; see FORCELLA, V., 103 *seq.* Reference to the help he gave in the erection of other buildings is contained in the inscriptions *ibid.*, XIII., 191 *seqq.*, and in *Inventario*, 263, 279. For the restoration of the fountain at the Villa Giulia, see LETAROUILLY, Text, 40. His restoration of the city walls is proved by inscriptions (see FORCELLA, XIII., 42 *seq.*), especially the portion between the Porta S. Sebastiano and the Lateran. For the new road from the Lateran to S. Croce, see ADINOLFI, *Roma*, I., 272. Inscriptions with threats of penalties for befouling the streets in *Inventario*, 467, and in MAES, *Curiosità Romane*, III. (1885), 34 *seq.* When the piazza near S. Cecilia was being laid out, the Pope, after reading the architect's report and viewing the site himself, gave more of the public ground than was asked for by the titular of the church, Acquaviva; see Thun's *report of August 19, 1741, State Archives, Vienna. In the Via degli Schiavoni I took down the following inscription: Benedicto XIV. | P. M. quod in haec aedificia veteribus | iam paene collapsis | in ornatiorum ampliorumque formam | iussu et auctoritate | Caroli Rezonici S. R. E.

Another monument of importance in the history of the Church was preserved by Benedict XIV. when he had a true copy made from fragments and old drawings of the mosaics in the middle tribune of Leo III.'s triclinium and commissioned Fuga to erect in its place a new tribune near the Scala Santa.¹ It stands in the street leading to S. Croce, which the Pope had rebuilt at great expense.² Luckily the proposal to restore the venerable basilica of S. Paolo fuori le Mura was not carried out; Benedict confined himself to a careful renovation of the portraits of the Popes, the task being entrusted to the painter Monosili, assisted by the learned Giuseppe Marangoni.³

The base of the column of Antoninus Pius, which had been excavated in the time of Clement XI. and whose principal face displayed the apotheosis of the Emperor and his wife Faustina, was set up by the Pope on the Monte Citorio. A competition was announced for the best suggestion as to how this base was to be surmounted.⁴ Some suggested the

card. | patroni beneficentissimi | recens excitata | aquam virginem in sextante deduci | sua liberalitate concesserit | curante Ferdinando M. de Rubeis | patriarcha C. politano | nationis illuricae [sic] congregatio | largitori munificentissimo | D. N. M. Q. E. | Anno salut. MDCCLIII.

¹ “*Benedetto XIV., di genio naturalmente fabricatore, pochi mesi dopo la sua assunzione al Pontificato aveva posto mano a più fabbriche in un tempo, ciò è ad aprire la gran strada o piazza da San Giovanni a S^{ta} Croce in Gerusalemme, con spianare vigne, empire valli e spianare alture con spesa grandiosa, come si vede, e terminata la piazza, fece copiare al naturale il celebre Triclinio e lo pose, ove ora si vede.” MERENDA, **Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome. The **Avvisi* of March 25 and May 6, 1752, record the Pope's intention “di rendere in linea diritta la strada Papale” near S. Andrea della Valle. Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich.

² NOVAES, XIII., 261, XIV., 156. Cf. DAVID in the *Röm. Quartalschrift*, XXXI. (1923), 139 seqq.

³ I. MARANGONIUS, *Chronologia Rom. Pontif. superstes in pariete basil. S. Pauli apost.*, Romae, 1751; NOVAES, I., 3 seqq., XIV., 154; *Papers of the British School*, IX., 174 seqq.; WILPERT, *Mosaiken*, II., 563 seq.

⁴ Thun's *report of May 18, 1743, State Archives, Vienna.

granite column that lay in the courtyard of the Curia Innocenziana,¹ others a statue of Justice and Peace. As no agreement could be reached, either on this point or on the site of erection, the matter was left in abeyance.²

In 1748, during the strengthening of the foundations of a house near S. Lorenzo in Lucina, there was brought to light the great obelisk of the sun which had been mentioned by Pliny. On the advice of Costantino Ruggieri, Benedict XIV. had it completely excavated, having no desire, as he playfully remarked to Cardinal Tencin, to have the reputation of being a "Gothic" Pope. Owing to scarcity of funds, however, the credit of restoring this monument, which had been broken into three pieces, had to be left to his successor.³

The Pope's treatment of the Colosseum was a great benefit to the city. Situated in a sparsely populated neighbourhood, the labyrinthine passages and dungeons of this gigantic building had long been used as a place of retreat by gangs of ruffians. For this reason, in 1675, under Clement X., the outer arches had been walled up and the interior enclosed for the performance of the Stations of the Cross. Later, however, after being severely damaged by the earthquake of 1703, in the time of Clement XI., the building was again neglected. President de Brosses suggested in 1739 that the portion lying over against the Monte Celio should be pulled down and that

¹ This column was used by Pius IX. for the monument in the Piazza di Spagna commemorating the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

² CERROTI, *Lettere di artisti*, Roma, 1860, 49 seq.; JUSTI, II., 140. Under Pius VI. the pedestal was taken to the Vatican Gardens, under Gregory XVI. to the Villa of the Giardino della Pigna (see G. DE FABRIO, *Il Piedestallo d. Colonna Antonina*, Roma, 1844), and in 1855 it was moved to its present position; see HELBIG, I³, 74.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 405; *Lettere d'uomini illustri*, 85. The obelisk was written about by G. Poleni; see LOMBARDI, VI., 37. A " *Commento sull' obelisco di Campo Marzo ", by Ridolfino Venuti, dedicated to Cardinal Quirini, in Cod. Vat., 9024, pp. 181 seqq., Vatican Library.

the remainder should be restored to its original condition. "The arena," he wrote, "would make a fine open space, and would not half a tidy Colosseum be better than a whole one in this dilapidated state? And then, ye noble Romans, why not set up in the middle of the space so created a great fountain, or even make a lake there and revive the ancient *nau-machia*?"¹

Benedict XIV. was not in the least inclined to adopt the plan put forward by the French free-thinker. In 1743 he devoted a considerable sum of money to the restoration of the enclosing walls; in the following year he issued an edict forbidding the misuse of the ruins under pain of penalty; and on the approach of the jubilee year he decided² to renew the measures taken in 1675 and to preserve from ruin Rome's most imposing monument of antiquity by consecrating it to the memory of the sufferings of Christ. A simple cross was set up in the middle of the arena and the fourteen Stations of the Cross which surrounded it were restored; the latter were consecrated by the Vizegerente Ferdinando de' Rossi. The devotion of the Stations of the Cross took place every Friday and Sunday, two hours before the Ave Maria: it was conducted by the Lovers of Jesus and Mary, a confraternity founded at the time, to which the Pope presented the Stations in 1752.³ In Lent especially, when they were conducted by a Franciscan, the devotions were attended by large crowds.

¹ See BROSSES, *Lettres* (tr. *Briefe*), II., 190 *seqq.*

² On December 13, 1749; for the decision, which was taken as the result of a memorial presented by Leonardo da Porto Maurizio, see PRINZIVALLI, *Anni Santi*, 181 *seq.*, who consulted the text of the decision preserved in the Capitoline Archives.

³ P. COLAGROSSI, *L'anfiteatro Flavio nei suoi venti secoli di storia*, Florence, 1913, 217 *seqq.* Cf. CLEMENTI, *Il Colosseo*, Roma, 1912, 203 *seqq.*; BARTOLI, *Cento vedute di Roma antica*, Florence, 1911, Nos. 17 and 18; BABUCKE, *Kolosseum*, 40, 47, 52 *seq.* A splendid engraving by Piranesi shows the stations which, as Justi (II., 142) correctly observes, "fell victims to the neo-Italian fanaticism." Since 1919, at least, the beautiful custom of performing the Stations of the Cross here has been revived.

At the end of the jubilee year, on December 27th, 1750, a service of this nature was held in the Colosseum by Leonardo da Porto Maurizio, a Franciscan who was highly esteemed by Benedict XIV. Here where human creatures had been sentenced to torture and death to indulge a savage lust, Leonardo preached with eloquent words the sufferings of Him who had freed the world from such atrocities.¹ The Pope gave 2,500 *scudi* for the maintenance of the Cappella della Pietà, which was set up in the inner arches facing the Lateran.² From time to time the interior of the Colosseum was used as if it were a church. Thus on September 19th, 1756, the Pope's Vicar General, Cardinal Guadagni, celebrated High Mass in the arena, with a general Communion in which thousands participated.³

As with the Colosseum, the name of the learned Pope is inseparably connected with the collections in the palaces on the Capitol, the statues adorning which he had restored.⁴ Firmly convinced that the masterpieces of ancient art ought not to be at the mercy of the whim of private owners, Benedict enriched the Capitoline Museum with magnificent donations. Although in other directions scarcity of money forced him to be careful, in this matter his generosity was unbounded. In Rome, he said, ruins were riches ; one had only to look around a little and one found treasures.⁵ By tightening up, in 1750, Clement XII.'s ban on exportation,⁶ he kept control of

¹ *Opere compl. di S. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio*, IV., Venice, 1868, 52 seq., 393 seqq. Cf. B. INNOCENTI, *S. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio. Prediche e Lettere*, Quaracchi, 1915, p. x.

² *Avviso of May 5, 1735, Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich. Here also was set up the large inscription, the text of which is in COLAGROSSI, 21.

³ COLAGROSSI, 222.

⁴ Cf. RODOCANACHI, *Capitole*, 178 seq.

⁵ CARACCILOLO, 75.

⁶ *Avviso of January 17, 1750, Cod. ital., 199, *loc. cit.* A list of the licences issued by Benedict XIV. for the export of works of art is given by BERTOLOTTI, *Esportazione di oggetti di belle arti da Roma*, in the *Rivista Europea*, 1877, II., 724.

everything that was brought to light in the course of excavation.¹ Further, he seized on every opportunity of making acquisitions on favourable terms. Thus he entered into negotiations with the Bishop of Piacenza with a view to obtaining the bronze tablet of the Emperor Trajan found in Velleia.² From Duke Francis III. of Modena, to whose persistent lack of money Dresden owes its picture gallery, he bought the pick of the sculptures from the Villa d'Este, most of them originating from Hadrian's villa at Tivoli. Year after year the Capitoline collection was increased, either by presents made to the Pope by Cardinals and others³ or by purchases. As early as 1741

¹ Cf. FEA, *Miscell.*, II., Roma, 1836, 208 *seqq.*; HAUTECEUR, 57. An *Avviso of September 2, 1752, mentions antique finds in Frosinone, which were brought to the Capitol. *Avvisi of September 30 and October 7, 1752, record the discovery of rooms with paintings and mosaics near the Pyramid of Cestius, which were to serve as models for a room in Cardinal Valenti's villa. *Avviso of March 20, 1756: Excavations outside the Porta Maggiore. *Avviso of April 24, 1756: Finds near the Palazzo Bolognetti (Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich). A *report from Rome of September 14, 1748: "Nella continuazione del cavo si fa a S. Maria Maggiore, è stato ritrovato un superbo bagno sotterraneo con un mosaico molto bello ed intatto con tutti li suoi acquedotti di piombo." Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

² C. MASNOVO, *La tavola alimentare di Velleia, Benedetto XIV. e G. du Tillot*, in *Bollet. stor. Piacent.*, VIII. (1913), 3, in which four letters from the Pope to the Bishop of Piacenza are published.

³ FORCELLA, I., 84; RODOCANACHI, *Capitole*, 161. For the antiquities presented by the Bishop of Spalato, see MARONI, *Lettere*, 752, 755, 758 *seq.* In the catalogue of the Capitoline Museum published in 1750 (see below, p. 176), which was acquired by the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele from the estate of Cardinal Besozzi, is a handwritten note referring to the "Piede di Fontana" found near S. Croce in Gerusalemme and mentioned on p. 62 of the catalogue: "*Questo piede fu ritrovato quando io Card. Besozzi ero abbate di S. Croce e fu poi donato alla S^{ta} di N. S. Benedetto XIV. nell' occasione che si portò a S. Croce e donò per un suo chirografo alla chiesa il stradone et apertura

the Pope bought the Boy struggling with a goose ; in 1743 he bought the double herma of Epicurus and his favourite pupil Metrodorus (discovered during the building of the front of S. Maria Maggiore) ; in 1744 the figure of a girl arbitrarily entitled "Flora", the Harpocrates, and the Amazon sarcophagus ; in 1746 the Satyr with a bunch of grapes, in *rosso antico* ; in 1749 the group of Cupid and Psyche found on the Aventine ; in 1752 the famous Venus, probably identical with that found in the reign of Clement X., opposite S. Vitale. In 1753 he paid 5,000 *scudi* for twelve of the best marble statues in the Villa d'Este, including the Praxitelean Satyr, the Cupid bending his bow, two Amazons, a Venus, and the Tormented Psyche.¹ From the Vatican Gardens the Pope ordered to be brought to the Capitol the tombstone of Titus Stuilus Aper, from Araceli the Capitoline fountain-mouth, from S. Sebastiano fuori le Mura the pedestal dedicated to Jupiter Sol Serapius, from Albano the reliefs of events in the life of Jupiter, from Nepi the sarcophagus with the education of the boy Bacchus,² from Anzio mosaics.³ It would be tedious to enumerate the many other statues, busts, sarcophagi, bas-reliefs, mosaics, columns, and inscriptions which were taken to the Capitol at this period. A particularly valuable acquisition was the fragments of the ancient plan of the city of Rome which were discovered in the reign of Pius IV. behind the church of SS. Cosma e Damiano, came into the possession of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, and were first described by Bellori in 1673. After difficult negotiations with the Spanish Ambassador Acquaviva, Benedict XIV. obtained them for

con la piazza che da S. Croce porta a S. Giov. Laterano, sito che prima era signato e comprato dalla S^{ta} Sua era stato fatto aprire nella maniera che ora si vede. Furono nella stessa occasione donati a N. S. alcuni libri."

¹ JUSTI, II., 26, 135. Cf. HELBIG, I.³, 426, 431, 445 *seq.*, 447, 474, 477, 480, 485, 487, 488, 490, 491, 494, 497 ; RODOCANACHI, *Capitole*, 160 ; HEECKEREN, II., 268. For the purchase of hermæ, see AMELUNG, II., 502 *seq.*

² HELBIG, I.³, 419, 422, 423, 434, 485, 488.

³ FORCELLA, I., 84.

his museum from Charles III. of Naples at the end of 1741¹; they were then immured in the walls of the staircase.²

The catalogue of the Capitoline Museum compiled by Ridolfino Venuti and published in 1750 by the keeper, Marchese Giovanni Pietro Locatelli, informs us how the treasures were exhibited.³ The most important were on the upper floor. In the first room, called the Stanza del Vaso after a splendid marble vase found near the tomb of Caccilia Metella, were the most valuable reliefs, the sarcophagi with the Muses, the Battle of the Amazons, the myth of Endymion, and the Fate of the human soul. The second room, named after the Hercules slaying the Hydra, contained the Cupid and Psyche, the tormented Psyche, the Drunken old woman, the statues of the children with the snake, the mask of Silenus, and the Goose; in the centre of the room was the seated Agrippina, on the wall the *Lex Regia*, before which Cola di Rienzo had proclaimed the sovereign powers of the Roman people and which Gregory XIII. had had removed hither from the Lateran. Facing each other in the central room, which was lit by three windows, were the bronze statues of Innocent X., the builder of the palace, and Clement XII., the founder of the museum. Of the many ancient sculptures assembled here, notably the Juno Cesi, the Vestal Virgin, and the

¹ Acquaviva's *reports to Villarias of September 14, October 26, November 9, December 7 and 9, 1741, Archives of Simancas. The inscription of the town plan in FORCELLA, I., 82.

² *Avviso of November 14, 1750, Cod. ital., 199, *loc. cit.*

³ "Museo Capitolino o sia Descrizione delle statue, busti, bassirilievi, urne sepolcrali, iscrizioni ed altre ammirabili ed erudite antichità, che si custodiscono nel Palazzo alla destra del Senatorio vicino alla chiesa d'Araceli in Campidoglio," Roma, 1750. Cf. JUSTI, II., 139. In the Appendix of the catalogue, pp. 69-71: "Nota de' preziosi e rari marmi, che dalla munificenza del regnante Sommo Pontefice Benedetto XIV. sono stati al Museo donati." An *Avviso of January 16, 1751, states that the museum has doubled itself under Locatelli (Cod. ital. 199, *loc. cit.*). Cf. PLATNER, II., 2, 328 *seq.*, 333 *seq.*; H. MACKOWSKI, *J. G. Schadow*, Berlin, 1927, 74 *seq.*

Amazon of Sosicles, five statues were placed in the middle of the room as being of particular importance: the dying Gaul, the youth from Hadrian's villa, wrongly named Antinous, an Egyptian priest from the same place, Harpocrates, the god of silence, and the Discus thrower, restored by Monot as a warrior. The adjoining Room of the Philosophers contained busts of philosophers and other men, some famous, some obscure. In the Room of the Imperial Busts, which were arranged in chronological order, were the colossal statue of the youthful Hercules, chiselled out of green touchstone, and the so-called "Flora". The passage and a room opening off it were also filled with antique statues.

On the ground floor was the Egyptian Museum inaugurated by Benedict XIV. in 1748, its nucleus being the Roman imitations of Egyptian statues found in the shrine of Serapis (Canopus) in Hadrian's villa at Tivoli. Here also was the statue of Anubis, the guardian of graves, found in 1750 in the Villa Pamfili at Porto d'Anzio.¹

The Capitoline Museum was open to all for the purpose of study. In 1753 anyone who wished to take a plaster cast had first to obtain a special permit.² One of the greatest of the scholars who took advantage of the opportunity of studying the treasures here was Winckelmann, who arrived in Rome in 1755 and was continually visiting the museum. "This is Rome's treasure trove of antiquities, statues, sarcophagi, busts, inscriptions, and the like," he wrote to Dresden on December 7th, 1755, "and one can wander about here quite freely from morning till night." It was probably here that the great archæologist conceived the outlines of his history of art.³

A comprehensive publication on the Capitoline Museum had appeared before Venuti's. Its author, the Abbate Guido

¹ The Egyptian monuments in the Capitoline Museum were transferred to the Museo Egizio in the Vatican by Gregory XVI. in 1836; see MARUCCHI, *Museo Egizio Vaticano*.

² *Avviso of September 29, 1753, Cod. ital. 199, *loc. cit.*

³ JUSTI, II., 136.

Bottari, born in Florence in 1689, had worked in that city for ten years on the lexicon of the *Crusca* before coming to Rome, where he was employed in arranging the Corsini collections of paintings and engravings.¹ He had long been acquainted with Lambertini,² who, on becoming Pope, made him the keeper of the Vatican Library³ and preferred him to a canonry in S. Maria in Trastevere. He was entrusted by the Pope with the re-editing of Bosio's *Roma Sottoterranea*.⁴ The first two volumes of his description of the Capitoline Museum appeared in 1750. He stated here with pride that Benedict XIV. was increasing the collection daily.⁵ A third volume followed in 1755, a fourth in 1782. He was assisted in this work by Pier Francesco Foggini, Giuseppe Querci, and Niccolò Foggini.⁶ The engravings were supplied by Giuseppe Vasi, who published also a separate volume of engravings of "the glories of ancient and modern Rome".⁷

Benedict XIV.'s desire, however, was to make the venerable Capitol a centre, not only of ancient but also of modern art. Encouraged by his art-loving Secretary of State, Valenti, he decided to establish a picture gallery in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, a project which had already been considered by Clement XII.⁸ The idea was first entertained by Benedict in 1744. His motive was to prevent the best pictures leaving the country, and with this intention he had already contemplated the purchase of the large collection of paintings owned by the

¹ *Ibid.*, 138 seq.

² P. Lambertini (poi Benedetto XIV.), *Lettere autografe scritte a Msgr. Giov. Bottari 1726-1746, Cod. 32 G. 49, Bibl. Corsini, Rome.

³ *Studi e docum.*, XXIV., 177.

⁴ The work, which had begun under Clement XII., was not a success; see KRAUS, *Roma Sottoterranea*, 14; BUCHBERGER, I., 713.

⁵ *Museum Capit.*, I., 1.

⁶ CERROTI, *Lettere di artisti*, Roma, 1860, 59, 63.

⁷ "Delle magnificenze di Roma antica e moderna, con spieg. istor. del P. Gius. Bianchini," Roma, 1747 and 1752.

⁸ COLASANTI, *La Galleria Capitolina*, Roma, 1910, iv seq.

Sacchetti family.¹ The purchase was effected, and for the reception of the paintings the Pope reserved the room which was built in 1747-48 above the archives of the Capitol.² His second important acquisition consisted in the paintings forming part of the estate of Cardinal Pio da Carpi.³ An inspection of his pictures made by the Pope in the middle of October 1751 convinced him of the necessity to extend the gallery.⁴

A bust of the Pope by Peter Verschaelfelt, with an inscription

¹ MERENDA relates in his **Memorie*: "Essendo il Papa molto dotto et amante della erudita antichità, andava arricchendo lo studio di Campidoglio, eretto da Clemente XII., con molte rarità, e prese fin d'allora il pensiero di erigere incontro all'altro un nuovo studio di pitture insigni per impedire che non escissero da Roma, e diede ordine di trovare il sito proprio per fabbricarvi le sale per collocarvi li quadri. Non si avvide esser questo un suggerimento del Card. Colonna Pro-Maggiordomo a stimolo della sua favorita Dama Patrizi, figlia del Marchese Sacchetti, per indurre poi il Papa a comprare li quadri di quella casa, che andava in rovina." Biblioteca Angelica, Rome.

² "Descrizione delle statue, bassorilievi, busti, altri antichi monumenti e quadri de' più celebri pennelli che si custodiscono ne' palazzi di Campidoglio," ediz. terza, Roma, 1775, 141; RODOCANACHI, *Capitole*, 179. A *report of December 14, 1748 (Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican) states that the "nuova fabbrica" for the gallery was then almost finished.

³ MERENDA, **Memorie*, loc. cit.

⁴ "Il Papa verso la metà del mese [ottobre anno XII°] andò a veder li quadri collocati e disposti nella nuova Galleria in Campidoglio, ma restano ancora da collocarsi altri 150 pezzi, e forse dei migliori della casa Pio, per li quali si cerca il luogo per proseguire la Galleria. Forse e senza forse era più decente e proprio di collocare questi quadri nelle Gallerie di S. Pietro e di Monte Cavallo. In Campidoglio fu ricevuto dal Card. Valenti." (*ibid.*). Cf. HEECKEREN, II., 145 seq.; *Avvisi of January 23, March 29, October 18 and 23, 1751, January 1 and March 4, 1752 (plan sanctioned), Cod. ital., 199, State Library, Munich.

recording his services to art, was set up in the first room in 1752.¹

Cardinal Giulio Sacchetti, who had been legate in Ferrara and Bologna in 1626-31, under Urban VIII., had specialized as a collector in works of the famous school of Bologna. Like his brother Alessandro, he was a close friend of Guido Reni, while Marcello Sacchetti stood in a like relationship with Pietro da Cortona. Cardinal Pio da Carpi's collecting had been done by the painter Giovanni Bonatti, chiefly in Venice.² Of the works purchased by Benedict XIV. for the Capitoline Gallery, nearly 200 in all, a large proportion were of outstanding merit, and most of these are still exhibited in the Capitol.³ Guido Reni is particularly well represented by a Magdalen, a Sebastian, his self-portrait, and the two unfinished pictures of a soul rising to Heaven; Domenichino equally well by a Sebastian and the Cumæan Sibyl; Annibale Carracci by a St. Francis; Ludovico Carracci by a Sebastian; Pietro da Cortona by the Triumph of Bacchus, Alexander and Darius, and the portrait of Urban VIII.; Domenico Tintoretto by a Scourging of Christ, His crowning with thorns, and a Magdalen; Guercino by one of his most famous pictures, the Persian Sibyl. Of the many other works in the gallery the most remarkable are Titian's Baptism of Christ, Garofalo's Annunciation, Caravaggio's Fortune-teller, Paolo Veronese's Rape of Europa, Romanelli's St. Cecilia, Rubens' Romulus and Remus (a delightfully naive group of children), and finally Vanvitelli's charming views of Rome, of the first half of the eighteenth century. As Bottari observed in the third volume (1754) of his edition of Bosio's *Roma Sottoterranea*, all these treasures, together with the antiquities in the Capitoline Museum, would have been scattered far and wide, had it not been for the foresight of Benedict XIV.

¹ Illustrated in BERINGER, plate 6.

² See in this connexion *Cod., 33 A 11, Bibl. Corsini, Rome. Cf. *Arch. Rom.*, XXII., 313, and L. OZZOLA in the *Corriere d'Italia*, 1907, No. 8.

³ AD. VENTURI, *La galleria del Campidoglio*, Roma, 1890.

The Pope was as interested in contemporary artists as he was in the old masters. He used to say with a smile that not having sufficient gravity himself he relied on artists to supply him with it.¹ Unfortunately, however, he was precluded from indulging in a thoroughgoing patronage of art by the lack, not only of financial means, but also of artists of creative ability. Of the architects employed by him only Fuga was outstanding, of the sculptors Bracci and Verschaffelt, of the painters Giuseppe Maria Crespi of Bologna,² Pannini of Piacenza, and Batoni of Turin. And how puny they were compared with the great men of the Renaissance and the baroque period!³

One of the objects of the Capitoline Gallery was to provide models for the students of the academy of St. Luke. The yearly prize-givings at this institution, which was intended to foster the arts of sculpture and architecture as well as that of painting, had been suspended for some time past, but they were now revived. In the jubilee year of 1750 the Pope attended the prize-giving in person. The speech of the day was delivered by the Bolognese Francesco Zannotti. In presenting his report on the prize-winning works he emphasized the Pope's services to art, making special reference to the two collections on Rome's most famous hill. After the performance of a piece of music composed by the musical director at St. Peter's, Nicola Iommella, there followed the distribution of the prizes, which took the form of silver medals with portraits of St. Luke (the patron of the academy) and

¹ MISSIRINI, 228.

² Cf. H. Voss, *G. M. Crespi*, Roma, 1921, 15.

³ JUSTI observes aptly (II., 144) that "In the same way as Batoni's genius was slight in comparison with Carlo Maratta's, Maratta is a mere imitator compared with Domenichino and Guido, to whom Titian and Correggio appear in the light of heroes". Batoni, a friend of Winckelmann and Mengs, wanted to strike out on his own but remained nothing more than an accomplished eclectic, notable only as a portrait-painter; see WOLTMANN-WOERMANN, *Gesch. der Malerei*, III., Leipzig, 1888, 914 *seqq.*

the reigning Pope. The proceedings ended with the recital of poems by members of the Arcadia.¹

Another function which had a stimulating effect on artistic life was the exhibition of pictures held every year in the portico of the Pantheon, under the auspices of the society of virtuosi located there, the opening day being the feast of St. Joseph. From time to time similar exhibitions were held in the church of S. Rocco.²

Up to this time the only institution in Rome where art students could draw from the nude (and then only from male models, by order of the Papal Government) was the French Academy, which had moved in 1725 from the Palazzo Capranica to the Palazzo Nivers-Salviati on the Corso.³ Benedict XIV. and Cardinal Valenti were responsible for the first public institution in Rome to offer facilities for drawing from the nude. It was founded in 1754 and was situated in a circular room beneath the Capitoline picture gallery, near Vignola's arch and facing the Monte Tarpeo. In this Accademia del Nudo instruction was free and was regulated by an ordinance of the art-loving Cardinal Girolamo Colonna. The sessions lasted three hours and took place in the evening, under the supervision of an academician of St. Luke. Not only Italians but Frenchmen, Spaniards, and Germans were to be seen here, among the last being Raphael Mengs, who had returned to the Church in 1754.

Benedict's love of art, great as it was, was exceeded by his zeal for learning. Ten years before he was raised to the see of Peter, when still Archbishop of Ancona, he wrote to the archæologist Giovanni Bottari, "The duty of a Cardinal, and the greatest service he can render to the Holy See, is to attract

¹ *Avviso of May 30, 1750, Cod. ital. 199, *loc. cit.*

² NOACK, *Deutsches Leben*, 55.

³ See *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 94 *seqq.*, and the *Descrizione delle statue*, etc., 164 *seq.*, mentioned above (p. 179, n. 2). Cf. NOACK, 55; HAUTECEUR, 43 *seq.*, 51. According to CARACCILO (101), Benedict XIV. said of the French Academy: "Ringraziamoli con tutto il cuore che così vengono con la loro emulazione a suscitare de' grand' uomini."

learned and honest men to Rome. The Pope has no weapons or armies ; he has to maintain his prestige by making Rome the model for all other cities." ¹ Benedict XIV. put the ideas of Lambertini into practice ; he attracted scholars to the Eternal City from every part of Italy and did his best to encourage learning with every means at his disposal.

One of the first steps he took was to establish in Rome four academies, each of which was given a meeting-place, a definite membership, a patron, and a secretary. The first academy, that of the Councils, which was regarded as a revival of the one founded by Ciampini in 1671, met in the Propaganda ; the second, devoted to church history, in the convent of the Oratorians near the Chiesa Nuova, where Baronius had written his famous *Annals* ; the third, for liturgy and rites, in the college of the *Pii operai* near S. Maria ai Monti ; the fourth, for Roman history and antiquities, which was supposed to work in the tradition of Livy, on the Capitol.

The respective patrons of these academies were Cardinals Landi, Tamburini, and Portocarrero, and the " Gran Conestabile " Lorenzo Colonna. The secretaries were Niccolò Antonelli, Giuseppe Bianchini, Niccolò Panzuti, and Antonio Baldani.²

The number of the members was twelve in each case, except for the academy of Roman antiquities, where it was fourteen. The original members were nominated by the Pope but were expected to fill subsequent vacancies themselves. Meetings took place monthly, on Mondays, and there was a printed list of the subjects to be discussed.³ Lectures could be delivered

¹ JUSTI, II., 132.

² " Notizia delle Accademie erette in Roma per ordine della S. di N. S. Papa Benedetto XIV.," Roma, 1740. Cf. RENAZZI, IV., 277 *seqq.*, 280 ; JUSTI, II., 133 *seqq.* ; NOACK, 55. For Baldani and Contucci, see JUSTI, II., 122 *seq.*, 124 *seq.* ; for Bianchini, see CABROL, *Dict. d'archéol.*, II., 1, 837 *seqq.* Brief reports on the first sessions in January 1741 in *Arch. stor. ital.* 4, Series XX., 369.

³ " Argomenti de' discorsi da farsi nelle Accademie, negl'anni 1742, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56."

in Italian as well as in Latin, except in the Propaganda, where only Latin was allowed, on account of the presence of foreign-speaking students. After the Pope had invited the academy of church history to hold a session in his presence in the Quirinal, in 1745,¹ the other academies were similarly honoured. The seating arrangements were such that the Pope could not be seen by any of the academicians except the lecturer. After the session the lecturer was presented to the Pope, who spoke with him and the others on the subject of the lecture. Enthusiasm was stimulated by commendation and awards.² To maintain the scholarly character of the meetings and to confine them to purely intellectual matters, even Cardinals were excluded unless they were members of an academy. The sole exception was the highly popular Cardinal York.³

Among the academicians were many of the most distinguished scholars then living in Rome: the Dominicans Orsi and Mamachi, the Augustinians Berti and Giorgi, the Jesuits Contucci, Faure, Lazzeri, Azevedo, and Giuseppe Rocca Volpi, the Theatines Paciaudi and Vezzosi, the Minorite Pietro Bianchi, the Minims Jacquier and Le Seur, the Somaschi Antonio de Lugo and Giovan Francesco Baldini, the two Assemani, Buonamici, Gaetano Cenni, Giuseppe Garampi, Michelangelo Giacomelli, Giovan Pietro Locatelli, Bottari, Francesco Antonio Vitali, Francesco Vettori, and Ridolfino

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 213. The *lectures given in the presence of the Pope by Ridolfino Venuti "sulle supplicazioni degli antichi" (January 23, 1747) and "degl'edili e loro ufficio" (July 12, 1746) in Cod. Vat. 7292, pp. 217 *seqq.*, 224 *seqq.*, Vatican Library; the *lectures given in the presence of the Pope by G. Bianchini "sopra l'antico Foro Boario" (September 1, 1749), "sopra gli antichi spettacoli dei gladiatori" (July 23, 1750), and "sopra la curia e sua situazione" (September 6, 1751) in Cod. Vat. 8113, pp. 1 *seqq.*, 42 *seqq.*, 113 *seqq.*, *ibid.* The following appeared in print: G. CENNI, *Dissert. sopra varii punti interess. d. istoria eccl., pontificia, canonica e romana*, ed. B. Colti, Pistoia, 1778 *seq.*

² CARACCILOLO, III.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 364.

Venuti, who preceded Winckelmann as commissioner of Papal antiquities.¹

The study of Roman antiquities had, it is true, for long been flourishing in the Eternal City, but Benedict XIV. had the joy of seeing church history also, especially the history of the Popes, take on a new lease of life during his reign. A number of works of solid worth were published on these subjects, such as the two-volumed biography of Paul IV. by the Theatine Bartolomeo Carrara and the copious biography of Sixtus V. by the Franciscan Casimiro Tempesta. Pollidorus' monograph on the noble Marcellus II., which is still useful, was written at Benedict XIV.'s instigation, and the edition of Gregory XIII.'s important records by the Jesuit Giampietro Maffei was dedicated to the Pope.² This was the case with many other historical works: Domenico Giorgi's biography of Nicholas V.,³ Borgia's Life of Benedict XIII.,⁴ Antonio Fonseca's monograph on S. Lorenzo in Damaso,⁵ Marangoni's history of the Sancta Sanctorum,⁶ Giuseppe Garampi's article on a silver coin of Benedict III.'s,⁷ Marescotti's work

¹ RENAZZI, IV., 179; JUSTI, II., 84 *seqq.*, 123, 126, 128, 134, 255 *seqq.*, 339. Cf. *ibid.*, 316 *seq.*, for Mgr. G. M. Ercolani's visit to the Accademia delli Infecondi. For Garampi's participation, see DENGEL, *Garampis Tätigkeit*, 2.

² For these works, cf. our account, Vol. XIV., II, n. 2, 489 *seqq.*

³ Rome, 1742. In the dedication of this work, which deals especially with the encouragement given to art and letters by the first Pope of the Renaissance, the author draws a parallel between Nicholas V. and Benedict XIV. D. Giorgi's '*Istoria del dominio temporale d. S. Sede sopra il ducato d'Urbino, il Montefeltro e la Massa Trabaria', which was begun at the instigation of Clement XII. and was dedicated to Benedict XIV. in 1740, has remained unprinted (Cod. Vat., 7758-7761, Vatican Library).

⁴ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV., 108 *seqq.*

⁵ FONSECA, *De Basilica S. Laurenti in Damaso libri tres*, Romae, 1745.

⁶ *Lettere d'uomini illustri*, 70.

⁷ *De nummo argenteo Benedicti III.*, Romae, 1749. Cf. DENGEL, *Garampi*, 3.

on the Fontana Trevi,¹ the large collection of Bulls and Briefs relating to St. Peter's,² the edition supervised by the Jesuit Lesley of the Mozarabic liturgy,³ and the first volume, edited by Joseph Aloisius Assemani, of the famous *Codex liturgicus Ecclesiæ universæ*.⁴ The Pope took a personal part in the last-mentioned work, also in the *Kalendaria Ecclesiæ universæ*, edited by Joseph Simonius Assemani,⁵ and in the new edition of the works of Leo I.

This last work had been undertaken at the Pope's instigation. It was necessitated not only on scholarly but also on ecclesiastical grounds, the critical supplements of Quesnel's edition of 1675 showing distinct traces of their author's Jansenistic and anti-Papal doctrines. The brothers Pietro and Girolamo Ballerini, who were commissioned with the work, were granted by the Pope the unusual privilege of access to the relative Vatican manuscripts not included in the library. He also obtained for them the requisite collations from other libraries. They were thus able to say, in dedicating the work to the Pope, that it was his edition they were laying before him.⁶ It was worthy of its exalted patron, for it was a truly model production.

¹ Mgr. MARESCOTTI, *De Aqua Virgine commentarii ad Benedictum XIV.*, 1742, *MS. in the Bibl. Corvisieri, Rome, which unfortunately was sold in 1904.

² *Collectio Bullarum eccl. basilicæ Vaticanæ*, t. I., Romæ, 1747.

³ *Missale mixtum sec. regulam b. Isidori dictum Mozarabes* ab A. Lesleo S.J., 1755.

⁴ Rome, 1749. By 1758 two more volumes had appeared. — Cf. also Gerdil's (afterwards Cardinal) 'Einleitung zum Studium der Religion' (see *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, V, 361); '*Seminarii Vaticanani descriptio, eiusdem hoc tempore status a Raphaelè Sindone rectore,' Cod., 701 (1367), University Library, Bologna; Aemil. Naise, O.S.B. (Weißenstephan-Freising), '*Isagoge ad reparandam optatam pacem et unitatem fidei in Germania', Cod. 599 (1105), *ibid.*

⁵ Vol. I. (Romæ, 1755) was dedicated to the Pope.

⁶ See the dedication of the first volume, which appeared in Venice in 1753, the second following in 1756, the third in 1757.

A new edition of the letters of Innocent III. was entrusted by the Pope to Domenico Giorgi and, after he had died, to the learned Dominican Tommaso Maria Mamachi,¹ who dedicated to the Pope the first volume of his annals of the Dominican Order.²

Mario Guarnacci's biographies of the Popes and Cardinals³ owed more than their origin to Benedict XIV. They were to be a continuation of the work by Ciaconius and Oldoin, which ended with Clement IX. For this purpose Guarnacci was granted access to the archives.⁴ Benedict found time to give him precise instructions as to the desired method of treatment, which was not to be too detailed. Before the work was printed he had it examined by other scholars, and he himself corrected his own biography, which stopped short at his election to the Papal see.⁵ The work thus ends with the year 1740. Avoiding every kind of polemic, it aimed at being a reliable and factual exposition. A work that may suitably be read in conjunction with it is that by Ridolfino Venuti, still much esteemed, on the medals of the Popes, from Martin V. to Benedict XIV. The Minorite Antonio Pagi the younger continued the epitome of the history of the Popes which his uncle had commenced. He was allowed to dedicate his work to the Pope and was encouraged to complete it by a Papal commendatory Brief.⁶ The General of the Dominicans,

Adopting the suggestion made in the dedication, Benedict XIV., in 1754, gave to Leo I. the title of "Doctor Ecclesiæ" in the Liturgy.

¹ *Lettere d'uomini illustri*, 58.

² *Annales ord. Praedic.*, I., Romæ, 1756.

³ Cf. RENAZZI, IV., 334 *seq.*

⁴ GUARNACCI, I., Præf. XII. The first volume was dedicated to the Pope.

⁵ HEECKEREN, II., 101.

⁶ " *Dilecte fili etc. Pater Procurator Generalis vestri Ordinis ad Nos detulit quatuor antiquos Libros de Gestis Romanorum Pontificum et etiam Librum quintum a te nuper editum, et Nobis dicatum, una cum aliis muneribus, quae omnia Nobis, tuo nomine, dono dedit. Libenti animo omnia accepimus, tibi que

Tommaso Ripoll, was also of service to historiography with his edition of the great Bullarium of his Order ; on falling ill in his old age, he was frequently visited by the Pope.¹ Benedict cordially approved of the Spanish Government's intention to set up an academy for the study of church history in the Iberian peninsula, and he placed at its disposal the relative archival sources.²

To cultivate the historical sense among young students, especially future priests, the Pope caused to be set up in the Roman College chairs for church history and liturgy and provided for their future.³

Every effort was made by Benedict XIV. to prevent the decline of the Roman University, of whose condition he had gained first-hand knowledge when he had been its Rector, under Clement XI.⁴ In the very first year of his reign he showed his interest in it by celebrating High Mass in the university church on the feast of its patron, St. Ivo, on May 16th, 1741, and by listening to a speech delivered in the Great Hall. A preliminary measure of reform followed in 1744, when the privileges of the consistorial advocates in

ex corde gratias agimus. Lectioni quinti Libri proximo mense Octobris operam dabimus, et ex nonnullis quae cursim legimus, videmus te strenuam operam navasse, egregie facinora Nostrorum Praedecessorum tuis scriptis illustrando. Ea profecto merebantur egregios scriptores ; sed nullus, praeter te, Patrumque tuum, repertus est, qui rem pro dignitate perficeret. Perge itaque, dilecte fili, nec manum a calamo et atramento submoveas : sed, quae supersunt, adimple. Scias Nos esse tui amantissimos, semperque promptos, ut rem gratam oblata occasione pro te faciamus. Tibique interea Apostolicam Benedictionem imperitimus." Datum Romae apud S. Mariam Maiorem die 19 Septembris 1748. Pontificatus Nostri Anno nono. *Epist. ad princ.* 241, p. 35, Papal Secret Archives.

¹ MERENDA, **Memorie*, loc. cit.

² *Bolet. de la Acad. de la Historia*, LXVIII. (1916), 76 seqq., 418 seq., 435 seqq.

³ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, I., 527 seq.

⁴ RENAZZI, IV., 64.

regard to the rectorate were extended. Undesirable rivalry for the occupation of the professoriates was lessened by the Pope's reserving for himself the nomination of deserving scholars.¹

Botany being of particular interest to Benedict XIV., he appointed a second professor in this subject and, the Botanic Garden having fallen into decay, he had it renovated and made himself acquainted with its condition by a personal visit.²

In his reform of the university, in the course of which considerable obstacles were encountered, the Pope adopted the proposals made by the Rector, Argenvilliers, for whom he had a very high regard, and by the jurists Filippo Pirelli and Niccolò de' Vecchi. The principal innovations were set down in an autograph letter of October 14th, 1748. They consisted in the regularization and increase of the lectures, in the stipulation that every professor would have to confine himself to the department to which he had been appointed, in the renewal of Leo X.'s decree that the professors were to devote themselves exclusively to their professorships and were to deliver their lectures regularly, and in the establishment of a special fund under the control of the Rector for the Botanic Garden and for anatomical and physical research.³

The reform aroused dissatisfaction in many quarters. The professors in particular were indignant that their lectures, but not their salaries, had been increased. Another defect in the reform, the omission to excite the students' zeal, was made good by the awarding of titular honours to those who had pursued their studies with success for three consecutive years.⁴

On Cardinal Valenti's suggestion, two new professorial chairs were instituted in the autumn of 1748, one for higher mathematics, the other for chemistry, a branch of the natural sciences in which considerable research was then beginning to

¹ *Ibid.*, 200 seq., 207, 450 seqq.

² RENAZZI, IV., 220 seqq.

³ *Ibid.*, 212 seqq., 214 seqq., 453 seqq. For Leo X.'s reform, see our account, Vol. VIII, 272.

⁴ RENAZZI, IV., 218 seqq., 224.

be made.¹ Nor did it escape the many-sided Pope that the teaching of physics at the Roman University no longer corresponded to scientific progress.² On the retirement of the Theatine, Orsi, he accordingly appointed in his place a distinguished Frenchman, Jacquier, a Minim. The Pope also saw to the establishment of a chemical laboratory and a physical institute, and it was to him that the university owed the renovation of its "anatomical theatre". On a visit to the university on the feast of St. Ivo, 1751, he was able to see with his own eyes that these improvements had been duly carried out. The visit was repeated five years later, though on this occasion the eighty-year-old Pope was no longer able to mount the steps to the Great Hall, and the reception took place in the laboratory on the ground level.³

Professor Giovanni Carafa, whom Benedict had appointed to the chair of church history, was entrusted with the task of compiling the history of the university. This was dedicated to the Pope,⁴ and the author was rewarded with the bishopric of Mileto. He was succeeded in the professorship by the learned Theatine, Francesco Vezzosi, who edited the works of Cardinal Tommasi. Other professors who owed their appointments to the Pope were the botanist Francesco Marotti, the chemist Luigi Filippo Giraldi, and the famous Latinist Benedetto Stay, who was an intimate friend of the Jesuit Boscovich.⁵ Ruggero Giuseppe Boscovich, a Dalmatian from Ragusa, famous as a mathematician, astronomer, and philosopher, was a professor at the Roman College, where among other objects that he showed the Pope was the model of the observatory he had designed.⁶

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 280 *seqq.* For chemistry, see the works mentioned in Herder's *Konversationslexikon*, II.³, 635.

² See the works mentioned in Herder's *Konversationslexikon*, VI.³, 1597; LOMBARDI, II., 216 *seq.*, 218.

³ RENAZZI, IV., 222 *seqq.*, 228 *seqq.*

⁴ IOS. CARAFA, *De gymnasio Romano*, Romæ, 1751.

⁵ RENAZZI, IV., 262, 270, 281.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 302. *Re Boscovich*, see SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, I., 1828 *seqq.* The mathematician H. Poincaré referred to him

A service to physical geography was rendered by Benedict XIV. when he commissioned Boscovich and his fellow Jesuit, Maire, to measure a degree of the meridian and to prepare a detailed map of the Papal States.¹ To promote the study of the natural sciences, experimental physics in particular, he reorganized the old Accademia dei Lincei and called it the academy "dei Nuovi Lincei".²

In his solicitude for Rome Benedict XIV. did not forget

as the precursor of modern ideas on the composition of matter. His *Theoria philosophiæ naturalis* has been reprinted (with an English translation by J. M. Child) by the Open Court Publishing Co. (London and Chicago, 1923). Cf. *Arch. stor. Lomb.*, 5th series, L 243; SIR WILLIAM THOMSON, *On Boscovich's Theory*, in the *Report of the British Association*, LIX., 494-6; *Nature*, XL. (1889), 545-7; *Smithsonian Institution, Annual Report*, 1889, Washington, 1890, 435-9. The discoverer of oxygen, Priestley (d. 1804), agreed with Boscovich's ideas on the nature of matter; see *Dict. of Nat. Biography*, XLVI., 361. This, of course, does not preclude the possibility of Boscovich's ideas on the subject being contradicted.

¹ R. J. BOSCOVICH ET C. MAIRE S.J., *De litteraria expeditione per pontificiam ditionem ad dimetiendos duos meridiani gradus et corrigendam mappam geographicam iussu Benedicti XIV. P.M.*, Romæ, 1755. "Il Boscovich," reports MERENDA in his **Memorie*, "fu incaricato dal Papa, che ne somministrava la spesa, di girare per tutte le provincie dello Stato minutamente, misurare le altezze e le distanze dei luoghi per elevarne poi una carta geografica esatta di tutti [luoghi ?] e delle provincie in particolare, come ancora per rettificare il meridiano di Roma." *Bibl. Angelica*, Rome. Further details in the **Avvisi* of September 19, 1750, April 10, 1751, April 1, 1752, Cod. ital. 199, State Library, Munich. The Pope's plan of inducing the Protestant princes, through the medium of the nuncio Stoppani, to adopt the Gregorian calendar, had to be given up owing to the circumstances being too unfavourable. The "**Memoria sopra l'affare del Calendario*", dated November 1, 1744, in which the advantages of the new calendar were set out, is in the *Nunziat. di Vienna*, 37, Papal Secret Archives.

² MORONI, I., 43.

his native city of Bologna. His dissatisfaction with the state of studies there¹ was an added incentive to him to arouse among the Bolognese a desire for knowledge. In commissioning (and financing) Mauro Sarti to write a history of the University of Bologna² and Costantino Ruggieri to write another of the Bolognese bishops,³ he was actuated not only by his interest in history but also by the hope that the memory of its great past would revive scholarship in Bologna. The same purpose was to be served by his generous presents of books and coins to the Istituto delle Scienze in Bologna. As an expression of its gratitude, the Accademia degli Inquieti, which was located in that institution, called itself the Benedettina.⁴

Too noble to be influenced by prejudice, Benedict gave his consent to two learned women being appointed professors at Bologna: Maria Gaetana Agnesi, who was famous as a mathematician, and Laura Caterina Bassi, who was making a name for herself as a philosopher.⁵

Benedict had already endeavoured to revive the practice of anatomical studies in Bologna when he was archbishop there, pointing out that a decree of Boniface VIII.'s of the year 1299 which apparently forbade it was directed only against the profanation of corpses. Among other points he made in the course of his argument was that Francis of Sales, when afflicted by a serious illness in his youth, had given directions for his body to be handed over to the anatomists in the event of his illness proving fatal.⁶ When he was Pope,

¹ Cf. KRAUS, *Briefe*, 84, 108, 116, 123, 126.

² Cf. the preface in M. SARTI e M. FATTORINI, *De claris archigymnasii Bonon. professoribus a sæculo XI. usque ad sæculum XIV.*, Bononiæ, 1769-1772, iterum ed. C. Albicinius et C. Malagola, t. I., Bononiæ, 1888.

³ *Lettere d'uomini illustri*, 58.

⁴ Cf. F. CAVAZZA, *Le scuole dell' antico studio Bolognese*, Milano, 1896, 286; LE BRET, *Magazin*, IX., 546 seq., 556. Cf. EDITH E. COULSON JAMES, *Bologna* (London, 1909), 84, 190.

⁵ Cf. CAVAZZA, *loc. cit.*, 289; LOMBARDI, II., 57, 132. For M. G. Agnesi, see the monograph by L. Angelotti (Milano, 1900).

⁶ GIOV. MARTINOTTI, *P. Lambertini e lo studio dell' anatomia in*

Benedict founded a chair of surgery¹ in Bologna and handed over to its occupant, Professor Molinelli, the valuable surgical instruments given him by Louis XV.² In 1752 he spent a considerable sum in founding an anatomical museum, and in 1757 he sent there a collection of anatomical preparations.³ His chief concern, however, was that the Istituto delle Scienze should have a well-stocked library, and in this he found a sympathetic helper in the friend of his student days, Cardinal Filippo Maria Monti, who bequeathed to the institute his uncommonly useful collection of 20,000 volumes. On the Cardinal's death, on January 17th, 1754, Benedict saw to it that these treasures were duly conveyed to their proper destination.⁴ The gift was all the more pleasing to the Pope inasmuch as he too had decided in 1750 to make over his private library to the institution. On February 2nd, 1754, he wrote to Bologna that it would have given him great pleasure to visit his native city once again and to have consecrated its cathedral, but that the building operations had lasted too long and he was retained in Rome by the burden of his years and his financial straits. As a proof that he had not forgotten his native city he was now sending it as a substitute Cardinal Malvezzi, who was to be its archbishop, while to the institute he was sending his beloved and, if he might so call it, his famous library, which was worth more than his person.⁵ In July 1755 the printers were given instructions to supply the

Bologna, in *Studi e mem. p. la storia dell' Univ. di Bologna*, II., Bologna, 1911, 148, 151 seq., who rectifies the information given by Töply in the *Handbuch der Gesch. der Medizin*, edited by Neuburger and Pagel, II., Jena, 1903, 227, as though the ordinance of 1747 applied to Rome.

¹ See the Motu Proprio of August 23, 1742, in *Lettere, brevi e chirogy. di Benedetto XIV. per la città di Bologna*, I., Bologna, 1749, 258 seq.

² CAVAZZA, 285, 290.

³ MARTINOTTI, 173, 174, 175.

⁴ E. GUALANDI in *Studi e mem. p. la storia dell' univ. di Bologna*, VI., Bologna, 1921, 76, 81 seq.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 100.

library of the institute with presentation copies, and in the autumn of that year, presuming that he was not to live much longer, he had a beginning made with the transport of his private library to Bologna. A year later he commanded the library of the institute to be thrown open to the public.¹

It was a truly regal gift that Benedict was making to his native city, for his private library comprised the rarest and best works from the most diverse countries, and all were magnificently bound and stamped with the family arms.² It also included about 450 MSS. of historical, literary, artistic, and palæographical value. Among these were the *Codex diplomaticus Bononiensis*, forty-four volumes of copies from Papal archives, which Benedict XIV. had had collected by Costantino Ruggieri, and a MS. of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, of the middle of the fourteenth century, which has been the subject of much discussion recently.³ Rome apart, no other Italian city could boast of such a library as was now possessed by Bologna.⁴ With the books presented by Cardinal Monti and some other acquisitions, it numbered 80,000 volumes and 2,500 MSS.⁵ The statue of Benedict XIV. which was erected by Bologna has disappeared, but his library endowment has endured; the handsome room with its beautiful cases containing so many precious treasures still bears witness to the enlightened vision of the greatest scholar Bologna has produced.⁶

¹ *Lettere, brevi e chirogr. di Bened. XIV. p. l. città di Bologna*, III., 385; GUALANDI, *loc. cit.*, 84 seq.

² GUALANDI, *ibid.*

³ FRATI in Sorbelli, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche di Bologna*, XV., Forlì, 1908, 5 seq. For the Cod. diplom. Bonon., see BLUME, II., 138 seq.; *ibid.*, 143, for the Pope's interest in the manuscripts of the Spanish College. For the Dante MS. see *Esemplare della Divina Commedia donato da Papa Lambertini (Benedetto XIV.)*, edito secondo la sua ortografia, illustrato dai confronti di altri XIX. codici Danteschi inediti e fornito di note critiche da Luca Scarabelli, 3 vols., Bologna, 1870-3.

⁴ HEECKEREN, II., 307.

⁵ *Notizie stor. d. Bibl. univ. di Bologna nel 1898*, 13.

⁶ GUALANDI, *loc. cit.*, 85.

Benedict XIV.'s support of learning was not confined to his homeland of Bologna. It was extended in many other directions,¹ principally in Italy. The number of scholars whom he promoted and encouraged is extraordinarily large.² In the works of many of them he took the greatest interest. He was delighted to receive from the Venetian senator Flaminio Cornaro a copy of his great work on the Venetian bishoprics. In a long Brief he encouraged the author to continue with the work, acknowledged its solidity, and spoke of the benefit which would accrue to the Church therefrom. At the same time, citing a number of examples, he refuted the idea that ecclesiastical matters of this sort ought not to be handled by a layman. He mentioned also that the Bollandists had made use of Cornaro's works for their excellent *Acta Sanctorum*.³ The praise which on this occasion he bestowed on the huge work undertaken by the Belgian Jesuits was a repetition of that contained in the Brief which he had addressed to them on April 3rd, 1751. It was occasioned by the unjustifiable attempt made on the authority of a private letter written by the Pope, to show that his opinion of the *Acta Sanctorum* was no longer favourable. He affirmed that this was far from being the truth and that he had never thought of censoring the work on account of some isolated errors. At the same time he expressed the hope that the Bollandists would be able to finish their enormous task before the end of his pontificate and suggested various improvements

¹ In the University of Coimbra Benedict XIV. founded new chairs of Church History and Liturgy; see NOVAES, XIV., 269.

² In addition to those already mentioned: F. Danzetta, G. de Cattaneo, V. M. Avvocati (Avogadro), B. Beccari, G. B. Bortoli, C. Polini, F. M. Ottieri, Fr. Quadrio, Fil. Scarselli, P. Chelucci, G. Lagomarsini, D. Vallarsi, G. Vita, A. Olivieri, P. L. Galletti, A. Politi, P. Grazioli, Ed. Corsini, A. M. Bandini, G. Lombardi; see LOMBARDI, I., 122, 172, 350; II., 46; IV., 10, 12, 18, 29, 144, 173; V., 150, 265, 305, 312; VI., 79, 87, 91, 118, 175, 205, 216, 244, 276.

³ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 164 *seqq.*

for the volumes which had already appeared.¹ To the Bollandist Johannes Stiltinck, who went to Rome at the end of 1752 for the purpose of further study, he gave the warmest welcome.²

With the greatest Italian historian then living, Ludovico Antonio Muratori, Benedict XIV. had become acquainted in the autumn of 1731 when he was Cardinal of Bologna.³ Muratori expressed his joy that in Benedict God had given the Church a Pope from whom the furthering of scholarship might confidently be expected.⁴ He had heard, he said, with particular pleasure of the institution of the new academies in Rome and of the choice as secretaries of such scholars as Bianchini and Valesio, for men of this type would bring

¹ *Ibid.*, 81 *seqq.* A second *Brief, not yet printed, to Joh. Stiltinck S.J. and the other Bollandists, dated 1748, Jan. 20, was in reply to a letter of November 11, 1747. In it the Pope observes: "Magnam vero semper apud Nos fuisse opinionem, adeoque esse, de ingenti opere "Acta Sanctorum" nuncupato, quod a decessoribus collegii vestris optimo consilio susceptum, atque incredibili labore continuatum, nunc demum vestro studio ac diligentia in hanc amplitudinem, in qua conspicitur, perductum fuit. Ex hoc opere libenter agnoscimus ac profitemur Nobis suppeditata fuisse, si quae sunt eruditorum gustui non inepta in Nostris Libris de Canonizatione Sanctorum alias conscriptis: quorum editioni Bononiae olim factae, alteram nuper addidimus Patavii adornatam, quae et accurata correctione, et complurium rerum utiliter cognoscendarum accessione, priori illi multo antecellit. Haec ut ad vos perferatur, idem Hieronymus [Lombardus S. J.] affirmavit se curaturum. Iidem nunc libri iterum subiiciuntur praelo typographi Romani, qui unica editione tum ipsum opus de Canonizatione Sanctorum, tum alia omnia a Nobis exarata, ac secundis curis retractata, et aucta, complectitur. Vos pergite in Sanctorum monumentis colligendis, illustrandisque, de Ecclesia Dei bene mereri etc. *Epist. ad princ.* 241, fo. 470, Papal Secret Archives.

² His long audience is reported in the *Avviso of December 30, 1752, Cod. ital. 199, State Library, Munich.

³ *Studi e docum.*, XXI., 347. For Muratori's biography, see *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, LXXIV., 333 *seqq.*, 524 *seqq.*

⁴ *Epist. di L. A. Muratori*, ed. Campori, IX., 4057, 4065.

honour and profit to the Holy See. Writing to Bianchini on this occasion, Muratori expressed himself in really memorable words on the subject of church history. If the academy which had been founded for this purpose was to produce good fruit, it must be given the necessary freedom. Certainly the actions of the Popes should be upheld as much as possible, but adulation should be ruled out. Nor should anything be passed off as old and lawful, which was not so. A healthy criticism of books, authors, miracles, legends, and other similar matters should be allowed. "It is better," continued Muratori, "that we ourselves should speak the truth than that we should hear it spoken by our enemies with scorn. Nothing is gained, and much is lost, by pretending that something is true when it is not. I keep before my mind the immortal Baronius, who was often daring in his judgments. Holy Church has no need of lies, thank God. She does not fear the truth. I say this because the people in Rome are sometimes too timid and anxious—an error which is not made by true scholars, who have always and everywhere loved the truth. Praised be God who has given us a Pope who is imbued with these opinions."¹

Benedict XIV. showed himself to be most favourably inclined towards "the father of Italian historical research"; he ranked him more highly than any other Italian writer of the time and he doubted that he had his equal beyond the Alps. The Holy See, he wrote, has need of men like him.² As the aged scholar could not comply with the Pope's desire that he should come to Rome,³ Benedict did what he could to secure his material existence in Modena.⁴ Muratori dedicated to his exalted patron his excellent work *Dei difetti della*

¹ See the letter to Bianchini of November 5, 1740, *ibid.*, IX., 4074. Cf. also the letter *ibid.*, 4091.

² A caustic criticism of the ecclesiastical intelligentsia of the period in a letter of June 30, 1745, in KRAUS, *Briefe*, 27 *seqq.*, and elsewhere; cf. above, p. 187, n. 6.

³ Cf. *Epist. di L. A. Muratori*, IX., 4172.

⁴ Letter to the Marchese d'Ormea of July 31, 1742, in B. MANZONE, *Frammenti di lettere inedite di Benedetto XIV.* (1900) (Nozze-Publ.), II., No. 1.

Giurisprudenza,¹ and in 1743 he sent the Pope through Cardinal Tamburini some notes on the proposed reform of the Breviary, suggesting at the same time that new editions should be brought out of Ughelli's *Italia sacra* and Leandro Alberti's *Italia*.² Benedict repeatedly showed his approval of Muratori through letters and the bestowal of favours, besides sending him copies of his own works.³

In one of his letters of thanks, in August 1748, Muratori announced as a return gift his work on the early Roman liturgy. He wrote also that he intended shortly to send his defence of a Papal letter to the Bishop of Augsburg for examination but that he first wished to submit it for approbation.⁴ Shortly after this occurred an incident which caused much pain to both parties. The Spanish Inquisitor General had ordered the suppression of the history of Pelagianism written by Cardinal Noris of the Augustinian Order, and Benedict XIV., in a confidential letter handed to the Procurator General of the Augustinians, had expressed his disapproval of the prohibition, observing that the works of distinguished writers ought not to be forbidden even though they might contain some erroneous information. By way of example, he mentioned, together with the works of the Bollandists, Tillemont, and Bossuet, the name of Muratori. To the Procurator General's suggestion that the letter might suitably be printed at the head of Noris's works, the Pope replied that it was not to be published yet and that when the time did come Muratori's name was to be omitted. In spite of this the letter was published two days later, at which the Pope was so angry that he forbade the Procurator General ever to enter his palace again.

The publication of the Papal letter was a grievous blow to Muratori. In a letter to the Pope of December 17th, 1748, he

¹ Cf. *Epist. di L. A. Muratori*, X., 4289.

² *Studi e docum.*, XXI., 350.

³ *Epist. di L. A. Muratori*, IX., xvi seq., X., 4311, 4671, XI., xi. seqq., 5046 seq., 5186.

⁴ *Ibid.*, XI., xxi., 5187.

stated candidly, though respectfully, the bewilderment, if not despair, which had come upon him. The unfavourable judgment, he complained, would endure for ever; never would it be forgotten that he had incurred this reproach without being formally condemned, and his errors and demerits would be thought to be greater than they actually were. Relying on the continuance of the favourable attitude that had formerly been taken towards him, he asked that his errors be pointed out to him, that he might retract them and thus by his dutiful repentance obtain forgiveness. In this way the fatherly hand which had inflicted the wound would also bring relief.¹

Benedict XIV. lost no time in rehabilitating this faithful son of the Church, to the latter's complete satisfaction.² In a letter of September 25th, 1748,³ he told him quite frankly of the indiscretion committed by the Procurator General. With regard to the passages to which exception had been taken, he assured him that it was not a question of dogma or discipline but merely of the jurisdiction of the Pope of Rome within his States, concerning which Rome adhered to other principles than those held by Muratori and could not accept as true several assumptions and facts which Muratori had stated. Had they been published by any other author, such matters would have undoubtedly been publicly denounced by the competent Congregation. In Muratori's case, however,

¹ *Studi e docum.*, XXI., 352; *Epist. di L. A. Muratori*, XI., 5203 (cf. XII., 5549); BRAUN, *Ehrenrettung Muratoris durch Papst Benedikt XIV.*, Trier, 1838, 17 seq.

² Cf. the letter to Bianchini of October 6, 1748, *Epist. di L. A. Muratori*, XI., 5213.

³ Printed in GIAN FRANCESCO SOLI-MURATORI, *Vita del provosto L. A. Muratori*, Venice, 1756, 416, and *Riv. Europ.*, VIII. (1877), III., 430. Cf. BRAUN, *loc. cit.*, 18 seqq.; CANTU, *Eretici*, II., 302. Cf. also Benedict XIV.'s letters to Cardinal Quirini of September 4 and November 9, 1748, in FRESCO, *Lettere*, XIX., 183 seqq. In this second letter the Pope especially stated that his censure referred to Muratori's statement concerning the "giurisdizione temporale del Papa ne' suoi stati e suo dominio e tutto ciò concerne l'acquisto di Ferrara".

this step had not been taken, on account of the great affection and respect in which he was held by the Pope.¹ In handing this Brief to a friend, Canon Pier Francesco Peggi, of Bologna, the Pope referred to Muratori as "the light of Italian scholarship".²

Another scholar towards whom Benedict XIV. showed the utmost leniency and indulgence was Scipione Maffei of Verona, who was one of his oldest friends, having been a student with him in Rome.³ As the result of a controversy which had arisen in his native city, Maffei published in 1744 a work on the use of money, in which he subjected the Church's condemnation of interest to a thorough examination. He came to the conclusion that it was not every kind of interest that was condemned by the Scriptures, the Fathers, the Councils, and the Popes but only that which was oppressively high and which was extorted from the poor, and that a moderate interest taken from the rich was not in itself unjust.⁴ This assertion gave rise to considerable discussion.

Benedict XIV. could hardly maintain silence on the subject, especially as the work in question had been dedicated to him. Accordingly, in July 1745, he appointed a commission of Cardinals and theologians, among whom was the Dominican Daniele Concina, to examine impartially the Church's principles in the matter of interest and usury. The report of this commission adhered to the Church's principles, and the Pope confirmed it in an Encyclical of November 1st, 1745. It was stated in the document that "on the one hand the profit obtained from the loan and in virtue of the loan is stamped as

¹ BRAUN, 19 seq.

² KRAUS, *Briefe*, 57. For Muratori's life, cf. TIRABOSCHI, *Bibl. Modenese*, III. and VI. LOMBARDI (IV., 74) was of the opinion that Muratori was too harshly judged by G. Fontanini.

³ See Benedict's *letter to Maffei of October 31, 1744, thanking him for a literary work he had sent him: "Così è, dal 1698 incomincia l'epoca della nostra amicizia." *Epist. ad princ.* 240, p. 195, Papal Secret Archives.

⁴ *Dell' impiego del danaro*, Verona, 1744. Cf. FUNK in the *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschr.*, LXI. (1879), 6 seqq.

usury, so that any loan-interest is shown to be sinful, whether it be large or small, whether it be taken from the poor or the rich, or whether the loan in question be used by the borrower to relieve his financial straits or to enrich himself. On the other hand, the exaction of interest is declared permissible when special titles are attached to the loan which are in no way naturally connected with it and which justify it, or when the investment of capital can be effected in other lawful contractual forms. It is admitted that this may often happen but at the same time the view is rejected that the exaction of a moderate interest is always allowed, whether it be the case of a loan based on special titles or by the application of other contracts. This view is opposed by the Scriptures, the teaching of the Church, and human intelligence, for no one can deny that there are cases in which a man is bound to come to the assistance of his neighbour with a simple loan for which no charge is made. This is the doctrine to be taught, and the putting forward of a contrary doctrine is liable to be censored. Questions in dispute among the theologians and canonists, to which a solution cannot be found, are to be left to the decision of the scholars. These are admonished to beware of extremes, which are always wrong, and in this case consist either in holding the view that any profit drawn from money is unjust and usurious or in being so indulgent as to hold that every form of profit is free from usury; nor are they to consider controversies on the subject of usury mere battles of words, on the plea that interest is demanded on nearly every loan".¹

The Encyclical was couched entirely in general terms; no mention was made of Maffei or his publication. Maffei was so convinced of the correctness of his view that he could not think of retracting it. So far was he, indeed, from doing this that he asked permission of the Pope to bring out a new edition of his treatise. This was granted by the Pope on condition that the text of the Encyclical be inserted as well as the letter in which Maffei sought to show that by no manner

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 328 *seqq.*; FUNK, *Gesch. des Zinsverbotes*, Tübingen, 1901, 67 *seqq.*

of means had he taught the doctrine which had been condemned but rather that he had anticipated the doctrine contained in the Encyclical.¹

Meanwhile the Dominican Concina had made known his intention of dealing with the question of interest in a special article. Benedict had a high opinion of Concina as a theologian but feared that as before he would adopt too immoderate a tone and draw too far-reaching conclusions from the Encyclical. At first, therefore, he was not prepared to consent to Concina's work being printed.² But when the new edition of Maffei's work appeared in 1746 he gave permission for his opponent's work to be published also. He refused, however, to comply with Concina's request that Maffei's work should be censored.³ A few years later the Pope had to compel Concina to retract the unfounded accusations the contentious Dominican had brought against some Jesuits on account of their moral doctrine.⁴ Another occasion on which Benedict decided against Concina was when the latter put forward too rigorous views concerning what was lawful on the stage. Maffei opposed him in a treatise on the ancient and modern theatre, and in a letter to Maffei of October 6th, 1753, the Pope remarked that he had read his defence of dramatic art with satisfaction. Maffei, he said, had defended him too, for his decree on the theatre was not by any means intended to be a prohibition of every comedy and tragedy but only to

¹ FRESCO, *Lettere*, XVIII., 294; HEECKEREN, I., 244. Cf. FUNK, *loc. cit.*, 43 seq.

² HEECKEREN, *loc. cit.*; FRESCO, 296 seq. It appears from a *letter of Concina's to the Pope, dated Venice, 1744, June 24, in which he thanks him for accepting the dedication of his theological textbook, that the Pope had counselled him to be more moderate in his dealings with his opponents (Papal Secret Archives). In a letter of October 18, 1746, the Pope advised Cardinal Quirini not to engage in polemics over Broedersen's work, *De usura* (1743); see FRESCO, *Lettere*, XIX., 159 seq.

³ Cf. FUNK, *loc. cit.*, 48 seqq., 54 seqq.

⁴ HEECKEREN, II., 157, 162; cf. 483.

prevent decency and morality being outraged in the theatre.¹

In a previous letter to Maffei of October 31st, 1744, Benedict had made the remark that the only happy moments in his hard life were when he had the chance to take up a book.² He let fall a similar observation when writing to Canon Peggì of Bologna: "The only relief We get from Our continual and painful labours is when We take a glance at Our library."³ That such an ardent book-lover should be sent new publications from every quarter is not to be wondered at.⁴ Much to his pleasure, the most distinguished writers, not only of Italy but of all countries, vied with one another in keeping him supplied with their newly-published works. Thus in 1754 Giovan Maria Mazzucchelli sent him the first two volumes of his lexicon of Italian authors (a work which is still indispensable) and received the praise he deserved.⁵ The nephews of the archæologist Francesco Bianchini, who had died in 1729, sent him the works, published by themselves, of their famous uncle, who also was praised by Benedict as a noted scholar and a holy priest.⁶ The Jesuit Lazzeri dedicated his edition of Dante to the Pope, knowing how fond he was of reading the works of the "*sommo poeta*" in his leisure hours.⁷

¹ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 159. Cf. also HEECKEREN, II., 323 *seq.*, for Quirini's edicts against the theatre. For Benedict's ordinance, see above, p. 147.

² " *Non avendo altro momento felice in questa nostra miserabile vita che quello in cui ci è permesso il leggere qualche libro." *Divers.*, 173, p. 195, Papal Secret Archives.

³ KRAUS, *Briefe*, 22.

⁴ Cf. CARACCILO, 66. Numerous *letters on this subject in the *Epist. ad princ.*, 239-241, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Mazzucchelli's *letters to Benedict XIV. of September 20, 1754, and January 12, 1758 (sends the fifth volume of the *Epist. card. Polo* and promises to send before long the third volume of his *Scrittori*, which the Pope praised), *ibid.*, 240, p. 217.

⁶ *Briefs to Gasp. and Franc. Bianchini of November 24, 1753, *ibid.*

⁷ Cf. KRAUS, *Dante*, 754, and SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, IV., 1609 *seqq.* Benedict XIV. appointed Lazzeri Corrector of the

Pietro Metastasio, whom Benedict had introduced to the practice of the law in days gone by, in Rome, was invited by him to come to Rome, but the celebrated poet preferred to remain in Vienna.¹ Another highly commendatory Brief was received by the Venetian diplomat, Marco Foscarini, who was also distinguished as a scholar.²

Of German scholars the one who received the greatest recognition from the Pope was Anton Roschmann, the Tyrolese historian, topographer, and archæologist. Almost all the works of this uncommonly industrious investigator were honoured by commendatory Briefs; for example, the "Life of St. Notburga", his studies of St. Cassian, and his writings on the Roman town of Veldidena (Wilten), with which he became the pioneer in the study of the ancient topography of the Tyrol.³

The number of French works which were sent to the Pope was especially large. He did not speak the language but he took great pleasure in reading the masterpieces of French literature; the eloquence of Bourdaloue and Bossuet in particular excited his admiration.⁴ The French ambassadors

Oriental Books and employed him in the reform of the Index. Cf. RENAZZI, IV., 343.

¹ LANDAU, *Italienische Literatur*, 538.

² *Brief of January 16, 1753, *loc. cit.*, 239, p. 174. For the relations between Benedict XIV. and the writer Fr. Benaglia of Treviso, see A. MARCHESAN, *Vita e prose di Fr. Benaglia*, Treviso, 1894.

³ *Briefs to A. Roschmann of December 9, 1752, April 14, 1753, and January 26, 1754, *loc. cit.* 240, pp. 174 *seqq.*, 181 *seq.*; for Roschmann, see *Beiträge zur Gesch. Tirols*, pub. by the Ferdinandeum, II., Innsbruck, 1826, 1 *seqq.*, and *Allg. Deutsche Biographie*, XXIX., 167 *seqq.* With regard to Germany, see also the *Brief of acknowledgment to I. A. Zeidler of June 19, 1756 (*loc. cit.*, 250, p. 11). I. A. v. Ickstatt (*cf. Hist.-polit. Blätter*, LXX., 359 *seqq.*, 585 *seqq.*; *Allg. Deutsche Biographie*, XIII., 740 *seqq.*) sent the Pope one of his writings, accompanied by a *letter dated Ingolstadt, 1757, Jan. 1.

⁴ CARACCILO, 137.

were always suggesting to their king to send the Pope the finest productions of the printing press in the Louvre. Cardinal Tencin and his talented sister rarely omitted to take the opportunity of pleasing the Pope by putting him in the way of some literary novelty or a rare edition. France's foremost writers sent their works to the learned head of the Church ; Archbishop Belsunce of Marseilles sent him his history of his diocese, the Benedictine Remy Ceillier his rare work on ecclesiastical writers, President Hénault his chronology—and Voltaire his *Mahomet*.¹ The tragedy was submitted to the Pope by Cardinal Passionei, who at the time was on very friendly terms with the author,² and later he was handed by Monsignore Leprotti the famous verses which Voltaire had composed for the Pope's portrait :

Lambertini hic est, Romae decus et pater orbis,
Qui mundum scriptis docuit, virtutibus ornat.

In return the Pope sent Voltaire some gold medals, for which the poet thanked him in a most dutiful letter dated August

¹ HEECKEREN, I., xc., 542 *seq.* The Brief to Belsunce in *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 418 *seqq.* Ceillier's *letter accompanying his *Bibl. eccl.* and the resultant commendatory *Brief of September 4, 1751, in Princ. 241. Papal Secret Archives. The learned Bishop of Carpentras, D'Inquembert, also received encouragement from Benedict XIV. ; see MAZZATINTI, *Bibl. di Francia*, III., 18.

² Cf. E. CELLANI, *Voltaire e Passionei*, in *Fanfulla della Domenica*, XXVI. (1904), Nos. 19 and 20, who quotes (from Passionei's collections of material on the Bull "Unigenitus" in the *Miscell. d. Bibl. Angelica*) a bitter satire of Voltaire's on this Papal decree. Voltaire here declaims against Rome, extols the Gallican Church, and scoffs at St. Ignatius, the Jesuits, and the Bull "Unigenitus" :—

Et du Siège de Rome une Bulle émanée,
Traitant l'amour de Dieu de vaine et d'erronée,
De ce premier précepte affranchit les esprits.
Nos prélats, lasches et perfides,
De la pourpre romaine avides,
Reçoivent le dogme inconnu, etc.

17th, 1745, which was handed to the Pope by Cardinal Acquaviva.¹ The medals, he said, were worthy of the age of Trajan and Antoninus and he rejoiced to know that a ruler who was loved and honoured as much as these emperors had been was in possession of medals of such excellence. The couplet was the result of reading the book with which his Holiness had enriched the Church and literature. He was astonished at such a stream of learning remaining undisturbed by the whirlpool of affairs. "Permit me, Holy Father," he continued, "to express the wish of all Christendom and to beg of Heaven that Your Holiness may be gathered as late as possible among the Saints whose canonization You have examined with such diligence and such success. Kissing Your Holiness's feet with the greatest veneration, I ask with the deepest respect for Your blessing."

The unsuspecting Benedict acceded to this request in a letter of September 15th, 1745, in which he thanked Voltaire for the compliments he had paid him. For the sake of saying something else, he added that a French *littérateur* had found fault with the couplet on prosodic grounds, the word *hic* having been used as though it were a short syllable. He himself, however, did not agree with this complaint and cited in Voltaire's support two passages from Virgil which he happened to remember, although he had not read that poet for fifty years.

Voltaire, who felt himself highly honoured, replied in a letter full of flattery on October 10th, 1745. He acknowledged the infallibility of His Holiness, he wrote, in questions of literature as well as in other and more venerable matters, and he marvelled at his knowledge of Virgil. Among monarchs who engaged in writing none were so scholarly as the Popes, but among these there was none who to such an extent embellished scholarship with literary knowledge. He ended with another fulsome compliment: on the election of Benedict XIV. Rome must have called out, "*Hic vir hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis.*"

¹ For this and subsequent correspondence between Benedict XIV. and Voltaire, see the Appendix, No. 5.

That the Pope should have entered into friendly relations with a writer such as Voltaire inevitably led to gossip. When it came to Benedict's ears that an exaggerated importance was being given to the affair, he tried to clear himself in a letter to Cardinal Tencin of February 9th, 1746. He wrote that the letter from Voltaire which accompanied the presentation of his tragedy *Mahomet* was full of expressions of reverence towards the Holy See and the Primacy. Under the impression that the author was not outside the Church, he thought that he ought to reply to him. He had had before his mind the example of St. Jerome, who when he was reproached for having praised Origen, replied, "We had in mind the philosopher, not the dogmatist." Later, when an Italian translation of *Mahomet* had come into his hands he had forbidden the tragedy to be printed or staged.¹

This affair, in which Benedict XIV. had undoubtedly failed to act with the necessary caution,² was not allowed to die a natural death in France. On October 7th, 1746, François Philibert Louseau of Paris addressed a letter to the Pope which was definitely frank in tone. Every good Catholic in France, he wrote, had heard with the keenest regret that His Holiness had honoured the "infamous atheist Voltaire" by sending him two gold medals. Being sure that the Pope had not read all the works of this "monster", Louseau cited a number of blasphemous passages from Voltaire's writings and asked the Pope to honour another French writer, Louis

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 246.

² DE LANZAC DE LAVERIE in his article *Un grand pape du XVIII^e. siècle*: "Il participait dans une certaine mesure à l'engouement de son siècle pour les écrivains et philosophes français; tout en condamnant et en réfutant leurs doctrines, l'éclat de leur célébrité lui en imposait quelque peu. C'est ainsi qu'au lieu de prendre la dédicace de la tragédie de Mahomet pour ce qu'elle était en réalité, c'est-à-dire pour le comble de l'impertinence et de la dérision, Benoît XIV. commit la faiblesse d'en accuser réception à Voltaire, et d'engager une controverse avec lui sur une question de prosodie latine." *Correspondant*, CCXLIX. (1912), 676.

de Racine, son of the famous tragic poet and a member of the " Académie des Inscriptions ", who had merited the favour of His Holiness through his poems on " Grace " and " Religion ". It is not known what reply was made to this letter, but Benedict acceded to the request that Racine be thanked for his poetry.¹

Other French scholars and men of letters, whose religious opinions were by no means beyond suspicion, took advantage of the Pope's liberal interest in literature to put themselves in touch with him.² Voltaire's bitter adversary, Pierre Louis

¹ I found the original of Louseau's *letter in the Instr. Miscell., 5370, of the Papal Secret Archives. It begins thus: " Tous les bons catholiques de France ont appris avec une extrême douleur que V. S^{té} avait envoyé à l'infame Athée Arrouët de Voltaire deux médailles d'or comme une marque de la protection et de la bienveillance dont V. S^{té} daigne l'honorer. Sans doute que V. S^{té} ne connaît point tous les ouvrages du monstre quelle [*sic*] a daigné récompenser." There follow a number of blasphemous passages taken from Voltaire's works. In view of these declarations, said Louseau, he was much embarrassed, especially as " nous avons en France un poète aussi estimable par son esprit que par ses ouvrages qui a fait un poème admirable sur la grâce et un autre sur la religion qui n'est pas moins beau et qui à juste titre méritoit la bienveillance de S. S^{té}, c'est Racine de l'Académie des Inscriptions." In a postscript Louseau says that he has written direct to the Pope because France's representative in Rome, Canillac, is a friend of Voltaire's.

² CARACCILO, 71, who defends the Pope in these terms: " Ma affin di non trovar dissonanze nella sua condotta, bisogna considerar due personaggi in Lambertini, l'uomo letterato, ed il Pontefice; e così non recherà più meraviglia vederle scrivere a Volter sopra la sua tragedia di Maometto, sentirle a far l'elogio della poesia, leggere la sua dissertazione intorno gli spettacoli in una lettera al celebre Scipione Maffei, sapere che conversava co' Russi, cogli Inglesi, in somma cogli uomini illustri di tutte le comunioni. In questi casi non è più Benedetto XIV. che parla, ma un poeta, uno storico. Quando poi ringrazia Racine pe' due suoi poemi sulla Grazia e sulla Religione, in tal caso risponde da Pontefice, perchè il soggetto così richiede."

Maupertuis, President of the Berlin Academy since 1740, known for his principle of mechanics but a most confused philosopher, was able in 1749 to thank the Pope for a letter he had received from him and took the opportunity to ask to be presented to a canonry in his native town of St-Malo.¹ As it happened, the post had already been allocated,² but in 1756 Maupertuis was again favoured by the Pope,³ who tried from time to time to make use of his influence with Frederick II. for the benefit of the Silesian Catholics.⁴ Another member of Frederick's literary circle, Count Francesco Algarotti, a charming writer but not a man of stainless character,⁵ sent the Pope one of his works in 1751⁶ and received in return a Brief which he triumphantly communicated to the Prussian king. By way of thanks Algarotti wrote to the Pope that Frederick II. was great as a warrior, Benedict as a prince of peace.⁷

¹ Maupertuis' *letter, dated St-Malo, 1749, March 4, in Princ., 239, p. 370, Papal Secret Archives. This and subsequent letters from the scholar are all originals but wrongly included in the "Lettere di principi". For Maupertuis, see the monograph by DAMIRON (Paris, 1856), especially p. 149; HARNACK, *Gesch. der Berliner Akademie*, I., 254 seqq.

² See the draft of the *Brief to Maupertuis of March 19, 1749 (*loc. cit.*, 369) in which the Pope assures him of his goodwill.

³ *Letter from Maupertuis, dated Berlin, 1756, March 23 (*ibid.*), in which in high-flown language he thanks the Pope for his "présent inestimable" (probably a book written by the Pope) and says that he is "comblé des bienfaits du pape".

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., 264.

⁵ Cf. MICHELESSI, *Mem. int. alla vita d'Algarotti*, Venice, 1770. Algarotti is severely judged by MAYNARD in his *Voltaire* (Paris, 1867); see also HARNACK, *loc. cit.*, 253 seqq.

⁶ See Algarotti's flattering *letter, dated Berlin, 1750, November 28, in Princ. 239, p. 207, *loc. cit.*

⁷ Algarotti's *letter to the Pope, dated Berlin, 1751, February 6 (*ibid.*, p. 209), enclosing Frederick II.'s letter of February 20, 1751 (old style), praising the Pope as a "grand homme" (*Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, XVIII., 78). In a *letter dated Venice, 1754,

No less remarkable in appearance were the friendly relations between Benedict XIV. and the Neapolitan Antonio Genovesi, whose subsequent attitude was entirely hostile to the Church.¹ In 1747 Genovesi asked the Pope's permission to dedicate to him his *Metaphysics*, for which, as regarded miracles and prophecies, he was greatly indebted to the Pope's works. He wanted, he said, to defend religion against the unruly spirits beyond the Alps.² Benedict immediately accepted the dedication,³ and Genovesi, highly pleased, expressed his thanks and sent "the supreme judge of the Church and the great scholar" a copy of his *Logic* too, announcing at the same time his intention of writing a theological work.⁴ In thanking him for his *Logic*, part of which he had read, the Pope took the author at his word with regard to what he had said about writing on theological matters.⁵ The truth was that he was only too willing to give encouragement, without worrying overmuch whether the work done was really worthy of a Papal Brief. Thus Papal recognition was accorded more than once to the Professor of Law at Constance, Joseph Anton von Bandel, who in a weekly journal and other publications had been attacking the Protestants and Febronians in excessively caustic language.⁶

May 12 (*loc. cit.*, p. 210), Algarotti writes that illness prevented his coming to Rome.

¹ BROSCHE, II., 11; G. M. MONTI, *Due grandi riformatori del settecento: A. Genovese e G. M. Galanti*, Florence, no date [1926].

² *Letter, dated Naples, 1747, July 8, Princ. 239, p. 287, Papal Secret Archives.

³ *Brief of July 14, 1747, *ibid.*, p. 289.

⁴ *Letter, dated Naples, 1747, August 15, *ibid.*, p. 290; *Brief of August 29, 1747, *ibid.*, p. 291.

⁵ *Brief of August 29, 1747, *ibid.*

⁶ " *Si heterodoxi adversus iubilæum insurrexerunt, gratias agimus Deo quod tu invicto robore adversus eosdem pugnas. Perge igitur," runs the *Brief of May 29, 1751, Princ. 240, p. 561, *loc. cit.* Similar in tone is a second *Brief of August 28, 1756 (*ibid.*). Cf. also Bandel's *letters to Benedict XIV. (*ibid.*). For Bandel, see *Allg. Deutsche Biographie*, II., 39; HURTER, V.³, 42.

On the other hand, in matters of which he had first-hand knowledge Benedict XIV. showed himself possessed of accurate judgment and proportionate circumspection. When Eusebius Amort,¹ a Canon of the Lateran in the convent of Polling, who in his day was Germany's most important theological writer, asked the Pope's permission to dedicate to him his work on scholastic theology,² Benedict first asked to see a portion of the work. The author was reluctant to comply with this legitimate request, but Benedict persisted in it.³ Eventually Amort submitted the first part of his book, and the Pope passed it for examination to the Secretary of the Index, the Dominican Tommaso Agostino Ricchini, to obviate any unpleasantness that might arise after publication both for the author and himself. At the same time he advised Amort to submit his works for approval before publication on future occasions.⁴ On the conclusion of the affair he was able to commend the author's willingness to accept Rome's revision.⁵

The Pope proved himself to be a good judge of character in his dealings with Cardinal Angelo Maria Quirini,⁶ who

¹ For Amort, see BAADER, *Das gelehrte Bayern*, I., Nürnberg, 1804, 20 seq.; WERNER, *Gesch. der kath. Theologie*, 97 seqq., 108 seqq.; *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, LXXVI., 107 seqq.; HURTER, V.³, 226; *Dict. de théol. cath.*, I., 1115 seqq. Amort had been invited to Rome on a previous occasion (1733 ?) by Cardinal Lercari, who was afterwards secretary to Benedict XIV.; see *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, *loc. cit.*, 110 seq. Joh. Friedrich's disquisitions (*Beiträge zur Kirchengesch. des 18 Jahrhunderts*, compiled posthumously from Amort's writings, Munich, 1876) are arbitrary and in many places erroneous. An earlier request is mentioned in a *Brief of July 13, 1748. Princ. 241, p. 38, *loc. cit.*

² *Theologia eclectica moralis et scholastica*.

³ *Briefs of January 10 and February 25, 1750, *loc. cit.*, 241.

⁴ *Brief of January 2, 1751, *ibid.*

⁵ *Brief of February 20, 1751, *ibid.* In consequence of this, Amort had printed on his work: "sub auspiciis S.D.N. Benedicti XIV." The Pope thanked Amort for his moral theology in a *Brief of July 2, 1752, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV, 185.

was ranked with Tamburini, Monti, and Passionei as one of the greatest scholars of his time and whose reputation in certain quarters was undeservedly high. The Pope, who had known him for a long time, gave him a proof of his confidence in him at the very beginning of his reign, by making him Prefect of the Congregation of the Index,¹ in the hope that so great a scholar would increase the efficiency of this authority.² Quirini had been Prefect of the Vatican Library since 1730, but even after this appointment he continued in his habit of spending the greater part of the year in his bishopric of Brescia. Naturally enough, the Pope, in his solicitude for the library, could not view with equanimity the absence of its chief director. Quirini refused to retire from his bishopric and offered to resign his post as Prefect of the Vaticana. Benedict would not hear of this, but as the library, which at that time had been increased by purchases, could not be left deserted for long periods at a time, he appointed Cardinal Passionei as Pro-Librarian for the months in which Quirini was away in Brescia. Although Quirini had been advised by the Pope of this justifiable step, he took it in very bad part.³

However, good relations were soon restored, they wrote to one another in a friendly way, and they exchanged books and gifts.⁴ Benedict thought more of Quirini's suggestions concerning the Congregation of the Index than he did of the Dominican Orsi's⁵ and he showed as much interest in Quirini's health as in the success of his scholarly researches. For the edition of Cardinal Pole's letters which Quirini began to publish in 1744 he allowed him to use the relative manuscripts,

¹ COLETTI, p. 1.; *Epist., I., Papal Secret Archives; BAUDRILLART, *Card. Quirini vita*, 35.

² L. FRESCO, *Lettere inedite di Benedetto XIV. al card. A. M. Quirini*, XVIII., 37. The edition is based on the copy in the archiepiscopal library in Udine. A better text is provided by the *Cod. Ashburnh. 1341, in the Bibl. Laurenziana, Florence. Cf. AMELLI, *Il card. A. M. Quirini*, in *Rassegna naz.*, 1911, II., 371.

³ FRESCO, *loc. cit.*, 37 seqq., 40.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 42 seqq.

⁵ AMELLI, *loc. cit.*, 369.

knowing full well the importance of the work for the true history of England under the Tudors, which was frequently distorted by the Anglicans.¹

Quirini's services to scholarship, which were undeniable, brought him many honours. He was even elected a honorary member of Protestant academies in Germany. Writers of the most diverse tendencies, including Voltaire and Frederick II., wrote in praise of the learned Cardinal,² who accepted all these tributes in a very self-complacent spirit. Benedict XIV. also gave him credit for his industry and erudition, without, however, being blind to his weaknesses. He considered it his duty as a genuine friend to warn him against intellectual pride and the concomitant disdain for others. He reminded him of the great humility of Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmine, the fathers of church history and dogmatics, and cited the examples of Cardinals Noris, Sfondrati, Casanata, Aguirre, and Ferrari, who had carefully guarded themselves against any inclination to conceit and contempt for others, even when they were provoked.³ When in the summer of 1744 Quirini was attacked in an abusive article which appeared in The Hague *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Benedict XIV. took the Cardinal's part but warned him to be moderate in his defence. Such attacks, he said, should be treated with contempt; the competent authorities in Rome would take action, but there was no need to set up a special Congregation for the purpose, as Quirini was demanding.⁴ The Cardinal, whose vehemence had developed in the course of many previous disputes, was so annoyed by this advice that he accused the Pope of making common cause with the Protestants. Benedict XIV. felt this

¹ FRESCO, 73 *seq.*

² For his election to the Berlin Academy, see HARNACK, I., 475; for his relations with Voltaire, see BAUDRILLART, 79 *seqq.* See also the *Otto lettere inedite di Federico il Grande al card. Quirini*, published by G. Livi in the *Illustraz. Ital.*, 1885, November 15.

³ See the Pope's beautifully composed letter of March 21, 1744, in FRESCO, XVIII., 80 *seqq.*; *cf. ibid.*, 84, the letter of July 4, 1744.

⁴ See the letters in FRESCO, XVIII., 87 *seqq.*

charge to be beneath his notice and put it out of his mind as soon as Quirini had made his peace with him.¹ On May 6th, 1745, he praised him unstintingly for his defence of the Holy See against the Gallicans.² About this time Quirini sent him the proof-sheets of his work on Paul III. Benedict made some apposite remarks about it and urged the author, for the sake of historical truth, to mention also the failings of the Farnese Pope, particularly his nepotism,³ but the self-opinioned Cardinal gave little heed to this advice.⁴ At the same time another matter threatened to disturb his good relations with the Pope. Quirini had presented his valuable library to the Vaticana, and the gift had been made known by the erection of a marble tablet and the distribution of printed Briefs of commendation issued by Clement XII. In the summer of 1745 Quirini asked the Pope to cancel this donation, so that he might give his library to his bishopric of Brescia. Benedict considered this unfitting and proposed, by way of compromise, that Quirini should compensate the Vaticana with a sum of money. Lengthy negotiations had to be gone through before this proposal was accepted.⁵ Subsequently, however, the two men recommenced a lively correspondence the tone of which was never anything but friendly. The Brief concerning the transference of the library to Brescia was drawn up by the Pope entirely in accordance with Quirini's wishes.⁶

In the spring and autumn of 1748 the Cardinal, who among his many other activities busied himself with peaceful attempts to win back the Protestants,⁷ made two journeys to Germany, to visit the Benedictine monasteries in Swabia and Bavaria.⁸

¹ *Ibid.*, 91.

² *Ibid.*, 92.

³ *Ibid.*, 279 seqq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 282.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 283 seq., 286, 288 seqq.

⁶ *Ibid.*, XIX., 164. Cf. E. MICHEL, *La Biblioteca Quiriniana di Brescia*, Città di Castello, 1916.

⁷ LAUCHERT in *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktinerorden*, XXIV. (1903), 243 seqq.; *Illgens Zeitschrift*, VII., 166.

⁸ LAUCHERT, *Die Reisen des Kardinals Quirini in Bayern und Schwaben*, in the *Beil. zur Augsburger Postzeitung*, 1902, Nos. 41 and 42.

The Pope, who as time went on was becoming more and more distrustful of Quirini's vanity and rashness, took care to mention in a letter to Cardinal Tencin that these excursions were not being made with his approval and recalled Quirini's failure to achieve his object of reconciling to the Church a Lutheran preacher and the ex-Jesuit writer Quadrio.¹ In 1748, when the question of reducing the number of feast-days became a controversial topic, Quirini, in opposition to his friend Muratori, stoutly asserted that no such step was necessary and went so far as to maintain that it was not a question of discipline but of dogma.² The Pope was highly incensed at this³ and rendered the imprudent prelate a service in forbidding him to engage in any further polemics. Quirini obeyed but considered that his honour demanded that he should justify himself in Rome in person, and he took it sorely amiss that the Pope, diminishing the number of feast days in the Kingdom of Naples, should have decided against him.⁴

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 442. For Quadrio and Benedict XIV., *cf.*, to supplement the brief note in LANDAU, 228, the detailed information in FRESCO, *Lettere*, XIX., 170, 172, 174, 182, 184, 190 *seq.*, 193. Quirini was also completely mistaken about the Benedictine F. Rothfischer, whom he visited in Ratisbon in 1748; in 1751 Rothfischer went over to Protestantism, and Quirini wrote several letters to him in a vain endeavour to win him back; see *Allg. Deutsche Biographie*, XXIX., 362 *seqq.*

² HEECKEREN, I., 453. *Cf.* also AMELLI, 375 *seqq.* For Quirini's relations with Muratori, see the letters published by Zanelli in *Arch. stor. ital.*, 5th series, II., 324 *seqq.*, and PALMIERI, *Spicil.*, I., 143 *seqq.*

³ " *Il Papa sempre più irritato contro il Card. Quirini coll' occasione d'una Congregazione di Stato adunata per altre materie, propose le sue querele e si dolse della maniera poco rispettosa e quasi scismatica colla quale scriveva contro Sua S^{ta}, chiedendo consiglio per obbligarlo a tacere; ma fu creduto dai cardinali più sano espediente il mostrarne disprezzo." MERENDA, **Memorie*, Biblioteca Angelica, Rome.

⁴ *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 283 *seq.*, 286 *seq.*; HEECKEREN, I., 453, 454, 462. *Cf.* *Riv. Europ.*, 1877, III., 423 *seqq.*; FRESCO, *Lettere*, XIX., 179, 187 *seq.*

Quirini's exalted opinion of himself grew more and more difficult for the Pope to tolerate¹ and finally he went too far when in 1750, in the conflict between the Pope and Venice with regard to the Patriarchate of Aquileia, he took up the cudgels for the Republic and even adopted a threatening attitude towards the Pope.² He now fell into complete disgrace. Although his conduct in this affair, in which the Head of the Church had no other interest than the good of souls, was inexcusable, he tried to stir up the Cardinals against the Pope.³ In these circumstances it is easy to understand how Benedict was forced to resort to sterner measures. When Quirini, who had stayed in Rome the whole of the jubilee year of 1750, sought a farewell audience of him, it was intimated to him that this would not be granted unless he undertook not to take advantage of the opportunity to argue with the Pope on the question of Aquileia. As Quirini was unwilling to agree to this the audience was not granted.⁴

How strained their relations were may be judged by Benedict's refusal to grant the Cardinal's application for permission to take up residence in Rome in the winter of 1751-52. Benedict wrote to his friend Tencin that Quirini's only object was to open an academy for satire and scandal.⁵ The prelate thus reproached allowed his resentment to get the better of him to such an extent that he sent a letter to the Cardinals in which he cited the examples of Cardinals Paleotto and Sadoletto in support of his contention that it was his duty to oppose the Pope when his actions were harmful to the Church.⁶ Further, in his dedication to Tencin of the fourth volume of Cardinal Pole's letters he insinuated some more charges against the Pope. Benedict, however, declared that

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 518; *cf.* 471.

² FRESCO, XVIII., 11.

³ HEECKEREN, II., 16, 19 *seqq.*, 29 *seqq.*, 38. *Cf.* also AMELLI, 372, 377 *seq.*, 381. For the dispute, *cf.* the present work, vol. XXXVI., Ch. III.

⁴ HEECKEREN, II., 101 *seqq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 174.

⁶ FRESCO, XVIII., 13; XIX., 213 *seqq.*

any reproofs that came from persons of this kind left him completely unmoved.¹ Nevertheless he was just enough to express his thanks to Quirini in a Brief of August 4th, 1753, for establishing a sacerdotal college.² This was all the more creditable inasmuch as shortly before the Cardinal had placed him in an awkward situation.

In the early part of 1753 Quirini had written to his friends in Rome that he intended to travel to Berlin to perform there a great task in the service of the Church. The news aroused universal interest. Some conjectured that the object of the journey was the conversion of Frederick II., others that it was the conversion of Voltaire, with whom Quirini was on very good terms. The Pope's view was that the Cardinal had such a lively imagination that he always saw his hopes as already fulfilled. The worst aspect of the journey, he said, would be its utter uselessness. The world, however, would ascribe every kind of project to the appearance of a Cardinal in the Prussian capital. In Germany especially the rumour would go around that he had been entrusted with a mission concerning the election of the Roman king. "Meanwhile," he concluded, "We shall be subjected to every kind of attack by Germany."³ In this delicate situation the Pope consulted a Congregation of Cardinals as to what was to be done. The Cardinals addressed a letter to Quirini in which they advised him not to make the journey. Although it was couched in the most laudatory terms it was far from being sufficiently complimentary to satisfy the recipient.⁴ In the end the journey was never made, as it was also opposed by the Government of Venice.⁵ Quirini also intervened in a very clumsy manner in the negotiations concerned with the beatification of Cardinal Bellarmine,⁶ and on the publication of the Pope's new and wise ordinance

¹ HEECKEREN, II., 221; *cf.* 356.

² FRESCO, XVIII., 8.

³ HEECKEREN, II., 238.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 239 *seqq.*, 251 *seqq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 247, 252, 256.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 295.

regarding the Index he tried to secure for himself the honour of having been its author, although his share in it was inconsiderable.¹

When Quirini died, in 1755, not a word in his disfavour was heard to come from the Pope's lips. On the contrary, he acknowledged his efficiency as a bishop and his generosity to the poor.² His services to learning were possibly underestimated by Benedict XIV., but his judgment of the Cardinal's character was shown to be correct: when the Venetian Government took possession of Quirini's papers there was found among them his correspondence with an unnamed person in Rome, which was full of spite and calculated to provoke nothing but discord.³ The general opinion in Rome was that Quirini had been a very learned man who had enjoyed a great reputation but that in all his undertakings he had revealed an inordinate desire for fame.⁴

Quirini's successor as Prefect of the Vatican Library was the well-known bibliophile, Cardinal Passionei. The appointment was made by Benedict XIV.⁵ although he was well aware that the Cardinal was not without his weaknesses, especially his vanity and his childish animosity towards the Jesuits. The Pope, however, merely smiled at his follies, as at his predecessor's,⁶ and with justice, seeing that as a scholar

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, 392. In the new cathedral at Brescia an inscription set up by the Septemviri in 1737 praises Quirini in these terms: "quod praeclaro huic templo perficiendo ab anno MDCV aedificari coepto curam omnem impendens proprio aere large collato illud ara maxima et splendidis aliis ornamentis magnificentissime decoraverit."

³ HEECKEREN, II., 428.

⁴ "Era uomo dotto e di molta reputazione, ma vaniglorioso in ogni sua cosa" (MERENDA, *Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome). Quirini's autobiography: Brescia, 1749, continued by Sanvitale, *ibid.*, 1761.

⁵ Brief of February 22, 1755, in ASSEMANI, *Cat. Bibl. Vat.*, I. (1756), xxiv.

⁶ More authentic than the story about the Pope having a work

he towered above them both, but, unlike them, was distinguished for his modesty. In a letter to Quirini of April 3rd, 1749, he mentioned that of all the books that had been dedicated to him he had never read one of their dedications to the end, as he had always passed over the pages that he saw were devoted to his praise.¹

Passionei's previous appointment in 1741² as Pro-Librarian of the Vaticana was due in some measure to the project then being considered of opening a museum of Christian antiquities in connexion with the library, as had already been proposed to Clement XI. by Marcantonio Boldetti and Francesco Bianchini.³ The idea had engaged the attention of Benedict XIV. even before he had been raised to the see of Peter.⁴ He was now able to acquire the collection of Cardinal Gaspare Carpegna, a large part of which consisted of objects taken from the Catacombs.⁵ The gilded glasses and imperial coins in this collection had been discussed in separate publications by the Florentine senator Filippo Buonaroti.⁶ Further acquisitions were the leaden seals formerly belonging to the antiquary Francesco Ficoroni and the antiquities collected with great difficulty and at much expense by Francesco Vettori and generously presented by him. Included in this latter collection were no less than 6,500 gems. A numismatic cabinet was also formed; to supplement the imperial coins the Albani collection of coins, with an atlas in copper, was

of the Jesuit Busenbaum's put on Passionei's desk, so as to be able to laugh at his annoyance (see JUSTI, II., 2, 97), are the remarks he passed about him in his letters to Tencin (HEECKEREN, II., 250, 288, 295). Cf. also KRAUS, *Briefe*, 28.

¹ FRESCO, *Lettere*, XIX., 197.

² Cf. above, p. 212.

³ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIII., 509 seq.

⁴ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 282.

⁵ Cf. *Cod. Vat. 9153/54, Vatican Library; *Docum. per la storia dei Musei d'Italia*, II., Roma, 1879, 182 seqq.; CORSINI, *Bibl. Vatic.*, 110; CERROTI, *Lettere*, 47; FRESCO, *Lettere*, XVIII., 39.

⁶ FIL. BUONAROTI, *Osservaz. sopra alcuni medaglioni antichi*,

bought for 12,000 *scudi*, and to these were added the Papal coins collected by Clement XII.¹

The Carpegna and Vettori collections formed the nucleus of the museum, which was established at the instigation of Scipione Maffei, who dedicated to the Pope his description of the museum of Verona. Benedict XIV. took up the proposal with enthusiasm, a collection of this nature seeming to him to be truly worthy of the Holy See and the city of Rome.² As Maffei in particular had pointed out, a Christian museum would not only be of assistance to archæology but it would demonstrate the antiquity of Catholic dogma and the discipline of the Church to those who denied them.³ Further, the members of the academies of church history and liturgy which the Pope had founded would find here excellent material for their learned productions.⁴ The Pope was strengthened in his purpose by the archæologist Bottari, who in 1750 observed in the dedication of his work on the paintings in the Catacombs that all who were interested in the antiquities of Christianity looked to Benedict to open a museum of this kind.⁵ Valuable

Roma, 1698; *Osservaz. sopra alcuni frammenti di vasi antichi di vetro ornati di figure trovati nei cimiteri di Roma*, Firenze, 1716.

¹ FRESKO, *Lettere*, XVIII., 39; *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 283; JUSTI, II., 287; CARINI, 110.

² See the *Brief to Scip. Maffei of September 13, 1749, in which the Pope thanks him for the dedication of the *Museum Veron.* and "per haver proposta l'idea di fare un Museo cristiano alla quale certo non lasceremo d'andar pensando riconoscendola per un' opera propria d'un Papa e di Roma." Princ. 240, p. 197, Papal Secret Archives.

³ "Neque de recreandis solummodo primum animis ac de sacrae eruditionis cultoribus iuvandis agitur. Dogmata ipsa catholica incorruptamque disciplinam mirum est, quantum contra veteres recentisque oppugnatores monumenta antiqua . . . confirment, corroborent, patefaciant."

⁴ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 282.

⁵ "Quicumque bonas litteras et antiqua, quae ad nostrae religionis cultum ritusque pertinent, impense amant, a te hoc [Museum] expectant." Dedication of *Picturae antiquae cryptarum Romanarum eccl.*, Romae, 1750.

finds made in the Catacombs in 1749, 1751, and 1752 were now earmarked for this collection; its location, however, remained uncertain for some time yet, the two possible sites being the Capitol and the Vatican.¹ It was not until the autumn of 1755 that the decision was made to establish it in connexion with the Vatican Library.²

In the preface to the third volume of his *Roma Sottoterranea*, which appeared in 1754, Bottari lamented the fact that there were so many Christian monuments distributed in different places and he eagerly welcomed the new undertaking.³ To the Oratorian Giuseppe Bianchini the Pope entrusted the task of collecting material for the Christian Museum. This scholar proposed that the passage leading to the library should be used for the housing of the inscriptions. The science of keeping a museum being still in its infancy, no effort was made when the various inscriptions were gathered together from different churches into one collection, to ascertain the places where they had originally been discovered. Another mistake that was made was to saw off the sculptures from the Christian sarcophagi which had been brought together from private palaces

¹ *Avvisi of January 16, 1751 ("una rarissima testa di vetro fuso", much admired by the Pope, is deposited in the "Museo sacro"), February 26, 1752 (expansion of the "Museo sacro"), May 6, 1752 ("urna sacra" from the catacombs of S. Sebastiano with a representation of the miracle of the loaves and five fishes, reserved by the Pope for the "Museo sacro"), Cod. ital. 199, State Library, Munich. MERENDA'S report for May 10, 1749, concerning the discoveries in the catacomb of Priscilla (**Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome): "Veramente venerabili sono le s. catacombe ultimamente scoperte fuori porta Salara, mentre si è ritrovata la piccola chiesa di quelli antichi cristiani con tre ordini di sepolcri di s. martiri, e molto s'internano continuandosi però il cavo. Si è rinvenuto il corpo di s. Priscilla coll' ampolla del sangue del suo martirio in una urna di superbo marmo, dal che si è rinvenuto essere quelle le catacombe Priscilliane, che non eransi mai scoperte, e la suddetta urna S. S. ha destinato mandarla nella sala del Campidoglio per la sua rarità."

² *Avviso of October 18, 1755, *loc. cit.*

³ DE ROSSI in *Triplice Omaggio a Pio IX.*, Roma, 1877, 93.

and from public localities, so as to be able to hang them on the walls of the museum. Splendid cases were made at the Pope's order for the other Christian antiquities. Here were placed the glasses, paintings, ivory carvings, bronze and clay lamps, gems, jugs, works in gold and silver, leaden seals, and the Papal coins from Adrian I. to Benedict XIV. which had been collected by Saverio Scilla and had been bought with money from Benedict's privy purse.¹ Pagan antiquities also were admitted. All scholars were to have the free use of the museum, and their studies were to be facilitated by a detailed inventory.²

The inscription placed above the entrance in 1756 relates that the museum was founded to heighten the splendour of Rome and to confirm the truth of the Catholic religion.³ Francesco Vettori was appointed director, with a monthly salary of 100 *scudi*. On his death the Prefect of the Library was to assume charge of the collection for the time being.⁴

Benedict XIV. had so much at heart the interests of the library at the Vatican that he transferred to it his rarest

¹ *Ibid.*, 94, and in *Bollett. di archeol. crist.*, 1876, 137 *seqq.* Cf. GALLETTI, *Passionei*, 227 *seqq.*; RENAZZI, IV., 281 *seq.*; KRAUS, *Roma Sottoterranea*, 15; FRESCO, *Lettere*, XVIII., 297. In the courtyard of the Palazzo Rondinini on the Corso is the following inscription: "Sarcophagum | quo facta quædam ex veteri testamento | repræsentantur | Iosephi marchionis Rondanini donum | Benedictus XIV. | in sacro Vatic. Museo collocavit. | 1747. In FORCELLA, XI., 354, the inscription in S. Agnese recording the transference thence in 1757 of a sarcophagus to the Museo Cristiano. In 1854 almost all the sarcophagus sculptures were taken to the Museo Lateranense Cristiano, which was then in course of erection; see FICKER, *Die altchristl. Bildwerke im Christl. Museum des Lateran*, Leipzig, 1890; MARUCCHI'S *Catalogo*, Roma, 1898.

² *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 316.

³ BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Œuvres*, II., 187. *Ibid.* for Giov. Angeloni's frescoes (cf. THIEME, I., 512) depicting Benedict XIV.'s buildings, in the last room of the library wing.

⁴ *Acta Benedicti XIV.*, II., 282 *seqq.*, 312.

printed works and many Oriental, Greek, and Latin manuscripts.¹

Of immeasurably greater value were the two famous private collections acquired by the Vaticana during Benedict's pontificate. The Marchese Antonio Gregorio Capponi, who died in 1746, left his antiquities to the Museo Kircheriano, and his choice library to the Vaticana, which was thus increased by numerous incunabula, other rare prints, 285 MSS., and the famous Ruthenian calendar.² On the death of the last of the Ottoboni in 1748 the library founded by Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni was threatened with dispersal, but the whole collection was bought by Benedict XIV. Part of the purchase money came from his private resources, the remainder from the Banco di S. Spirito, which was to be paid back from the revenue of the Vaticana.³

The praise which even his contemporaries bestowed upon Benedict XIV. for acquiring the Ottoboni library was fully deserved. The nucleus of the collection was the library of the learned Pope Marcellus II., who bequeathed it to Sirleto. Increased by him, it was bought by Cardinal Ascanio Colonna, who also added to it. On his death it passed into the hands of Duke Giovanni Angelo Altemps. Finally the greater part of it was combined with his own manuscripts by Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni, who, on becoming Pope Alexander VIII., added to it 100 codices forming part of the bequest of Queen Christina of Sweden. In this way the Ottoboniana possessed more Greek, Latin, and Hebrew manuscripts than any other private collection in Rome; they numbered in all 3,300.⁴

¹ "Alla Biblioteca Vaticana sempre abbiamo consegnate le cose più rare che ci sono state regalate ancorchè si avessero potuto conservare nella nostra domestica biblioteca donata per uso pubblico all'Istituto di Bologna." *Ibid.*, 311. Cf. Assemani's catalogue of the Vaticana, I., xxiv.

² *Catalogo della libreria Capponi*, Roma, 1747; G. SALVO Cozzo, *I codici Capponiani d. Bibl. Vatic.*, Roma, 1897.

³ CARINI, 112 *seqq.* Cf. KRAUS, *Briefe*, 57.

⁴ BLUME, III., 67 *seqq.* The work written for Benedict XIV. by Costantino Ruggieri, the last librarian of the Ottoboniana, is

Various other manuscripts were presented to the Vaticana by Benedict XIV., notably a Pentateuch in Persian and a commentary on Dante. Other gifts were the drawings by Pier Leone Ghezzi, the manuscripts on the religion and history of the Chinese which had been left to the Pope by the missionary Fouchet, and a volume of the records of the Council of Constance which had been given him by Abbot Norbert of Wilten.¹

Benedict, who also devoted his attention to the Roman archives,² reached the summit of his efforts on behalf of learning when he took in hand the vast undertaking (which

mentioned here as being to hand in manuscript form, but it has not been used ; it was published by A. MAI in *Mem. stor. degli archivi della S. Sede e della Bibl. Ottoboniana*, Roma, 1825, 40 *seqq.* Cf. *Codices manuscripti græci Ottob. Vatic. Bibl.*, Romæ, 1893, xv. *seqq.*, xxv. *seqq.*, xl. *seqq.*, which contains a new and better reproduction of Ruggieri's treatise. See also FRESCO, *Lettere*, XVIII., 294, 297. Cf. our account, Vol. XXXII., 553, 554.

¹ CARINI, 113 *seqq.* The *Brief of thanks to the Abbot Norbert, dated 1754, IV. Cal. Mai., in Princ., 241. Papal Secret Archives.

² The employment of G. Garampi in 1749 was of epoch-making importance for the Papal Secret Archives. Appointed Prefect on August 1, 1751, on the death of Ronconi, he set about the task of cataloguing the archives with great energy ; see DENGEL, *Garampis Tätigkeit*, 3 *seqq.* Another acquisition for the Holy See made by Benedict XIV. was the papers of Clement XI., which had remained in the hands of the Albani (see HEECKEREN, II., 155). He also saw to the safekeeping of the records in the Castel S. Angelo ; see RODOCANACHI, *St-Ange*, 191, 232 *seq.* Cf. KRAUS, *Briefe*, 57 *seqq.* For the institution of the Archivio del Tribunale delle Strade in 1743, see *Gli Arch. ital., Rivista*, VI. (1919), 163 *seqq.* Cf. FORCELLA, I., 82. Other acquisitions for the Papal Secret Archives were 307 MSS., mostly in the Fondo Pio (see *Catalogo dei libri della Biblioteca di casa Pio, fatti acquistare dall' Em. Valenti per l'archivio nell' anno 1753, in Archivietto, I, fo. 148, *ibid.*), and, for 25 scudi, the MS. of Bernardo of Naples (for whom see BRESSLAU, *Urkundenlehre*, II.², I, 267, n. 6), Reg. Vatic., 29A, through a donation of Benedict XIV.'s, " qui in colligendis apost. sedis monumentis nulli parcat sumtui, nulli labori, nullique diligentiaë."

was not resumed until the time of Leo XIII.) of bringing out a detailed and complete catalogue of all the manuscripts in the Vatican Library.

This colossal work, which was to make accessible to every scholar the treasures of the finest collection of manuscripts in the world, was to be contained in twenty folio volumes: six for the Oriental, four for the Greek, and ten for the Latin, Italian, and other European manuscripts. A beginning was made with the Oriental treasures by Stephan Evodius and Joseph Simon Assemani, who in 1756 were able to present the Pope with the first folio volume, which dealt with the Hebrew and Samaritan manuscripts.¹ Two more volumes, dealing with the Syrian manuscripts, followed in 1758 and 1759.

In the preface to the first volume, which is dedicated to Benedict XIV., the editors enumerate his services to learning: his "own golden works", the restoration of the frescoes in the Salone Sistino and the decoration of the cases there with paintings, the important increases made to the manuscripts, especially through the purchase of the Ottoboniana, and the collections of antiquities that had been joined to the library, notably the Christian Museum, which might well be called the Lambertinian. Since the days of Sixtus IV. and V. no other Pope had done so much for the Vatican Library—a tribute well deserved by the man who was called by Montesquieu the "scholars' Pope".²

¹ *Bibliothecae apostolicae Vaticanae codicum mss. Catalogus in tres partes distributus, in quarum prima orientales, in altera graeci, in tertia latini italici aliorumque europaeorum idiomatum codices: STEPHANUS EVODIUS ASSEMANUS ARCHIEPISCOPUS APAMENSIS, ET IOSEPH SIMONIUS ASSEMANUS EIUSDEM BIBLIOTHECAE PRAEFECTUS . . . illustrarunt. Partis Primae Tomus primus, complectens codices ebraicos et samaritanos, Romae MDCCLVI. Ex typographia linguarum orientalium Angeli Rotilii, in aedibus Maximorum.* For the fate of the first four volumes, which were printed down to 1768, and almost the whole edition of which was destroyed in a fire, see BLUME, III., 98 seq. After this the printing was suspended.

² *Lettres familières du Président de Montesquieu, Baron de Brède, à divers amis d'Italie* (no place of publication), 1767, 214.

CHAPTER IV.

JANSENISM IN FRANCE AND HOLLAND.

(1)

RELIGIOUS conditions in France were at first scarcely affected by Benedict XIV.'s accession to the throne. In acknowledging the congratulations of the French bishops he took the opportunity of expressing his approval of the attitude they had adopted hitherto towards Jansenism. Thus he commended the action taken by Colbert's successor to the See of Montpellier, Berger de Charancy, who had demanded the subscription to Alexander VII.'s formulary. This, he said, would pave the way for the acceptance of the "most salutary" constitution, *Unigenitus*, which was extremely dear to the heart of the new Pope, "on personal as well as other grounds."¹ Bishops La Fare of Laon, Lafitau of Sisteron, and Belsunce of Marseilles were commended² for the zealous way in which they had upheld the Bull in the face of the opposition of certain Dominicans in Marseilles and Sisteron. Saint-Albin of Cambrai and Belsunce were thanked for their writings against the Jansenists,³ and La Rochefoucauld of Bourges and Fitzjames of Soissons were encouraged to take action against error.⁴ The Jansenists, therefore, had no cause to rejoice at Lambertini's election; though the admonition he gave to Charancy,

¹ "Sternet viam ad publice proponendam saluberrimam Constitutionem Unigenitus, nobis unice privato etiam sensu commendatissimam." Document of October 14, 1740, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 28; cf. 29, 39.

² On February 7, September 18, and December 18, 1741, *ibid.*, 40, 84, 86.

³ On December 9, 1741, and January 17, 1743, *ibid.*, 86, 141.

⁴ On December 15 and 20, 1740, *ibid.*, 29, 30.

not to take any steps that might cause a stir without first consulting Fleury,¹ might possibly have been regarded as a preliminary symptom of the cautious attitude adopted subsequently by the new Pope. On another occasion too he let it be understood² that the Minister's wary method of procedure met with his approval, and he was particularly pleased³ that on Fleury's instigation the king was demanding that the Sorbonne should submit to the Bull.⁴ There were in fact a considerable number of the doctors, about 200 in all, who were now for the first time announcing their submission.

An embarrassing situation arose immediately on the occasion of the jubilee indulgence⁵ which it was the custom to grant at the beginning of every new pontificate. Should it be said in the Bull proclaiming the indulgence that the appellants were excluded from the graces of the Holy Year? If this were done the French parliaments would seize the opportunity to ban the Bull. Ought nothing at all to be said about the appellants? The Jansenists would undoubtedly make use of this silence to represent the Pope as being in favour of them. Cardinal Fleury was strongly against anything that might lead to trouble,⁶ it having been found possible to reduce the number of the innovators by taking action against avowed Jansenists, by keeping agitators and suspects out of public appointments, and by reserving episcopal sees and prebends for those who could be trusted. As a result of this policy, he maintained, parliamentary opposition was becoming less lively and some of the worst infected religious congregations were showing signs of repentance. But let them be under no delusion: the party was still in existence and its adherents, now dispersed, would reunite on the slightest excuse. The first principle of this sect was its independence of any authority, whether

¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

² On January 7, 1741, *ibid.*, 35.

³ On November 26, 1741, *ibid.*, 85.

⁴ Document of September 6, 1741, in FERET, VI., 106.

⁵ HEECKEREN, I., xxii. *seq.*

⁶ To Tencin on October 13, 1740, *ibid.*

spiritual or temporal ; the Jansenists were no less enemies of the State than of the Holy See.¹ Thus the wary Minister. On the other hand, the Inquisition and the supporters of the Bull in France were pressing for a strongly worded pronouncement against the innovators.²

Benedict XIV. tried to escape from the dilemma by using only general terms in his jubilee Bull³ in excluding from the graces of the jubilee year all who had incurred ecclesiastical censure. In an accompanying Brief addressed to Louis XV. the appellants were expressly included in their number, but it was left to the king to publish this Brief or not, as he thought fit.⁴ Even so the jubilee was not accepted in France.⁵

In the midst of the turmoil caused by the war of the Austrian succession, by which the States of the Church also were sorely affected, Benedict XIV. proclaimed another jubilee for Italy and the surrounding islands.⁶ Louis XV. desired it to be extended to France, and the difficulties of 1740 were renewed.

¹ " Le fond de cette secte est l'indépendance de toute autorité spirituelle ou temporelle et ils ne sont pas moins ennemis de l'État que du Saint-Siège " (*ibid.*, xxiii.). Of the appellants in particular Massillon draws a picture that is hardly flattering : " Je connais le caractère des appellants, et c'est parce que je les connais que dans aucun temps il ne m'a été possible de les goûter : orgueil, amour de la singularité, mépris pour tout ce qui ne pense pas comme eux, quelque rang qu'on puisse tenir dans l'Église, partis extrêmes sur tout, hardiesse à décider et à revenir sur ce qu'il y a mieux établi, nulle règle, nul amour de la paix, une intrigue et une cabale éternelle et puérile ; les ignorants, les femmes, les dévotes, les mondaines, tout leur est bon. Si vous les connaissez, les voilà. Je les ai toujours vus tels à mes propres yeux pendant près de 30 ans que j'ai été à Paris." To Tourouvre on February 28, 1728, in SICARD, *L'ancien clergé de France*, I., 471.

² HEECKEREN, I., xxiii.

³ Of November 11, 1740, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 1 *seq.*

⁴ HEECKEREN, I., xxiv.

⁵ Benedict XIV. to Tencin, January 2, 1745, *ibid.*, 170 ; *cf.* 31, 159.

⁶ On November 20, 1744, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 254.

The Pope desired the proclamation of the jubilee year because it contained the last remaining evidence that France was in communion with the Holy See.¹ However, he handed the matter over to the Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons, Tencin, who was to come to an agreement with the nuncio, and said that he was ready expressly to exclude the Jansenists in the Bull or in the accompanying Brief, or to omit such a clause, just as the king wished.² At this point, to make things awkward for Tencin, Canillac, the French ambassador to Rome, spread the rumour that the Pope had already published a jubilee Brief without the clause against the Jansenists. On being informed of this by Fleury's successor, Boyer, Benedict replied³ that the appellants were already excluded from the jubilee year without the need for a separate declaration and that therefore Boyer could follow Tencin's advice as to what he was to do in any particular case. The jubilee Brief for France⁴ was the same as that for Italy, except that it was made a condition for obtaining the jubilee indulgence that prayers should be said for the king, who had just recovered from an illness. In an accompanying letter to the king⁵ the Pope explained why the appellants had not been excluded expressly but only indirectly. On this occasion, probably out of consideration for the king, for whose health prayers were being offered, the parliament placed no difficulties in the way.

¹ “ *È stata una politica ridicola quella del sig^r. d'Argenson. Sarà però bene dissimulare sino a che sia una volta pubblicato il Giubileo, troppo importando, che non se ne perdesse costà affatto la memoria, come che è il solo segno che vi resta della comunione colla Santa Sede.” The Secretary of State to the nuncio Durini on June 9, 1745, *Nunziat. di Francia*, 442, fo. 162, Papal Secret Archives.

² HEECKEREN, I., 175.

³ On February 5, 1745, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 253. Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 175, 177, 198.

⁴ Of February 18, 1745, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 287.

⁵ Of February 20, 1745, *ibid.*, 287. Cf. P. RICHARD in *Revue des quest. hist.*, XCII. (1912), 373 seq.

Benedict wrote not only to individual French bishops on the question of the Jansenists but also to them all collectively.¹ On the latter occasion he confirmed their authority to proceed against anyone, even members of religious Orders, who refused to submit to the Bull *Unigenitus* or who defended the tenets put forward by Bajus, Jansen, and Quesnel, which had been condemned by the Apostolic See. The Brief was written at the request of many of the Bishops themselves, who complained that the audacity of the innovators was growing from day to day.

Even before this admonition the aged Fleury had done his best towards the end of his life to deprive the innovators of their mainstay in the religious Congregations. In so doing, however, he pursued his usual policy of avoiding anything that might cause unrest, contenting himself with banishing particularly noisy exponents of Jansenistic opinions, with closing certain theological seminaries, and with preventing the Quesnelists from filling important posts.² The Pope in his turn took care not to intervene with general measures which were certain to have met with parliamentary opposition. The new Bishop of Montpellier, for example, had been forced to withhold the Sacraments from some Jansenistic nuns and wanted the Pope to approve his action in writing. Benedict assured the Bishop of his full approval, but so as not to expose himself to the accusation of causing unrest in France, he referred him to Fleury and sent the latter a letter of commendation for the Bishop.³ A former vicar of Saint-Médard in Paris, who had played a conspicuous part in the alleged miracles of the deacon Pâris, was continuing his malpractices as an official of the Order of Malta in the archbishopric of Rheims, and the Vicar General, for fear of Parliament, did not dare to withdraw his licence to say Mass. The nuncio appealed to Rome, but Benedict contented himself with writing for assistance to the Grand Master of the Order,⁴

¹ On August 4, 1741, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 83 seq.

² HARDY, 325.

³ Of May 3, 1742, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 123.

⁴ On January 7, 1746, *ibid.*, 286.

who some time before had instructed the superiors of the French province ¹ not to allow any cleric who was an appellant to serve in the churches of the Order or to share in its revenue.

Fleury, who died a nonagenarian, was succeeded by the former Bishop of Mirepoix, Jean François Boyer, of the Order of Theatines, who in his administration of ecclesiastical affairs followed in the footsteps of his predecessor. In 1746 he succeeded in wresting from the Jansenists one of their chief strongholds, the Congregation of the Oratorians. The appellants had been excluded from the general assemblies of the Congregation since 1723, against which measure, needless to say, they had never failed to protest.² The Superior General, De la Tour, although he himself had once been an appellant, did his utmost to secure the acceptance of the constitution, but contented himself for the time being with demanding the signature of the formulary. Under the generalship of De la Valette, De la Tour's successor, it was decreed by royal command that no one should attend the general assembly of 1745 who had not accepted the constitution *Unigenitus*. The assembly had to be postponed till the following year and even then it met under serious difficulties. Protests were sent by several of the Order's establishments; many of the houses of the Congregation failed to elect a delegate; and others had to be excluded at the assembly itself. The remaining eighteen members accepted the formulary, with the distinction between right and fact, and the Bull as a law of the Church and the State, but not as a rule of Faith. On the conclusion of the assembly very many of the Oratorians protested.³ It was hardly surprising that Benedict XIV. gave voice to his displeasure ⁴ when he read the minutes, and a letter from the

¹ On March 7, 1742, *ibid.*, 107.

² [NIVELLE] II., 2, 618-623.

³ *Ibid.*, 623-630.

⁴ To the Superior General on December 28, 1746, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 395 *seq.*; to Tencin on December 14, 1746, HEECKEREN, I., 288. On September 1, 1745, Benedict had written to Tencin of the necessity of having the general assembly superintended by a commissary. *Ibid.*, 208.

Superior General afforded but little satisfaction. Nevertheless, the Oratory as such had submitted, and the assemblies of 1749 and 1752 were further manifestations of loyalty to the Church.¹

The Congregation of Doctrinarians, founded by César de Bus,² had decided on obedience some time before. One of their three provinces, that of Avignon, was loyally inclined, and it was from here that attempts were made to induce the other two provinces, Paris and Toulouse, to accept the Bull. This object was attained at the general assembly at Beaucaire in 1744, by the same means as had been used in the case of the Oratorians, though naturally here too vigorous protests were made by those who were inclined towards Jansenism. Acceptance of the Bull was made a condition for attendance at the meetings of the Order, for electing a Superior, for taking vows, and for receiving holy orders. These stipulations were renewed by the next general assembly, of 1749.³

In the same way the acceptance of the constitution was obtained in the French Congregation of Canons Regular known as the Genevievans,⁴ in 1745, 1748, 1751, and 1753. Everywhere the general assemblies were held in the presence of royal commissioners and on instructions given by Boyer.

Benedict XIV. was very chary of intervening personally in the French situation, which may have been the reason why he was represented by the Jansenists as an opponent of the Bull *Unigenitus*. A Papal letter of 1749 in particular was interpreted in this sense. Two works by a well-known Augustinian scholar, Cardinal Noris, had been put on the list of forbidden books, or rather books which needed correction, by the Spanish Inquisition, after the author's death in 1704. Noris's works having been examined and passed in Rome both before and after they had been printed, before his nomination as Cardinal, and again afterwards, the Pope wrote a confidential

¹ [NIVELLE], II., 2, 630-33.

² Cf. our account, Vols. XXIII, 185, XXIV., 165.

³ [NIVELLE], II., 2, 633-642.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 644-652.

letter to the Grand Inquisitor,¹ pointing out that even if the forbidden books did bear traces of Bajanism and Jansenism, it would be inexpedient to condemn them after so long an interval, if only on account of the commotion that would be bound to arise among the Augustinian and other scholars. On these grounds the Holy See had waived its right to censorship in many previous instances, the examples quoted by Benedict being Tillemont, the Bollandists, Bossuet, and Muratori, who was still living. Through a breach of confidence on the part of the Procurator General of the Augustinians the letter became public knowledge, and the Pope was forced not only to propitiate Muratori,² but to defend himself against the French Jansenists,³ who drew the inference from his letter that he had revoked the Bull *Unigenitus*. This was pure imagination, said the Pope; he had merely instructed the Grand Inquisitor not to encroach on the liberty of the Catholic schools, the Thomists, the Augustinians, and the Jesuits. The Dutch Jansenists, he said, would have declared their readiness to submit, if only they had not to accept the Bull publicly; but he had demanded their acceptance of it in plain terms, without conditions. So much for his so-called revocation of the Bull *Unigenitus*.⁴

Like Cardinal Noris in Spain, another Augustinian, Lorenzo Berti, became the object of violent attacks in France. In a vast synthesis he had composed of the whole of theological knowledge he propounded a new way of explaining the efficacy of grace. According to him, grace consisted in a supernatural sweetness, which, when it attracted the will so strongly as to overcome the contrary attraction of sin was efficacious

¹ On July 31, 1748, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 554 seq.; REUSCH, II., 832 (cf. 671 seqq.). Cf. above, p. 198.

² On September 25, 1748, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, II., 396; also the Bollandists (letter of April 3, 1749, in FLEURY, LXXIX., 703 seq.).

³ To Tencin, May 14, 1749, HEECKEREN, I., 485.

⁴ "Voilà comment Nous avons révoqué la bulle *Unigenitus*." *Ibid.*, 486.

grace ; when it failed to do so it was only sufficient grace.¹ Needless to say, this solution of the problem had points in common with Jansenism. Consequently, Ize de Saléon, Bishop of Rodez and, from 1746 onwards, Archbishop of Vienne, petitioned the Pope to take action against the book. This petition was repeated by Archbishop Languet of Sens,² who stressed the fact that the Pope's silence was being represented by the Jansenists as approval of the Jansenistic doctrine. Archbishops Tencin of Lyons and De la Rochefoucauld of Bourges also held unfavourable opinions of Berti's book.³ The assembly of the French clergy only refrained from condemning it because the case was pending in Rome.⁴ In this matter, as in so many others, Benedict XIV. took a moderate course. Wishing to form his own opinion on the subject,⁵ he gave Berti time to defend himself, for, as he maintained, even when it was only a book that was in question and not also its author, it was difficult not to give the author a hearing.⁶ Finally he replied to the Archbishop of Vienne⁷ that nothing had been found in Berti's work which was against the decisions of the Church. An over-hasty judgement, he added in his reply to Languet,⁸ might start a fire that would spread to the ends of the earth. It was not just to condemn

¹ Cf. for instance, CHR. PESCH, *Praelectiones dogm.*, V.³, Freiburg, 1908, prop. 21, p. 156.

² Cf. Benedict XIV. to Tencin on May 5, 1745, HEECKEREN, I., 197 ; to Saléon on January 22, 1749, and December 30, 1750, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, II., 33, 74 ; to Languet on July 17, 1750, and May 12, 1751, *ibid.*, 397, 412. Languet's letter of complaint (not Saléon's, as stated by REUSCH, II., 838) in FLEURY, LXXX., 667-687.

³ HEECKEREN, I., 281, 313.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 316.

⁵ To Tencin on October 6, 1745, *ibid.*, 216.

⁶ November 16, 1746, *ibid.*, 281. Cf. the letter to Tencin of June 10, 1749, in *Études*, CXXXII. (1912), 342 *seq.* (not included by Heeckeren).

⁷ On December 30, 1750, *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, II., 74.

⁸ On July 15, 1750, *ibid.*, 397.

everything that had been put to a wrong use by sectarians, especially the Jansenists. Some harsh expressions that had been used by Berti and his fellow-Augustinian Bellelli, whose writings had also been attacked, had been satisfactorily explained by them in other passages.¹ After both parties in the dispute had written against each other,² Berti and Bellelli were left in peace, but a list of Jansenistic works compiled by the Jesuit De Colonia was banned in Rome, one reason being that it had included works by Noris, and the same fate befell the new and enlarged edition of Patouillet's list, which omitted Noris but included Berti and Bellelli.³

Another matter brought the Pope into direct conflict with the Paris parliament. A Dominican of the name of Viou, who

¹ May 12, 1751, *ibid.*, 412.

² Vols. 5-7 of Berti's *Theologia*, published at Bassano in 1776, are full of these writings (*Baianismus redivivus* and *Iansenismus redivivus*, by Saléon, also Languet's pastoral letter). Cf. HURTER, *Nomenclator*, IV.³ (1910), 1371, V.³ (1911), 1 *seqq.*; REUSCH, II., 837 *seq.* The *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* of 1751 devoted an appendix of 22 pages to Berti's case. DUDON in *Recherches de science rel.*, IX., 247.

³ REUSCH, II., 827 *seqq.* The Pope called the book an "ouvrage hardi qui donne le brevet de janséniste à tant d'hommes élevés par leur dignité, leur piété et leur savoir" (To Tencin on January 22, 1750; in HEECKEREN, II., 5). *Ibid.*, I., 209, Benedict XIV. applied the epithet "livre vraiment mauvais" to Bellelli's book discussed by [PATOUILLET] in II., 107 *seqq.* The Jansenists exulted at the prohibition, although, as the Pope ordered to be written to the French nuncio: " *è un trionfo ben ridicolo quello che fanno i Giansenisti del decreto proibitivo della Biblioteca Giansenista, mentre non so vedere cosa possino dedurne a loro favore. La Congregazione non deve soffrire che un particolare di sua propria autorità s'arroggi il diritto di dichiarare Giansenisti o sospetti almeno di Giansenismo una quantità di scrittori cattolici e di comprendervi ancora un Cardinale tanto dotto e tanto benemerito della S. Sede. Questa temerità doveva reprimersi." The Secretary of State to the nuncio Durini on December 17, 1749, Nunziat. di Francia, 442 *seq.*, fo. 328^v, Papal Secret Archives.

had become a confirmed Jansenist, on being expelled from his Order went to Paris and appealed to the parliament, which ruled that he was to stay in his monastery and wear the habit of his Order.¹ If the king did not come to his aid in this affair, wrote the Pope, he would not know what to do in future. If he took no action against the Jansenists, he was accused of favouring them, and if he did proceed against them out of a sense of duty he had his arms and legs cut off.² The king sided with the Pope against Viou, as did also the judgement given by twelve advocates.³

The question which had been the subject of Antoine Arnauld's first publication, when Jansenism was only just beginning, still seemed to be a burning one in Benedict XIV.'s time. In 1745 a Jesuit, Jean Pichon, after thirty years of missionary work among the people, considered it his duty to resort to the pen to advocate frequent, even daily, Communion⁴—a daring undertaking at a time when the deacon Pâris was being praised for abstaining from Easter Communion, especially as Pichon represented frequent Communion as nothing less than a duty.⁵ His book caused a great sensation. Although it had been published with the approval of five bishops, twenty of their colleagues declared themselves to be against Pichon,⁶ several of them being firm opponents of the Jansenists, such as Languet of Sens, Brancas of Aix, Beaumont of Paris, and Tencin of Lyons. Pichon found himself compelled to sign a recantation, which was published by the Archbishop of Paris in a pastoral letter. This rendered

¹ HEECKEREN, I., 41, 47, 77.

² To Tencin, October 24, 1744, *ibid.*, 159.

³ To the same, January 9, 1745, *ibid.*, 171.

⁴ Cf. P. DUDON in *Recherches de science religieuse*, VI. (1916), 513 *seqq.*, VII. (1917), 110 *seqq.*, 507 *seqq.*, VIII. (1918), 102 *seqq.*, 256 *seqq.*, IX. (1919), 243 *seqq.*, 373 *seqq.* In a private letter to Rome a Jesuit in Paris surmised that Pichon's object was "denuo suscitare extinctum prope fidelium in Gallia fervorem circa frequentem Eucharistiæ et Poenitentiaë usum". *Ibid.*, VII., 508.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VI., 522.

⁶ *Ibid.*, VII., 121; SOMMERVOGEL, VI., 718-722.

pointless the action which had already been brought by Antoine Arnauld's family, first in the parliament and then in the royal council, against the defamer of his name¹; but Pichon failed to put into print in time a second edition of his book which had been prepared by the Jesuit Patouillet² on the advice of Languet and Rastignac, Archbishop of Tours, and thus to expunge his inaccurate quotations and exaggerations. The Paris nuncio Durini was very guarded in his judgement of the matter. The majority of the French bishops, he wrote,³ have made no move and were right in not doing so; those who did speak were not unanimous in their opinions, and some of them held suspicious doctrines. Even when this was not the case it was difficult to see on what grounds they had condemned Pichon. Among most of the Paris Jesuits, said Durini, Pichon found no support. Benedict XIV. was also of the opinion⁴ that Pichon's little book hardly deserved the uproar that was being made about it, especially as it had been written in such good faith. Nevertheless the book was put on the Index on August 13th, 1748, though by order of the Pope its suppression was not published⁵ until September 11th, 1750.⁶ Nor was Pichon's teaching on frequent Communion the reason for its suppression.⁷

The affair had an unpleasant sequel for the Pope.⁸ The publication of Pichon's book prompted Archbishop Rastignac of Tours to publish some pastoral letters, one of which, on Christian justice, was thought by many to be dangerously akin to Jansenistic notions, when treating of the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. Benedict XIV. was most

¹ DUDON, VI., 524 *seqq.*; RÉGNAULT in *Études*, 1876, II., 810-820.

² DUDON, VII., 507-519, VIII., 256 *seqq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 376.

⁴ To Tencin, March 20, 1748, HEECKEREN, I., 391.

⁵ To the same, September 17, 1749, *ibid.*, 517.

⁶ REUSCH, II., 453 *seq.*

⁷ Communication of the Secretary of the Congregation of the Index, Thomas Esser, O.P., of June 1, 1910, in DUDON, IX., 253.

⁸ DUDON, VIII., 102-122.

upset at the thought of another controversy among the Bishops of France after all that had already happened in that country.¹ He had the letter examined, entrusting this delicate task to the scholars whom he thought to be least affected by party spirit.² Rastignac's death on August 3rd, 1750, put an end to the investigation ; a few months before, when writing in defence of his letter, he had declared in the most unambiguous terms his acceptance of the Bull *Unigenitus* and his rejection of Quesnel's 101 propositions.³

(2)

On March 13th, 1746, Vintimille du Luc, Archbishop of Paris, died at the age of ninety-one, and was succeeded by Gigault de Bellefonds, who reigned only for a few weeks. Next to succeed as the first prelate of the realm was Christophe de Beaumont de Répayre, who had exchanged the diocese of Bayonne for the archdiocese of Vienne as recently as 1745 and had shown himself to be a zealous bishop.⁴ The Jansenists gave the appearance of being pleased with the choice of the new primate ; in Rome the pleasure was genuine.⁵

Beaumont was determined from the start to oppose Jansenism in the most definite manner possible and not to allow anyone to exercise the cure of souls who had not accepted the Bull *Unigenitus* with both outward and inward obedience.⁶

¹ To Tencin, June 11, 1749, HEECKEREN, I., 490.

² To the same, February 11, 1750, *ibid.*, II., 10.

³ DUDON, VIII., 120.

⁴ Biography by E. RÉGNAULT in *Études*, 1876 *seqq.* (special edition, Paris, 1882).

⁵ “ *Non mi fa specie che i Giansenisti si mostrino contenti del nuovo arcivescovo. Questo è il loro solito anche quando non lo sono internamente. Conosco particolarmente il prelato quanto savio altrettanto zelante per la buona causa ; onde voglio sperarne un ottimo governo.” The Secretary of State to the nuncio Durini, April 13, 1746, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 187^v, Papal Secret Archives.

⁶ RÉGNAULT, 1876, II., 796.

That these principles would bring him into conflict with the parliament was brought in upon him as early as the second year of his administration, by the fate that befell one of his colleagues. The Bishop of Amiens had demanded the acceptance of the Bull *Unigenitus* as a condition for giving Communion to the dying and the parliament suppressed this instruction.¹ In this case, it is true, the matter ended with the king forbidding the justiciaries to pronounce judgement in ecclesiastical affairs,² but the incident was only a foretaste of what was to follow. During the war of the Austrian Succession the controversy about the refusal of the Sacraments temporarily ceased, but after the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 it blazed up more furiously than ever. Everything depended on the attitude of the Court. Personally the king had preserved a certain feeling for religion deriving from his education by Fleury; the Bull *Unigenitus* he regarded as a law of the Church and of the State, and consequently, to his mind, the Jansenists were disturbers of the peace and of his personal tranquillity. He was, however, entirely dependent on his entourage, and here the pious Queen Marie Leszczinska and her daughters were opposed by the Pompadour, advised by the Comptroller-General and Keeper of the Seals, Machault, by Marshal de Noailles (with whom it was a family tradition to regard Jansenism as a mere chimera), and in the last instance by the anti-religious party of the so-called philosophers. The Chancellor, D'Aguesseau, was on the side of the clergy but had no influence. Not ill-disposed at first towards the clergy, the king allowed himself to be influenced more and more by the Pompadour's party. Decisive measures, which alone could have saved the situation, were never to be expected of him.³

The struggle between the new Archbishop and the parliament began in connection with the so-called "confession

¹ On January 7, 1747, [NIVELLE], III., 625. Cf. CAHEN, 52.

² RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*; GLASSON, II., 147 *seq.*

³ CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 109-113; Nuncio Durini on April 24 and May 22, 1752, in CALVI, 243-5.

tickets".¹ Authorization to hear confessions being unobtainable from the Archbishop by Jansenist priests, one of them tried to prove in a quarto volume of 800 pages that episcopal authorization was in any case unnecessary, as the authorization was given by the universal Church.² These principles were put into practice. Jansenist priests went from one Parisian parish to another hearing the confessions of their adherents.³ The giving of Communion to the sick, however, remained the exclusive right of the parish priest. To put a stop to this unauthorized hearing of confessions by Jansenist priests, Beaumont ordered that Communion should be given to the dying only when they could prove by the production of a "confession ticket" that they had confessed to an authorized priest. This was no new measure. It had already been used by Cardinal Noailles against the Jesuits, to prevent them from taking part in the cure of souls.⁴ In 1749 there died without the Sacraments a noted appellant, Charles Coffin, who had been Rector of the University, then director of a school to which the Jansenists were pleased to entrust their sons, and incidentally the composer of the hymns in the new Paris breviary. Coffin had asked his parish priest, Bouettin, to give him Communion and Extreme Unction but had

¹ F. ROCQUAIN, *Le refus des sacrements* in *Rev. hist.*, V. (1877), 241-264.

² [TRAVERS], *Les pouvoirs légitimes du premier et du second ordre dans l'administration des sacrements* (1744). Cf. [PATOUILLET] III., 273 *seqq.*; first draft of 1734, *ibid.*, I., 340. Another Jansenist maintained that in view of absolute predestination confession was futile. ROCQUAIN, *loc. cit.*, 250.

³ RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 76. "Entre eux, ils se confessent, et s'administrent, dit-on, les sacrements secrètement sans s'embarrasser autrement des pouvoirs de l'archevêque." (BARBIER, *Journal*, IV., 504; RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 86). In the Lemère case (see below, p. 243) a parliamentary councillor defended the confession tickets on the ground that "trop souvent des prêtres habillés en laïques et l'épée au côté, vont confesser les malades sans pouvoir aucun". CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 102.

⁴ RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 77; CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 94-161.

steadfastly refused to divulge the name of the priest who had heard his confession. His family referred the matter to the Archbishop, who demanded as a condition for the administration of the Last Sacraments that the dying man should submit to the Bull *Unigenitus*; but Coffin would not hear of such a thing. As he finally died without the Sacraments, the clergy took no part in his funeral, which was made the occasion for an imposing demonstration against the Archbishop. The University was represented by the Rector, the faculty of philosophy by the procurators of the four nations, and over four thousand persons are said to have followed the hearse through the streets.¹ It was a manifestation of the spirit of revolt, which for the time being was directed only against the spiritual authority; but already by 1750 the Parisians were being called "republicans".²

The dead man's nephew then procured four counsels' opinions on the case and distributed them in Paris. They contained the advice to bring an action in the parliament against the Archbishop for abuse of official authority. But whatever steps the parliament might have taken were forestalled by a decision of the Council, issued on August 1st, 1749, annulling the four counsels' opinions.³

The Government thus seemed to have decided to leave Church matters to the Church. But it failed to abide by this principle. When six more actions were brought in the parliament for refusal of the Sacraments⁴ the king, in his reply, abided by his last decision but at the same time declared that in matters of this kind he would be the guardian of public order and that further cases would be reported to him. If anyone were refused Communion in a public church, the royal judges could decide the case.⁵ Thus the Government ran with

¹ RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 80 *seq.*; GLASSON, II., 153 *seq.*

² BARBIER, *Journal*, V., 253, in RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 81, n. 3.

³ RÉGNAULT, *ibid.*, 83 *seq.* For the parliament's deliberations on this occasion, see [NIVELLE], III., 492-494.

⁴ [NIVELLE], III., 494.

⁵ Decision of March 20, 1750, *ibid.*, 497.

the hare and hunted with the hounds, and it was easy to see where this would lead, even though the king did continue to hold to his former principles in the complications that at first ensued. One case that cropped up not long afterwards aroused considerable feeling.

The same young member of the Coffin family who had complained about the treatment of his uncle fell ill himself towards the end of the year and asked his parish priest—Bouettin again—for the Sacraments. Bouettin having been asked in vain three times, Coffin appealed to the parliament.¹ The court was only too glad to hear the case; lengthy discussions ensued and Bouettin was kept in custody for a day, but finally the parliament found itself in a blind alley, for the Archbishop persisted in maintaining that he had found the rule as to confession tickets already in existence and that he neither could nor would alter it. The parliament then put the case before the king, who said that he would reserve it for a royal decision. In the end all the parties concerned were relieved of their difficulties by the sick man agreeing to make his confession to a priest authorized by the Archbishop. The parliament, however, availed itself of the opportunity to make a lengthy representation to the king² in which it again defended its right to intervene in matters relating to the administration of the Sacraments.

A further collision with the parliament came about as the result of Beaumont's measures against the Jansenist nursing sisters in the general hospital in Paris.³ The Archbishop forbade these nuns to go into the town whenever they liked on the pretence of going to confession; whereupon the Mother Superior with some of the Sisters left the convent altogether. At the election of a new Superior Beaumont decided in favour of a widow of the name of Moisan, who was supported by the most highly reputed but not the majority of the electors; of the twenty-two votes only ten were cast in her favour.

¹ [NIVELLE], III., 499-515.

² On March 4, 1751, *ibid.*, 507-515. For Coffin, *cf.* RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 81-91.

³ RÉGNAULT, *ibid.*, 208-220; GLASSON, II., 165-173.

Nevertheless, the Archbishop's action was approved in a royal declaration of March 24th, 1751, which also empowered him to nominate the chaplains to the hospital. This led to a contest which had a most important bearing on the future history of the constitution. When the time came for the parliament to enter the royal declaration in its records, it demanded that it be amended according to the wishes of the court; in other words, this was the first occasion on which the parliament intervened in the legislation and assigned to itself a legislative power. This time, it is true, the Government upheld the Archbishop in his choice of the new officials and on August 16th administered a reprimand to the parliament, which replied with further remonstrances. The whole affair was important as a sign of the times: the Revolution was announcing its approach through the principles held by the parliament and by the treatment meted out to the Archbishop by the Jansenist church journal. On its reassembly after the vacation the parliament continued its resistance, and on November 24th went so far as to suspend itself, though it very soon thought fit to resume its functions. The truth was that the parliament's prestige was on the decline at this period; the prices asked for the parliamentary posts which were for sale had dropped considerably.¹

But the parliament, as the chief opponent of the monarchy, which was becoming more and more despised, still had a strong support in the people, and the recovery of its influence was accelerated by the weakness shown towards it by the king. At the beginning of 1752 the Sacraments were refused to a sick priest named Lemère—once again by Bouettin—and the game began anew.² Lemère appealed to the parliament, which summoned Bouettin before it, forbade him under pain of heavy penalties to set a bad example again, and ordered the Archbishop to prevent the repetition of similar scandals.³ The king declared this order to be null and void, but when the sick

¹ GLASSON, II., 170-175.

² [NIVELLE], III., 515-530.

³ "Ordonne en outre que l'archevêque de Paris sera tenu de veiller à ce que pareil scandale n'arrive plus." *Ibid.*, 517.

man had again asked for the Sacraments, this time through the court-bailiff,¹ without success, and a parliamentary deputation went to wait on the king, he began to give way. He promised² to give the necessary orders without delay and to take care of the invalid, and he assured the deputation that they could rely both on his zeal for religion and his determination to preserve public order. Meanwhile Lemère died. On the eve of the Easter recess the parliament met at six o'clock in the evening and remained in session until three o'clock the following morning, which was that of Maundy Thursday. At midnight the order was given for Bouettin's immediate arrest, but he had taken to flight.

After the Easter vacation³ the king annulled the decree against the parish priest and reserved to himself the right to decide on the whole affair. The parliament, as a matter of course, made more remonstrances,⁴ in which it represented itself as the judge of both matters of Faith and of Bishops, and tried to intimidate the king by stressing the danger of a schism if a section of the faithful were to be excluded from the Sacraments. Louis XV. now as good as yielded. He said in his reply⁵ that he would always listen to the parliament's representations with a favourable ear when they had as their subject the good of religion and the peace of the State; he then spoke of the danger of schism and announced that he had punished a parish priest of Orleans who had preached a sermon of which the parliament had complained, that measures were being taken to remove Bouettin from his parish, and that he had never intended entirely to withdraw from the parliament's control the matters now in question. A commission of prelates and officials was to discuss the appropriate measures to be taken.⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, 520.

² On March 27, 1752, *ibid.*, 518.

³ On April 9, *ibid.*, 521.

⁴ On April 15, *ibid.*, 525-528.

⁵ [NIVELLE], III., 528 *seq.*

⁶ CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 104; Durini to Valenti, May 22, 1752, in CALVI, 245.

This gave the parliament what it wanted. As expected, the commission effected nothing, and on April 28th, 1752, there was published the fateful decree of the parliament by which clerics were forbidden to do anything that might lead to schism. In particular it was forbidden publicly to refuse the Sacraments on the ground that no confession ticket had been produced, or that the name of the confessor had not been stated, or that the Bull *Unigenitus* had not been accepted. Further, clerics were not allowed to use in their sermons such terms as innovators, heretics, schismatics, Jansenists, and semi-Pelagians, when speaking of the Bull *Unigenitus*. Offenders would be treated as disturbers of the peace.¹ In the face of this decree the Government acted with its usual weakness. It published an order in council in which it undertook to settle the question by itself but allowed the parliament's decree to stand, and in a covering letter to the Bishops it recommended its observance.²

Naturally those who were loyal to the Church did not fail to raise their voices against the counsellors who had prevailed upon the king to make "so weak and submissive a reply" to the "provocative and subversive" remonstrances of the parliament, but they made no impression on the originators of the answer, the Comptroller-General, the Pompadour, and Marshal Noailles. With the exception of the Chancellor, who protested in vain, the Ministers had been bought by the Pompadour and feared to lose their posts.³

The Jansenists had good cause to exult. Printed copies of the parliamentary decree were distributed by the thousand, and they were soon to be seen posted up at every street corner; they were even affixed to the Archbishop's palace in twelve different places. Many persons had a copy framed and hung it at the head of their beds, along with the images of Saints. They also distributed printed invitations to the funeral of "the noble lady, Madame la Constitution *Unigenitus*, daughter of Clement XI., widow of Monsieur

¹ [NIVELLE], III., 530.

² RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 231 *seq.*; GLASSON, II., 181.

³ Nuncio Durini on April 24, 1752, in CALVI, 243.

Formulaire, who died suddenly in the Great Hall of the parliament in Paris.”¹

To make things difficult for the clergy several Jansenists took up their residence in the parish of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont, knowing that the Sacraments would be refused them there.² “You all know,” wrote the Bishop of Amiens, “the confusion that reigns in Paris. The king commands his subjects to obey the Bull as much as if it were a law of the State, while the parliament punishes those who demand this obedience. I should like to know what object the king had in view when he published his order in council. It is easy to see what the parliament wants, but for the life of me I cannot see what the king is aiming at.”³ Other Bishops would have liked the Pope solemnly to condemn the representations of the parliament, since that would have impressed those who meant well. But in that case the parliament would have burnt the condemnation in public, and the situation would have been worse than before.⁴ Beaumont then circulated for subscription by his parish priests a memorial in which the confession tickets were described as an old custom of the archdiocese. This gave rise to further debates in the parliament, to interrogations, to declarations of invalidity on the part of the Court, and to threats on the part of the parliament to cease functioning.⁵ There was no lack of attacks on the Archbishop, one decree of the parliament referring to the schism “of which the Archbishop dares to declare himself in favour”.⁶ In the face

¹ RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 232 *seq.*; ROCQUAIN, 156.

² GLASSON, II., 184. “Il était évident,” Glasson says here, “que le Parlement, au lieu d’éteindre le feu, l’excitait.”

³ RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 232 *seq.*

⁴ Durini to Valenti, May 22, 1752, in CALVI, 244. C. STRYIENSKI in *Le dix-huitième siècle*, Paris, 1912, 136: “Le Parlement fait du Jansénisme une arme politique empiétant le pouvoir ecclésiastique, fomentant sous le couvert des libertés gallicanes une opposition qui menace le pouvoir royal.”

⁵ [NIVELLE], III., 530-539.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 534; repeated in the president’s first speech before the king, *ibid.*, 538.

of these insults Beaumont's fellow-Bishops made representations to the king.¹ "What," they asked, "will the people think, what will they be able to respect, when those who in virtue of their office ought to cultivate submissiveness set it an example of insubordination; when they set themselves up as censors and teachers in matters in which they ought to allow themselves to be instructed, namely in matters of religion?" At the same time, with Beaumont at their head, they protested against the violations of the ecclesiastical authority.² But it was all in vain. While the decree of the parliament was being circulated in thousands of printed copies a royal command forbade the publication of the Bishops' petitions. Nevertheless, these latter, which were signed at first by twenty Archbishops and Bishops, were eventually agreed to by sixty prelates.³ At about this time the nuncio Durini represented to the Minister Saint-Contest that the king would have to deprive the parliament once for all of the right to pronounce unfavourable judgement on the refusal of the Sacraments. If Jansenism were no longer able to rely on the royal protection, he maintained, it would disappear from France in a few years. It seemed to the nuncio that his representations had made a certain impression, but nothing resulted from them.⁴ With Marshal Noailles he was even less successful.⁵

The parliament took advantage of the weakness of the Government to make the fullest use of its decree against the refusal of the Sacraments. Clerics were found guilty and arrested in every diocese that was within the administrative area of the Paris parliament.⁶ In the parish of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont in Paris, by July 1753, not only the parish priest

¹ On June 11, 1752, in RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 234.

² RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 235; FLEURY, LXXVII., 695.

³ RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*; SCHILL, 282 *seq.*

⁴ Durini to Valenti, July 17, 1752; CALVI, 248.

⁵ Durini on October 9, 1752, *ibid.*, 254.

⁶ Cf. *Journal historique* of the parliamentary sessions from May 17 to September 6, 1752, in [NIVELLE], III., 548-595, from November 29, 1752, to the banishment of the parliament, *ibid.*,

Bouettin but also his three vicars had fled before the persecution of the parliament,¹ so that there was no priest left to conduct the services. The Bishop of Amiens wrote to the king that several parishes in his dioceses had been deserted, their pastors having flown ; surely the king would not abandon the clergy to the wrath of his lay officials.² Nevertheless, the persecution continued. When the parliament went into recess at the beginning of September its part was taken over by the *Chambre des Vacations*, and when this retired from the scene on October 27th, 1752, it was replaced until the parliament reopened on November 12th by the officials of the Châtelet, who ordered a letter from their Archbishop to be burned by the public executioner.³ " Things are going persistently badly for us," wrote this prelate on September 22nd, 1752⁴ ; " the Court, it is evident, is disturbing itself very little on our account, and the parliament, which is being given a free hand, is bent on destroying the Bull so far as France is concerned, and it will succeed in its purpose only too well if the clergy are forced to administer the Sacraments to the Jansenists. If the lower ranks of the clergy are not supported they will lose courage and do whatever the parliament wants. No respect is paid to the Bishops ; false hopes are held out to them, and they are prevented from taking action. Everyone to whom I write replies that we can only wait ; but the parliament does not wait ; it persecutes us incessantly."⁵

651 *seqq.* ; also, for the parliamentary vacations, the records of the *Chambre des Vacations* for 1752, *ibid.*, 595 *seqq.*, for 1753, *ibid.*, 721 ; of the Châtelet for 1752, *ibid.*, 607 *seqq.*, for 1753, *ibid.*, 723. For the measures taken by the tribunals dependent on the parliament, *ibid.*, 619 *seqq.*

¹ Cf. the records in [NIVELLE], III., 539-548.

² ROCQUAIN, 161.

³ GLASSON, II., 185.

⁴ In RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 237 *seq.*

⁵ " Au commencement de 1753 la querelle entre les Jansénistes et les Molinistes [namely over the refusal of the Sacraments] avait pris un degré d'acuité inouï et cela au dépens de tous,

At the end of 1752 another case in which the Sacraments were refused gave rise to more confusion and to far-reaching discussions on constitutional law.¹ In the convent school of St. Agatha five of the Jansenist nuns had already died without the Sacraments,² and when in December 1752 a certain Sister Perpetua had an apoplectic stroke, the parliament ordered the Sacraments to be given her. The vicars of the parish cited the prohibition of the Archbishop, and when he refused to retract his former instructions the court ordered the episcopal revenues to be confiscated and invited the peers of France together with the king to sit in judgement on Beaumont, since he, being a peer, could only be tried by his equals. At this the prelates who were present in Paris, the rest of the clergy, and, to no less a degree, the king, were highly indignant. The king called the parliament an assembly of republicans and could find no other consolation for himself than that the present state of things would last at least as long as he did.³ He reserved for himself the handling of the affair and forbade the convening of the peers,⁴ which action gave rise to the following questions of constitutional law: Had the parliament the right to convene the peers? Could the king reserve for himself the judgement of a case after the summons to the peers had gone forth, and if he did so, could a peer be subsequently judged by the Council of State? ⁵ The first question was answered by the parliament in the affirmative, by the king in the negative; nevertheless the parliament convened the peers, and the king again forbade them to assemble. Then the parliament sent a deputation to the king to explain the necessity for the summons, and he replied curtly that he had

surtout au préjudice de la religion. Ces querelles faisaient soulever des controverses de toutes sortes et régner un véritable souffle révolutionnaire." GLASSON, II., 186.

¹ [NIVELLE], III., 542-8, 654-662; RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 240-243; GLASSON, II., 187.

² [NIVELLE], *loc. cit.*.

³ RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*; CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 113.

⁴ On December 16, 1752, [NIVELLE], *loc. cit.*, 657.

⁵ GLASSON, II., 189 *seqq.*

every respect for the peers, but that they knew what command he had issued, and that he was amazed at the parliament's presumption. This reply was then the subject of long and heated arguments among the magistrates, and nine different proposals were made as to what was to be done.¹ Finally they agreed on twenty-two articles as the basis of an extensive representation to be made to the king.² Meanwhile Sister Perpetua had recovered from her stroke and had been taken to the convent of Port-Royal in the suburb of Saint-Jacques, which had long ceased to be Jansenist. The other nuns had to dismiss their pupils and were dispersed among other convents.³

While the proposed representations were being elaborated the parliament continued on its former course, though opposed by the royal Council of State. On January 18th, 1753, the Bishop of Orleans received instructions to administer the Sacraments to a sick nun within an hour.⁴ The Council reserved the case for its own judgement, but in spite of that the parliament imposed a fine of 6,000 *livres* on the Bishop and summoned him to appear in person, whereupon the Council again objected to all that had been done.⁵ The parliament also met with objections and censures on the part of the jurists. Opinions were published which disputed its authority in the matter of the administration of the Sacraments, notable examples being that which was signed at the end of January 1753 by forty doctors of the faculty of law in the University of Paris, and another one which appeared about the same time and was signed by various canonists and barristers. There was also a recrudescence of the old question

¹ GLASSON, *loc. cit.*

² Copy in [NIVELLE], III., 678.

³ RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 342.

⁴ [NIVELLE], III., 662 *seqq.* She was the twentieth nun in her convent to die without the Sacraments. *Ibid.*, 663.

⁵ [NIVELLE], III., 662-673. At the time the Bishop of Autun proposed a national council, but it was not approved of by the nuncio Durini. Durini to Valenti, February 26, 1753. CALVI, 257.

whether the Jansenists still believed in the presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar. The parliament, of course, condemned all these documents.¹

To put an end to the turmoil the king addressed letters patent to the parliament on February 22nd, 1753, forbidding it to occupy itself any further with the question of the Sacraments.² The parliament replied by deciding to extend the representations to the king, which had been in preparation for a long time past. On April 5th the work was ready at last, and the king was asked when a deputation might appear before him. His answer was that it would be enough for him to see the outline of the representation, namely the twenty-two articles of February 25th. On May 4th, 1753, he announced his decision not to accept the representations in full and ordered the parliament to place on record his letters patent of February 22nd. The parliament's reply was that as it was impossible to bring the truth to the steps of the throne, the chambers of the parliament would continue to sit but without performing their official functions. The king ordered it to resume its functions and to record the letters patent of February 22nd. This command being disobeyed, there was no other measure to apply but that of force. At 3 o'clock on the morning of May 9th orders were handed by musketeers to every member of the five parliamentary chambers of the *Enquêtes* and the two chambers of the *Requêtes*, according to which they were to betake themselves within twenty-four hours to specified towns in the kingdom. The highest section of the parliament, the *Grand'Chambre*, was spared, and on May 10th dealt with another case of refusal of the Sacraments, but with no cases of another kind; and this, indeed, was not possible, owing to the barristers having ceased to function. On May 11th the *Grand'Chambre* was also banished, to Pontoise; but here too it refused to attend to any other matter than the refusal of the Sacraments. The banished members were cheered by the people in the streets, and incidentally

¹ [NIVELLE], III., 635-642.

² *Ibid.*, 673.

were quite content to be in exile, which for them was by way of being a holiday.¹

The voluminous representations of April 9th, 1753,² failed to fulfil their purpose inasmuch as they were never laid before the king, but they are noteworthy nevertheless as presaging the principles of the coming revolution. After violent protests had been made against the "pretensions" of the clergy it was explained to the king that he was acting unjustly in interfering with the jurisdiction of the parliament so as to reserve for himself the decision of certain cases, and that the resistance of the parliament was justified. In other words, the nation, of which the parliament felt itself to be the representative, was above the king.³

The banishment of the parliament naturally entailed some very harmful consequences. The administration of justice practically ceased; almost the only court which continued to function was that of the Châtelet, which dealt with minor cases only. Advocates and auxiliary officials were deprived of their living, there was no longer any revenue from the tax on legal documents, and provincials no longer came to Paris to have their cases heard. It was calculated that the population of the city was reduced by 20,000.⁴

Some substitute, therefore, had to be found for the missing courts. In November 1753 the king removed the members of the parliament from Pontoise to Soissons, and with this the *Grand'Chambre* was dissolved. A *Chambre Royale* was set up in its place, but no one would make use of it; its members met and after waiting for a quarter of an hour went away again.⁵ In the provinces the other parliaments joined with

¹ GLASSON, II., 195; CAHEN, 54.

² [NIVELLE], III., 678-708 (heads 60).

³ " Il y a dans ces remontrances un reflet de la doctrine nouvelle qui commençait à se faire jour et suivant laquelle la nation est au-dessus du roi, comme l'Église est au-dessus du pape." GLASSON, II., 199. These remontrances have been termed " le coup de tocsin avant-courreur de la révolution." RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 347.

⁴ GLASSON, II., 199, 205.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 203, 205, 209.

that of Paris in resisting the Government, and the persecution of the clergy there was continued with greater energy than before.¹

Even before his differences with the parliament the king's prestige had sunk extremely low, owing to the maladministration of the Government, the impoverishment of the people, and the presence of the Pompadour. On one occasion when the Dauphin and his wife were driving to Notre-Dame to give thanks for the birth of a child, their carriage was surrounded by two thousand women who shrieked out at them, "Give us something to eat, we are starving! Away with that strumpet who is ruling France and bringing her to ruin! Once we lay our hands on her there won't be enough of her left to make relics of!"² In his reports to Rome the nuncio Durini related that the king was bringing about his own downfall by his weakness towards the parliament and that the ground was being prepared for a political as well as a religious upheaval.³ All, he said, who were still Catholic in thought and cared for the king's honour and renown deplored the remissness of the

¹ GLASSON, II., 207.

² ROCQUAIN, 144.

³ On May 22, 1752, in CALVI, 243-5. The king did not realize, wrote Durini on October 9, 1752 (*ibid.*, 254), "che la debolezza delle sue risoluzioni è la vera maniera di perdere affatto colla religione anche la sua autorità, ed aprire la strada a catastrofi che saranno un giorno senza riparo, se con forza non vi si rimedia a tempo." Similarly on March 12, 1753 (*ibid.*, 262): "L'indolenza è grande, e l'ignoranza o piuttosto malignità di chi guida i gabinetti di Versailles è incredibile." While the parliament was active, "la corte non dà segno di vita, perchè si travaglia sempre dal Guardasigilli [Machault] colle sue lanciae spezzate [Noailles] che ha nel Consiglio, a ritenere il Re da quelle maschie risoluzioni che mostra di tanto in tanto di voler prendere, ora con larva d'emozione nel popolo, ed ora con pretesti, di non doversi fare nuove illegalità, perchè queste darebbero maggiori prese ai Parlamentarii di conculcar davantaggio l'autorità regia. Così il povero Re è tradito, e la religione ogni giorno più discapita con scandalo universale e dolore dei buoni, che pure non ne mancano in questa cloaca d'iniquità."

Government. The queen herself had spoken to him about the matter with tears in her eyes. The king was fundamentally good at heart but ill-advised. He could find no way out of his difficulties and meanwhile his reputation was lessening every day, and when things had become desperate in both the religious and political sphere it would be too late for him to exert his authority. He listened willingly enough to the remonstrances of the queen and Boyer, but when it came to making a decision he followed the advice of the Ministers, who out of regard for a false policy, for the sake of their own interests, and for lack of intelligence and religion, inspired the king with the fear of still greater encroachments on his rights by the parliament, and told him that it would do no harm to religion to abolish the Confession tickets. It had been said in the Council that Christ Himself gave Communion to Judas.

The chief obstacle to any decisive action was the popularity of the parliament, which had been increased enormously by its resistance to the maladministration of the Government; and the loss of prestige suffered by the king was accompanied by a corresponding lack of respect for the clergy, which was looked on as an ally of the Government. At the time when the parliament was preparing its grand remonstrances with Louis XV. posters with the words "Long live the parliament! Death to the king and the bishops!" were affixed to the walls of houses; every night for a week mounted troops rode through the streets to maintain public order; the Archbishop's palace was guarded by soldiers; and clerics could rarely appear in the streets without being insulted.¹ To the banished *Grand'Chambre* legal officials who had also been banished wrote, "The king may have 100,000 men but the parliament has the hearts, the respect, and the will of all."² Even at this time a work written against the grand remonstrances of the parliament contained the warning that its republican principles were more threatening to the crown than all the teachings of Rome regarding indirect authority, which had raised such an outcry in France. Thanks to the influence

¹ ROCQUAIN, 170.

² *Ibid.*, 173.

it had won it was more in a position to dethrone the king than was the Pope. The Bishop of Montauban seems to have had the gift of prophecy when in a pastoral letter he reminded his readers of the English revolution and the fate of Charles I.¹

Louis XV. gradually realized that he would have to make peace. Welcomed by bonfires, the parliament returned in September 1754, and its sessions were opened to the accompaniment of cheers and clapping. The "Royal Chamber" was dissolved before it had given its first verdict.² On September 2nd the king had an announcement read in the parliament, imposing a general silence on religious questions and instructing the parliament to see to its observance.² In spite of this concession the parliament made difficulties about recording the announcement. On September 5th it debated the matter from nine o'clock in the morning till five in the evening and in addition sent deputies to the king to protest against much that had been said to the detriment of the parliament in the preamble to the announcement.⁴ It was also stated expressly that the parliament's attitude towards the administration of the Sacraments remained unchanged.

For the clergy the reconciliation between the king and the parliament brought no relief, but rather the reverse. Hitherto

¹ *Ibid.*, 175.

² *Ibid.*, 184; GLASSON, II., 208; [NIVELLE], III., 994 *seq.*

³ GLASSON, II., 209; [NIVELLE], III., 995 *seq.* The congratulations of the various Paris corporations on the parliament's return, *ibid.*, 998-1000.

⁴ GLASSON, 210 *seq.* The opinion in Rome was " *Il silentio imposto non sarà osservato et invece di quiete continueranno i torbidi e ne insorgeranno dei nuovi, sì coi fatti che con i scritti, come in simili casi ha fatto conoscere l'esperienza del passato. Sopra tutto ha fatto ammirazione l'audacia e temerità del Parlamento, che, abusando della facilità e bontà del Re, ha registrato la regia dichiarazione con tante modificazioni e riserve che intieramente la distruggono, specialmente con aver dichiarato che a tenore della medesima dichiarazione abbia ad intendersi proibita qualunque innovazione nell' amministrazione esteriore e pubblica dei sacramenti." To the nuncio Gualtieri, September 25, 1754, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 458. Papal Secret Archives.

the king had been, on the whole, on the side of the clergy ; that this was no longer the case was discovered by the Archbishops of Paris and Narbonne, when, together with Cardinals Soubise and La Rochefoucauld, they remonstrated with the king about the decree he had issued in September commanding silence ; they were simply turned away.¹ The truth was that the situation had entirely altered. A law of silence was nothing new ; what was new was that the bitterest enemy of the clergy had been appointed as guardian of this silence and to judge whether it had been observed.² The parliament saw at once that there was no longer any fear of its decisions being quashed by the Council of State and made good use of the new conditions. The vacation chamber had been dealing with the case of a Canon of Orleans, Cougniou by name, who on his death-bed had called the Bull *Unigenitus* a work of the Devil and had consequently been refused the Sacraments. On August 25th 1755, by way of punishment the Paris parliament inflicted a fine of 100 *livres* on the Canons of Orleans and compelled them to give 400 *livres* to charity ; four of them were permanently banished from the country, their property was confiscated, and part of the capital had to be spent on holding an annual commemorative ceremony for the deceased and on erecting a marble tablet in the church as a lasting record of the judgement of the court.³ A protest sent to the king by the clergy met in assembly effected nothing, whereupon the Bishop of Orleans forbade services to be held in the church. The parish priest, however, continued to hold them, and not only he but also the Bishop were sent into exile by the king.⁴ Incidentally, the parliament took it upon itself to declare as an abuse the fact that some priests were calling the Bull *Unigenitus* a rule of Faith.⁵ But against this encroachment on the spiritual sphere

¹ [NIVELLE], III., 996.

² RÉGNAULT, 1878, II., 673.

³ [NIVELLE], III., 1000-3.

⁴ SCHILL, 287 *seq.* ; [NIVELLE], III., 1020 *seq.*

⁵ " Et attendu les faits de la cause, reçoit le procureur général du Roi incidemment appellant comme d'abus de

the Royal Council intervened. This time the parliament accepted the reprimand, having secret information that the Council of State had only made this gesture because the king was hoping to obtain from the assembly of the clergy a contribution of fifteen to sixteen millions for the conduct of the Seven Years' War, which was just commencing.¹ By the beginning of 1775, however, priest-baiting had become general,² and the harshest measures were approved. A cleric who in the name of his Archbishop had openly, in church, forbidden two priests to take the Sacraments to a Jansenist, was condemned—in his absence, it is true—as a disturber of the peace, to be branded with a red-hot iron and to work for the rest of his life in the galleys.³ Other than that of Paris, the parliaments that showed the greatest zeal in persecuting clerics were those of Aix, Rennes, and Toulouse.⁴ Even prelates could not count on being spared. At Troyes the Bishop himself had taken the place of a parish priest who had been driven away, and he had refused the Sacraments to a Jansenist. For this he was fined 3,000 *livres*, his property was sold, his income was sequestered, and he was relegated by the king to a humble little town in his diocese. From here he wrote a pastoral letter in which he complained of the insolence of the Jansenist heresy, and the document was publicly torn up and burnt by the public executioner. The Bishop in his turn forbade his subordinates to take any cognizance of this decree of the parliament, and the conflict continued until in 1756 the king removed the

l'exécution de la bulle Unigenitus, notamment en ce qu'aucuns ecclésiastiques prétendent lui attribuer le caractère ou lui donner les effets de règle de foi." Decree of March 18, 1755, [NIVELLE], III., 1002.

¹ ROCQUAIN, 188.

² " Ces hostilités étaient générales au commencement de l'année 1755 " (GLASSON, II., 215). For cases of refusal of the Sacraments brought before the parliament of Toulouse, see A. DEGERT, in the *Bulletin de littérat. eccl.*, 1924, 277 seq.

³ On May 14, 1755, [NIVELLE], III., 1005 seq.

⁴ GLASSON, II., 219.

Bishop to Murbach in Alsace, where he was outside the parliament's jurisdiction.¹ The Bishop of Auxerre had forbidden his clergy to follow the Jansenistic custom of reading aloud the Canon of the Mass. Even this instruction was adjudged by the parliament to be an abuse and a breach of the peace and it was accordingly abrogated.² A document in which the Bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Auch expressed their common opinion on the refusal of the Sacraments had to be torn up and burnt by the executioner at the order of the Paris parliament.³ Such incidents as these should be remembered in connection with certain features of the French Revolution. The people were deliberately trained to despise first the spiritual authority and then authority of any kind.

The cleric who had most incurred the wrath of the all-powerful tribunal was the Archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont. When questioned about a case of the refusal of the Sacraments which had occurred in his archdiocese his reply was that for this he was answerable to God alone. He was then charged with contempt of court by the president of the parliament, whereupon the king banished the Archbishop to his country residence of Conflans, near Paris. Here he continued to express his standpoint in fresh cases of the refusal of the Sacraments and forbade two priests who in defiance of his prohibition had administered the Sacraments to Jansenists, to exercise their priestly functions. Beaumont was then banished to Legay, which was still further from Paris, but was soon allowed to return to Conflans.⁴

The Bishops who were faithful to the Church spoke of a systematic religious persecution. "Our priests," wrote the Bishop of Amiens,⁵ "are still scattered, with no assistance or protection. Everything is managed so carelessly in this respect

¹ [NIVELLE], III., 1021-7.

² *Ibid.*, 1027.

³ *Ibid.*, 1027-9. Cf. SCHILL, 286; DEGERT, *loc. cit.*, 340; ROHRBACHER, *Hist. universelle de l'Église*, XIII., Paris, 1877, 99.

⁴ [NIVELLE], III., 1003 *seq.*, 1001-1020; RÉGNAULT, 1878, II., 674-688.

⁵ On September 17, 1753, in RÉGNAULT, 1877, I., 353.

that the greatest indifference would not be worse. Hard as your life may be"—he was writing to a Trappist—"there are days in mine which are bitterer. When I am forced to see people who openly talk against the Bishops and the Pope, flout their judgements and then have the impudence to demand the Sacraments and extort them by the temporal power, I can no longer control myself, and my suffering is intensified by the number of priests who allow themselves to be intimidated. A persecution with fire and sword would be easier for me to bear, for then the people would not be led astray. But if the Sacraments are given to everyone without distinction the people do not understand why they should not subscribe to views which do not exclude them from the Sacraments."

Not only were the Bishops attacked from without, but they were not fully agreed among themselves. An assembly of twenty-six prelates, headed by Cardinals La Rochefoucauld, Archbishop of Bourges, and Soubise, declared it to be unnecessary to demand Confession tickets, and to meet their wishes the Archbishop of Paris consented to postpone the discussion of the matter until the assembly of the clergy. This decision was approved by the Pope in a letter to the two Cardinals.¹ Cardinal La Rochefoucauld, Boyer's successor as administrator of ecclesiastical affairs and consequently the leading personality among the prelates, was inclined as far as possible towards conciliation and compromise.² At the assembly of the clergy which took place on May 25th, 1755, a commission under his presidency discussed the questions connected with the Bull *Unigenitus*, the refusal of the Sacraments, and the rights of the spiritual and temporal authority. Their principles were embodied in ten articles, which were signed by seventeen Bishops and twenty-two delegates. In disagreement with them, 16 Bishops and 10 delegates formulated their views under eight headings.³ Both parties agreed that the Sacraments had to be refused, even publicly, to notorious opponents

¹ CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 131 *seq.*; P. RICHARD in *Rev. des quest. hist.*, XCII. (1912), 397; HEECKEREN, II., 404; BOUTRY, 37.

² BRIMONT, *Le cardinal de la Rochefoucauld*, Paris, 1913.

³ ROSKOVÁNY, III., 196-8; SCHILL, 288-293.

of the Bull *Unigenitus*, but they differed as to what constituted notorious opposition.¹ The tenets of the minority struck a clearer and more definite note, but as they did not enter into difficult individual cases, they might, in practice, have led to excesses. For although no one was in any doubt that an unworthy person ought not to receive the Sacrament, the Church's principle was that, as a rule, the question of worthiness or unworthiness must be left to the conscience of the recipient. It was only in certain cases that the Sacrament could be openly withheld. The assembly failing to come to an agreement, there was no other course open but to ask the Pope for his decision. In a letter to the king the assembly asked for freedom for the Bishops and for theological instruction, for the cessation of the unprovoked molestation of the clergy, and the recall of the Archbishop of Paris.² Both to this request of the Bishops and to that of the parliament, that a circular letter written by the prelates to their fellow-Bishops should be suppressed, the king gave no definite reply.³

One reason for his non-committal attitude may have been that there were already under way negotiations with the Pope, which the Government did not want to prejudice. Consideration for Rome may also have had something to do with the Government's failure to support the parliament in the measures it was taking against the Sorbonne. Some theses which were not entirely Gallican in tone had incurred the disapproval of the self-opinioned magistrates, who warned the syndic not to allow anything of the kind in future. This order of the parliament the faculty was commanded to enter in its records. Secretly encouraged by the Government, the doctors refused to obey the order, and when, on May 14th, 1755, they were

¹ La Rochefoucauld being in control of the "*feuille des bénéfices*", his followers were known as *Feuillants*; their opponents, who adhered to the principles of the former Theatine Boyer, went by the name of *Théatins*.

² RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 690 *seq.*

³ [NIVELLE], III., 1029 *seqq.*

forced to appear before the parliament and to make the required entry in the records, which had been brought with them, all examinations for the licentiate and baccalaureate ceased forthwith. The parliament objected, but further theses which displeased it were defended. The parliament raised objections again, and again the examinations for the licentiate and baccalaureate were suspended. Then, when two doctors sought the right to attend the meetings of the faculty, they were asked to subscribe to the decree of December 15th, 1729, by which the faculty had submitted to the Bull *Unigenitus*. The parliament examined the decree, judged it to be invalid, and forbade it to be signed. This decision of the parliament the theologians were commanded to put on record, but it was cancelled by a decree of the Royal Council.¹

(3)

When, in 1755, on the birth of the future Louis XVIII., the Bishop of Castres, in a pastoral letter, invited the mediation of the king, so that peace might be restored to France through a Papal decision, the letter was banned by the parliament as being an insult to the country, whose king and laws were a sufficient guarantee of peace.²

Nevertheless it was becoming clearer as time went on that even for Gallican France the last hope of its escaping from its difficulties lay in an appeal to Rome. It had long been evident to everyone that nothing was to be expected from the Court. The hope that had been cherished in Church circles that the assembly of the clergy would provide a solution had proved to be illusory. It has come to no conclusion, wrote the Bishop of Amiens,³ and has possibly done more harm than good. To show its contempt for it, the parliament had been persecuting the priests even more than before. While the

¹ [NIVELLE], III., lxxvii., 1031-8.

² DEGERT, *loc. cit.*, 341.

³ On January 25, 1756, in RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 697.

assembly was still in progress this same prelate had complained¹ that the king was abandoning the clergy entirely to the mercies of the parliament, which was boldly attacking religion and was treating its servants as disgracefully as it could. If this continued they would have a Gallican religion in France in the same way as England had its Anglican religion.

As it happened, the Bishop underestimated the utility of the assembly's activity, since its deliberations were the starting-point of Benedict XIV.'s decision which, so far as the ecclesiastics were concerned, put an end on all cardinal points to the doubts about the administration of the Sacraments. Even before the assembly met, at the end of 1754, Louis XV. had appointed Count Choiseul-Stainville, afterwards Duke of Choiseul, to be envoy extraordinary to Rome.² His instructions began with the statement that religion 'had always been the foundation of the kingdom, the safeguard of princes, and the joy of nations.'³ It went on to say that the king had devoted all his attention to settling the religious troubles, and that the Pope could rely on his prudence and constancy but that not one of the Gallican liberties would be surrendered.⁴

Like the Bishop of Amiens, Benedict XIV. feared that a State Church independent of the Pope would be formed in France under the leadership of the parliament, on the model of the English one.⁵ Consequently conditions in France caused him more anxiety than any other consideration.⁶ No one with any religion and any heart, he wrote, could fail to be appalled by what is being done there against the Church and

¹ On August 21, 1755, *ibid.*, 690.

² Cf. BOUTRY, *Choiseul à Rome*, Paris, 1895; W. MARCUS, *Der Jansenistenstreit und seine Beilegung durch Choiseul* (Progr.), Wohrlau, 1906; P. RICHARD in *Rev. des quest. hist.*, XCII., 27-61, 364-403.

³ BOUTRY, iv.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xxi.

⁵ To Tencin, March 21, 1753, HEECKEREN, II., 253; to the same, January 1, 1755, *ibid.*, 384.

⁶ July 4, 1753, *ibid.*, 278.

the royal authority, without there appearing to be any human solution of the trouble.¹ He was quite convinced that France was threatened with nothing less than the "utter ruin of religion and the kingdom", with the "destruction of the Faith, the Church, and the realm",² and with a repetition of the old persecutions of the Christians,³ and he deplored the "intolerable indifference" with which the most important matters were treated in France.⁴ It was therefore with the keenest attention that he followed the sequence of events in the country which he had formerly thought to be the strongest bulwark of the Church.⁵ There was no action taken by the parliament against the Church that he did not bitterly bemoan in his correspondence with Cardinal Tencin,⁶ no sign of firmness on the part of the king that did not fill him with joy.⁷

It was therefore certainly not indifference, but only unfavourable circumstances, that kept the Pope from openly intervening. During the last centuries, he wrote, the Pope's prestige had been damaged by the French; the propagation of their tenets in Germany, in parts of Spain, and even in Italy had done much harm to the Papacy. In consequence the Popes had not been able to come to the aid of the oppressed as in the past.⁸ There were few countries now, he lamented, which did not offer insults to the Pope.⁹ As for France, the parliament was showing the utmost contempt for the Papal authority; no one from there had asked for his advice in the present situation. He refrained from intervening, for fear of doing greater harm, although this attitude reminded him of Nero, lyre in hand, looking down from his window on the

¹ May 21, 1755, *ibid.*, 414.

² October 9, 1755, *ibid.*, 464.

³ February 19, 1755, *ibid.*, 395.

⁴ January 30, 1754, *ibid.*, 319.

⁵ Letter of October 9, 1754, *ibid.*, 365.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 234, 237, 251, etc.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 213, 269, 310.

⁸ To Tencin, May 28, 1755, HEECKEREN, II., 414.

⁹ To the same, October 18, 1752, *ibid.*, 219.

burning city of Rome.¹ The Jansenists, indeed, made use of this silence of the Pope's to depict him as a supporter of the parliament and an opponent of the Bull *Unigenitus*. To Durini, his nuncio in France, he had to administer a sharp reproof when he reported to him the stupid stories and gossip about his supposed indifference²; as a rule, however, he was silent when this kind of talk came to his ears. "What means have We," he wrote,³ "to close the mouths of these calumniators?" He replied to them indirectly, however, by issuing a Brief in condemnation of a work written in defence of the parliament, for, as he said, he would never let pass the slightest opportunity of showing his adherence to the Bull *Unigenitus*, and he firmly believed that he was strictly bound to do so.⁴ Unfortunately, however, his Brief was suppressed by the Royal Council of State, on the plea that it was thus preventing the parliament from having it publicly burnt. In these circumstances, he asked, how was he to comply with Archbishop Languet's request that he should declare that to disobey the Bull was a grievous sin?⁵ In other matters, too, the parliament was trampling under foot the authority of the Holy See. That was the thanks he got for the moderation and the extreme delicacy with which he had consistently avoided an attack on the doctrines of the French, opposed as they were to those of Rome, and, in fact, to those of the rest of the world, and even

¹ Letter of June 14, 1752, *ibid.*, 193.

² Durini to Valenti, August 14, 1752, in CALVI, 264. " *Li Giansenisti sostenevano e dicevano pubblicamente in Parigi che il Papa stesso fosse del loro sentimento, et è certo che vedeva mal volentieri il card. Durini, perchè, quando era Nuncio in Francia, avesse scritto con sincerità questa falsa nova per stimolarlo a fare qualche passo publico che la smentisse, come fece con alcuni Brevi e con la proibizione di alcuni libercoli." MERENDA, *Memorie*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome, 1613, fo. 155.

³ On August 9, 1752, HEECKEREN, II., 205.

⁴ December 6, 1752, *ibid.*, 230; *cf.* 228.

⁵ February 7, 1753, *ibid.*, 243. Actually he agreed with Languet. *Ibid.*, 365, 376, 415, 495. Choiseul maintained that he had heard the opposite. BOUTRY, 104.

to those which had been held by the French themselves before 1682.¹ He was not asking the French to speak in the Italian way, but they ought to let the Italians speak in their own way.²

There was only one action that the Pope thought that he could take without harming France still more, namely to write again to the king, as he had already done on several previous occasions,³ since, in spite of his weakness and incompetence, he was the only protection against the parliament. His hopes were raised somewhat when there was talk of an assembly of the clergy,⁴ but they sank again when the assembly failed to invite his intervention, when it protested in vain against the "outrageous" decree of the parliament dealing with the chapter of Orleans, and finally when dissension among the Bishops seemed to preclude the possibility of any definite action.⁵ Nevertheless he still held back, it being the opinion of many in Rome that there was only one way of uniting the Bishops: for the Pope to open his mouth; then with one voice they would all turn against him.⁶

On Choiseul's arrival in Rome Benedict's attitude towards him was again guided by the thought that nothing could be done in the religious question without the king. He therefore let the envoy make his peace proposals, merely making a few additions to them and adapting them to the requirements of the Church. The Secretary of State, Valenti, assured Choiseul at their very first meeting that the Pope would do nothing that would displease the king. Benedict himself spoke in the same vein⁷ and continued to maintain a friendly attitude

¹ March 14, 1753, BOUTRY, 251.

² May 30, 1753, *ibid.*, 268.

³ *Ibid.*, 196, 207 (1752), 318 (1754), 395, 397 (1755).

⁴ Letters of November 27, 1754, and May 7, 1755, *ibid.*, 375, 411.

⁵ Letters of September 10, October 8 and 29, 1755, *ibid.*, 438, 445, 551.

⁶ To Tencin, November 12, 1755, *ibid.*, 453 *seq.*

⁷ Choiseul on November 6 and 13, 1754, BOUTRY, 4-9.

towards the envoy,¹ even when the Archbishop of Paris was banished to Conflans and the attitude of the French Bishops on this occasion was the daily talk of the Cardinals in Rome, while he himself was writing to Tencin² that the news of the Archbishop's banishment had made his blood run cold, and finally when a storm of indignation was sweeping through the city, and the French nuncio was forwarding bitter complaints to Rome.³ On the other hand, Valenti explained to the envoy that it was hardly surprising that the Pope considered himself obliged to make representations to the French Court, for it was very painful to him to be accused of cowardice by the French Bishops.⁴ Benedict did in fact send a letter to the king,⁵ emphasizing the unrestricted right of the Church to decide on matters connected with the Sacraments; and Cardinals Besozzi, Tamburini, and Galli were instructed to confer together on the French situation.⁶

Otherwise, however, in spite of the many alarming events in France, the Pope remained steadfast in his resolution to show every confidence in the French Government. He accepted Rouillé's explanation of the banishment of the Archbishop of Paris, that the king had only wanted to forestall the parliament and to prevent its interference.⁷ When, on March 18th, 1755, the parliament decided against the validity of the Bull *Unigenitus*⁸ Valenti expressed his amazement at such arrogance, but after the decree in question had been declared invalid by the Council the Pope expressed himself as satisfied⁹ and said that he would act in conjunction with the king and that he had his confidence.¹⁰

¹ *Ibid.*, 40.

² On December 18, 1754, HEECKEREN, II., 380.

³ Choiseul on January 8, 1755, *ibid.*, 27.

⁴ The same on November 15, 1754, *ibid.*, II.

⁵ On February 26, 1755, *ibid.*, 30, n. 2.

⁶ Choiseul, on January 8, 1755, *ibid.*, 23.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁸ See above, p. 256, n. 5.

⁹ Choiseul on April 23, 1755, *ibid.*, 43.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 53 seq., 59.

Choiseul would have liked Benedict to have settled the trouble without having recourse to a Congregation of Cardinals but the Pope assured him that only those Cardinals would be called in consultation who had his, Choiseul's, approval. Accordingly Tamburini, Galli, and Spinelli were selected. D'Elce was rejected by the envoy as being too old, and in his place he chose Landi, on account of his sincere devotion to France. Passionei, too, had to be included as being too dangerous a personage to be omitted, and it was thought that in spite of his pride, his fiery temperament, and his superficial way of thinking, he would follow the lead of Tamburini and Spinelli.¹ Thus, to quote the Pope, the selection of the Cardinals might have been made by the French Court itself.²

On December 19th, 1755, Rouillé wrote to Choiseul that the Pope ought not merely to issue another Brief in the manner of Clement IX., whose acceptance would have to be ensured by a decree of the Royal Council, but that he should make up his mind to publish a formal Bull which would acquire legal force through being registered in every parliament. In this Bull the expression *Motu proprio* was to be avoided, the Bull *Unigenitus* was not to be described as a rule of Faith or by any other means to be given its full value; it should simply be said that it was to be respected and obeyed by the faithful. Finally, in the spirit of the royal declaration of September 2nd, 1654, the Pope was to recommend silence on the points at issue and to leave to confessors in the confessional the decision as to disobedience against the Bull *Unigenitus*.³

In a covering note intended only for Choiseul the Government itself expressed its doubts as to the possibility of all the foregoing stipulations being observed.⁴ Under the same date the king forwarded the Pope the statement made by the assembly of the clergy and assured him of his intention to

¹ *Ibid.*, 61 seq.

² HEECKEREN, II., 484.

³ BOUTRY, 68 n.

⁴ CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 147.

co-operate with him in settling the various disputes.¹ Again the Pope received Choiseul in a very friendly manner. He agreed with what had been said in the royal communication about the incompleteness of the Clementine peace and he read the relative passage twice.² He made no difficulty about undertaking to issue a Bull in which French ears would not be offended by any objectionable expression and said that he was prepared to submit the draft of it to the French king. Nor had he any objection to silence being imposed on the questions in dispute. But the other points gave rise to difficulties in his mind. How could he avoid expressing his opinion on the character of the Bull *Unigenitus*? All the Bishops of France described it as a dogmatic Bull and consequently as a rule of Faith.³ The demand that seemed to the Pope the most difficult to grant was that the question of revolt against the Bull *Unigenitus* should be decided only in the secrecy of the confessional. A concession such as this needed careful consideration if it was not to provoke a fresh war. Open rebellion demanded open atonement, and whoever declared himself to be opposed to the Bull on his death-bed ought also to suffer public ecclesiastical punishment. Choiseul replied that he would report to the king.⁴ It was then agreed that the Pope was to set down briefly in writing the doubtful points in the proposed Bull and refer them to the six Cardinals

¹ BOUTRY, 67 n.

² *Ibid.*, 70.

³ Choiseul, suspecting that Benedict held a different view of the matter, asked him point blank whether he personally considered it to be a rule of Faith. "I? No," replied the Pope, caught off his guard. "Well," said Choiseul, "all that the king wants is Your Holiness's personal opinion." "In this matter," said Benedict, "we shall be able to satisfy the king" (*ibid.*, 71; cf. 208 and PIATTI, *Storia de' Pontefici*, XII., Venezia, 1768, 423). The only conclusion to be drawn is that according to Benedict XIV., and theologians as a whole, the Bull is not a rule of Faith in the strict sense; its validity in other respects, however, Benedict frequently upheld in unambiguous terms. See above, p. 226.

⁴ BOUTRY, 73.

composing the commission, who in their turn were to write down their individual proposals for the draft of the Bull and present them signed and sealed, without conferring among themselves, to the Pope. The Pope was then to draft the Bull himself and to send the draft to the king, who was being informed by a Papal letter¹ of the proposed method of procedure. Benedict then delivered to the six Cardinals the memorial presented by the assembly of the clergy, together with the covering letter from the king, the proposals of the French Court, and an instruction from himself, asking for suggestions how the troubles in France might be finally settled.²

The Cardinals began their work but made but little progress, while the envoy did his best to expedite affairs and to remove possible obstacles. In particular he asked the Pope not to reply to any letters that might come from the French prelates, lest he might tie his hands by some imprudent expression of opinion. Benedict replied that he had already written to them that he could not give them a decision until he had come to a clear understanding with the king, and as for the memorial of the Archbishop of Auch, which was particularly unwelcome to the envoy, he had made no mention of it to the Cardinals.³ Choiseul also wrote to Paris that communication between the Bishops and the Pope ought to be restricted as much as possible; in their letters they spoke in an exaggerated fashion of schism and the downfall of religion. In any case the Pope was apprehensive, and after a time it would be impossible to banish this fear from his mind. Moreover, if the slightest sign of this came to the knowledge of the Cardinals the negotiations would be spun out indefinitely. It was therefore suggested that the king should hold back the letters from the French Bishops for six months, by which time everything would probably be settled.⁴

¹ Of January 3, 1756 (*ibid.*, 74 *seq.*, n.), delivered on January 15 (*ibid.*, 80).

² *Ibid.*, 81.

³ BOUTRY, 82.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 83 *seq.*

Meanwhile Choiseul was doing all he could to bring the matter to a conclusion. Through Valenti he urged the Pope to spur on the Cardinals in their work¹; he visited the Cardinals separately² and in Paris he advised that the Pope's letter be answered with the least possible delay, since, until he had an answer, the Pope would take no further step.³ To confirm the Pope's good will, he suggested in Paris⁴ that at the same time as the draft of the Bull was returned the Pope should be sent the draft of the royal declaration by which the Bull would be endowed with full legal force in the eyes of the French law. At last Choiseul was able to hand the Pope the royal reply of January 25th,⁵ which described the order of universal silence on the points in dispute as the only way of obtaining peace.⁶ But with this the Pope refused to agree, arguing that he was being asked to take a step which would cover him with shame both at the present time and in the centuries to come. To this Choiseul said quite openly such expressions made him feel that it was the French Bishops who were speaking through the Pope's mouth. On the question of silence another lively argument arose in connection with a memorial on the French demands.⁷ The Pope, highly indignant, said that he would not allow his work to suffer the same fate as the Bulls of Clement XI., that it was unthinkable that a Pope should prevent his Bishops speaking about a Papal decree, that he had no desire to make himself despised, in short, that he refused to yield on this point. Nor would he allow Choiseul's retort to pass uncorrected, that in other countries besides France a deep silence was everywhere maintained on the Bull *Unigenitus*. In France, he replied, the Bull had actually been

¹ *Ibid.*, 82.

² *Ibid.*, 87.

³ *Ibid.*, 85, 86.

⁴ On February 4, 1756, *ibid.*, 88.

⁵ On February 7; see Choiseul on February 11, 1756, *ibid.*, 89 *seqq.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, 90 n.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 91 *seq.*, n.

demand, by Louis XIV., which was not the case in other countries. Nevertheless Choiseul persisted in his request, arguing that the king knew his country and that the memorial had indicated the only means of obtaining peace which he could accept at the hands of the Roman Court. The Pope responded with general assurances that he would do nothing without the king and referred the envoy to the draft of the Bull, which he would have ready in a short time.

The other demands made in the memorial met with no opposition. It was desired in Paris that the Pope should not describe the Bull *Unigenitus* as a judgement on the teaching of the Church, since then, on the strength of the opinion expressed by the French Bishops, it would be represented as a rule of Faith, and this would provoke the opposition of the civil authorities. The last point made in the memorial concerned the opponents of the Bull. The king, it held, obviously could not insist on secret ecclesiastical penalties for the public contradiction of the Bull, but once the law of silence was promulgated its infringement became a public offence and could be punished publicly as well as privately.

By the middle of February the Cardinals who had been asked for their opinions had handed them in, except Passionei and Tamburini, who were still engaged in preparing a lengthy joint memorial. The Cardinals' opinion on the law of silence was more accommodating than the Pope's; it was that the Bull should recommend but not actually command silence; the king could then give this admonition the force of law. As to the duty of questioning an applicant before administering the Sacraments, they held that the parish priest ought not to put any questions on his own authority but to follow the ritual of the diocese and when dealing with the sick not to be guided by any other principles than those he would follow when dealing with the healthy. Choiseul made out that he had persuaded the Pope's theological adviser, the Dominican Ricchini, to adopt the more lenient view. Cardinal Spinelli had assured Choiseul that the Pope had said himself that to satisfy the king he would alter the draft of the Bull four or five times if necessary. During the Carnival, said Choiseul, the Pope

would make up his mind and draft the Bull. Once the draft had been prepared, the king would have won the game, for the Pope valued his work too much to allow it to be wasted altogether ; rather than that he would resign himself to the most far-reaching alterations.¹

And indeed, immediately after Shrove Tuesday, Choiseul was able to report that the Pope had finished his work and that after it had been looked over by the Cardinals it would be in his hands.² Its secrecy was well kept even though there were fifteen persons who could have divulged it.³ The Pope wrote to Tencin that in spite of his old age and the pain he was suffering from the gout, he had seen, read, and examined everything, and had then drawn up the outline of the constitution, which he had communicated to the most judicious and moderate of the Cardinals.⁴ Debts had to be paid before the Easter Communion, he said jokingly to the envoy,⁵ and he too hoped that everything would be finished before then. The remarks that had been sent in by the nuncio Gualtieri and those which he foresaw would be made by the French Bishops would be disregarded, since time was precious.⁶ Translated into French and accompanied by a letter to the king, everything was then sent to Paris through Choiseul.⁷ The Pope had abstained from issuing a formal Bull owing to the many formalities which would be necessary to make it effective in France ; he contented himself with writing an ordinary Encyclical to the Bishops.⁸

But although Benedict did all he could to show that he trusted in the French Government, he was very doubtful that his efforts would be rewarded with success,⁹ and events seemed

¹ Choiseul to Rouillé, February 18, 1756, *ibid.*, 98 *seqq.*

² *Ibid.*, 103.

³ *Ibid.*, 108, 131.

⁴ To Tencin, March 10, 1756, HEECKEREN, II., 484.

⁵ On March 17, *ibid.*, 486.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 484.

⁷ Letter, of March 24, 1756, *ibid.*, 487.

⁸ CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 150.

⁹ Choiseul, on May 5, 1756, BOUTRY, 136.

to show that he was right. Week after week went by, but no answer came.¹ At last he became impatient, complaining that when he had been at work a pistol had been held to his head, forcing him to hurry, but that now the Government seemed in no hurry at all.² Choiseul did his best to calm him and at the same time urged haste on Paris, for at the end of May the Pope would retire into the country, when the envoy would be able to speak to him only once a month and would thus be unable to refute the arguments of his adversaries.³

Meanwhile the Bishops who had formed a minority at the assembly of the clergy were writing treatise after treatise.⁴ Benedict read the first part of their memorial and then sent word to France that there was no need to send the second.⁵ There were also a number of writings being sent in by the majority party at the assembly, including a letter from Cardinal La Rochefoucauld, but Choiseul wrote to Paris⁶ that it would be dangerous to hand on anything of this kind to the Pope, lest he might think that he was being taught his business. Benedict refused to accept a memorial presented by the majority party, saying that all that kind of writing was futile. He had reflected long enough, he maintained, and he had made up his mind what course to take. When the king's answer came he would decide the matter without reference to either party. He had read something of what had been written by La Rochefoucauld's opponents and was convinced that it

¹ " *Continua N. S. le sue serie applicazioni sul grande ed importantissimo affare, ma sempre più dubbioso dell' esito, attesa, come ha detto, la debolezza della Corte, l'ardire del partito e la disunione de' vescovi, i quali di tanto tempo non hanno neppur terminato non che trasmesse le loro informazioni." The Secretary of State to the nuncio Gualtieri, March 3, 1756, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 519^v, Papal Secret Archives.

² For the cause of the delay, see CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 150 *seq.*

³ Choiseul, on April 21 and May 3, 1756. BOUTRY, 134, 136 *seqq.*

⁴ The same on May 5, *ibid.*, 136 *seqq.*

⁵ The same on April 7, *ibid.*, 128 *seqq.*

⁶ On May 12, 1756, *ibid.*, 141.

was only adding fuel to the flames.¹ He also wrote to Tencin² that the writings of the minority had been examined by himself as well as by Tamburini and Galli, and they were all of the opinion that in places they had overstepped the limits of a salutary strictness, that their assertions were theologically and canonistically untenable, and that if put into practice they would disrupt the country.

On the night of May 23rd the courier arrived with Louis XV.'s reply.³ In the accompanying memorandum exception was taken to three points in the Papal draft. Disobedience to the Bull, it was thought in Paris, ought not to be described as grievous sin, since the Bishops had not employed this term. Submission to the Bull "in mind and heart" ought not to be demanded, since this would make it an article of Faith. Finally, up till then, the only discussion in France had been about the refusal of Communion to persons who were seriously ill; the draft, however, contemplated the withholding of it from the healthy also, and this might provoke fresh disputes.⁴ It was also asked that the Pope should make no mention of appellants, and that both appellants and reappellants, if there were any of them left, should be allowed to live and die in their obscurity, for their day was over. Nor should there be any mention of the writings against the Bull, since their authors had not disclosed their names.⁵ The Pope replied to Choiseul that he could not give an immediate decision on these matters. He had the memorandum inspected in turn by Cardinals Spinelli, Landi, Tamburini, Galli, and Valenti, and assured Choiseul of his intention to meet the king's wishes as far as possible but that nothing would come from his pen that might afterwards be brought up against him as being a slur

¹ Choiseul, on May 19, 1756, *ibid.*, 143, 145, 153.

² On May 12, HEECKEREN, II., 498.

³ Of May 14, *ibid.*, 150 n.

⁴ Benedict to Tencin, June 2, 1756, *ibid.*, 504; BOUTRY, 154 n.

⁵ "... afin de ne pas en rendre le goût qui commençait à passer et jugeant préférable de laisser les appellants et réappellants, s'il en reste encore quelques-uns, vivre et mourir dans leur obscurité." BOUTRY, 155 n.

on the Papal reputation.¹ He did not ask the French to speak Italian instead of French, and he ought not to be asked to speak French instead of Italian.²

In his eagerness to satisfy the French Court the Pope continued to work during his villeggiatura in Frascati. To the French Court's desire that he should send an Encyclical to the Bishops rather than issue a Bull, he assented, and consideration was paid to all the proposed modifications. In this Encyclical he refrained, for the sake of peace, from saying a word about the maltreatment of the French Bishops by the parliament, and it was only in an accompanying letter to the king that any reference was made to the rights of the episcopate. If the usual custom had been followed the Encyclical would have been printed in Rome, but out of special consideration for the king permission was given for this to be done in Paris, and it was left to him to decide whether it was to be published or not.³ As all the wishes of the Court had been fulfilled it seemed to Benedict unnecessary to send the draft of the Encyclical to Paris a second time, but when Choiseul insisted on it he gave way.⁴

In a covering letter to the king⁵ the Pope stated that he had been unable to make any further concession and that it had been difficult enough to carry the Cardinals with him as far as he had. He asked the king to see to the observance of the Encyclical, for without the support of the royal authority it would be of no avail. He asked him also to see that his Brief was put into effect, otherwise the ecclesiastical authority in the matter of the administration of the Sacraments would be suppressed, and the clerical and civil authorities would never be in harmony. It was impossible for the Bishops to relinquish the authority with which God had endowed them for the guidance and the welfare of souls.

¹ *Ibid.*, 148 ; to Tencin on June 23, 1756, HEECKEREN, II., 500.

² To Tencin, May 26, 1756, *ibid.*, 502 ; BOUTRY, 154.

³ To Tencin, June 30, 1756, HEECKEREN, II., 510.

⁴ Choiseul, on July 7, BOUTRY, 158.

⁵ Of July 18, *ibid.*, 163 n.

Again there was an interval of over two months before an answer came from Paris. At the end of August Benedict expressed his discontent in unmistakable terms. When he had been at work pressure had been put upon him to make all possible speed for the sake of religion and the kingdom, but now more time was being taken than Rome had found necessary to examine and make ready the whole draft of the letter. It was clearly useless for him to entertain the hope of seeing peace restored before his death.¹

Choiseul impressed on Paris the necessity for speed, especially now that the Secretary of State Valenti was dead,² and there was little hope of obtaining any successful result from his successor Archinto when he took command of affairs. The Pope declined to delay Archinto's nomination for a fortnight, by which time the king's reply was expected to arrive, but he made the concession of allowing the envoy to continue dealing directly with himself.³ On the whole, the Pope was more than satisfied with the envoy; he paid him the compliment of saying that when Choiseul had returned to France he would have two nuncios there.⁴

At last, on September 23rd, the draft of the Encyclical came back from Paris,⁵ with remarks made by the Court; but of these the only one which seemed at all encouraging to the Pope was that the envoy was empowered to conclude the negotiations without further reference to the king. Apart from some minor points, which were easy to settle, there was one great stumbling block: the king desired that "notorious" Jansenism, on which account the Sacraments were to be withheld from the dying, should be found to be present only when it was confirmed by a judicial decision or by the admission of the invalid himself; a "notoriety" deduced from

¹ Choiseul, on August 31, 1756, BOUTRY, 170 *seq.*

² He died on August 28, 1756, HEECKEREN, II., 528.

³ BOUTRY, 174.

⁴ Choiseul, on September 29, 1756, *ibid.*, 176; Benedict XIV. to Tencin on August 11, 1756, HEECKEREN, II., 520.

⁵ BOUTRY, 176.

the general conduct of the invalid in the past was not to be recognized, since this would subject him entirely to the caprice of the parish priest. The Pope rejoined¹ that notoriety resulting from the actual behaviour of the invalid was recognized by everyone, including the Bishops at the last assembly of the clergy ; he could not leave the Bishops in the lurch, and the precise description of actual notoriety as contained in his Encyclical precluded any abuse.² Finally, Choiseul had to rest content with Benedict's toning down of some of his expressions.³

But before the final conclusion was reached, several other difficulties and disturbances had to be overcome. The Pope wanted to discuss with the Cardinals the concessions he had made, but except for Landi and Galli all the consultors were away from Rome.⁴ And then at the most unfortunate moment possible another disturbance arose in France. On September 19th the Archbishop of Paris, who had been banished to Conflans, had read from the pulpit a pastoral letter which he had also had printed in secret and distributed.⁵ In the introduction to this letter Beaumont protested against the misguided desire for conciliation which on the plea of maintaining peace compromised dogma to some extent. The Bishops had kept silent because of their love of peace, the fear of embittering relations, the hope that better times would come, and the thought that a shepherd of souls was in duty bound to exhaust every expedient that was charitable and moderate ; but when he saw how the Church was laid waste, the sanctuary desecrated, the Sacraments handed over to the authority of secular courts, dogmatic decisions flouted, priests banished, imprisoned, and outraged, he quivered with indignation at the silence that was being kept. He therefore forbade his

¹ To Tencin, September 29, 1756, HEECKEREN, II., 531.

² *Ibid.* Cf. letters to Tencin on October 20 and November 3, 1756, *ibid.*, 536, 538.

³ Choiseul on October 9 and 17, 1756, BOUTRY, 182, 184.

⁴ To Tencin, October 6, 1756, HEECKEREN, II., 533.

⁵ RÉGNAULT, 1878, II., 833 ; FLEURY, LXXVII., 703 *seq.*

flock to read or to keep certain parliamentary decrees. Whoever, in order to receive the Sacraments, invoked the intervention of lay judges or advised others to do so, were forthwith excommunicated, as was also every official or judge who in his official capacity interfered with the administration of the Sacraments. Priests were forbidden to administer the Sacraments in compliance with an official order.¹ Quite a number of Bishops openly sided with Beaumont.²

The Archbishop's letter was welcomed by the French Government. Rouillé wrote at once to Choiseul,³ instructing him to give an exact description of the incident to the Pope and to use it as a means of extracting from the Pope the desired alterations in the Encyclical; the envoy was unlikely to have a better opportunity of rendering an important service to the Church and State. The Secretary of State Archinto most definitely disapproved of the Archbishop's action and told Choiseul that the Pope too would condemn it as an obstacle to the peace which it was hoped to restore and as showing scanty respect for the king or even for the Pope. Benedict did indeed express his astonishment at the pastoral letter and said that he had thought Beaumont was more discreet.⁴ Nevertheless he did not entirely withdraw his favour from the Archbishop, describing as "fine" the

¹ RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 834-6; FLEURY, *loc. cit.*, 704.

² Between October 29 and December 5 the Bishops of Saint-Pons, Troyes, Metz, Amiens, Auxerre, Tours, Chartres, Meaux, Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux. RÉGNAULT, *loc. cit.*, 841.

³ On September 26, BOUTRY, 179 n.

⁴ Choiseul on October 6, 1756, *ibid.*, 179 seq. In a letter of October 10 Benedict asked the king "de continuer d'user de son héroïque modération à l'égard du pauvre archevêque de Paris, . . . sur ce qu'il n'a pas fait, dans l'embarras où il se trouvait, toutes les réflexions qu'il aurait dû faire" (*ibid.*, 182 n.; HEECKEREN, II., 534 n.). In writing to the king, the Pope informed Tencin on October 13 (*ibid.*, 534), he had disregarded the "fond du mandement" [of the Archbishop] "qui nous a paru juste" and had based his letter on the assumption that Beaumont had broken his promise to the king.

accompanying letter which Beaumont sent him together with his pastoral letter, though, in accordance with the king's wish, he replied to it with an admonition to keep the peace.¹

Archinto was thus able to write to Gualtieri² that the Pope had played his part and that it was now the duty of the king, in accordance with his repeated promises, to persevere in exerting his authority for the preservation of religion and the peace of the realm.

After Choiseul had sent the Pope's Encyclical to Paris his task in Rome had been accomplished, and he was thinking of returning to France when, on November 18th, the Pope was seized with an illness which brought him near to death.³ On November 21st he received the Last Sacraments and on December 14th he signed the profession of Faith to which it is the custom of the Popes to subscribe before their death.⁴ Arrangements for the funeral had already been made and the order given for the preparation of the conclave.⁵ But even on his sick-bed Benedict still continued to take an interest in French affairs and asked if a courier had come with news of his Encyclical.⁶ To the surprise of his physicians he rallied once again and at a consistory of Cardinals at the end of the year spoke of his recovery and gave notice of his Encyclical and of the accompanying Brief.⁷ On January 3rd, 1757, he gave them fresh news of the steps taken by Louis XV. in dealing with the Parliament.⁸

Meanwhile the two documents had arrived in Paris. The

¹ HEECKEREN, II., 540. The letter has been lost. BOUTRY, 189.

² *On October 20, 1756, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 544^v, Papal Secret Archives.

³ Choiseul on November 20, 1756, BOUTRY, 194.

⁴ Choiseul *ibid.*, copy, and on December 15, BOUTRY, 200.

⁵ The same on December 22, *ibid.*, 201.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 199, 202, 204.

⁷ FLEURY, LXXVII., 726 *seqq.*

⁸ " *Diede parte al s. Collegio delle risoluzioni prese dal Re di Francia col suo Parlamento con un discorso proprio e bello et all' improvviso, che poi nell' istesso giorno volle dettare ad istanza del marchese di Stainville ambasciatore di Francia per mandarlo

Encyclical,¹ which alone was the subject of public discussion, was addressed to the members of the clerical assembly, whose representations had called forth the Papal decision. The expressions to which the Government had objected for the sake of the parliament were not employed. Thus the Bull *Unigenitus* was not explicitly referred to as a "rule of Faith", nor its rejection as a "grievous sin", nor was it demanded that submission to the Bull must be made "with mind and heart"; but all this was expressed in equivalent terms of speech. The authority of the Bull within the Church was so great, it was stated, and in every place it called for such sincere respect, compliance, and obedience that no member of the Church could refuse the submission due to it or oppose it in any way without endangering his eternal salvation.² Whoever, therefore, publicly and notoriously revolted against the Bull and was convicted of this revolt by a judicial sentence, his own admission, or his conduct, could not receive Communion; on the other hand, he was not to be excluded because of rumours, conjectures, and the like. Whoever, therefore, asked for the Sacraments for the dying, was in general not to be refused unless he was excluded from the Easter Communion. But if anyone was suspected with good reason, the parish priest was to speak to him in private and make it clear to him what he was about to do. If he continued

al Re, e ciò fu cagione che nella notte fu nuovamente attaccato dalla febre e dal male d'orina e ridotto a cattivi termini. Per altro la dichiarazione del Re accennata, della quale fu fatta tanta pompa, non era punto favorevole alla Chiesa; e così ne giudicavano prudentemente quelli che erano bene intesi dei costumi di Francia, et è certo che il Papa fu sorpreso e circonvenuto dal marchese di Stainville ambasciatore di Francia." MERENDA, *Memorie*, fo. 162^v, Bibl. Angelica, Rome.

¹ Of October 16, 1756. FLEURY, LXXVII., 706-716; ROSKOVÁNY, III., 199-203. The well-informed Merenda writes: "Questo Breve o lettera fu opera del card. Spinelli, studiato e consultato in Palestrina con alcuni teologi e particolarmente col Castagnasco, Min. obs." *Loc. cit.*

² FLEURY, LXXVII., 709.

to demand the Sacrament he was to be left to the judgment of his own conscience.

Choiseul's task being now completed, he sent his letter of farewell to the Pope on March 25th, 1757.¹

(4)

The assembly of the French clergy of the year 1760 gave its unanimous assent to the Papal Encyclical.² With regard to the Brief, the Archbishop of Paris was of the opinion³ that the zeal of many of the faithful would not be satisfied by it but that it contained all that was essential; had the Pope been able to do more in the conditions which then prevailed in France, he would have done it. The Bishop of Amiens, one of the most zealous of the Bishops who formed the minority party, wrote of the Papal decision⁴ that what was essential had been said and that the Jansenist party could no longer assert that the Pope had no great opinion of the Bull *Unigenitus* and would like to see it buried in an everlasting silence. Against the Jansenists it had been laid down that it was not to be rejected without grievous sin, and against the parliament that there were cases in which the Sacraments must be publicly refused. It was true that the boundaries had been drawn in such a way that refusals of the

¹ BOUTRY, 217.

² CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 187.

³ On January 27, 1757, RÉGNAULT, 1878, II., 696. A satire on the Encyclical, dedicated to Cardinals Spinelli and Tamburini, was communicated to all the Cardinals in Rome. Its author was thought to be a Jesuit (*MERENDA, Bibl. Angelica, Rome, 1613, fo. 166^v, 169^v; dispatch by the agent of Lucca, Filippo Maria Buonamici, of August 13, 1756, in *Arch. stor. ital.* XX. [1887], 373; REUSCH, *Index*, II., 758 *seq.*). Benedict XIV. condemned the writing in a Brief of September 5, 1757 (*Bull.* XIX., 287). “*Il peggio è,” writes Merenda (*loc. cit.*), “che il Papa presso li Francesi sia tenuto comunemente per favorevole ai Giansenisti.”

⁴ On November 29, 1756, RÉGNAULT, 1878, II., 695 *seq.*

Sacraments would be extremely rare ; on the other hand, it was not good that everything should be left to the judgment of the priest. For himself, he was firmly resolved to comply with the Papal answer and he thought that the majority of the Bishops, if not all of them, would act as he did.

But though the Bishops might bow to the Papal decision there was another power which had no desire for peace, least of all when it came from the hands of the Pope. Even while the Encyclical was still in preparation the courts had vented their fury on the pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Paris and on the Bishops who supported him.¹ When Beaumont's letter appeared the parliament was in recess, but on September 24th the vacation chamber forbade the priests to publish it.² Then a series of judgments were issued by the Châtelet against the Bishops who had agreed with the Archbishop of Paris. On November 9th it condemned a document written by the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines to be torn up and burnt ; and the same treatment was ordered for the pastoral letters of the Bishops of Saint-Pons, Auxerre, and Troyes (on the 19th) and for the writings of the Bishops of Orleans and Amiens (on the 26th). More lenient was the sentence passed by the court of Tours against the Archbishop of that town ; his letter was only prohibited.³

When the parliament reassembled after the vacation the Archbishop's pastoral letter was the first matter to which it directed its attention. Twice, however, the king commanded it to postpone the debate on this subject. Between November 25th and December 7th protest after protest was made against this order, the occasions for them being provided by a pastoral letter of the Bishop of Troyes, a sequel to the Cougniou case in Orleans, and a fresh refusal of the Sacraments in Paris.⁴ The king continuing to answer evasively, the parliament became more explicit and on December 7th banned the Pope's

¹ A list of them in [NIVELLE], III., lxxxiv.

² *Ibid.*

³ FLEURY, LXXXIII., 216 *seq.*

⁴ [NIVELLE], III., iv-lxxxvi.

Encyclical.¹ This action was copied by the parliament of Rouen on December 9th.² On December 7th also fresh protests were made by the Paris parliament against a letter written by the Bishop of Troyes, who had been banished, and two days later similar protests were made against the Bishop of Orleans.³ In the protests made on December 7th it was claimed that the excesses of the French Bishops who were revolting against the royal authority had increased to such a terrible extent that only the most unconditioned and continuous exercise of that authority, with the full force of the law, could prevent the fatal evils, domestic strife and disturbances, with which France was threatened.⁴

The king now announced that he would attend in person a *lit de justice* to be held on December 13th. The first step taken at this meeting was the proclamation of a manifesto⁵ on the religious question. In the preamble of this manifesto Louis XV. stated that, for the purpose of restoring peace, he had tried to ensure for the Bull *Unigenitus* the respect due to it but that he had also tried to obviate the abuse of attributing to the Bull an importance which it did not possess. It was for this purpose that the command of silence had been issued. His efforts in the cause of peace, he claimed, had been acknowledged by the Pope; to complete his work he was issuing some further regulations for the execution of previous laws. There followed five points which were supposed to satisfy both the Bishops and the parliament and which, of course, satisfied neither. To every concession made to the Church was attached a clause which to some extent at least nullified it. All the former ordinances concerning the Bull, it was affirmed, remained in force, but it was to have no right to the title, nature, or consequences of a rule of Faith. The law of silence was not to hinder the Bishops in the religious

¹ FLEURY, LXXXIII., 221-4.

² *Ibid.*, 220.

³ [NIVELLE], III., lxxxvii.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Of December 10, 1756, FLEURY, LXXVII., 717-722.

instruction of the people, but nevertheless it was to be strictly observed. The right to give rulings as to the administration of the Sacraments was withdrawn from the civil judge, who in no circumstance was allowed to order their administration, and the priest was not to be arraigned for refusing to administer the Sacraments when the applicant was under ecclesiastical censure or had announced his intention of disobeying the Bull. But all these concessions were rendered practically valueless by the fact that the right of appeal to a civil court in cases of alleged abuse of the official ecclesiastical authority was expressly upheld. All previous judgments on ecclesiastical disputes were to be forgotten.

The manifesto on the religious question was not the only one to be proclaimed at the *lit de justice* on December 13th. The Government had long desired to restrict the excessive influence of the parliament; but the attempts made in previous years to increase the jurisdiction of the *Grand Conseil* at the expense of the parliament had been in vain. The king now issued two more manifestoes, the first of which suppressed two chambers and sixty-four places in the council which formed part of the department of the parliament concerned with the examination of lawsuits, while the second effected drastic changes in the procedure of the court.¹ The right of remonstrance was severely curtailed, the junior members of the parliament were excluded from the general meetings of all the parliamentary chambers, and the right to register royal decrees was denied to any but these general meetings.

The result of these measures was that except for a round score of councillors of the *Grand'Chambre* the whole of the parliament ceased functioning, so that the Government was again faced with the choice of giving way on yet another occasion to the overweening magistrates or of suspending legal activity, which would have stirred up the discontent of the people, which was already near revolt, and would thus have forced the Government to give way in any case. The

¹ CAHEN, 59 *seqq.*

dilemma was solved by the attempted assassination of the king by Damiens on January 5th, 1757, the king being slightly wounded by a penknife. Damiens having been a servant in the Jesuit College in Paris twenty years back, the Jesuits became the object of the worst suspicions.¹ At the inquiry, however, it came to light that Damiens had attended the meetings of the parliament with great enthusiasm and had imbibed his hatred of the king and clergy from the speeches which he had heard delivered there.² The magistrates, having no desire to appear as the accomplices of an assassin, were willing to accept a compromise by which the rearrangement of the parliament was indeed postponed but not abandoned, and thus the Government was enabled, at least to some extent, to save its face.³ Subsequently the victorious parliament stressed still more its alleged rights as a sharer in the governmental authority and became still more of a danger to unlimited monarchy by reason of the fact that all the parliaments in the realm formed themselves as "classes" into one great body.⁴

As for the clergy, their position improved after the publication of the Pope's Encyclical in so far as "Confession tickets" were no longer demanded. The parliament, however, continued to consider itself entitled to interfere in the administration of the Sacraments. After Damiens' attempt at assassination the banished Bishops were allowed to return, though the Archbishop of Paris was soon expelled again from his city of residence for having taken measures against some Jansenist hospital sisters.⁵

The Government was bolder in its dealings with the Sorbonne than it was with the parliament. A royal decree of

¹ RÉGNAULT, 1879, I., 198.

² Abstracts from the judicial examinations in ROHRBACHER, *Hist. universelle de l'Église cath.*, XIII., Paris, 1877, 101.

³ CAHEN, 61.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 62 seq.

⁵ RÉGNAULT, 1879, I., 211 seq., 220; A. GAZIER, *Une suite à l'histoire de Port-Royal. Jeanne de Boisgnorel et Christophe de Beaumont*, Paris, 1906.

December 2nd, 1757, forbade it to make any mention, in its lectures or its records, of the disputes about the Bull *Unigenitus*, since this would be an offence against the law of silence, which was renewed by the manifesto of December 10th, 1756. The order was impossible of execution, for how was one to lecture on the doctrine of grace without referring to the Bull which was the burning question of the hour? The faculty was therefore compelled to remonstrate against it, and since it stood on its rights in spite of many signs of unfriendliness evinced by the Government, the king gave way again in December 1758.¹

In other respects also the law of silence was found to be incapable of restoring peace. It closed the mouths of the Catholics, while the Jansenists paid it little attention. The journal *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques* pursued its former course, and it was precisely the period beginning with 1750 that saw the appearance of a number of voluminous historical works on Port-Royal, whose authors, although otherwise at loggerheads with one another, were at one in their glorification of the famous abbey.²

Even the Government saw that other methods would have to be adopted. Secret negotiations were opened between Paris and Rome, for the expenses of which Louis XV. is said to have placed a million *livres* at the disposal of the Comptroller-General, Laverdy. Their object was to induce the Pope to issue a Bull in which were laid down clearly and definitely the tenets concerning the doctrine of grace which must be held by every Catholic. It has been said that Benedict XIV. viewed the plan with favour and that the matter was taken up again in the reign of his successor but came to nothing.³ Rome could not but have been shocked to find that in the Government's decree on Benedict's Encyclical the king had

¹ FERET, VI., 112-116.

² GAZIER, II., 127-130.

³ *Ibid.*, 109-113. The only source for these negotiations is the account given by Augustin Clément, who was sent as a delegate to Rome to represent the Jansenists.

taken it on himself to decide that the Bull *Unigenitus* was not a rule of Faith. To this new encroachment on his rights Benedict said nothing, either because it had been kept from him in his poor state of health, or because he was not inclined to ascribe too much importance to a single statement.¹

From the beginning of 1757 the leading statesman in France was the Abbé Bernis, who was made a Cardinal in the October of that year. His principle was to keep on friendly terms with both parties to the struggle, namely the parliament and the Bishops, to offend neither of them, and by evasive methods to avoid collisions with them. Similarly he advised the new envoy to Rome, Bishop Rochechouart of Laon, to hold Rome in check by means of Gallicanism, and Gallicanism by means of Rome. Acting on these principles, he had succeeded in making a beginning with the reconciliation of the king and the parliament and in bringing about the recall of the banished clerics. On the Archbishop of Paris, however, he practised his art of persuasion with no success, although Beaumont's banishment met with only his qualified approval. At the end of 1758 Bernis himself was sent into exile by the Pompadour, his place being given to Choiseul.²

(5)

In Holland the cleavage between Catholics and Jansenists was essentially complete. In the provinces of Zeeland, Gelderland,

¹ “*Per quello poi che mi richiede di ciò che fece Benedetto XIV. dopo la sua enciclica famosa, le dirò che quel pontefice non fece mai verun atto contro l'arresto del Re, in cui eravi l'espressione avanzata di non attribuire alla costituzione *Unigenitus* la qualità di regola di fede. Egli o nello stato languente in cui era di salute nulla seppe o non credette che una semplice espressione meritasse tanto risentimento contro l'arresto d'un Re e d'un Re che allora prometteva tutto benchè poi niente obtendesse.” The Secretary of State to the Spanish nuncio Pallavicini on October 14, 1762, Nunziat. di Spagna, 431, fo. 483v, Papal Secret Archives.

² CROUSAZ-CRÉTET, 162-185.

and the Upper Yssel there was not a single Jansenist priest ; Friesland, with the exception of Leeuwarden, had long since cast them off entirely ; and not one village in the province of Utrecht had a Jansenist as parish priest. In the chief towns of the province of Holland there were Jansenists enough, but they were as shepherds without flocks.¹

Moreover, the Jansenist Church was not only small in numbers ; it was threatened with extinction. Its four Bishops, Steenoven, Barchman, Van der Croon, and Meindaerts, had been consecrated by the deposed missionary Bishop Varlet, but Varlet had died on May 15th, 1742, and however much the Jansenists might boast of their recognition abroad, no Catholic Bishop was prepared to give them a new head in the event of Meindaerts' death. Meindaerts himself, therefore, nominated and consecrated as Bishops of Haarlem, first Hieronymus de Bock, a parish priest of Amsterdam, in 1742, and then, on his speedy demise, another parish priest of Amsterdam, Van Stiphout, in 1744.² Against these new Bishops Benedict XIV. did not fail to raise his voice.³ Later, in 1757, Meindaerts nominated a third Bishop, Bartholomæus Johannes Bijlevelt of Deventer, whom he consecrated on January 25th, 1758.⁴ To Meindaerts' advice of the election of the new Bishop

¹ Mozzi, II., 333 *seqq.* For conditions in the Dutch mission in 1741, see A. VAN LOMMEL in *Archief voor de Geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht*, 1874, 59-117.

² Mozzi, II., 337, 370 *seq.*

³ Against the election and consecration of De Bock on January 24, 1741, and September 1, 1742 (Mozzi, III., 117 *seqq.*, 121 *seqq.* ; *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 115, 127), against the election and consecration of Van Stiphout on June 26 and August 28, 1745 (Mozzi, III., 136 *seqq.*, 141 *seqq.* ; *Bull.*, *loc. cit.*, 302, 311).

⁴ Mozzi, II., 382 *seqq.* ; [DUPAC], 592-602. Documents for the Haarlem election in *Recueil des témoignages*, 291-9 ; for that of Deventer, *ibid.*, 300-4. The Jansenist Bishop of Auxerre had declared himself in favour of both the Haarlem and the Deventer elections (*ibid.*, 294, 297, 299, 328), for Deventer, also Verthamon of Luçon (*ibid.*, 363).

Benedict XIV. answered in the usual way¹; to his announcement of the consecration he made no reply. In this last communication² Meindaerts had abandoned the humble, suppliant tone he had used in his former petitions of a like character; it was nothing but a violent attack on the Jesuits, whom he accused of having been the cause of the schism. Like so many other writings against the Order at this period, it was repeatedly printed and translated.³ When appealing in 1744 against their condemnation in Rome, Meindaerts and De Bock had sent in a confession of Faith; this also failed to escape the Papal condemnation.⁴

The chapter of Haarlem had had no part in the election of the Haarlem Bishops. It was not till May 27th, 1743, that De Bock informed it of his election and consecration,⁵ and it quickly protested.⁶ De Bock had no church in Haarlem, his permanent residence being in Amsterdam.

In the reign of Benedict XIV. some more or less serious negotiations were undertaken by the Jansenist and Catholic clergy for the restoration of ecclesiastical unity.⁷ After some fruitless discussions had taken place,⁸ the ex-Capuchin Norbert in particular, who had won notoriety in the troubles in Malabar and who found himself in Holland in 1747, saw in the confused conditions in that country a promising field for his disturbing activity. There was no quarter in which he

¹ On December 29, 1757, in MOZZI, III., 189 *seqq.*; *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, II., 326.

² On February 13, 1758, [DUPAC], 600; MOZZI, II., 386.

³ [DUPAC], 602.

⁴ Of June 26, 1745, in MOZZI, III., 132; *Bull., loc. cit.*, 303: *Acta*, II., 303.

⁵ In MOZZI, III., 345 *seqq.*

⁶ On June 21, 1743, *ibid.*, 348 *seq.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, 148 *seqq.*; G. BROM, *De H. Stoel en de Klevezy*, reprinted from the *Archief voor de Geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht*, XXXVIII. (1912).

⁸ *Bijdragen voor de Geschiedenis van het bisdom Haarlem*, XX. (1895), 1 *seqq.*, 221 *seqq.*; XXI. (1896), 429; XXIII. (1898), 178 *seqq.*

failed to exert his influence. To the Stadtholder he propounded the argument that it was the concern of the civil as well as of the ecclesiastical authority to extirpate the roots of national disunity. The favour of Cardinal Corsini he succeeded in winning to such an extent that the Cardinal wrote him two letters, in November and December 1747, encouraging him in his project. He won over to himself the dean of the so-called chapter of Utrecht, Nikolaus Broedersen ; and another notable person whom he induced to fall in with his way of thinking was the Italian prelate Antonio Niccolini, who in June 1748 had been commissioned by the Secretary of State Valenti to report on conditions in the Netherlands on his way from England to Rome. The Brussels nuncio, Crivelli, on the other hand, would have nothing to do with Norbert ; he instructed the arch-priest Van der Valck to keep himself clear of the peace negotiations. Norbert's audacity and liking for trickery were notorious, he said, and it was impossible to be too much on one's guard against him.¹ Everything should be done to bring about his departure from Holland at the earliest possible moment.²

Neither Norbert nor the Jansenists were serious with their submission to the decrees of Rome. On March 8th, 1747, Broedersen wrote to Cardinal Valenti that the impediment to agreement was the stringent prohibitions issued by the States against acceptance of the Bull *Unigenitus* ; it would be best, therefore, for Rome to be satisfied with a general promise of

¹ " Novimus illius in suscipiendo audaciam ac in confingendis fallaciis et commentis proclivitatem adeoque numquam satis commendatum putamus, ut ab illius fraudibus vos caveatis." (Crivelli to Van der Valck, June 30, 1748, in BROM, *loc. cit.*, 10). " Infinita pena mi dà co' suoi raggiri il Padre Norberto unito co' Giansenisti ; ha suscitato un vespaio e lo sta stuzzicando in maniera da sentire pessime conseguenze " (Crivelli to Valenti, July 12, 1748, *ibid.*, 15).

² *Ibid.* Cf. Crivelli under the same date to Valenti (*ibid.*, 16) : " Prevedo che se non si trova la maniera di sradicare d'Olanda questo frate ben presto, ci metterà in combustione colle sue machine, raggiri e menzogne tutta quella fioridissima missione."

obedience to the Papal decrees, among which, though not expressly mentioned, the constitution *Unigenitus* would be included.¹ The probable object of these proposals, however, was to bring about the Pope's recognition of the Jansenists without their acceptance of the Bull against Quesnel. But Benedict XIV. was not to be deceived. He wrote to Cardinal Corsini² that Father Norbert had no right to speak of Broedersen's obedience to the Apostolic constitutions on the ground that he accepted the Tridentine confession of Faith and the ruling of the Council of Florence on the primacy of the Pope; Quesnel too could have been had on these terms. What was intended, he wrote, was to get hold of a letter from the Pope or some other important person and to turn it to a wrong use. For this reason he himself was on his guard and he trusted that Corsini was, too. Broedersen's proposals were examined by a Congregation of Cardinals, which at a meeting on October 6th, 1748,³ decided that the Dutch Jansenists must first adopt the formulary of Alexander VII. and the Bull *Unigenitus*. The Jansenists, of course, were not prepared to do this, as they had already stated expressly in a manifesto of September 12th, 1747, though no actual protest was made.⁴ Meanwhile, the Brussels nuncio, Crivelli, had bluntly refused to listen to Norbert and his citation of letters from Cardinal Corsini and had ordered him to leave the Dutch mission without delay.⁵

In spite of everything, however, a not inconsiderable movement had been set going among the Dutch Jansenists by Norbert's proposals. Putting their trust in the States, they

¹ MoZZI, III., 148 *seqq.* Van der Valck's opinion on Norbert's motives was expressed to Crivelli on August 16, 1748: ". . . cum Iansenistæ hic culinam eius tam sollicite curent." (BROM, 29.)

² On May 20, 1747, MoZZI, III., 146. Cf. the letter to the Brussels nuncio of November 11, 1747, *Acta*, I., 453.

³ Extract from the records in MoZZI, III., 148-163. The members of the Congregation were Cardinals Valenti, Corsini, Tamburini, Besozzi, and the secretary Lercari.

⁴ MoZZI, III., 158.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 154 *seq.*

pressed for a public conference with the Catholics who were faithful to the Pope and they appealed also to the civil Government to bring such a conference into being. Benedict XIV. then became apprehensive lest some unwelcome Papal decision might provoke the States against the Catholics. Preferring not to make any reply at all and to let the matter rest, he desired, before coming to a definite decision, to have the opinion of the most reputable priests in Holland.¹ Their opinion, given almost unanimously, was that it would be wrong to enter into negotiations with the Jansenists, as they were not to be trusted. To allege as an excuse the State decrees against acceptance of the Bull *Unigenitus* was a dishonourable evasion, for of the priests in Holland who had been questioned some had said they had failed to discover any such decrees,² while others professed their ignorance of any difficulties put in their way by the Government on account of the Bull *Unigenitus*,³ although it was aware that this constitution was accepted by the Catholics along with all the others.⁴ Accordingly the Congregation of Cardinals, meeting again on May 1st, 1749,⁵ declared that it abided by its decision of the previous year.

In his report to Cardinal Valenti ⁶ on conditions in the Dutch mission and the prospects of reincorporating the Jansenists, Niccolini spoke most highly of the Catholics in the Netherlands. He said that he had never seen a finer Church and that were it not for the schism it would certainly be the best of all.⁷ As opposed to the 200,000 Catholics there were

¹ Letter of Cardinal Valenti, December 21, 1748, *ibid.*, 166 *seq.*

² Mozzi, III., 172.

³ *Ibid.*, 182.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 180. An ordinance of the States of September 20, 1730, concerning the office of Gregory VII., is cited by Broedersen; it mentions the Bull but lays down no penalty for the infringement of the ordinance. *Ibid.*, 183; *cf.* 177.

⁵ Extract from the records, *ibid.*, 164-189.

⁶ End of August 1748, in BROM, 36-67.

⁷ "Ho provato la consolazione di vedere una chiesa di cattolici, di cui, benchè in mezzo agli eterodossi, non ho giammai

only 6-10,000 Jansenists. Among the faithful the Pope was held in the highest respect. The places of worship, including those in the country, were fully equipped with costly furniture and vestments, while the parish priests, though living on the charity of their flocks, had more than enough with which to support the poor. Everywhere the parish priest was the central figure of his parish and its sole leader and comforter ; among the Catholics scandals were unknown.¹ The schism, however, was disuniting families : parents were in disagreement with their children, fathers with mothers, relatives with relatives, to such a degree that they had ceased to recognize each other in the street.²

veduto sin ora la più bella e che . . . chiamarei semplicemente e assolutamente la bellissima per eccellenza." *Ibid.*, 39.

¹ *Ibid.*, 40 *seqq.*

² *Ibid.*, 44.

CHAPTER V.

BENEDICT XIV.'S ACTIVITY WITHIN THE CHURCH—HIS LEGISLATION—THE VENERATION OF THE SAINTS—THE JUBILEE YEAR OF 1750—THE APPOINTMENT OF CARDINALS—THE INDEX—THE BEGINNING OF THE UNDERMINING OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

(1)

WHEN, at the beginning of his reign, Benedict XIV. addressed himself in an Encyclical to all the Bishops of the Church,¹ he put before them as their chief duty the education and maintenance of a good clergy. They were to be careful in their choice of candidates; it were better to have fewer priests so long as they were good ones. They were to establish seminaries, for clerics needed to be trained from their youth onwards. These seminaries were to be visited frequently, for clerics were not born but made. Priests entrusted with the cure of souls were to be impressed with the necessity for Sunday sermons and for teaching Christian doctrine. Other episcopal duties were residence among the flocks, visitations, and vigilance, for what had been prescribed at a visitation had also to be carried out. To ensure a supply of good Bishops a special Congregation was instituted,² which was to decide on the merits of the nominees. The duty of visiting Rome every three years was henceforth to apply not only to Bishops but also to all who wielded the equivalent of episcopal authority³; an instruction was drawn up, giving the points to which attention was to be paid on visits to the Eternal City⁴; and a Congregation was established for the purpose of answering questions on difficult points propounded by the Bishops.⁵

¹ On December 3, 1740, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 3 *seq.*

² On October 17, 1740, *ibid.*, 7 *seq.*

³ Brief of November 23, 1740, *ibid.*, 11 *seq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 13 *seq.*

⁵ On November 23, 1740, *ibid.*, 16 *seq.*

The Pope returned more than once to the episcopal duty of residence ; for example, in a constitution for the Bishops of Ireland ¹ and, a few years later, in a special Bull, in which the subject was treated generally.² It would be difficult, he said, to name any requisite for Church discipline that had been more frequently inculcated by the Councils and the Popes than this particular duty of the Bishops. So long as the prelates conformed to it, he ruled, they would be entitled to the nomination to benefices in the Papal months alternately with the Holy See, during the term of his pontificate. There being differences of opinion about the length of time during which Bishops might legitimately absent themselves from their Sees, Benedict XIV. revived the Congregation which had already been instituted by Urban VIII. for the settlement of the various questions arising therefrom.

So that ecclesiastical offices might be held by the most deserving persons available at any particular time the Council of Trent had prescribed the method of competition ; Benedict now supplemented the regulations for this procedure.³ The pastor's most important duty, he declared, was to instruct the faithful in the Christian religion.⁴ For all clerics he confirmed the prohibition against engaging in commerce.⁵ As a means of strengthening the priestly spirit he recommended yearly exercises,⁶ which he himself performed under the direction of a Jesuit, on the approach of the jubilee year.⁷ The undertaking of such spiritual exercises in retirement would be blessed by the Church ; since the time of Ignatius of Loyola all the Orders had performed these exercises, and the Jesuits had established special houses for the purpose. On several occasions Benedict XIV. showed his approval of the

¹ Of August 15, 1741, *ibid.*, 39.

² On September 3, 1746, *ibid.*, XVII., 79.

³ On December 14, 1742, *ibid.*, XVI., 121-5.

⁴ On February 7, 1742, and June 26, 1754, *ibid.*, XVI., 64 ; XIX., 108.

⁵ On February 25, 1741, *ibid.*, XVI., 19.

⁶ Of September 3, 1740, *ibid.*, 3.

⁷ NOVAES, XIV., 148.

movement by granting special favours.¹ Similarly he praised the exercises of the Capuchins² and encouraged missions to the people, the benefits of which he had observed when holding former posts, including that of Bishop.³ Missionaries in England who were members of an Order were bidden⁴ to retire to the Continent every six years and there devote two weeks to spiritual exercises. On several occasions he ordered that seminarians should perform these exercises regularly.⁵ Related to these decrees on exercises was one in which he recommended the practice of contemplative prayer.⁶

Having so much at heart the need for good priests, the Pope naturally did not fail to bestow his favour on the institutions devoted to their training. On acknowledging his regulations,⁷ the seminary at Naples was endowed with spiritual favours,⁸ while that at Coimbra, which had just been established, received an increase of revenue.⁹ The training school at Recanati was given the property of a dissolved brotherhood,¹⁰ and a similar establishment at Piacenza was presented with the property of a hospital which had closed its doors.¹¹ To the German College in Rome Benedict XIV. showed especial friendliness. Its church was rebuilt at his instigation, the

¹ Briefs of January 25, 1746, March 29 and May 16, 1753, *Acta*, I., 305, 433-6; *Institutiones ecclesiasticæ in Benedicti XIV Opp.*, X., Romæ, 1747 *seqq.*, Inst. 51 and 104; *De synodo*, Ferrariæ, 1764, I., II, c. 2, n. 16, p. 65. Cf. H. WATRIGANT, *Benoît XIV. . . et les retraites spirituelles*, Enghien-Paris, 1919.

² *Bull. Cap.*, VII., 376.

³ To the Bishops in the Kingdom of Naples, on September 8, 1745, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 315 *seq.*

⁴ On May, 30, 1753, *ibid.*, XIX., 54.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XVII., 270; *Acta*, I., 317.

⁶ On December 16, 1746, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 97. The Brief was issued at the instigation of Leonardo da Porto Maurizio. WATRIGANT, 25.

⁷ January 13, 1746, *Acta*, I., 301, 304.

⁸ On August 19, 1746, *ibid.*, 359.

⁹ On March 10 and July 29, 1755, *ibid.*, II., 227, 461.

¹⁰ On June 3, 1748, *ibid.*, I., 539.

¹¹ On February 23, 1746, *ibid.*, 309-329.

foundation stone was laid by his hands, and the high altar was his gift. He never failed to attend there for the devotion of the Forty Hours.¹ The greatest proof, however, of his interest in training schools was the visitation which he ordered to be made of all the colleges dependent on the Propaganda.² For the dioceses also he considered visitation the chief means of remedying defects. He had recommended it to the Bishops, and in Rome the custom was inaugurated by Cardinal Annibale Albani in 1745.³

Benedict XIV.'s importance in the life of the Church consisted chiefly, however, in his activity as a legislator. From the very beginning he seems to have set himself the task of finishing what was incomplete in ecclesiastical statutes, of clearing up uncertainties, of filling in gaps, and of recalling what had been more or less forgotten.⁴ In this way it might be said of him that he rounded off the modern, post-Tridentine development of Church discipline.⁵ In so doing he drew freely on the "store of experience and wisdom" which had been amassed in the Roman Church in the course of the centuries; on the other hand, "a wealth of excellent annotations and wise judgments owed their origin directly to him."⁶ Of the constitutions he issued in the first six years of his pontificate, noted for their "wealth of material and their legal-historical foundation", he himself made a collection,

¹ STEINHUBER, II., 144.

² See below, p. 392.

³ NOVAES, XIV., 79.

⁴ To quote his own words, "Per omnem vitæ Nostræ ætatem nihil curavimus impensius, quam ut e medio sublatis contentionum, litium disceptationumque forensium dissidiis et tricis, per solam liquidamque veritatis inspectionem ius suum unicuique tribueretur." Brief for the Italo-Greek College in Rome, of December 17, 1745, *Ius pontif.*, III., 248; similarly in the Brief of February 15, 1748, on the Marian Congregations, *Institutum S.J.*, I., Florentiæ, 1892, 305.

⁵ H. LÄMMER, *Zur Kodifikation des kanonischen Rechts*, Freiburg, 1899, 27.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 36.

which is of great legal value ¹ ; he was known as " the greatest of all canonists " .²

His legislative activity began in the first years of his pontificate. He was already issuing ordinances in 1741 concerning the system of benefices, which was to be kept free of any commercial spirit.³ These were followed in the same year by regulations for the observance of Lent,⁴ which were later repeated in a Bull addressed to all the Bishops of the Church.⁵ More important were a constitution designed to protect from abuse the administration of the Sacrament of Penance,⁶ and another ⁷ which forbade over-zealous confessors asking their penitents the names of their accomplices in sin. Many of Benedict's ordinances relate to the Sacrament of marriage. " Marriages of conscience," i.e. those celebrated without the prescribed public announcements, he did not entirely forbid, but made dependent on the permission of the Bishop.⁸ He

¹ *Ibid.*, 27.

² RICHTER, *ibid.*, 36. Cf. J. FESSLER, *Sammlung vermischter Schriften über Kirchengeschichte und Kirchenrecht*, Freiburg, 1869. Particular aspects of Benedict's work on the diocesan synod are praised by SCHULTE also (III., 505), who disapproves of it as a whole : " Since at the time of its publication the book was incontestably the best exposition of the subjects under review . . . unexcelled for the clarity and intelligibility of its exposition, surpassing every other in its practical usefulness . . . the effect of the book must have been enormous." " For canon law it is the most important work of modern scholarship in existence." " Benedict was well ahead of his time ; no other disciplinary body had a book so valuable as this. Benedict inaugurated for canon law the era of historical jurisprudence."

³ NOVAES, XIV., 22.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁵ Of June 10, 1745, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 298 *seqq.* Cf. PICOT, III., 96 *seqq.*

⁶ Of June 1, 1741, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 32 *seq.* Cf. the decree of July 7, 1745, *ibid.*, 304 *seq.*

⁷ Of June 7, 1746, *ibid.*, XVII., 29 *seq.* Cf. the Briefs of June 2 and September 28, 1746, *ibid.*, 29, 88 *seq.*

⁸ On November 17, 1741, *ibid.*, 53.

took steps to put a stop to the malpractice which had arisen in Poland through the ignorance of the ecclesiastical courts of too hastily adjudging marriages to be invalid.¹ On the other hand, dispensation to enter into marriage was not to be given too easily.² In marriages among Jews it was tolerated that the husband might give his wife a bill of divorce in the presence of the rabbi; but this was forbidden to baptized Jews; in this respect they had to keep to the instructions of St. Paul.³ A very important decree was that concerning marriages in the Netherlands; the Pope decided⁴ that marriages there between Protestants and between Catholics and Protestants were valid; this was an exemption from the legislation of the Council of Trent, which was followed by many other exemptions for other regions.

There were also questions of other kinds that needed to be settled. Through imprudent zeal, Jewish children had been baptized without the consent of their parents. On this matter the Pope set forth the Church's principles at some length.⁵ The question whether Confirmation administered by Greek priests in Italy was valid was now decided in a negative sense,⁶ on the ground that the necessary authorization from the Pope had not been obtained. *A propos* of this, Benedict XIV. often gave simple priests authority to confirm, especially those in missionary countries.⁷ Many of the decrees he issued related to the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Priests were allowed to accept alms at the celebration of the Mass but they were to take care to guard against avarice.⁸ Severe

¹ On April 11, 1741, and May 18, 1743, *ibid.*, 26 seq., 160 seqq.

² Brief of February 25, 1742, *ibid.*, 73 seq.

³ Brief of September 16, 1747, *ibid.*, 186 seqq.

⁴ Declaration of November 4, 1741, *ibid.*, XVI., 52 seq.

⁵ On February 28, 1747, *ibid.*, XVII., 110-137. Amplified in the Brief of December 15, 1751, *ibid.*, 247. Cf. C. RUCH, in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II., 341-355.

⁶ On May 26, 1742, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 96 (in the constitution for the Italo-Greeks).

⁷ Cf. the list in HUGHES, II., 568, n. 4.

⁸ Brief of June 30, 1741, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 35.

measures were enacted against persons unlawfully posing as priests¹ and against anyone who stole consecrated Hosts for superstitious reasons.² Another question settled by the Pope was what cases of necessity entitled a priest to say two Masses in one day.³ In Spain and Portugal every priest was to be allowed to say three Masses on All Souls' Day.⁴ Another ruling was that every parish priest was bound to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass for his flock on Sundays and holidays,⁵ and that during the Mass an image of the Crucified was to be exposed on the altar.⁶ In 1757 his own infirmity induced the Pope to apply his learning to the question whether a priest might be allowed to sit when celebrating Mass.⁷

Nearly all the reformatory decrees already mentioned were enacted during the first years of the Pope's reign. It would seem that as Benedict XIV. he felt impelled to remedy with the least delay the shortcomings he had observed as Prospero Lambertini. Also in the years that followed he discovered much that needed his decision and elucidation. Thus in 1744 he issued regulations for the Penitentiary, and in 1746 for the Dataria.⁸ His Brief on interest and usury amounted to a relaxation of the stringent views which had hitherto been held.⁹

¹ January 20, 1744, *ibid.*, 196.

² March 4, 1744, *ibid.*, 161.

³ On March 16, 1746, *ibid.*, XVII., 8.

⁴ August 26, 1748, *ibid.*, 276-280. Cf. KNELLER, in the *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theologie*, XLII. (1918), 74-113. The concession was granted as the result of a written work by the Jesuit Em. de Azevedo. SOMMERVOGEL, I., 726, n. 10.

⁵ August 19, 1744, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 214 *seqq.*

⁶ Brief of July 16, 1746, *ibid.*, XVII., 77. At private Masses there was to be no obligation to administer Communion. November 13, 1742, *ibid.*, XVI., 117.

⁷ NOVAES, XIV., 242 *seq.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, 70, 85.

⁹ Of November 1, 1745. *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 328; PICOT, III., 99-105; FUNK in the *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1879, 6, and in the special edition issued in honour of A. Schäffle, Tübingen, 1901; T. TIBERGHIEU, *Encyclique Vix pervenit*, Tourcoing, 1921; REUSCH, II., 847. See above, pp. 100, 201.

His decree on duelling was important,¹ and, as was only to be expected, he took up the question of ecclesiastical immunity,² which had given so much trouble to his immediate predecessors.

No one, it has been said, has possessed so wide a knowledge of the liturgy as Benedict XIV.³ In this field he rendered service both as a writer, in his work on the Mass and the feasts of the Church, and as Pope, through several legislative measures. At the time when the King of Portugal was contemplating the production, at his own expense, of a new edition of the missal and a translation of the martyrology (a list of the Saints, to be used each day in choir), the Pope took the opportunity to have the martyrology read through and improved.⁴ In Croatia the Glagolitic missal in the Old Slavonic language of the Church was still in use; as many modern Croat and Latin elements had been incorporated in it, the Pope ordered a return to the unadulterated Old Slavonic.⁵ He decided also to have the liturgical books of the Alexandrine rite printed in the Arabic and Coptic languages and entrusted the task to Raphael Tukhi, a former pupil of the Propaganda, who, after completing it, died in 1772.⁶ The edition of the Greek Euchologion, on which work had been in progress in Rome since the time of Urban VII. and Innocent X., was completed in the reign of Benedict XIV.; a Brief of March 1st, 1756, prescribed it for the use of the Greeks.⁷ In 1741 a start was made with the revision of the Roman breviary, whose

¹ Of November 10, 1752, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 19. Cf. Brief to Stadler of March 3, 1753, *Acta*, II., 127; FOURNERET in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, IV., 185 seq.

² On March 15, 1750, *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 161.

³ “. . . la plus vaste science liturgique dont jamais homme ait été orné.” GUÉRANGER, *Institutions liturgiques*, II., Paris, 1880, 494, quoted in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrétienne*, II., Paris, 1910, 771.

⁴ Brief to the King of Portugal, of July 1, 1748, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 240.

⁵ On August 15, 1754, *ibid.*, XIX., 112.

⁶ KARALEVSKIJ in the *Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclés.*, III., 863.

⁷ *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 192.

defects had been observed by Benedict before he became Pope.¹ In 1744 a special Congregation, composed of Cardinals Gentili, Monti, Valenti, Tamburini, and Besozzi, was appointed to examine the proposals made by the consultors, but when the Cardinals handed in their work the Pope expressed his extreme dissatisfaction with it. If only, he wrote,² he had undertaken the work himself, unaided ! It was easier to put the breviary itself to rights than the proposals for improvement made by the Cardinals. He did in fact take up the work himself but could not find the time to finish it.³ The Congregation for the breviary had allowed itself to be influenced by various currents of thought running in France, where since c. 1680 almost every diocese had a breviary for itself.⁴ The revision, however, of the manual for episcopal functions (*Cæremoniale episcoporum*) which had been begun under Benedict XIII. was brought to a conclusion ; it was published together with a Brief on March 25th, 1752.⁵ The Pope also attempted to free Church music of the theatrical style which had invaded it⁶ and opposed the habit of behaving in church as in a concert hall.⁷

(2)

In the organization of the religious Orders Benedict found no lack of opportunity to act as legislator or as protector of ecclesiastical legislation. Of importance here are his directions regarding the relations between religious and their Bishops⁸ ; they were to be subject to them in all that concerned the

¹ BÄUMER, *Brevier*, 562-584. Of his plans for its improvement Benedict wrote to Tencin on June 7, 1743, HEECKEREN, I., 61. Of the need for improvement he spoke in *De can.*, IV., 2, c. 13.

² To Tencin, on August 7, 1748, HEECKEREN, I., 421 ; *cf.* 125.

³ To Tencin, on September 25, 1748, *ibid.*, 431 ; BÄUMER, 584.

⁴ BÄUMER, 529-536.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 530.

⁶ On February 19, 1749, *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 9-24.

⁷ Brief of March 11, 1755, *ibid.*, XVII., 240 *seqq.*

⁸ Bulls of November 6, 1744, and February 24, 1746, *ibid.*, XVI., 249 ; XVII., 1.

cure of souls, and the same rule applied to their relations with the Vicars Apostolic, in India or England, for example.¹ Religious living outside the house of the Order were likewise subject to episcopal authority.² That churches of an Order could be visited by the Bishop had already been ordained by the Council of Trent ; a few doubtful questions connected with this decision were now settled by Papal decree.³ The question whether a priest could join a religious Order without the permission of his Bishop had been raised by Cardinal Quirini at the time when Leonardo Chizzola, Archdeacon of Brescia Cathedral, became a Jesuit without informing the Cardinal. Benedict XIV.'s decision⁴ was that everyone must be free to choose a more perfect state of life. A special commission to examine the matter was unnecessary, he maintained, since out of a hundred archdeacons scarcely one would want to enter an Order, while out of a hundred monks almost all would like to be archdeacons. Ordination of a religious, the Pope ruled,⁵ was the right of the Ordinary ; a religious was not to apply to any Bishop he liked.

A question of prime importance was touched on by the Pope in a Brief addressed to the Hermits of St. Augustine. The Order was contemplating a return to its original custom, by which the Prior General was chosen for life. Benedict permitted and encouraged this step. On confirming the election of the new Augustinian General⁶ he said that for the

¹ Decree of May 30, 1753, *ibid.*, XIX., 49 *seq.* For the importance of the Bull, *cf.* A. GASQUET, *History of the Ven. English College at Rome*, London, 1920, 175 *seqq.*

² Brief of May 27, 1746, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 28.

³ On November 6, 1745, *ibid.*, XVI., 49.

⁴ On January 14, 1747, *ibid.*, XVII., 101.

⁵ On February 17, 1747, *ibid.*, 106.

⁶ On August 6, 1745, *ibid.*, XVI., 289. *Cf. Acta Capituli generalis a. 1745 Bononiae celebrati*, in *Analecta Augustiniana*, XIII. (1929), 5 *seqq.* *Ibid.*, 82, renewed Papal confirmation of December 13, 1749, and *ibid.*, 86, records of the general chapter of 1753.

heads of Orders lifelong office was desirable. On March 4th, 1748, he enlarged upon the difficult question when the validity of vows taken in an Order might be contested.¹ Another constitution protected the enclosure of an Order by abolishing the authority to grant dispensations²; this important requisite of discipline in religious Orders was re-emphasized for the benefit of female religious in particular.³ Benedict would have liked nunneries to be independent of the male branch of the Order,⁴ but as the execution of such a plan was fraught with difficulties he had to content himself with issuing an instruction⁵ that female religious should be given an extraordinary confessor from time to time.

The privileges of the Order of Malta and the association of secular priests that went by the name of the " Pious Workers " were confirmed by Benedict XIV.,⁶ also those of the Olivetans⁷ and the Brothers of Charity⁸; to the Premonstratensians he granted exemption⁹ and the right to take charge of parishes.¹⁰ The Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, he ruled,¹¹ was to be subject to the Bishops and was not to regard Mary Ward as its foundress. For the canons and the women members of the Order of the Holy Ghost who lived too far from Rome he prescribed¹² that they should now be subject, not to the

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 220 *seq.*

² On January 3, 1742, *ibid.*, XVI., 60.

³ Under the same date and on October 13, 1749, *ibid.*, XVI., 62, XVIII., 54. Special decree for Portugal, of June 1, 1741, *ibid.*, XVI., 30.

⁴ To Tencin, August 19, 1750, HEECKEREN, II., 50; *cf.* 40, 43, 97.

⁵ On August 5, 1748, *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 39.

⁶ On March 12, 1753, and April 12, 1752, *ibid.*, XIX., 38 *seqq.*, and XVIII., 299 *seq.*

⁷ On April 1, 1755, *ibid.*, XIX., 137.

⁸ On February 14, 1749, *Acta.* II., 5-24.

⁹ On September 11, 1753, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 66.

¹⁰ On September 1, 1750, *ibid.*, XVIII., 174.

¹¹ On April 30, 1749, *ibid.*, 30-8.

¹² On April 5, 1741, *ibid.*, XVI., 24.

Superior of the Roman Hospital of the Holy Ghost, but to their Bishops.

The importance ascribed by Benedict to the various Orders was also shown by his consenting on several occasions to preside in person over the election of new Generals. He paid this honour to the Franciscan Conventuals on May 20th, 1741, to the Franciscan Observants on May 16th, 1750,¹ and to the Dominicans on July 5th, 1756.² He would have liked Ricchini, the Secretary of the Index, to become General of the Order of Preachers, but it was urged against Ricchini that he was devoted to the Jesuits. This "devotion", objected Benedict, merely meant that he did not place individual opinions on the same level as defined dogmas and did not approve of an acrimonious dispute between two famous Orders whose unity would have brought to the Church much benefit which was now prevented by their discord.³

This was not the only reproach which Benedict XIV. had to make against the conduct of the Orders in his time. The Capuchins alone received his unqualified praise. On March 11th, 1743, he decreed⁴ that the preacher for the Apostolic Palace was always to be provided by this Order, as, indeed, had long been the custom in the past. Among the Capuchins whose sermons he had heard he singled out for praise Bonaventura Barberini, who had been raised to the archbishopric of Ferrara. To a letter thereupon addressed to him by Bonaventura he replied⁵ that the Order of Capuchins deserved the praise that had been given it, since it was the

¹ NOVAES, XIV., 32, 158; to Tencin on May 20, 1750, II., 33, 34. The allocution of May 16, 1750, in *Bull. Benedicti XIV.*, Vol. XIII., Mechliniæ, 1827, 179.

² To Tencin, June 9 and July 7, 1756. II., 505, 512. An anecdote connected with this election in REUMONT, *Ganganelli*, 215. The Pope's address to the assembled electors in *Bull. Benedicti XIV.*, Vol. XIII., 199.

³ HEECKEREN, II., 505.

⁴ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 141.

⁵ On March 26, 1753, *Bull. Capuc.*, VII., 356.

only remaining example of evangelical perfection.¹ It had an abundance of distinguished preachers, and the truths to be proclaimed from the pulpit to the Pope, the Cardinals, and the prelates sounded better coming from the lips of a Capuchin than from any others.

Obviously this praise implied a rebuke for other Congregations, and in fact Benedict expressed his objection to the Orders of his time more than once. Thus he complained that the Dominicans in France had often showed themselves favourable to Jansenism.² As for the Jesuits, the continual complaints that in China and India they did not obey the Papal ordinances found credence with him at first.³ At the same time, these complaints against the Dominicans and Jesuits were applicable, as Benedict expressly said, only to small groups within the two Orders.⁴ He also observed serious disorders among the Franciscans.⁵ On the other hand it must

¹ " cum sit unicum exemplar, quod hodieum de perfectione evangelica remanet " (*ibid.*). Cf. EBERL in *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, VII., 134. At about this time there were two members of the Capuchin Order who were afterwards beatified: Angelo d'Acri (d. 1739) and the lay-brother Crispino of Viterbo (d. 1750). There had already been mention of the office of preacher to the Papal Court in the middle ages. Father Antonio Massa, a Minorite, preached in 1422 at the Court of Martin V., the Vicar General of the Capuchins, Father Francesco da Iesi, in 1529, under Clement VII. But it was not until the pontificate of Paul IV. (1555-59) that the permanent office of preacher to the Papal Court was established. Until the time of Benedict XIV. the Preachers Apostolic were chosen from various religious Orders; thus Fathers B. Palmi, Toledo, Oliva, Segneri from the Society of Jesus, Da Pegna from the Carmelites; Fathers Brandi, Riccardi, and Ferrari were Dominicans, Father Pellegrini was a Missionary Brother, others were Capuchins. Cf. MORONI, LV., 74.

² See below (p. 444) and the Briefs to the Bishops of Sisteron (Lasitau) and Marseilles (Belsunce), of September 18 and December 9, 1741, *Acta*, I., 84, 86.

³ See below, p. 445.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ To Tencin, March 27, 1745, I., 188.

not be forgotten that at that time this last-mentioned Order included among its members a great Saint whom the Pope highly valued: Leonardo of Porto Maurizio—and Leonardo himself testified of the reform group of the Franciscans, to which he belonged, that it had rendered excellent service and was most highly thought of in every quarter.¹ Teofilo da Corte, canonized in 1930, died shortly before Benedict XIV.'s election.

Otherwise, when speaking of the religious associations of his time, the Pope can hardly be cited as a witness to the general decay of the Orders. When certain reforms among the Carthusians came up for consideration, he wrote² that this Order was worthy of every consideration and if in France it was the most exemplary of all, the same was true of the Order in Italy. The Brief³ with which he reserved for the Theatines a post among the consultors of the Congregation of Rites, speaks of the shining examples of piety and religious perfection, combined with outstanding knowledge of sacred subjects which the sons of the Order, from its very beginning, had given the world, day after day, to the benefit of the Catholic Church. Among the Theatines who had rendered meritorious service Cardinal Giuseppe Maria Tommasi⁴ and Gaetano Merati (d. 1745) were singled out for special praise.

When Benedict XIV. allotted to the Jesuits also a permanent place among the consultors of the Congregation of

¹ "Non si può negare che questa Congregazione non faccia un gran bene nella nostra Italia, e da per tutto dove vado sento il buon odore di questi ottimi operai, perchè assistono al confessionale e sono indefessi in aggiustare le anime e porle nel buon sentiero." To Benedict XIV., on July 9, 1751, in INNOCENTI, 301.

² To Tencin, April 26, 1752, II., 182.

³ Brief of March 20, 1745, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 288: "luculenta pietatis et religiosæ perfectionis exempla . . . , quæ . . . in dies proferre pergunt religiosissimi eiusdem [ordinis] alumni."

⁴ "immortalis memoriæ vir, doctrinæ præstantia, morum sanctimonia et austerissima vivendi forma clarissimus et spectatissimus". (*ibid.*). Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIII., 351.

Rites he did not stint his praise of the Society of Jesus in the introduction to his Brief. The members of this Order, he wrote, by their practice of virtue and learning, were still justifying¹ the universal conviction that God had opposed the reformers of the sixteenth century with St. Ignatius and his sons, so that they deserved fresh evidence of the good favour of the Holy See ; the Society of Jesus which was being so violently decried for its disobedience was then described as " most devoted to the Holy See ".² A few years later, from among the many virtues for which the Order was famous, he picked out for special tribute no other than its extraordinary obedience to the Apostolic See,³ and gave the missionaries of the Order special privileges. On quite a number of occasions he went out of his way to compliment them. Thus in one of his Briefs⁴ he said that he was opening the store of heavenly treasures for those who from love of God and their neighbour and from religious zeal were doing their utmost to promote the welfare of souls in the missions, and that among them he included the members of the Society of Jesus, especially those who had been sent out by the then General, Retz.

These words of commendation were borne out by the favours which he bestowed on the Order. Great relief was afforded to it by the granting of its repeatedly expressed desire for the

¹ " comprobare pergunt ". Brief of April 24, 1748, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 227.

² " addictissima huic S. Sedi ipsa Iesu Societas ". *Ibid.*

³ " Quo luculentioribus religiosarum virtutum exemplis ac præsertim singulari erga Nos et Apostolicam hanc Sedem observantia et obedientia increscere te, dilecte fili [the Jesuit General, Visconti], et inclitam Societatem Iesu . . . magna cum pontificii animi Nostri lætitia intelligentes gratulamur, eo amplioribus apostolicæ benignitatis potestatisque argumentis par æquumque esse ducimus, uti te eiusdemque Societatis tuæ religiosos alumnos [in the Portuguese possessions], assiduos labores sedulamque operam navantes, prosequamur." Brief of March 3, 1753, *Acta*, II., 128 ; similarly in the Brief of March 2, for the Spanish colonies, *Ius pontif.*, III., 520.

⁴ Of January 12, 1743, *Acta*, I., 139 ; *Ius pontif.*, III., 95.

abrogation of Innocent X.'s instruction that a general congregation be held every nine years.¹ In the introduction to the relative Brief the Pope again bore witness to the Society's indefatigable activity, which was of the greatest profit to the Church of God.² Further evidence of his good will towards the Order was afforded by his confirmation of all the privileges enjoyed by the Marian congregations,³ the beneficial effects of which he had himself experienced in his youth, and by his recommendation of the Jesuit exercises.⁴

The General of the Order, Retz, was honoured by the Pope with special marks of his esteem; his state of health was frequently described by him in his correspondence⁵ and once, when he was ill, he was unexpectedly visited by Benedict from Castel Gandolfo.⁶ He was received by the Pope on an appointed day in every week, and on important matters he

¹ Cf. our account, Vol. XXX., 178.

² "Devotam maiori Dei gloriæ promovendæ adiuvandæque proximorum saluti Societatem . . . sicuti Ecclesiæ Dei utilissimam operam assidue navare . . . compertum habemus," etc. Brief of December 17, 1745, *Institutum S.J.*, I., 262.

³ "Golden Bull" of September 27, 1748, *ibid.*, 283-292.

⁴ See above, p. 295. In a Brief of April 24, 1748, concerned with these Congregations he said that the sons of the Order "Christi bonus odor sunt et ubique gentium habentur" (*Instit. S.J.*, I., 278). In a Brief of July 15, 1749, it was said of the priests of this Order that they "non ultimum locum et gradum inter tot religiosos ordines . . . sibi vindicant, quippe qui assiduis laboribus", etc. (*ibid.*, 293 seq.).

⁵ To Tencin on November 4 and 25, 1750, II., 73, 75.

⁶ To the same, November 4, 1750, II., 70. On this occasion he referred to him as a "grand homme de bien et de beaucoup de prudence" (*ibid.*). On the death of Visconti, Retz's successor, Benedict wrote: "Questa morte è stata ed è di rammarico agli esteri ed ai domestici; agli esteri, appresso i quali era in una gran stima per la sua prudenza: ai domestici, perchè governava con tutta piacevolezza e bon garbo" (to Tencin, on May 7, 1755, II., 410; Papal Secret Archives, Arm. XV., Vol. 157). On the election of Centurioni, Visconti's successor, the Pope wrote to Tencin on December 3, 1755 (II., 459): "Non ha avuto altra

was asked to write letters to the Court confessors, which very often had the desired effect.¹ On the other hand, the Pope had serious complaints to make against the confessor of the Spanish king, the French Jesuit Le Fèvre,² nor was he satisfied with Querini, the confessor of the Polish king, Augustus of Saxony; for fear of the Protestant Minister, he alleged, Querini was not sufficiently active on behalf of the Catholic religion, which consequently made no progress in Saxony in spite of the presence there of seventeen Jesuits.³

As Archbishop of Bologna, Prospero Lambertini had written to the Jesuit Caravita and thus indirectly to the General of the Order, Retz, that as time went on he was more and more pleased with the conduct of these learned and holy religious.⁴ As Pope, he made use of their services in important questions of canon law and for the improvement of his own written works. Two Jesuits who were intimate friends of his were the Venetian Lombardi and Budrioli, whom he valued particularly highly on account of his experience in matters connected with canonization. In difficult cases the Pope sought the opinion of the Jesuit Turano, the theologian of the Penitentiaria. In his view the most sagacious of the Italian Jesuits was Egidio Maria de' Giuli, who had a firm grasp of the Church's principles, was moderate in his views, and was well versed in canon law and Church history. For Benedict XIV.'s most outstanding work, on the diocesan synod, the material supplied by himself was arranged and co-ordinated by Giuli, who was also responsible for its Latin form; its rather long preface was provided by Cordara. In return for these services Giuli was to have been offered the post of one of the secretaries

eccezione che quella dell' età " (70 years). Papal Secret Archives, *loc. cit.*

¹ Cordara in DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, III., 12.

² To Tencin, May 17, 1747, I., 326. See above, pp. 63 *seqq.*, and P. A. KIRSCH in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, XXIV. (1903), 551.

³ To Tencin, February 22, 1747, I., 307.

⁴ " *che sempre più sono contento di questi suoi dotti e santi religiosi ". Letter of September 5, 1731, original in Jesuit ownership.

to the Congregation of the Bishops, but he died before he could take it up.¹ Another Jesuit who enjoyed Benedict's favour was Emanuel de Azevedo; in collaboration with his fellow-religious Lazzeri he brought out in 1747-1751 a complete edition of Benedict's works, the cost being met by the King of Portugal.²

Benedict XIV. was also destined to realize that even in the rationalistic eighteenth century the Church still possessed sufficient vigour to produce new Orders. To two religious associations that had recently come into existence he bestowed the Papal confirmation: in 1741 to the Passionists, founded by Paul of the Cross (d. 1775),³ and, on February 25th, 1749,⁴ to the Redemptorists, founded by Alphonsus Liguori in 1732. Two other associations, missionary Orders like the Passionists and Redemptorists, were formed in the reign of Benedict XIV. and received from him the confirmation of their rules: the so-called Scalzetti,⁵ founded by the Spaniard Juan Varella y Losada, and the Baptistines, founded by Domenico Francesco Olivieri and confirmed by the Pope on September 23rd, 1755. More lasting than the Baptistines was the female congregation of that name, founded by Giovanna Battista Solimani, directed by the same Olivieri, and papally approved in 1744. The Church therefore had its Saints in those days too.

¹ To Tencin, February 16, 1746, October 31 and November 20, 1748, I., 247, 438, 442. Costantino Ruggieri wrote on November 16, 1748, the day after Giuli's death: "Era un galantuomo di 24 carati, amato e stimato moltissimo per la sua grande abilità ed onoratezza dal Papa e da tutta Roma. Era anche amicissimo del nostro Concina." NARDINOCCHI, 95.

² To Tencin, May 29, 1748, I., 407. A *letter of Benedict XIV.'s to the king of Portugal, of December 4, 1748, with a request for support for Azevedo's liturgical publications, in Princ. 173, p. 342, Papal Secret Archives.

³ *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, IX., 1719.

⁴ *Ibid.*, VII., 2025 seq.

⁵ "Ordo religiosus de pœnitentia," *ibid.*, II., 1450; V. MENGhini, *Memorie storiche del servo di Dio P. Giovanni Varella y Losada*, Roma, 1879.

(3)

It was not only as a scholar that Benedict XIV. had much to do with Saints and canonizations. He himself reviewed his services in this field in his Consistorial address of April 18th, 1746.¹ As a young jurist he came into touch with the future Cardinal Caprara, who was then auditor of the Rota and who initiated him into the procedure of that tribunal. The Rota having occupied itself with canonizations in former times and as Caprara was also consultor of the Congregation of Rites, Lambertini was afforded the opportunity, which he eagerly seized, of perusing the records of canonizations. On becoming Consistorial advocate he was entrusted by Clement XI. with the processes of Pius V. and Catherine of Bologna, and the same Pope afterwards made him *Promotor Fidei*; this latter office he filled for twenty years, handling all the processes of canonization which were brought forward during the reigns of Clement XI., Benedict XIII., and Clement XII. As Cardinal he was allotted to the Congregation of Rites, but he was soon called away from Rome by his elevation to episcopal rank. When a Bishop he managed through skilful disposition of his time and by working late into the night to expand the notes he had made in his stay in Rome into a large work on beatification and canonization. For the accomplishment of this task he was greatly helped by the libraries of his episcopal residence, Bologna, and by the intercourse he had there with various physicists and doctors. After he became Pope he brought out a second edition of his work.

And yet only one solemn canonization was celebrated by Benedict XIV. It took place in St. Peter's, the church expressly designated by him for canonizations and beatifications. On one or two occasions Benedict XIII. and Clement XII. had departed from the ancient custom of performing these

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 62. Cf. above, p. 25. For his services for the beatified members of the Franciscan Order, see below, p. 315, n. 3. For the processes of the canonization of Augustinians under consideration in his reign, see *Analecta Augustiniana*, XIII. (1929), 103-6.

ceremonies in the largest of the churches and had chosen in its place the Lateran ; Benedict XIV. now restored its rights to St. Peter's. The ceremony was carried out on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul in 1746, in honour of five new Saints.¹ The Order of Capuchins, which up to then had had only one canonized Saint, Felix of Cantalice, was now able to give him two companions. One of these was Fidelis of Sigmaringen, who in 1622 in consequence of his apostolic activity had been done to death by Calvinist peasants in the Prättigau and had been beatified by Benedict XIII.² ; the other was Joseph of Leonissa (d. 1612), who also suffered the torments of martyrdom at Pera in Turkey and after his rescue spent twenty more years as an ardent missionary to the people in Italy.³ These two Capuchins were joined by a third son of St. Francis : Pedro Regalato (d. 1456), a Spaniard who was a reformer of the Spanish Observants. Whether or not he himself was an Observant is still disputed,⁴ but there is no doubt that his reforming activity, which he exercised in collaboration with Petrus Villacretius, was of importance for the whole Church, seeing that the reformed convent of S. Maria Saliceti, which was under the direction of the two men, produced Cardinal Ximenes, who prepared the ground for the Catholic reform of the sixteenth century. Camillus de Lellis (d. 1614), founder of the " Fathers of a Good Death ", had been raised to the altars as one of the beatified by Benedict XIV. on April 7th, 1742 ; after only four years he was now honoured as a Saint.⁵ Like the family of St. Francis, the Third Order of the Dominicans was also honoured by the canonization of Caterina de'

¹ The Bulls in *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 35, 40, 46, 51, 56.

² Cf. our account, Vol. XXVII., 212, XXXIV., 166. Biographies by F. von Scala (1897) and F. de la Motte-Servoleix (1901).

³ *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, VI., 1869 seq.

⁴ NOVAES, XIV., 91 ; *Acta SS. Mart.*, III. (reprint), 850 seqq.

⁵ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 83 ; cf. 74. Biographies by Bäumker (1888), Latarche (1907), and others. Description of the beatification in AMICI, *Memoria intorno S. Camillo de Lellis*, Roma, 1913, 73 seq. ; *ibid.*, 83, for the canonization. Cf. our account, Vol. XXI., 140 seqq.

Ricci (d. 1590), a noblewoman of Florence who was a contemporary of Philip Neri and Maddalena de' Pazzi and shared their ideals.¹ Honour was paid by Benedict XIV. to still another Saint: Queen Elizabeth of Portugal (d. 1336), who had been declared a Saint by Urban VIII. in 1625 but who had not been given the usual testimony in the form of a Bull; this defect was now remedied.²

Apart from this one solemn canonization, Benedict XIV. furthered the veneration of several deceased persons of saintly life. Only on six occasions, however, in the years 1741–1753 did he actually proceed to solemn beatification. The first person to be beatified in this period was Alessandro Sauli, the "Apostle of Corsica" (d. 1592),³ the last the Minorite Joseph of Copertino (d. 1663), whose life was so full of unusual and inexplicable features that he finally had to be removed to secluded convents on account of the immoderate attention he attracted.⁴ All the other four persons to be beatified (and afterwards canonized) were founders of Orders: besides Camillus de Lellis, the founders of the Somaschi and the Piarists, Girolamo Miani and Giuseppe da Calasanza,⁵ and Francis de Sales' collaborator in the founding of the Order of the Visitation, Jeanne Françoise de Chantal.⁶

¹ Only two years after her death her biography was published by the Bishop of Fiesole, Francesco de Cataneo Diaceto, and it was followed by others. Cf. our account, Vol. XIX., 191, n. 7.

² By the Bull of April 28, 1742, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 84.

³ Brief of April 23, 1741, *ibid.*, XVI., 27; P. CASARI, *In occasione d. solenne triduo che si celebra in S. Carlo a' Catinari per il b. Alessandro Saoli vescovo di Aleria in Corsica, rime offerte alla Santità di N. S. Papa Benedetto XIV.*, Roma, 1741. Cf. CIBRARIO, *Lettere*, 268, and our account, Vol. XVII., 237 *seqq.*, XIX., 81, n. 4.

⁴ Brief of November 20, 1753, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 37. For his influence on the conversion of Duke John Frederick of Brunswick-Lüneburg (1651), cf. RÄSS, *Konvertiten*, VI., 451.

⁵ Briefs of July 17 and September 22, 1747, and August 7, 1748, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 204, 261, 271.

⁶ Brief of November 13, 1751, *ibid.*, XVIII., 243. For this, cf. our account, Vol. XXVI., 68 *seqq.*; CIBRARIO, *loc. cit.*, 270.

On the strength of declarations made by the Congregation of Rites, Benedict XIV. confirmed in many cases, though not by solemn beatification, the veneration, mostly long-established, of distinguished members of the Church. Among them was a queen of France, Jeanne de Valois (d. 1505), who, after the annulment of her marriage with Louis XII., founded the Order of the Annunciation (the Annunciades).¹ A Cardinal, the Carthusian Niccolò d'Albergati (d. 1443),² was honoured in the same manner, and along with him a Servite, Francesco Patrizi (d. 1328),³ and a Benedictine of the Congregation of St. Silvester Guzzolini (d. 1267), Ugo degli Atti, who was also a pupil of that Saint; also the laymen Girio or Gerard (d. 1298) and Heinrich of Bozen (d. 1315), and Andreas of Rinn, a child said to have been murdered by the Jews in 1460. Benedict XIV. sanctioned the traditional veneration of these persons but on May 23rd, 1755, refused their canonization. Of the other holy persons eight were Franciscans. Some of them bore famous names: the Blessed Coletta (d. 1447, canonized in 1807), whose reformation of the Clarissines spread to the male branch of the Order, Odorico Matiussi da Pordenone (d. 1331), the heroic traveller and missionary, who though without the means of transport available in later days penetrated to the heart of Asia and reached Peking,⁴ and the

The decree, stating that the beatification could confidently be proceeded with, was composed by the Pope himself (letter to Tencin, August 25, 1751, II., 136). For the beatification, *cf. ibid.*, 142 *seq.*, 153.

¹ Decree of July 18, 1742, *Acta SS. Febr.*, I., 574-591; HEIMBUCHER, II.³, 271 *seq.*

² Decree of October 4, 1744, *FRESCO*, XVIII., 24; XIX., 201. For D'Albergati, see our account, Vol. II., 14-18.

³ A fuller account of the persons subsequently mentioned and of the date of the confirmation of their cult, in *NOVAES*, XIV., 95-108. The Pope related his services in connexion with the canonization and beatification of Franciscans in his allocution to the General Chapter, *Bull. Benedicti XIV.*, Vol. XIII., *Mechliniæ*, 1827, 181.

⁴ *Acta SS. Ian.*, I., 984-6; BUCHBERGER, II., 1193.

learned Angelo da Chiavasso (d. 1495), who compiled a synthesis of moral cases (*Summa de Casibus Conscientiæ*). The other Franciscans to be honoured are noteworthy as showing that even in the periods before and during the Reformation holiness in the Church was not extinct. They were Gabriel Ferretti, of the fifteenth century; Pacifico da Ceredano (d. 1482); the Pole, Ladislaus of Gielniow (d. 1505); the lay-brother and son of Ethiopian slaves, Benedict "the Moor", of San Philadelfi (or S. Fradello; d. 1589)¹; and the Franciscan Sister, Serafina Sforza (d. 1478). Only slightly less was the number of Dominicans whose veneration was confirmed. Of these Pedro Gonzalez Telmo (d. 1246) is well known through the "St. Elmo's fire" which takes its name from him. Marcolino Amanni of Forlì (d. 1397) and Álvaro of Cordova (d. ca. 1430) were distinguished for their zeal in reforming the Order, while Matteo Carrieri (d. 1470) and Giovanni Liccio, who was more than a hundred years old when he died in 1511, were famous preachers. The Third Order of St. Dominic was represented by Giovanna (Vanna) of Orvieto (d. 1306) and Stephana de Quinzanis (d. 1530).

Many processes for beatification which were not brought to a conclusion during his pontificate were furthered by Benedict XIV. by means of Briefs. One of these processes was that of the Cardinal of Arezzo, Paolo Burali, whose virtues he declared to be heroic²; another was that of the Jesuit, Andrew Bobola, a missionary in Lithuania, who was to be considered as good as a martyr.³ In the case of Crescentia of Kaufbeuren, however, laudatory reports of whom had reached the Pope even during her lifetime, he impressed caution on the Bishop of Augsburg on May 17th, 1744, and

¹ PICOT, III., 114.

² February 8, 1756, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 191. For Burali cf. our account, Vol. XVI., 165, and the biographies by G. B. Bagatta (Venice, 1698), G. Bonaglia (Rome, 1772), and G. A. Cagiani (Rome, 1669).

³ February 9, 1755, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 120. Cf. *Anal. iuris pontif.*, XX., 927.

repeated this admonition in a long Brief,¹ in which he also disapproved of the extraordinary pictures of the Holy Ghost which Crescentia was supposed to have distributed. The Brief afforded an excuse for Protestant attacks, which were answered by Muratori.² The beatification of the Franciscan nun Maria of Ágreda (d. 1665) was impeded by the writings, including alleged revelations, which were ascribed to her. They had been approved by the Spanish Inquisition after an examination lasting fourteen years, but had been condemned by the Sorbonne and on August 4th, 1681, had been prohibited by Rome, though, at the request of the Court, Spain was exempted from the prohibition. The dispute, in which Cardinal Aguirre had taken part in 1699 and Eusebius Amort in 1734, was still in progress when Benedict XIV. pronounced on January 16th, 1748,³ that it was not certain at the time of speaking whether the writings were really those of Maria of Ágreda; but until the doubts connected with the revelations had been cleared up, the discussion of the nun's virtues could come to no conclusion. On the veneration enjoyed by Lucas Casalius at Nicosia, and Maro among the Maronites,⁴ the Pope expressed his opinion at some length in a document⁵ of his own composition; from the Catacomb of St. Thraso he sent

¹ Of October 1, 1745, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 318-323. Crescentia (d. April 5, 1744) was beatified in 1900; biography by Jeiler (1901). For the pictures of the Holy Ghost, mentioned later, *ibid.*, 5th ed. (1900), 176-183.

² NOVAES, XIV., 83.

³ To the Minister General of the Franciscans, Raffaele de Lucagnano, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 214-220. Cf. FRESCO, XVIII., 25; KRAUS, 47. According to Friedrich (DÖLLINGER, I., 403) it was Amort who had induced the Pope to come to this decision. The difficulties in which he was involved by this affair were described by Benedict in letters to Tencin on February 14 and April 3, 1748 (I., 384 seq., 395), and to Quirini on August 17, 1748 (in which he spoke of Gonzalez' writing against Amort). FRESCO, XIX., 178.

⁴ Brief of September 28, 1753, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 70 seq.

⁵ Of February 8, 1747, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 138-147. Cf. *Lex. für Theol. u. Kirche*, I. (1930), 146 seq.

to Bologna relics which on the score of several distinguishing marks were held to be the body of a St. Procus¹; and at the request of the Council of Tarragona he permitted² a greater veneration to be paid to St. Maginus. The veneration of the Empress Aelia Pulcheria, which had already been granted to the Augustinian Canons in Portugal, he extended to the Society of Jesus.³

Of his devotion to the Mother of God Benedict XIV. gave many proofs.⁴ He had the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore restored, endowed it with a yearly income,⁵ and ordered a solemn Papal Cappella to be held there every year on the feast of the Immaculate Conception.⁶ He drafted a Bull on the Immaculate Conception but it was never published; in it was stated that it was not to be doubted that the holiness of the Mother of God began at the first moment of her existence.⁷ In a Brief on the veneration of the Holy House of Loreto⁸ he stated frankly that his visit to it had filled him with devotion. A decree of Innocent XII.'s making the Holy

¹ Brief and letter of April 20, 1745, *ibid.*, App. ii-x. Cf. *Acta*, I., 254.

² On December 22, 1745, *Acta*, I., 285.

³ On February 2, 1752, *ibid.*, II., 90. Benedict XIV. to Cardinal Quirini on the cult of St. Simeon, in CIBRARIO, *Lettere*, 284.

⁴ "quam toto vitæ Nostræ cursu propitiam Nobis atque indulgentissimam experti sumus." Allocution of May 5, 1749, *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 70. Cf. allocution of September 30, 1750.

⁵ On February 11, 1745, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 281 seq.

⁶ In the consistory of November 26, 1742, *ibid.*, 282. *Della papal cappella per la festa dell' Immacolata Concezione di Maria Vergine Madre di Dio da N. S. Papa Bened. XIV. in perpetuo decretata. Discorso storico e panegirico.* Padova, 1752.

⁷ V. SARDI, *La solenne definizione del dogma dell' Immacolato Concepimento di Maria SS. Atti e documenti*, II., Roma, 1905. Cf. *Civ. Catt.*, 1905, IV., 59 seq. For discussions on the Immaculate Conception in the reign of Benedict XIV., see *Civ. Catt.*, *loc. cit.*, 513-527, 655-674.

⁸ Of December 2, 1747, *Acta*, I., 459.

House independent of the Bishop of Loreto had given rise to disputes ; Benedict ordered the collation of the Papal decrees ¹ by which the disputes were to be settled. He encouraged the pilgrimage in honour of Our Lady at Coimbra by granting favours to those taking part in it.² The most striking proof, however, of Benedict XIV.'s devotion to the Mother of God was the great Bull of September 27th, 1748, by which he confirmed the privileges of the Marian Congregations.³

He ordained that the feast of SS. Peter and Paul was to be solemnly celebrated not only on June 29th but also in the following octave ⁴ and that the two Princes of the Apostles were to rank as the chief patrons of the Eternal City.⁵ An ancient shortcoming of the Roman Church, due to excessive cautiousness, had been the insufficient honour paid to one of the most prominent of its teachers in the times of the Fathers, Leo the Great ; Benedict now named him a Doctor of the Church.⁶

Of mediaeval Saints Benedict honoured St. Francis by conferring special privileges on his basilica at Assisi ⁷ ; of the Apostle of Andalusia, Juan de Ávila (d. 1569),⁸ of John Leonardi (d. 1609),⁹ and of the Trinitarian Michael de Sanctis (d. 1625)¹⁰ he said that they had reached the degree of virtue which was required for canonization.

¹ On January 3, 1743, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 129. Cf. *Anal. iuris pontif.*, I., 470.

² On February 25, 1748, *Acta* I., 493.

³ *Institutum Societatis Iesu*, I. (Bull.), Florentiæ, 1892, 283. Other decrees on these Congregations, *ibid.*, 278 ; *Acta*, II., 94.

⁴ Bull of April 1, 1743, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 155. Two of the Pope's treatises on the celebration in Rome and Antioch of the feast of the Chair of Peter were published by Foscolo (Rome, 1828) and J. G. Brighenti (Rome, 1829).

⁵ Decree of October 16, 1743, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 157.

⁶ On October 15, 1754, *ibid.*, XIX., 115.

⁷ *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, II., 21.

⁸ Decree of February 8, 1758, *Anal. iuris pontif.*, XX., 7.

⁹ Decree of December 27, 1757, *ibid.*, 802.

¹⁰ Decree of March 6, 1742, *NOVAES*, XIV., 40.

A noticeably large number of Benedict XIV.'s pronouncements were concerned with Jesuit Saints. He gave his permission for special prayers to be said to Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier and attached indulgences to them.¹ At the request of the King of Portugal he nominated Francis Xavier patron of the foreign missions,² and Francis Borgia patron of Portugal.³ He said of Ignatius of Azevedo and of Rudolph Acquaviva that they were to be regarded as martyrs,⁴ and of the Indian missionary John de Brito that his alleged observance of Malabar customs, even if a fact, was no obstacle to his beatification, seeing that he was a martyr.⁵ The process of the Pole Andrew Bobola gave him the opportunity of elucidating certain doubts connected with beatification in general,⁶ as did also the decree on the heroic virtue of the apostle to the negroes, Peter Claver.⁷ He attached an indulgence to the feast of St. Aloysius and allowed a beginning to be made with the processes of beatification of John Berchmans and Luis de Ponte.⁸ The last decree which he signed, on May 10th, 1758, shortly before his death, was concerned with the beatification of the Jesuit Franciscus de Hieronymo.⁹

In Benedict XIV.'s correspondence very many references are made to the beatification of Cardinal Bellarmine.¹⁰ Under Clement XI. Prospero Lambertini had been *Promotor Fidei*

¹ *Acta*, I., 187; II., 298.

² On February 24, 1748, *Ius pontif.*, III., 367 seq.

³ *Acta*, II., 265.

⁴ NOVAES, XIV., 35, 40. For Azevedo, cf. our account, Vol. XVIII., 326 seq.

⁵ Decree of July 2, 1741. Cf. *Anal. iuris pontif.*, I., 1257.

⁶ Brief of May 22, 1749, *Ius pontif.*, III., 398 seq.

⁷ September 24, 1747, *Anal. iuris pontif.*, XX., 8-10.

⁸ On March 23, 1754, *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, I., 580; II., 388; X., 185.

⁹ *Ibid.*, IV., 1824; NOVAES, XIV., 244.

¹⁰ HEECKEREN, II., 265, 274, 277, 280, 288, 292, 294, 295, 300, 301, 339, 356 seq., 364, 374 seq. Cf. BRUCKER in *Études*, LXVII. (1896), 663-676; ROSA, *Passionei e la causa di beatificazione del ven. card. Bellarmino*, Roma, 1918.

in Bellarmine's process and in this capacity had had to bring forward objections to the holiness of the great controversialist, but he disposed of all of these in his work on beatification. After becoming Pope, Benedict caused the process to be revived and at the General Congregation of May 5th, 1753, he himself bore witness on Bellarmine's behalf in brilliant fashion¹; of the votes cast by the twenty-one Cardinals and six consultors only three were against him, those of Passionei, York, and Corsini. With feverish activity the enemies of the Jesuits had launched a campaign to prevent the beatification.² Passionei did all he could to disparage Bellarmine, but Benedict XIV. said quite definitely that all his "gossip" (*ciarle*) made no impression on him.³ In France, however, the defenders of the Gallican liberties saw in Bellarmine their mortal enemy; Benedict, not wanting to "throw oil on the flames", decided to let the matter rest "as long as the bull was on the ram-page".⁴ When Choiseul arrived in Rome the following year as envoy he had been given instructions to raise objections to a resumption of the proceedings; Bellarmine's canonization would never be recognized in France, he said.⁵ At the same time the Minister Boyer wrote to the General of the Jesuits

¹ "Le cardinal Bellarmin, outre qu'il était très savant, a été comme religieux, comme archevêque et comme cardinal un exemple vivant de vertu." In addition, he performed "travaux immenses et utiles" in the various Congregations (to Tencin, May 9, 1753, II., 265). "Nous savons parfaitement ce qu'en bonne justice nous devons faire, mais en même temps nous voyons le danger auquel nous nous exposons en la rendant" (to the same, July 25, 1753, *ibid.*, 280).

² ROSA, 14 *seqq.*

³ "Nous avons dit au général des Jesuites que le retard de la cause ne provenait pas des pauvretés [*ciarle*] débitées par le cardinal Passionei, mais des tristes circonstances du temps; que ne voulant pas jeter de l'huile sur le feu, nous croyons ainsi rendre service à la cause." To Tencin, August 29, 1753, *ibid.*, 288.

⁴ To the same, September 19, 1753, *ibid.*, 292.

⁵ "que certainement pareille canonisation ne serait jamais reconnue en France." BOUTRY, 237 *seqq.*

that at the moment, if an uproar was to be avoided, it would be better to raise any other person to the altar than a Jesuit, and any Jesuit rather than Bellarmine; Bellarmine's canonization would be the signal for the adherents of the parliament to raise a tumult.¹ Consequently the process was left in abeyance until recent years, when the facts concerning Bellarmine's holiness established in Benedict XIV.'s time were taken into consideration.² On the process of the canonization of his predecessor, Innocent XI., Benedict expressed himself unfavourably.³

Hostility towards the Society of Jesus not only postponed the honouring of Bellarmine but favoured the process of beatification of an opponent of the Jesuits, Palafox.⁴ The idea of paying him this honour had first cropped up in 1691. It was supported by the Spanish king and about a score of Spanish Bishops, but when the General of the Jesuits, Gonzalez, had convinced the Bishops that an insulting letter written against the Jesuits⁵ really was the work of Palafox, the matter was shelved.⁶ In 1726, however, the process of beatification was actually begun. In 1756 Cardinal Passionei, whose task it had been since 1741 to promote the process, joined with Cardinal Enriquez in seeking support from the Spanish Court. Subsequently, the Spanish envoy in Rome was instructed to take no steps for the time being, either for or against the process⁷; but it was not long before Passionei's request was

¹ RÉGNAULT, *Beaumont*, I., 259.

² For an account of Bellarmine's canonization, see DUDON in *Recherches de science relig.*, XII. (1921), 145-167; RAITZ VON FRENTZ in *Stimmen der Zeit*, CXIX. (1930), 332-344.

³ To Tencin, November 14, 1744, I., 162. On October 10, 1744, the French envoy *wrote that there was no fear of Innocent being canonized in his time; it was only with a view to the future that the Pope allowed the witnesses still living to be heard. Nunziat. di Francia, 442, Cifre al Durini, Papal Secret Archives.

⁴ For Palafox, see our account, Vol. XXX, 207 *seqq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 211, n. 1.

⁶ ASTRÁIN, VI., 360. Letter from Gonzalez to the Spanish king in *Vie du vén. Dom Jean de Palafox*, Cologne, 1767, 506 *seq.*

⁷ *Wall to Portocarrero, March 9, 1756, Archives of the

granted, probably as a result of the influence exercised by the Minister Wall.¹

Notwithstanding all his zeal for the veneration of God and His Saints, Benedict XIV. considerably diminished the number of feast days. From the beginning of his pontificate, he wrote,² requests of this nature had reached him from Bishops on both sides of the Alps. These desires were satisfied by him in a Bull of September 13th, 1742.³ He had long studied the question and had inserted a discussion of it in his work on canonization, in which he wrote in favour of a diminution of the number of feast days, on the grounds that they were not worthily celebrated by many persons and that their excessive number made it difficult for the poor to earn their living. After publishing this discussion the Pope sought the opinions of forty scholars; thirty-three were in favour of diminishing the number of feast days, fifteen suggested that the Holy See should draw up a new table of feasts for the whole Church, and eighteen were of the opinion that any such reform should be granted only to the Bishops who might apply for it. Between 1742 and 1748 twenty-five Bishops from Spain alone applied for the diminution, eight from the Papal States, and six from Tuscany.⁴ On a dispute arising between

Spanish Embassy to Rome, Reales Órdenes, 39; *Portocarrero to Wall, April 1, 1756, *ibid.*, Registro de la correspond. oficial, 99.

¹ *Wall to Portocarrero, November 16, 1756, *ibid.* R. Órdenes 39; *Portocarrero to Wall, December 9, 1756, *ibid.* Registro, 99.

² To the Bishop of Breslau, March 1, 1755, *Acta*, II., 224; letter of August 17, 1748, in *FRESCO*, XIX., 179. Cf. *Arch. Rom.*, XXXVII., 697.

³ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 116. As far back as 1727 the Council of Tarragona had presented a petition to the Pope for the diminution of the feast days. The people went on working on these days in spite of the prohibition, pleading as an excuse the infertility of the soil, the heavy taxes, and the fact that there were as many as ninety-one holidays of obligation in the year. *Coll. Lac.*, I., 785.

⁴ NOVAES, XIV., 134 *seq.*; Brief for Naples, December 12, 1748, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 286; for Poland, 1745, *ibid.*, XVI., 312;

Muratori and Cardinal Quirini on the diminution of the feasts the Pope suppressed it by a decree of November 14th, 1748, in which he forbade anyone to write on the subject.¹

The demand for the diminution of feast days may have been due to some extent to the decrease of religious fervour. On the other hand there were living at that time in Italy quite a number of persons who were afterwards paid the honour of canonization,² notably Alphonsus Liguori (d. 1787), the founder of the Redemptorists, Gerard Majella (d. 1755),³ a lay-brother in the same Order, Paul of the Cross (Paolo Danei; d. 1775),⁴ the founder of the Passionists, the Franciscan Leonardo da Porto Maurizio (d. 1751),⁵ and the secular priest Giovanni Battista de Rossi (d. 1764).⁶ Even in her best

for Maria Theresa and the Milanese possessions, December 3, 1754, *Acta*, II., 214. According to the Brief of September 28, 1745, the Ascension was not to be included in the diminution of feast-days for Spain. *Ibid.*, I., 284.

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 283; AMANN in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, X., 2554 *seq.* — A writing of Muratori's against Quirini in *Scritti inediti di L. A. Muratori, Documenti*, Bologna, 1872, 261-322. *Cf.* above, p. 215.

² DE WAAL, *Roma Sacra*, 546 *seq.*

³ Biography by DILGSKRON, Dülmen, 1909.

⁴ Biography by STRAMBI (Rome, 1786); AMADEO DELLA MADRE DEL B. PASTORE, *Lettere di S. Paolo della Croce*, disposte ed annotate, Roma, 1924. Paul of the Cross wrote about thirty letters weekly; 2,000 have been preserved.

⁵ *Opere*, 12 vols., Roma, 1853 *seq.*; 5 vols., Roma, 1867 *seq.* (in the latter edition the "Diario delle missioni"; biography by Salvatore d'Ormea at the beginning of the editions); *Prediche e lettere inedite*, published by B. Innocenti (Quaracchi, 1915).

⁶ *Cf.* KATHOLIK, 1881, II., 487-526; biography by Leitner (1899). — Among others who died with a reputation for sanctity were the Capuchin Archbishop of Ferrara, Bonaventura Barberini (see *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, VII., 130; *cf.* above, p. 305); Paolo Buono (Pianelli) of Naples, who tended the poor for forty years, and was buried in S. Lorenzo in Damaso (*MERENDA, *loc. cit.*); the Franciscan Conventual Francesco Antonio Fassani, d. 1742 (PICOT, III., 369).

periods the Church has seen nothing better than the lives and influence of these men and their followers.

(4)

For De Rossi, whose priestly activity was entirely devoted to the care of the poor, the sick, and the imprisoned, the jubilee year of 1750 was an especially fruitful opportunity of showing his love for the poor among the pilgrims.¹ No less zeal was displayed by Leonardo da Porto Maurizio. In preparation for the Holy Year, and beginning in July 1749, he gave three missions lasting two weeks each, with intervals of one week between them; the Pope was present in person at the sermons and gave Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament.² The missions were followed by exercises.³ This great missionary had long had at heart the devotion to the Passion of Christ by means of Stations of the Cross, of which he was responsible for the erection of no less than 572, and through him the devotion was adopted by the whole Church. In the jubilee year he set up the most famous of these Stations; on November 27th, 1750, at his instigation, a cross with the appropriate Stations was erected in the middle of the Colosseum.⁴

Benedict had a very high regard for this ardent preacher. He gave him permission to come into his presence every Sunday without formality⁵ and often had to come to his assistance when, carried away by his zeal, the indefatigable missionary discovered that he had promised to be in two places at once.⁶ Thus it was that the Pope himself summoned

¹ STOCKER in the *Freib. Kirchenlex.*, X., 1300.

² NOVAES, XIV., 146.

³ INNOCENTI, 271.

⁴ "Discorso fatto nell'istituzione della Via Crucis eretta nel Colosseo di Roma" (*Opere*, vol. IV.), Venezia, 1867, 393; INNOCENTI, x.; "Statuti della ven. Arciconfraternita degli Amanti di Gesù e di Maria eretta in Roma nell'anno del giubileo 1750," Roma, 1773.

⁵ INNOCENTI, 289.

⁶ "Eso è un degno religioso, ma non può essere in cinquanta luoghi nello stesso tempo, come forse per la sua gran carità

Leonardo to Rome to hold the jubilee missions and encouraged the aged religious to step into the breach and die there fighting like a brave soldier.

Already in 1749 missions were being held in all the principal churches of Rome, mostly by Capuchins¹; the next year they were resumed for the benefit of considerably increased congregations.² The Pope considered the missions to be of the greatest possible value and himself instructed the missionaries how their duties were to be performed.³

Benedict desired most ardently the success of the jubilee in all its aspects, and he had given it his attention for a long time past. As far back as September 25th, 1748, he had written⁴ that he would not leave Rome the following month but that he would spend it all at his desk; much preparation was required for the Holy Year, for it was really to be a holy year, a year of edification and not of scandal.

The principles enunciated by Benedict on this occasion were subsequently carried into practice by him. He issued

bramerebbe d'essere. Dice di sì a tutti, e poi ritrovandosi imbrogliato, ora chiama in aiuto il Papa, ora il suo P. Generale." Benedict to Storano, March 1, 1747, in MARONI, 751.

¹ *Roman newspapers of October 25, 1749, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio wrote on April 25, 1749 (INNOCENTI, 271): "Noi daremo principio alle nostre [missioni] dopo l'Ottava di S. Pietro, e primieramente se ne faranno tre in varie piazze, e poi esercizi spirituali in varie chiese. Nel mese di Novembre si ripiglieranno le missioni, e allora non saremo soli, ma 7 o 8 missionari in varie chiese; e poi segueremo gli esercizi sino al Natale."

² *Roman newspapers of February 28, 1750, *loc. cit.* The Pope had appointed the ablest preachers: for St. Peter's the regular cleric Bona, for the Gesù the Jesuit Tommaso Carli, for the Minerva the Dominican Tacconi, for S. Lorenzo in Damaso the Servite Galeotti, for Araceli Ludovico da Siena, for S. Eustachio Pier Maria da Casalini, etc. On January 24 and May 21 mention was made of the large numbers of pilgrims.

³ *Avviso for December 13, 1749, in Cod. ital. 199, of the State Library, Munich.

⁴ To Tencin, I., 431.

a dozen ordinances on the subject, generous in length and full of learning based on history and canon law. An Encyclical of February 19th, 1749,¹ addressed to the Italian Bishops, instructed them to get rid of anything that might give scandal ; the jubilee pilgrims were not to find ruinous or dirty churches, with sacred vestments in tatters or without any vestments at all ; Benedict XIII. had held up as models the churches of the Capuchins, which though not costly were clean and neat. The Pope was particularly anxious that singing and church music should be edifying and to this subject he devoted a large portion of his letter.² In an address to the Cardinals on March 3rd, 1749,³ he asked them to take to heart the duty of repairing their titular churches in Rome ; he himself when he was younger had seen to the improvement of the high-roads and later had done his best to improve the decoration of the Roman churches, especially S. Apollinare ; the Cardinals were asked to do likewise. Another allocution ⁴ followed on May 5th announcing the Holy Year and explaining how it was to be made holy : the Pope would arrange for missions to be held, would address instructions to the Bishops, appoint confessors, invest them with special powers, and elucidate the doubtful points connected with the customary instructions for the celebration of the jubilee. On the same day the announcement of the jubilee was made to all the faithful.⁵ In this the Pope explained that on account of the sinfulness and the indifference of the world special times had been reserved in which the Church could issue special exhortations. "Do penance" was the burden of his message. Another reason for his invitation to the world to make a pilgrimage to Rome was that it was thus given an opportunity of witnessing

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 9 *seqq.*

² *Ibid.*, 12-24.

³ *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 66.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 69 *seqq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 70 *seqq.* On May 12, 1749, Ruggieri called the Bull "un capo d'opera e ve lo dico senza adulazione." NARDINOCCHI, 106.

the splendour of Christian Rome.¹ “What could give a Christian greater joy than to see the glory of the cross of Christ shining with a more brilliant splendour than anywhere else on earth, and to testify with his own eyes to the glorious victory won by our Faith over the world? We see here how the greatest worldly power bows down in awe before religion and how what was once the earthly Babylon has been transformed into a new, heavenly city that instead of threatening to destroy whole peoples and subjugate nations with the force of arms and the tumult of war, sets before our eyes a heavenly doctrine and a spotless morality for the enlightenment and salvation of the nations. Here we see the former rule of superstition buried in oblivion, while the pure worship of the true God and the majesty of divine service cast their radiant light in all directions; we see the sanctuaries of false gods razed to the ground, while the temples of God are hallowed by holy veneration; we can see here with our own eyes how the godless pastimes of the theatre and the insane spectacles of the circus have vanished from the memory of man and how instead of them the resting-places of the martyrs are thronged with visitors; how the monuments of tyrants lie prostrate in the dust, while the burial places of the Apostles, built by the hands of emperors, rear themselves aloft; how the precious works intended for the honouring of Roman pride are used for the embellishment of churches; how the memorials erected in thanksgiving to heathen deities for the subjugation of provinces, now, purged of their godless superstition, bear on their summits, with more right and as the emblem of a greater blessing, the victorious symbol of the unconquerable cross. Lastly, the sight of the countless bands of the faithful who during the jubilee year pour into the Eternal City from all points of the compass will fill your hearts with joy, for each of you will find his own Faith shared by the members of many different nations, speaking different languages. With all of these you will be joined in brotherly love in the Lord, under the protection of our common Mother, the Church, and you

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 73 *seq.*

will feel with joy how the dew of heavenly grace will be rained down on you more lavishly."

The following month saw the publication of another Encyclical¹ which after a learned preface dealing with the antiquity of pilgrimages in general and of that to Rome in particular was directed especially to Bishops, priests, and religious. The reason why the invitation to Rome was issued was to venerate the Princes of the Apostles; moreover, Rome was the head of the Catholic religion and the centre of its unity, and the prospect was offered of the complete remission of the punishment for sin by means of a plenary indulgence. The Encyclical then dealt with the confessors, who were instructed how they were to prepare the faithful for the gaining of the jubilee indulgence. The confessors' powers were enumerated in a special decree,² and in a further instruction³ the difficulties which had formerly attached to the use of these powers were discussed and solved under ninety-one headings. According to custom, all indulgences except the jubilee indulgence were suspended during the Holy Year.⁴ A special Brief⁵ set forth the manner in which those persons were to be treated who were prevented from visiting the Holy City, namely enclosed nuns, invalids, and prisoners. After the Holy Year had begun apostates from monastic life were invited to return.⁶ Thus nothing seemed to be forgotten; even judges were appointed to settle possible legal disputes among the pilgrims.⁷

At a secret consistory on December 1st the Pope made arrangements for the opening of the Holy Door, which according to custom had to be performed at the beginning of the

¹ Of June 26, 1749, *ibid.*, 78-97.

² Of November 25, 1749, *ibid.*, 97-102.

³ Of December 3, 1749, *ibid.*, 102-145.

⁴ Brief of May 17, 1749, *ibid.*, 77.

⁵ Of December 17, 1749, *ibid.*, 149-151.

⁶ On February 12, 1750, *ibid.*, 151-2.

⁷ Brief of November 28, 1749, *ibid.*, 145. Quirini had advised the Pope to invite also the Protestant sovereigns to the jubilee.

Holy Year by the Pope at St. Peter's, by Cardinals at certain other basilicas.¹ In the first week of December he summoned the mission preachers and personally instructed them in their duties.²

As the days went by the jubilee year furnished an impressive proof that the adherents of the Catholic Faith formed a body that was still pulsing with life. According to Merenda, there were already 30,000 visitors in Rome by the end of 1749; in the following January he noted that 200 Armenians and Greeks had come for the jubilee.³ The Holy Year had opened well, wrote the Pope. A band of Armenians, who were living at their own expense, were attracting attention, and eight hundred Catholic Swiss who were visiting the basilicas in procession were edifying all who saw them. Pilgrims from Vienna had arrived already, also from Casale. As so many were travelling in spite of the severe winter, even larger bodies of visitors might be expected when the better weather came.⁴ Of the Armenians he wrote again⁵ that there were a hundred of them, mostly merchants; they had brought with them their womenfolk, but the latter were always veiled when they went out of doors; it was only when they were being entertained in the refectory of St. Peter's by the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity that one saw their jewels and diamonds; at table the men were waited on by six Cardinals, the ladies by the wives of the envoys from France and Venice and by princesses.⁶ Many more bands of pilgrims arrived for Lent. The ceremonies of Holy Week were attended by large numbers of the Italian and foreign aristocracy; the concourse was so great that people of rank had to go on

¹ The allocution in *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 147 seq.

² *Newspapers of December 11, 1749, Archives of the Austrian Embassy to the Vatican.

³ **Memorie*, 92 seq., Bibl. Angelica, Rome. Marangoni supplied a booklet for pilgrims: *Il devoto pellegrino guidato*, Roma, 1749.

⁴ To Tencin, January 7, 1750, II., 1 seq.

⁵ On January 28, 1750, *ibid.*, 6.

⁶ *MERENDA, 95, *loc. cit.*

foot to St. Peter's because all the carriages had been reserved for visits to the basilicas and other devotions of the Romans. More than 17,000 pilgrims had to camp out in the open. The people visited the basilicas with great reverence.¹ In April and May the Pope wrote that visitors were still pouring into the city.² At Whitsun, he said, he intended to celebrate a triduum at S. Maria in Trastevere, S. Carlo in the Corso, and S. Andrea della Valle ; every morning he would attend a sermon and give Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament.³ In the manner of the pilgrimages of old, the Bishop of Spoleto, accompanied by a goodly part of his chapter and his priests, altogether 70 persons, had made the pilgrimage entirely on foot and had himself borne the cross in front of the procession. He wanted to take up his quarters with the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity, but this the Pope would not allow.⁴ Incidentally, this confraternity estimated its expenditure on entertaining the pilgrims from December 1749 to the end of March 1750 at 65,000 *scudi*.⁵ The people attended with great devotion the Corpus Christi procession⁶ and the celebration of the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, which took place after the Pope's return from Castel Gandolfo and was also attended by an "enormous" number of aristocrats ; besides the Cardinals, forty Bishops were present and in the evening the dome of St. Peter's and the colonnades were illuminated.⁷ At the closing of the Holy Door, wrote the Pope,⁸ the concourse of the foreign aristocracy defied description, and at the giving of the Papal blessing the crowd had filled the piazza of St. Peter's and part of the adjoining streets.

Requests were made in many quarters for the extension of

¹ March 11 and 23, 1750, II., 18, 21.

² April 1, 22, 29, May 6 and 22, 1750, *ibid.*, 21, 24, 26, 27, 32.

³ April 22, *ibid.*, 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Benedict on April 29, 1750, *ibid.*, 26.

⁶ Benedict on June 3, 1750, *ibid.*, 36.

⁷ Benedict on July 8, 1750, *ibid.*, 41.

⁸ On December 30, 1750, *ibid.*, 82.

the jubilee for the whole Church to the year 1751, but before acceding to them Benedict considered it advisable to sound Cardinal Tencin ¹ how such a step would be likely to be received in France. On November 11th he was able to write ² that the extension of the jubilee year was actually requested by the French envoy. On acceding to this wish on December 25th, 1750,³ and on reviewing the past year in a corresponding letter to the Bishops,⁴ the Pope was able not only to pride himself on the preparatory measures he had taken—the repair of the roads in the Papal States, the provision of food, the restoration of the Roman churches—but also to speak of the brilliant success of the Holy Year itself. Pilgrims had come from the most remote places, from Armenia, Syria, and Egypt; he himself had taken part in the two previous jubilees, but the number of people who had flocked to Rome on this last occasion had been far larger. That the Bishops had prepared their flocks for the jubilee year in accordance with the Papal instructions was shown by the fact that the basilicas had never been visited by so many people showing evident signs of devotion and piety as during the past year. Very many general confessions had been made, as he had learnt from the penitentiaries. Nor had the inhabitants of the city allowed themselves to be outdone in devotion by the strangers. The crowds which had attended the mission sermons and the piety they displayed were incredible. Edifying examples of repentance and devotion had been given by all classes. Those whose duty it was to set a good example to others, namely the Bishops, the Cardinals, and the gentlefolk, had done so to the Pope's satisfaction. He knew, and had seen it with his own eyes to some extent, how they had made the prescribed visits to the churches, had waited on the pilgrims at table, had washed their feet, and had given them generous alms.

¹ On January 28, 1750, *ibid.*, 6.

² *Ibid.*, 72.

³ *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 50.

⁴ Of January 1, 1751, II., 156–161.

(5)

Benedict XIV. did not always speak so approvingly of his Cardinals. It is significant that he was in no hurry at first to fill the vacancies in their College. Even after two years had passed since his election he wrote ¹ that the position of the Holy See was not favourable for the nomination of Cardinals. Except for Doria, he said, not one of the nuncios in office was worthy of the red hat. Doria combined noble blood with purity of morals and erudition ; but the others were lacking in knowledge, and yet either all or none of them had to be promoted. The difficulty was increased by the severity with which their intellectual views were held : whoever was not a Molinist or an upholder of lax morality was promptly dubbed a Jansenist.² In any case, he declared, he was determined to make no concessions to flesh and blood when making his choices. His difficulties were still further increased by the financial straits of the Holy See ; he certainly had several hats to dispose of but he had not the means with which to endow the new Cardinals in fitting fashion. Perhaps, however, it was not a bad thing, he added slyly, for pleasure-seeking gentlemen to be kept a little short.³

Meanwhile four more Cardinals had died : Pieri, Giudice, Belluga, and Colonna.⁴ Pieri did not leave enough behind him to pay for the funeral that befitted his position ; Giudice, on the other hand, left vast riches. He envied the former, wrote Benedict XIV., not the latter.⁵

By the end of 1743 it became almost impossible to put off

¹ To Tencin, December 29, 1742, I., 20.

² Allusion to the difficulties connected with Berti, Bellelli, and Cardinal Noris.

³ To Tencin, March 8, 1743, I., 38 *seq.* ; *cf.* 40.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 28, 38. On January 17, 1743, Acquaviva *wrote that with the death of Cibo there were eighteen hats free ; on February 14 he reported the death of Corradini, on the 28th that of Cardinal Belluga, who died " in gran concepto por sus virtudes y con universal dolor de los pobres ".

⁵ To Tencin, February 1, 1743, I., 28.

the long-awaited nomination of new Cardinals any longer. The first appointment to be made, though then only *in petto*, was that of Emperor Charles VII.'s brother, Duke John Theodore, Bishop of Liége and administrator of Freising and Ratisbon, where he had been Bishop. The "Cardinal of Bavaria", as he was called, did not pay a single visit to Rome in the course of his life, which ended in 1763; the red hat was sent to him by the Pope through the hands of Lazarus Opatius Pallavicini, afterwards Secretary of State under Clement XIV. and Pius VI.¹

As a companion for this foreigner from the North Benedict appointed a Spaniard: Joaquin Fernando Portocarrero, a Knight of Malta and the Order's envoy to Charles VI., who made him Viceroy of Naples. After he had adopted the ecclesiastical state in Rome, he became Patriarch of Antioch, Protector of the Spanish realm (1749), and Cardinal Archbishop of Sabina (1756). Though not a scholar himself, he was a protector of scholars and was described as a man of straightforward and friendly disposition.²

Except for these two foreigners only Italians were invested with the purple in 1743. Some of these had done duty as nuncios: Camillo Paolucci in Poland and Vienna, Giambattista Berni in Switzerland, Giacomo Oddi in Lisbon, Cologne, and Venice, Marcello Crescenzi in Paris, where also Federico Marcello Lante had been sent to present the consecrated swaddling clothes. Giorgio Doria, a Genoese of noble birth, was nuncio at the Diet of Frankfort which elected Charles VII. and had remained with the emperor in the same capacity.³ He earned high praise from Benedict XIV., who

¹ M. ROTTMANNER, *Der Kardinal von Bayern*, Munich, 1877.

² For those promoted in 1743, see NOVAES, XIV., 53; BARTHOLOMAEUS ANT. TALENTI, **Vita seu necrologia Benedicti XIII., Clementis XII. et cardinalium a d. 20 mart. 1730 ad 29 iun. 1743 defunctorum, additis iconibus et insigniis ære incisus*, Bibl. Angelica, Rome, 1701; *Item cardinalium defunctorum 1743 ad 1758, ibid.*, 1702; *Item cardinalium defunctorum 1758-1768 and 1767-1777, ibid.*, 1703 and 1704; MORONI, IX., 192 seq.

³ NOVAES, XIV., 53 seqq.

wrote¹ that he had known him during the six years when Doria had been vice-legate in Bologna ; he was a man of intelligence and knowledge, and not only in legal matters ; as nuncio he had contributed 100,000 *scudi* towards his expenses from his private means.

High praise, though on other grounds, was also bestowed on the French nuncio, Marcello Crescenzi, who died in 1768 as Archbishop of Ferrara. He was not the man to write a commentary on Aristotle, was the Pope's opinion, but seeing that he had been a canon of St. Peter's with him he had known him for a long time and knew that he was a consistently good ecclesiastic.² Since 1730 Crescenzi had been a close friend of the great Franciscan missionary Leonardo da Porto Maurizio.³

The learned Bolognese Filippo Maria Monti (d. 1754)⁴ had been a friend of Benedict XIV. in his boyhood and student days ; he was the author of a work on the Cardinals, and as Secretary of the Propaganda he wrote a history of the mission to Tibet.

On the whole, Benedict XIV.'s first promotion took the form of a mark of honour paid to learning ; though he could find no scholars among his nuncios he had not to look far for them in Rome in other walks of life. Raffaello Cosimo Girolami, from Florence, was one of the most competent theologians of his time and found ample opportunity to exercise his knowledge amid the various Roman Congregations. A deep knowledge of jurisprudence was possessed by Carlo Leopoldo Calcagnini (d. 1746), who left behind him ten manuscript volumes of legal decisions and also printed works,⁵ and by Carlo Alberto Guidoboni Cavalchini, who was Bishop of Ostia and Velletri and Dean of the Sacred College when he died in 1774 at the

¹ To Tencin, February 8, 1743, I., 30.

² *Ibid.*, and to the same, on March 8, 1743, *ibid.*, 38.

³ INNOCENTI, 304.

⁴ GUALANDI in *Studi e memorie per la storia dell' Università di Bologna*, VI., Bologna, 1921, 59 ; Benedict to Tencin, October 11, 1743, I., 89.

⁵ His tomb is in S. Andrea delle Fratte ; see FORCELLA, VIII., 232 ; DOMARUS, *Bracci*, 33.

age of ninety. It was probably only the "exclusion" exercised by France that prevented his being elected Pope on the death of Benedict XIV. Giuseppe Pozzobonelli, who died in 1783 as the Archbishop of Milan, left behind him a reputation for virtue, scholarship, and beneficence. Francesco Ricci, the Governor of Rome under Benedict XIV., was also regarded as an authority on jurisprudence but he was more highly esteemed on account of his moderation, faithfulness to duty, and piety.¹ Francesco Landi was also noted for his learning; he died as Archbishop of Benevento in 1757. Antonio Ruffo, on the other hand, who died in 1753, had no reputation for learning, but for piety. Three more Cardinals who owed their promotion to their learning were members of Orders: the Dominican Ludovico Maria Lucini (d. 1745),² the Benedictine Fortunato Tamburini, theologian to the Roman Council under Benedict XIII. (d. 1761), and the Cistercian Gioacchino Besozzi (d. 1753). Tamburini received high praise from Benedict when the latter was distressed by the prospect of losing him through death; he was, he said, an excellent theologian and an untiring worker, and he wrote in a good style, both in Italian and Latin. Moreover, he lived in a little room with his fellow-religious and had declined a rich abbacy with the remark that he had enough to live on and that by the favour of the Holy See he had enough to pay for his burial.³

Besides the nineteen Cardinal Bishops and Priests whom we have named above, six Cardinal Deacons were created in 1743. Of these it was learning again that distinguished

¹ " *L'illibatezza de' suoi costumi, l'integrità e la vigilanza nell' esercizio delle sue cariche, la sua esemplare pietà e solida devozione e finalmente la sua invitta pazienza e rassegnazione nella sua ultima malattia gli meritavano la morte de' giusti " (Bibl. Ricci, Rome). His merits are duly recorded in the *Storia di S. Agnete di Montepulciano*, Siena, 1779, 148. Caracciolo (38) describes Tamburini as "learned", Portocarrero as "judicious and straightforward"; in 1758 the latter almost became Pope.

² Cf. TAURISANO, *Hierarchia Ordinis Prædicatorum*, Roma, 1916, 76.

³ To Tencin, March 13, 1754, II., 327.

Alessandro Tanara ; his decisions on legal cases which he reached as Auditor of the Rota were printed in Rome in 1747 in two volumes. Mario Bolognetti, the Treasurer General, was esteemed for his intelligence and his integrity. A similar reputation was enjoyed by Prospero Colonna di Sciarra, of the ducal family of Carbognano, afterwards Prefect of the Propaganda. Other scions of the Roman aristocracy besides Prospero Colonna and Bolognetti were Girolamo Colonna, the Pope's Maggiordomo, and Domenico Orsini d'Aragona, Duke of Gravina, who had been the Queen of Naples' envoy to Clement XII. and who was now given his cardinalship after the death of his wife. Girolamo Bardi derived from the noble Florentine family of the Counts of Vernio. Famous for his rectitude, piety, and charity, he bequeathed 30,000 *scudi* for the foundation of a hospital for the poor. Though not created a Cardinal on this occasion, Lazzaro Pallavicini was highly commended at the Consistory of September 9th, 1743, for having repeatedly declined the purple.¹

In Vienna the nominations of September 9th aroused a storm of indignation. It was true that among the new wearers of the purple were two Florentines and four Milanese—that is to say a sufficient number of the princely pair's dependents—but no importance was attached to this ; what had been taken for granted was the promotion of Mellini, for which the Austrian statesmen had been working since the beginning of the new pontificate.² The Pope, however, could not grant him this honour as he was too strong a supporter of Austria, which was one of the worst oppressors of the Papal States. It was Cardinal Kollonitsch who was prominent in urging Mellini's advancement. The discontent at his having been

¹ MERENDA in his **Memorie* (43, *loc. cit.*) renders high praise to several of those promoted in 1743. Girolami, for instance, is described as "dotto e santo", Cavalchini as "dotto e ecclesiastico esemplare", Crescenzi as "di costumi angelici", Landi as "dotto", Ricci as "di non molto sapere, ma dolce, ecclesiastico e di santi costumi".

² Cf. above, pp. 122 *seqq.*

passed over was aggravated by the grievance that in the appointment of Monti and Landi, France—and in the latter case Spain too—had been favoured in preference to Austria.¹

In addition to this the three Powers, France, Spain, and Austria immediately began to press for the nomination of Crown Cardinals. France especially was insistent in its demand that the Archbishop of Bourges, De la Rochefoucauld, be admitted to the Sacred College. The Pope, however, was unable to meet the wishes of all three Powers, since he had not at the time that number of Cardinals' hats to give away; nor could he yield to the demand of the French envoy, Canillac, that France should be preferred to Spain and Austria, since this would have antagonized the neglected princes and would have provoked Austria especially to further acts of oppression in the States of the Church. Benedict therefore urged Canillac to persuade the other Powers to agree to the selection of a Frenchman.²

Another motive for the postponement of the nominations was put forward in Paris through the nuncio Durini: the oppression of the Papal States. Let France put an end to the bondage, Durini was told, and the promotion would follow without delay.³

Thus the Governments, unwilling though they were, were forced to contain themselves in patience. On January 16th, 1746, the nomination of the "Cardinal of Bavaria", which had formerly been *in petto* only, was openly proclaimed and he was given precedence over the other wearers of the purple who had been appointed with him in 1743⁴; but it was not

¹ To Tencin, October 11 and 25 and December 6, 1743, also on June 10, 1744, I., 89, 94, 103, 141.

² To Tencin, March 27, 1745, *ibid.*, 186 *seq.*

³ " *che venga a liberari dalla schiavitù in cui siamo per colpa della Francia, e non si tarderà allora per parte nostra la promozione." To Durini, October 15, 1746, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, fo. 207-8, Papal Secret Archives.

⁴ ROTTMANNER, *loc. cit.*, 43. Cf. above, p. 334; DENGEL, *Garampi*, 67.

until April 10th, 1747, that the next promotion of an appreciable size took place ¹ and it was clear that in this the satisfaction of the secular princes was the first consideration.² Austria and France saw the demands which they had urged so violently fulfilled by the admission to the Sacred College of Mario Mellini and Frédéric Jérôme de la Rochefoucauld de Roye.³ Spain and Portugal were given their Crown Cardinals in the persons of Álvaro de Mendoza and the Patriarch of Lisbon, José Manuel d'Atalaia. The pressure exerted by Venice, in the one case, and consideration for the Pretender to the English throne, James III., in the other, resulted in red hats being given to the Patriarch of Aquileia, Daniel Delfino, and to the Frenchman Armand Rohan de Soubise. The kings of Sardinia and Poland saw their efforts crowned with success in the nominations of Carlo Vittorio Amadeo delle Lanze, Elemosiniere of Charles Emmanuel III., and Gian Francesco Albani. Raniero Simonetti, internuncio in Turin, nuncio in Naples, and Governor of Rome, who died as Bishop of Viterbo in 1749, had probably no need of the recommendations from high quarters which he actually received; and the same may be said of Ferdinand Julius Count Troyer, an alumnus of the German College and Prince Bishop of Olmütz since 1746, "an energetic and zealous pastor," who died in 1758.⁴

Whereas the promotion of all the foregoing was facilitated by their noble birth, that of Giambattista Mesmer, the son of

¹ For the various Cardinals, *cf.* NOVAES, XIV., 122-7.

² *Cod. Vat. 8545, p. 181-5, Vatican Library. Only two were nominated without reference to the considerations of the sovereigns.

³ DE BRIMONT, *Le card. de Rochefoucauld et l'ambassade de Rome 1743 à 1748*, Paris, 1913. The following opinion of him as envoy to Rome was expressed by Benedict XIV. on October 27, 1745 (I., 221): "Nous n'avons pas assez de mots pour louer l'archevêque de Bourges, type accompli d'un ambassadeur ecclésiastique, dont la vie et le respect qu'il marque au Saint-Siège devraient être un sujet de confusion pour tant d'autres."

⁴ STEINHUBER, II., 280.

a middle-class family of Milan, was due entirely to his own ability. Among the others, too, who owed their new dignity to the recommendations of princes, there was considerable merit. Thus the protégé of Spain, Mendoza, who was ninety years old when he died in 1761, was a famous enemy of pomp and pride and was known for his perspicacity, courage, and prudence ; his copious income he distributed among the poor. Delfino of Aquileia was a model priest, a zealous Bishop, and very charitable. The death of Rochefoucauld in 1757 was lamented by the poor. Towards the close of his life, which ended in 1784, the Piedmontese Lanze left liberal incomes to be used for the promotion of the canonization of the poorest of the poor, Benedict Labre (d. 1783), and he founded at his last place of residence, the Abbey of S. Benigno di Fruttuaria, a seminary in which he maintained thirty pupils at his own expense. On his elevation to the cardinalate the Pope wrote to him that the honour was a reward for his virtue.¹

In July 1747 there was another promotion to Cardinal's rank of an unusual nature : only one admission was made to the Sacred College, but it was celebrated with an unwonted solemnity. The cannon in the Castel S. Angelo were fired at the moment when the Pope, on July 8th, was placing the red hat on the new member's head, and when this newly created Cardinal visited St. Peter's in the afternoon he was received at the door by four Canons, to the accompaniment of a peal of bells.² The Cardinal in question was the grandson of James II. of England, Henry, Duke of York. After the battle of Culloden in 1746 had deprived the Stuarts of their last hope of obtaining the throne of England, the Duke of York left Paris secretly on April 29th, 1747, for Rome, there to enter the ecclesiastical state. On June 30th the Pope gave him the tonsure with his own hands and accorded him the cardinalate³ ; and he had no cause to regret this mark of his favour. " The Cardinal of York," he wrote at various times, " is an example

¹ CIBRARIO, *Lettere*, 251.

² Benedict XIV. to Tencin, July 12, 1747, I., 338.

³ To Tencin, July 5, 1747, *ibid.*, 337.

to all¹; his conduct is irreproachable and his love of study unbelievable²; he is an angel in human form and edifies the whole of Rome."³ Duke Henry was made Bishop of Frascati in 1761 and Bishop of Ostia in 1803. He died as the last of the Stuarts in 1807—a redeeming conclusion to the history of an ill-starred family.⁴

It was not long after the names of the new Cardinals had been announced that complaints came in from Madrid that two Cardinals, Mellini and Troyer, had been granted to the Government of Vienna⁵; Spain must demand an honour of equal value for herself.⁶

Petty jealousies in other quarters deferred another promotion till 1753, by which time death had brought about seventeen gaps in the Sacred College. King John V. of Portugal, after several attempts, succeeded in persuading Rome to agree to the nunciature in Lisbon carrying with it the practical certainty of a future cardinalship; in fact the nuncio was not to leave Lisbon without actually receiving his nomination. Lisbon was thus placed on the same footing as Vienna, Paris, and Madrid. At this point, however, the same preferential treatment was claimed for himself by the king of Sardinia, and when the rumour got abroad that steps were being taken to procure the red hat for the nuncio in Turin (Merlini), Poland, Naples, and Venice objected to being ranked lower than Sardinia and threatened to close the nunciatures in their States if Sardinia was to be honoured more than they. Benedict

¹ To Tencin, August 2 and 23 and November 15, 1747, *ibid.*, 342, 346, 364.

² To Tencin, November 15, 1747, *ibid.*, 364.

³ To Tencin, May 15, 1748, *ibid.*, 404.

⁴ HERBERT M. VAUGHAN, *The last of the royal Stuarts: Henry Stuart, Cardinal Duke of York*, London, 1906; A. SHIELD, *Henry Stuart, Cardinal of York, and his times*, London, 1908. Cf. *Dublin Review*, CXIX. (1896), 97-120.

⁵ Archives of the Spanish Embassy to Rome, August and September, 1747, 64 and 79.

⁶ **Ibid.*, October 1747: the envoy was to "pedir equivalente indemnizacion por los capelos concedidos a Vienna y Turino".

XIV., not wanting the Church to lose its influence in Turin or to give offence to the three other Powers, thought to solve the problem by keeping back one of the red hats at his disposal at the next promotion and to give it to Merlini after a suitable interval, during which he hoped that the three Powers would have quietened down again.

There was yet another difficulty which stood in the way of an early promotion. The Secretary of State, Valenti, would have liked his relative and friend, Gian Francesco Stoppani, the nuncio in Vienna, to be vested with the purple, but at the Diet of Frankfort Stoppani had supported the election of the Duke of Bavaria, as against that of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and consequently Maria Theresa, through her representative, Cardinal Mellini, was opposing his promotion. Were Benedict to give way to this objection there was a danger of the princes conferring on themselves the right to exclusion in the choice of Cardinals, just as they had long claimed it in the election of a Pope. Moreover, Stoppani's action at Frankfort was only in accordance with Papal orders. Through skilful negotiations the Pope succeeded in overcoming Maria Theresa's objection.¹

When at last the long-awaited promotion took place on November 26th, 1753,² Stoppani, who had represented the Holy See in Florence and Venice besides Vienna, was one of the five prelates who were raised to the rank of Cardinal in reward for their services as nuncios. The other four nuncios were Fabrizio Serbelloni, Luca Melchiorre Tempi, Carlo Francesco Durini, and Enrico Enriquez; Serbelloni had been nuncio in Florence, Cologne, Poland, and Vienna; Tempi in Brussels, Cologne, and Lisbon; Durini in Switzerland and Paris³; Enriquez in Madrid. Cosmo Imperiali, Vincenzo Malvezzi, and Gian Giacomo Millo⁴ had long been personal

¹ NOVAES, XIV., 195; Benedict XIV. to Tencin, September 12, 1753, I., 290 *seq.*; TOMASSETTI, *Palazzo Vidoni*, 44 *seq.*

² NOVAES, XIV., 208 *seqq.*

³ A crucifix presented by Louis XV. to the nuncio Durini is in the Durini Gallery, Milan.

⁴ For the tomb of Millo (d. 1757) in S. Crisogono, see DOMARUS, *Bracci*, 59.

friends of the Pope. Imperiali had been governor of various towns, lastly of Rome, also President of the Archives and the Annona. The Bolognese Malvezzi had been made a canon by Lambertini when Archbishop of Bologna; on Lambertini becoming Pope, Malvezzi was summoned by him to Rome and was appointed his successor to the archiepiscopal see of Bologna in 1754. Millo had been Lambertini's Vicar General in Ancona and Bologna; he, too, was called to Rome when Lambertini became Pope and was given by him the posts of Datarius and Prefect of the Congregation of the Council. Like Imperiali, Gian Francesco Banchieri, Ludovico Maria Torrigiani, and Luigi Mattei had made their mark as civil officials: Banchieri as treasurer, Torrigiani as governor (on Archinto's death he was made Secretary of State in 1758), and Mattei as an official in the Fabbrica of St. Peter's, as Auditor of the Camerlengo, and as Vicar of St. Peter's. Flavio Chigi had occupied various positions in the Apostolic Chamber, while Giuseppe Livizzani had been universally admired as Secretary of the Memorials.¹ Antonio Andrea Galli, Canon Regular of the Holy Redeemer and General of his Congregation, owed his new dignity to the recommendation of an able theologian of unknown identity who for thirty years was consultor to the Holy Office but whose delicate health had made him unwilling to become a Bishop or a Cardinal. Benedict XIV. had once asked this good friend of his to name the ablest of the theologians who were free from any partisanship. He replied that there were only two: Galli and Mancini. The Pope chose the elder of the two, Galli, who was incidentally a Bolognese. A man of particularly interesting character was Clemente Argenvilliers, a Roman of low estate, who by his own efforts had become a famous advocate in the Curia. A summer holiday spent at Ariccia brought this capable person in touch with the Pope at Castel Gandolfo, and after the promotion of

¹ On Livizzani's falling ill, Benedict XIV. wrote to Tencin on March 27, 1754 (II., 329): "On craint beaucoup pour lui à notre grand regret et à celui de tout le monde, tant il est aimé pour l'exactitude et la douceur qu'il a mises à toutes ses fonctions."

1743 the Pope, despite the strong objections made by Valenti and others, made him his Auditor. Argenvilliers was most outspoken but he gained the Pope's confidence. He was known as the Seneca of the Curia ; a tall, spare man of chilly and severe demeanour, he bore also a physical resemblance to the Roman philosopher, whose appearance was well known by his bust.¹

At the opening of the promotion of 1753 the Pope announced that he had reserved two Cardinals *in petto* in 1747 but that in the meantime both of them had died. It was surmised that the persons in question were Ormeo and Galiani.

Merlini, therefore, was not made a Cardinal in 1753 and in his vexation at this omission the king of Sardinia closed the nunciature in Turin. He did not, however, recall his envoy from Rome, so that there was still some hope of friendly relations being restored, especially as the Pope had reserved two Cardinals *in petto* in 1753, with the intention of publishing their names when circumstances were sufficiently favourable to allow of his doing so. As it happened, however, a return of favourable conditions were awaited in vain until the Napoleonic period.²

In the promotion of 1753 the claims of only the Apennine peninsula were met ; in that of the following year a foreigner, namely a Spaniard, was given the red hat, besides another Italian.³ Both were famous as Bishops. Antonio Sersale, Bishop of Brindisi in 1743, Archbishop of Taranto in 1750, and Archbishop of Naples in 1754, was promoted on April 22nd ; when he died in 1775 he had acquired the reputation of being an untiring and extraordinarily zealous guardian of the spiritual and temporal welfare of the poor, for whom, especially

¹ *MERENDA, *loc. cit.* *Description of the nominated Cardinals in the Archives of the Spanish Embassy to Rome, September 12, 1754.

² NOVAES, XIV., 196, 215. The king was still friendly at heart, wrote Benedict to Tencin on December 4, 1754 (I., 376), realizing that Merlini's nomination would have meant the closing of three nunciatures.

³ NOVAES, XIV., 225 *seq.*

in the famine of 1764, he had not only founded hospitals and pledged his silver plate but had even contracted debts. Luis Fernandez de Cordova, dean of the chapter of Toledo, had waived his right to the rich inheritance which devolved on him on the death of his brother ; after he had been made a Cardinal at the instigation of King Ferdinand VI. the archbishopric of Toledo had to be forced upon him. He died in 1771 with the reputation of a pastor who might well have lived in early Christian times : modest, unassuming, an enemy of luxury and idleness, but charitable to the last degree. Benedict XIV. had formally to apologize to his friend Tencin for conferring the purple on a foreigner ¹ but it did not mean that Spain was to have another Cardinal's hat, for at the same Consistory of December 18th at which Fernandez was promoted the Cardinal Infante Luis de Bourbon resigned both the purple and his two bishoprics of Toledo and Seville. Thus there was no cause for any other nation to demand another Cardinal's hat for itself. It would seem that it was not blind prejudice in favour of his compatriots that caused the Pope to promote only Italians the year before ; the conferment of distinctions on foreigners was clearly a matter that called for extreme caution.

This careful weighing of the pros and cons, and the endeavour to be fair to all the Powers, were shown in Benedict XIV.'s last promotion, that of April 5th, 1756,² which came about as the result of the representations made by the envoys, Choiseul, the French representative, having persuaded all his colleagues to make a joint demand for another nomination of Cardinals.³ Benedict acceded to their request, and on this occasion the choice of every nominee was influenced by the proposals made by the various sovereigns. Maria Theresa had recommended the Archbishop of Vienna and Imperial Councillor, Johannes Joseph Trautson of Rodt-Busmannshausen, Spain the Archbishop of Seville, Francisco de Solis

¹ To Tencin, December 18, 1754, I., 380.

² NOVAES, XIV., 238 *seqq.*

³ To Tencin, March 31, 1756, II., 488 ; *MERENDA, fo. 151 *seq.*, *loc. cit.*

Folch de Cardona, Portugal the Patriarch of Lisbon, Francisco de Saldanha da Cama. Louis XV. had proposed his Grand Almoner, Nicolas de Saulx de Tavannes, Archbishop of Rouen, Poland the Bishop of Beauvais, Étienne René de Gesvres. Even England's interests were considered, since the Archbishop of Sens, Paul d'Albert de Luynes, owed his promotion to the petitions of James III. The vacancy which Venice might have claimed remained unfilled, owing to the Signoria having issued an anticlerical decree.¹ Merlini was again passed over on this occasion; the Pope wrote to Turin that his nomination could not take place until the nunciature there was reopened.² Sardinia, however, had its share in the honours paid to the Great Powers, inasmuch as the Archbishop of Turin, Giambattista Rovero, was also given the red hat. After considering the interests of so many others, the Pope was entitled to think of his own, which he did by admitting to the Sacred College Alberico Archinto, formerly nuncio in Florence and Poland and, after Valenti's death, Secretary of State from September 1756 onwards. Although State interests played the decisive part in these nominations, it was definitely acknowledged that all the persons selected were worthy prelates.

The promotion of 1756 was the last to take place under Benedict XIV. In seven promotions he had raised sixty-six persons to the purple.

(6)

Benedict XIV.'s claim to greatness rests not only on his constructive activity as a legislator but also on his services

¹ To Tencin, II., 488; *cf.* 490.

² *MERENDA, *loc. cit.* The fact that Merlini's nomination was out of the question solved a difficulty that had arisen with the Court of Naples, which had demanded, in the event of Merlini's promotion, the red hat for the Neapolitan nuncio Gualtieri (*ibid.*). “*Pendenze colla corte di Napoli rispetto all promozione al cardinalato del Nunzio Apost. alla corte di Torino.” Boncompagni Archives, Naples, Benedetto XIV. F 44; *cf.* E 129.

in checking anticlerical views and tendencies through his reorganization of the censorship.

As soon as he had ascended the throne he was called upon to deal with an embarrassing affair left to him as a legacy from his predecessor. It originated in a literary undertaking. In 1739 a bookseller in Venice had begun the printing of an Italian translation of Fleury's history of the Church. Fleury's Gallicanism and the pro-Jansenist attitude of Fabre, who continued his work, had induced Cardinal Corsini in the time of Clement XII. to demand the suppression of the book by the Signoria. This was also desired by the French Government, to escape the indignation of the Jansenists which any action of the Index against Fleury was expected to arouse. But when Benedict XIV. renewed in Venice the demands put forward by Corsini, the reply was that the French edition of Fleury's work was being sold openly in Rome and was in everybody's hands, so that the suppression of the translation would simply cause bewilderment. Besides, the printing of the Italian version had already begun. Benedict got out of the difficulty by making the publisher a present of 200 pistoles to indemnify him for the sheets which had already been composed.¹

More important than this particular step was Benedict XIV.'s legislation for the administration of the censorship. He had been thinking of reorganizing it, he wrote,² since the second year of his pontificate. In the time preceding the appearance of his own constitution on the subject in 1753³ he had ample opportunity of gaining personal experience in it. He stated in his Bull⁴ that both in the Inquisition and in the Index—that is to say in the two Congregations that concerned themselves with literary productions—he had taken a personal part in the examination of suspected works and he could vouch for the abundant reflection and good sense with

¹ HEECKEREN, I., xxi. Cf. *Analecta iuris pontif.*, XX., 513 seqq.

² To Tencin, October 3, 1753, II., 294.

³ On July 9, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 39 seqq.

⁴ *Ibid.*

which the task was done. This did not mean, however, that no mistakes were made. The examination of the writings, wrote Benedict himself,¹ had not always been what it should, either because it had been entrusted to persons of insufficient knowledge of the subject in question or because the examiners had been lacking in circumspection. For the most part the censorship was in the hands of the Dominicans; while the Holy See expressed its recognition that this famous Order led the way in theology and was capable of giving a trustworthy judgment of what was consistent with the principles of the Faith and what was not, there was another side to the picture: the Preacher Friars were saddled with the burden of invidiousness inseparable from their judicial office, and they would have been angels instead of men if they had prevented the value they placed on their own views from at least colouring their judgments. As a natural consequence, those adversely affected were embittered. When the Spanish Inquisition took it upon itself to prohibit the first fourteen volumes of the work produced by the Bollandists, solely because Elias had not been recognized as the founder of the Carmelites, the Flandro-Belgian province of the Jesuits proposed at the ensuing General Congregation that the Pope be asked to grant the Jesuits the privilege of not having their books censored by the Dominicans, a similar privilege, according to report, being already possessed by the Franciscans.² When one remembers that it was not young hot-heads who were chosen as delegates to the General Congregations, such a proposal is a striking proof of the degree of intensity which the discontent had reached . . . a discontent which led to further regrettable expressions. The Jesuit Raynaud considered it his duty to expose his grievances to the general public,³ which was certainly not seemly. It was

¹ To Tencin, August 1, 1753, II., 281.

² ASTRÁIN, VI., 355.

; "De immunitate authorum Cyriacorum a censura. Diatribe Petri a Valle clausa": Opera, XX., 267 seq. It need scarcely be said that the work was put on the Index (in 1662).

curious, he wrote, that books written by Dominicans hardly ever appeared in the Index, although the weaknesses they displayed were numerous enough; on the other hand, the Franciscan Archbishop MacCaughwell (d. 1626) had complained that it was especially the members of his Order and the Jesuits who were treated tyrannically.¹ Works by thoroughly Catholic writers, continued Raynaud, were frequently pilloried together with the productions of all kinds of gaol-birds; what was especially noticeable was that there appeared regularly among atheists, heretics, and pornographers the name of a Jesuit. An even more deplorable effect of these conditions was the loosening of discipline within the Orders. Without obtaining the approval of their Superiors, which was prescribed by the constitution of their Order, writers who had been found wanting by the Index published written defences on the plea that the authority to defend their good name was a natural right that preceded any statutory ordinance.

It cannot be said that books were put on the Index which offered no scandal at all, but many people thought that works which taken by and large were useful should be treated more leniently, by overlooking their minor blemishes.

Grievances of this nature were raised in the first years of Benedict XIV.'s reign. In 1744 a Jesuit work was prohibited in a manner likely to offend the honour of the Order in its most susceptible spot. Bernardino Benzi, professor of moral philosophy in Venice, had published in 1743 a booklet on reserved cases in the diocese of Venice, namely cases in which an ordinary confessor was not empowered to absolve the penitent.² In this little work Benzi had maintained that certain sins against chastity—not, however, those of the most serious nature—did not in certain circumstances come under the reservation. Benzi was thereupon opposed by the

¹ *Ibid.*, 268, 313.

² Cordara in DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, III., 11; REUSCH, II., 818. A *report on Benzi's work in the Papal Secret Archives, *Regolari, Soc. Iesu*, 58.

Dominican Concina, who in his "Letters on Moral Theology" wrongly ascribed to his opponent the statement that the matters in question were not sins at all. By prohibiting Benzi's work on April 16th, 1744, the Congregation of the Index seemed to side with Concina. Benzi submitted, but two of his fellow-religious took it upon themselves to publish anonymously two works intended to dispel the shadow which the prohibition had cast over the whole Order. When the names of the authors, Faure and Castellini, were discovered, the Inquisition was about to take action against them, when the Pope intervened and dealt with the case himself; the upshot was that the General of the Order had to impose a heavy penance on the two religious. Meanwhile Benzi's banned work was withdrawn from circulation, while Concina's reply was read as much as before. Consequently the dispute went on¹; a bitter satire against Concina was also put on the Index, until finally, on February 19th, 1746, the Inquisition issued an order to the Generals of both Orders forbidding any further polemical writings. At the beginning of the quarrel Benedict XIV. had remarked² that the trouble with the Jesuits was that, unlike other religious bodies, they made an individual's business the business of the whole Society.

Five years later there was more trouble of the kind. In 1722 the French Jesuit Dominique de Colonia had had published a list of Jansenist or pro-Jansenist writings with short extracts or characterizations.³ It appeared in its fifth edition in 1744 and especially as revised by Patouillet in 1752 is still of value for the historian. A decree of the Index of

¹ Some of the controversial writings in SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, I., 1316. According to Cordara (in DÖLLINGER, III., 11), they were not concerned with the condemned passage but with other misrepresentations made by Concina.

² To Tencin, June 17, 1744, I., 143.

³ "Bibliothèque Janséniste ou catalogue alphabétique des livres Jansénistes, Quesnellistes, Baianistes ou suspects de ces erreurs," [Lyon] 1722, 1731, 1735, 1739, 1744; "Dictionnaire des livres Jansénistes ou qui favorisent le Jansénisme," Anvers, 1752. Cf. SOMMERVOGEL, II., 1328, VI., 355; REUSCH, II., 832.

September 20th, 1749, directed against De Colonia, and another of March 11th, 1754, against Patouillet, condemned the work as containing much that was false and ill-considered and offensive to Catholic schools and writers, including individuals on whom high ecclesiastical honours had been conferred.¹ This was probably an allusion to Cardinal Noris, who on the authority of the "Jansenist Library" had been put on the Spanish Index. Circumstances rendering it impossible to have Noris removed from the latter, its source was put on the Roman Index.² The condemnation of the "Jansenist Library" was regarded by the Jansenists, however, as a victory for them. In France, complained Bishop Champflour of Mirepoix, the struggle against Jansenism was being waged night and day, and now all efforts were rendered null and void by a single stroke of the pen in Rome.³ The Spanish Minister Carvajal and the Court Confessor Rábago expressed their astonishment that declared enemies of the Church should find protection in Rome and that the Jansenists should be able to brag about it.⁴ Benedict was not unaffected by these

¹ Copy of the decree in MIGUÉLEZ, 442. The "Bibliothèque" has now been removed from the Index.

² Cf. above, p. 235.

³ " *che in Francia si faticava giorno e notte per reprimere et annientire il Giansenismo, et in Roma con un tratto di penna si guastava tutto " (to Valenti, December 1, 1749, Nunziat. di Francia, Cifre 491, Papal Secret Archives). For Tencin's *complaints about the decree, see Durini's letter to Valenti on December 29, 1749 (*ibid.*). For the ill-feeling among the Catholics and the jubilation of the Jansenists, cf. *Durini's letters to Valenti, of November 24, December 1 and 29, 1749, and January 5, 1750 (*ibid.*).

⁴ *Carvajal to Portocarrero, April 13, 1751, Archives of the Spanish Embassy in Rome, Reales Órdenes; Rábago to the same on April 13 and May 18, 1751, *ibid.* Exped. 65/1. A. M. WEISS (*Lebensweg und Lebenswerk*, Freiburg, 1925, 514): "When the invaluable *Bibl. des livres Jansénistes* was put on the Index on account of a few mistakes, their [the Jansenists'] respect for this institution knew no bounds."

complaints, especially as the condemnation encouraged the rumour that he himself was in favour of the Jansenists. Against the talk of the Jansenists, he wrote,¹ he was powerless; the journals printed whatever they liked. As for his attitude towards Jansenism, he had already given sufficient proofs. But he allowed all Catholic currents of thought to have their freedom, and if a school were unjustly attacked he would take its part. A book such as the "Jansenist Library" which stamped as Jansenists so many men of high rank, piety, and scholarship could not be endured, even if its condemnation were to give offence.

The condemnation had an unpleasant sequel. The Jesuit Lazzeri opposed it in a writing² in which he held that the decree against the "Jansenist Library" was solely the work of Ricchini, the Secretary to the Index, who had persuaded the Pope that it would be an effective answer to the prohibition of Cardinal Noris's works by the Spanish Index. The monks employed in the Index should be replaced by prelates of learning, maintained Lazzeri, since, as a result of their work, the prohibitions of the Index were being treated with utter contempt. The censure passed on Lazzeri's writing, namely that it contained false, rash, scandalous, and rebellious passages, which were also insulting to the Holy See, was fully deserved. But even then the author refused to hold his peace. Ironically he thanked Ricchini for the prohibition, which had once again displayed the partiality of the Index, for whereas Ricchini had taken his writing so ill, he had approved of Lorenzo Berti's apology, had violently attacked the Archbishop of Vienne, and had left untouched the writings of Bishop Caylus of Auxerre, in which Benedict XIV. had been numbered among the Jansenists.³

¹ To Tencin, January 21, 1750, II., 4 *seq.*

² *Epistola Doctoris Sorbonici ad amicum Belgam, Parisiis* [?], 1749.

³ 'Sorbonici Doctoris ad Rev. Ricchinium . . . gratiarum actio, quod epistolam Sorbonicam nomine s. Congregationis proscribendo confirmaverit' [no place or date of publication].

Following closely on Lazzeri's heels, the gifted but quick-tempered Jesuit Faure published a pamphlet which according to its title was a commentary on the Bull concerned with the constitution of the Inquisition but was actually a bitter criticism of the methods employed by the Dominicans in the Inquisition. The reason for the Inquisition being in disrepute, he alleged, was not the organization itself but the way in which it was managed. This time seven years went by before this work, too, was included in the list of forbidden books. Moreover, Benedict XIV. appointed Lazzeri as a consultor to the Index.¹

Cordara's opinion, given many years afterwards, on the conditions prevailing at this time was that the judging of books by the Index was in the hands of the eight consultors, four of whom were always Dominicans, who formed a party against the Jesuits; moreover, one of the four was the influential commissary. Among the Cardinals of the Index had been Passionei, Tamburini, Spinelli, and Orsi, all of whom were hostile to the Jesuits; it was not surprising, therefore, that almost every book that had been denounced was also condemned.²

Almost simultaneously with the condemnation of the "Jansenist Library", another agitation arose in France over Pichon's book on frequent Communion.³ Three complete issues of the Jansenist *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*⁴ were devoted to an attack on Pichon, and the appellant Caylus, Bishop of Auxerre, railed against both the book and the Jesuits. For a time it looked as if "Pichonism" would cause a split among the Bishops.⁵

¹ SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, 1609.

² DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, III., II *seq.*

³ Cf. above, pp. 236 *seq.* and PICOT, III., 136-9; RÉGNAULT, I., 142-153; REUSCH, II., 453 *seqq.*

⁴ Of February 20 and 27 and March 6, 1747, RÉGNAULT, I., 144.

⁵ " *Dubito, che siamo alla vigilia di una scissura fra i vescovi di Francia a conto del noto libro della frequente comunione dei P. Pichon, Gesuita Lorenese " (Durini to Valenti, December 29, 1749, Nunziat. di Francia, Cifre 491, Papal Secret Archives).

Rome, it appears, was at first in favour of the book,¹ but afterwards changed its opinion. On December 16th, 1748, and September 11th, 1750, it was prohibited by the Inquisition. In a letter written to the Archbishop of Paris from Strasbourg on January 24th, 1748, Pichon had already publicly recanted.² The case was comparable to that of Arnould, who had escaped the Index. Some years later the Jesuit Faure delivered to the Master of the Sacred Palace a refutation of Arnould's book on frequent Communion, but Cardinal Corsini had been prejudiced against Faure by Foggini,³ with the result that the work did not appear till 1791.⁴

In the censoring of another book the merits of its learned author were taken into consideration by Benedict XIV. A decree issued by the Bavarian Elector, Max Joseph, provided his Court Confessor, the Jesuit Daniel Stadler, with the opportunity of writing at length on the evils of duelling.⁵ From the theological and historical viewpoint the work was

For Rastignac (see above, p. 237) *cf.* also *Durini to Valenti on April 8, 1748, *ibid.* Rastignac is called here "l'antesignano di questo fuoco". *Durini to Valenti on April 28, 1749 (*ibid.*): Rastignac "diede la mossa a tutte le condanne et lettere pastorali uscite contro il libro del P. Pichon".

¹ On January 17, 1748, Valenti *warned the nuncio Durini not to give any cause "di far trionfare quelli che sostengono opinione di rigorismo contro il vero spirito della Chiesa". Nunziat. di Francia, Cifre 442, *ibid.* *Cf.* Benedict to Tencin, July 24, 1748, I., 417.

² REGNAULT, I., 145; SOMMERVOGEL, VI., 718; REUSCH, II., 453 *seq.*

³ "Memoria per l'Em. Feroni che concerne le difficoltà incontrate del P. Faure nella stampa d'un suo libro, con vari fogli annessi a questa materia" [November 28, 1755], Papal Secret Archives, Regolari, Soc. Iesu 58.

⁴ SOMMERVOGEL, III., 566.

⁵ *Tractatus de duello honoris vindice*, Ingolstadt, 1751. For the author, see DUHR in *Miscellanea Fr. Ehrle*, III., Rome, 1924, 239 *seqq.*; for the condemnation, see DUHR, *Gesch.*, IV., 2, 397 *seq.*; REUSCH, II., 823 *seq.*; FRIEDRICH, *Beiträge*, 84.

soundly done,¹ but Stadler asserted that if one disregarded civil and ecclesiastical prohibitions and decided to discuss the lawfulness of duelling from the standpoint of the natural law, on purely rational grounds, duelling was permissible in certain extreme cases. This would hold good, he opined, in a State in which complete anarchy reigned. The work was denounced in Rome.² The two objectionable statements completed Benedict XIV.'s collection of false tenets on the subject of duelling, five of which he condemned in a special constitution of November 10th, 1752.³ Otherwise the Pope dealt gently with Stadler, and his book was not prohibited. He had wanted, he wrote to Tencin,⁴ to show his displeasure with the scandal of duelling in Germany, which Stadler had treated too leniently. It had been impossible for him to preserve complete silence on the matter, as the statements complained of had also been made by other theologians. He had privately instructed the author to alter the censored passages, and to give him time to improve them he had postponed the publication of the condemned theses. The required improvement, he added, had been carried out. In January 1753 Stadler addressed himself to Rome, to declare his submission but at the same time to complain that his opponents and those of the Jesuits in general were now representing the affair as though the Bull against duelling were aimed against him alone, whereas of the five tenets which had been condemned only the last two were his and even these had been advanced by other theologians.⁵ A Brief of March 3rd, 1753,⁶ commended the Court Confessor on his obedience; the Pope, it was stated, had no other intention but of depriving duelling of

¹ Cf. *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, LXX., 159; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, V.³, 240 seq.

² Perhaps by the Franciscans. *Oefele to Lori, December 12, 1751, State Library, Munich, Oefeliana, 63, VII.

³ *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 18.

⁴ November 29, 1742, and January 3, 1753, II., 229, 235.

⁵ *Amort to Bassi, December 26, 1752, State Library, Munich, Clm 1408, No. 73.

⁶ *Acta*, II., 127.

any possible defence ; the other three condemned tenets had originated with the Franciscans Reiffenstuel and Sporer and the Dominican Milante.¹ To Tencin the Pope wrote² that the Bavarian Jesuit could have no cause to complain about him.

At about this time Benedict gave further evidence of his leniency in his treatment of another German scholar. Johann Kaspar Barthel, professor of canon law in Würzburg, was accused in Rome of having allowed expressions detrimental to the Holy See to appear in his lecture notes. Barthel defended himself in a letter addressed to the Pope, and the charges made against him had no further result.³

While dealing with Stadler's case, Benedict was preparing the constitution which was to obviate the many complaints which were being made against the Index, whether justified or not. The constitution appeared on July 9th, 1753,⁴ and was retained unaltered when the Index was reorganized under Leo XIII. In it Benedict laid down regulations for the examination of books both by the Congregation of the Index and by the Inquisition.

In cases where the Inquisition was unwilling to hand over to the Index the judgment of a written work and reserved the matter to itself, it was to instruct a consultor to draw up a written report in which the alleged errors were to be noted, together with the passage in question and the page of the book in which it occurred. The censure was then to be sent together with the book to the consultors and with their

¹ Stadler's letter and the Pope's reply were printed under the title *Epistola S. D. N. Benedicti P. XIV. ad authorem tractatus de duello P. Daniele Stadler S. J.*, Munich, 1761 ; reproduced in BUSEMBAUM-LACROIX, *Theol. mor.*, ed. Zaccaria, I., Venice, 1761, 246.

² On January 3, 1753, II., 235.

³ REUSCH, II., 944. According to I. F. SCHULTE, III. (1880), 184, Barthel protested against the "Curial encroachments" and upheld the view "that the Bishop derived his power directly from God".

⁴ *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 39 *seqq.*

remarks to the Congregation of Cardinals for their final decision.

In the case of Catholic writers, if the condemnation had been approved by all the consultors, a second censor was to be appointed, and if he presented a divergent report, a third censor was to be appointed. If this third censor approved of the condemnation, the matter was to be referred immediately (otherwise only after a fresh examination by the consultors) to the ordinary Congregation of Cardinals or, if the Pope so desired, to the Congregation of Cardinals which came to a decision in his presence.

With regard to the Congregation of the Index, the Pope stated that he had already intended at the beginning of his pontificate to prescribe a fixed method of procedure for the examination of books. After consulting Cardinal Quirini,¹ as the Prefect of the Index, and the Dominican Orsi, his former secretary, he was now issuing his instructions. The first principle of these was that as a rule the Index was to concern itself only with books which had been definitely denounced as dangerous. The Secretary of the Congregation on whom fell the duty of accepting the denunciation was first to inquire into the grounds on which the condemnation was desired, and then to read the book carefully with the aid of two consultors. If the book seemed to the Secretary to deserve condemnation, an expert critic was to draw up a written report containing precise information about the errors and the places in the book in which they occurred. This report was to go to the Congregation of the consultors, which was to meet at least once a month and was to consist of the Master of the Sacred Palace and six assistants. The matter was then to come before the Congregation of Cardinals. For the final condemnation the confirmation of the Pope was necessary.

If the writer of the work under consideration was a Catholic of repute against whom no complaint had previously been made, he was to be informed of the objectionable passages. If

¹ That he was mentioned merely for politeness' sake appears from Benedict's letter to Tencin, October 3, 1753, II., 294 *seq.*

he was prepared to amend them, the prohibition of the book was not to be published unless a large number of copies of the first edition were already in circulation, in which case the prohibition was to appear as though it applied to this first edition only.

The Congregation had been blamed for having, in many cases, condemned books without giving a hearing to their authors. It was true that the object of the censorship was not to condemn persons but to protect the faithful from misleading doctrines, but when the writer was a well-known or deserving Catholic and his work could be published after the removal of certain passages, his defence was to be heard or he was to be provided with a lawyer, as had often been done already. When important Catholic books were under consideration the Pope was to attend the final session, either of the Inquisition or the Index. Strict silence regarding their proceedings was imposed on both Congregations; the consultors were to be men of unblemished reputation, erudite, impartial, and capable of passing judgment. They were not to start their work with the idea that the book was to be condemned at all costs. If in the course of the examination any one of them saw that he had not the necessary technical knowledge he was to inform the Secretary. In passing judgment they were not to be influenced by their attachment to any nation, family, or school of theology, for there were not a few opinions which were held by certain schools and nations to be beyond the possibility of doubt but which might be rejected by others, with the knowledge of the Holy See and without causing any harm to Faith. Passages were not to be torn from their context, nor were doubtful matters to be interpreted in a favourable sense. Writers were not to be allowed to plead that they were merely informing their readers of pernicious doctrines and that their failure to insert a refutation did not mean that they approved of such doctrines. Finally, the examiners were not to let pass abusive language or to allow mere opinions to be presented as doctrines of the Church. On all these points St. Thomas Aquinas was to be the model for Catholic writers.

No small service was rendered by the Pope when he caused his constitution on the censorship of books to be followed by a new edition of the Index, for "the best edition of the Index prior to 1900 is undoubtedly that of Benedict XIV., of 1758, which is immediately seen to be a great improvement on its predecessors". Until the time of Leo XIII. Benedict XIV.'s Index underwent "no alteration, even of a formal nature, except for occasional additions, and certainly no improvement; on the contrary, in the course of time, many grave editorial errors found their way into the new impressions."¹ The new edition appeared with a special introductory Bull of December 23rd, 1757. Compared with previous editions it represented on the whole a relaxation of the strictness which had hitherto prevailed.² Most of the many misprints and inaccuracies of earlier impressions had been rectified. The chief merit for the improvement was due to the Dominican Ricchini, who had been Secretary to the Congregation of the Index since 1749.³

Not long after his constitution on the censorship the Pope was given an opportunity of putting into practice his principles of circumspection and leniency. The French Jesuit Isaac Joseph Berruyer, who in 1728 had undertaken the task of bringing the intelligentsia of his time into closer touch with the time-honoured stories of the Old Testament by means of an imaginative and almost romantic recital, afterwards attempted to perform the same service for the New Testament.⁴ Neither undertaking lacked the support of the reading public: three years after its appearance, Berruyer's "History of the People of God from its origin to the Advent of the Messiah" had gone into seven editions and had been translated into several other languages; but in 1732 and again in

¹ HILGERS, I4.

² Thus, the prohibition of writings in defence of the Copernican system was rescinded, the Church history by the Dominican Noël Alexandre was allowed to circulate in Roncaglia's edition, and so forth.

³ REUSCH, II., 880.

⁴ Cf. SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, I., 1357; RÉGNAULT, I., 359-367.

1757 it was banned by the Index. Even greater offence was given by the continuation of the work, "from the Birth of the Messias to the End of the Synagogue", which appeared in 1753. This, too, both sold well and provoked opposition¹; on the Jansenist side the author was charged with Arianism, Nestorianism, and Socinianism, while Alphonsus Liguori included him in his list of heretics.

In 1753, immediately after the appearance of the volumes dealing with the New Testament, Archbishop Beaumont of Paris placed 10,000 scudi (*écus*) at the disposal of the head of the Paris Jesuits, for the purpose of buying them back from the publisher, but too many copies had already been put into circulation. The Jesuit Provincial broadcast a statement that the book had been printed without the knowledge or the approval of himself and the author's Superiors, and on December 13th, 1753, an assembly of about twenty Bishops at Conflans forbade the book to be read, though they made no mention of Berruyer's name or the Jesuits. The French journal of the Jesuits published a statement of the Superiors that they agreed with the declaration of Conflans.² On December 3rd, 1754, the second part of Berruyer's work was condemned in Rome, too, but true to the regulations laid down in his constitution on the Index Benedict XIV. postponed the publication of the condemnation until he had heard the verdicts given in France.³ But despite the invitation no

¹ The Jesuits, too, expressed their disapproval. *Gualtieri to Valenti, July 1, 1754, Nunziat. di Francia, 492, Papal Secret Archives.

² RÉGNAULT, I., 360 *seq.*; HEECKEREN, II., 315 *seq.*, 418. The first to write against Berruyer was a Jesuit, Duhamel. The rumour that the Pope encouraged the Italian Jesuit Trigona to have an Italian translation of the book made (Cordara in DÖLLINGER, III., 12) must be founded on error, seeing that Benedict knew in good time of the objections raised by Beaumont and the Paris Superiors and that he himself had disapproved of the continuation of the Spanish translation. To Tencin, August 21, 1754, II., 355.

³ *Valenti to Gualtieri, October 2 and 23, 1754, Nunziat. di Francia, Cifre, Papal Secret Archives.

Jesuit appeared for the defence, and the appointed lawyer failed to weaken the charges brought against the book. The Pope accordingly ordered the decree of the Index to be made known but would not allow Berruyer or the Jesuits to be mentioned in it. When, after the delivery of the decree, a belated reply was received from the author, the Pope had word sent to him that he was ready to have the matter re-examined if fresh cause for so doing could be proved.¹ Under Clement XIII. various works in defence of the book were put on the Index, in 1759 and 1764, also the third part of the book itself, in 1758.² Benedict XIV. had refused to allow the apologies to be put on the Index, as, in his opinion, there was too much partisanship in the matter.³ Up to the last he was ready to provide learned and impartial judges for Berruyer's case.⁴

Berruyer found himself opposed in Parliament, too. On a motion put forward by the Attorney General, Joly de Fleury, the *History of the People of God* was burnt by the public executioner on April 9th, 1756, not because of its anticlerical doctrines but because it might corrupt its readers with "the ultramontane doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope", the

¹ Letter to Tencin, June 11, 1755, II., 418.

² For this and the numerous polemical writings connected with the work, cf. SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, I., 1362-9. Three apologies which Sommervogel (I., 1362) and Reusch (II., 811) ascribe to Berruyer were written, according to the Paris Jesuits, by a non-Jesuit who hoped thereby to bring about the condemnation of the work by Rome. *Gualtieri to Valenti, August 12, 1754, supplement B, postscript, Nunziat. di Francia 492, *loc. cit.*

³ "Nell' affare del predetto religioso [Berruyer] regna molto lo spirito di partito, et ella [Tencin] dice molto bene che forse anche si penserà a far proibire le difese del libro. Noi leviamo il ' forse ' e le diciamo, che a questo si è anche pensato, e che Noi abbiamo ostato, e che asciugata questa burrasca, si vedrà quello che si potrà fare rispetto alla causa principale, che vuol dire, all' opera già proibita" (Papal Secret Archives, Miscell. Arm. XV., t. 157). Cf. the letter to Tencin, September 24, 1755, II., 442.

⁴ To Tencin, November 12, 1755, II., 454.

doctrine of "this unlimited power by which an unwarranted holiness was attached to him".¹

In Berruyer's case the Pope had proceeded against a blame-worthy book with great clemency ; in another case he acted as the protector of the justifiable freedom of scholarly inquiry. Incited by the Calvinist Leclerc, Muratori had set forth the rights of a prudent criticism of certain opinions which had endeared themselves to the defenders of the Faith.² To others, however, many of his assertions regarding the veneration of the Virgin seemed to infringe the rights of piety, which involved him in not a few attacks, to which he duly replied. The dispute dragged on for decades and was continued even after Muratori's death, in 1751, one of his writings published in 1747 arousing particular opposition.³ Benedict XIV. had the book examined by the Congregation of the Index, whose verdict, given on December 18th, 1753, was that Muratori's writing was not deserving of the slightest censure and that his teaching was irreproachable ; the objects of his attacks were either abuses or popular opinions which had not the Church's approval.⁴

Another writer to whom the Pope extended his protection was the Jesuit Zaccaria.⁵ Zaccaria had written a defence of the Bollandists⁶ in which he had discussed the descent of St. Dominic from a family of Spanish grandees and the foundation of the Carmelite Order by the Prophet Elias. Zaccaria submitted to the suspension of the printing of his work, which was ordered by the General of his Order at the instigation of the Venetian and Roman Inquisitions, but

¹ RÉGNAULT, I., 365.

² LAMINDUS PRITANIUS [Muratori], *De ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio*, Paris, 1714. Cf. E. AMANN in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, X., 2551-4.

³ LAMINDUS PRITANIUS, *Della regolata divozione de' cristiani*, Venice, 1747.

⁴ "Nullam illi posse vel levissimam censoriam notam inuri." AMANN, *loc. cit.*, 2554.

⁵ *Civiltà Catt.*, 1930, I., 349 seq.

⁶ *Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana . . . vindicata*, Antwerp, 1755.

subsequently appealed directly to the Pope, complaining that the Inquisitions at Venice and Padua had placed difficulties in his way and that in Rome he had been threatened with the Index, whereas Sarpi's work had been let pass. Benedict allowed the work to be completed and to be dedicated to him.¹

(7)

An outstanding occasion on which Benedict XIV. put into practice his principle of allowing free play to all Catholic schools and views within the bounds of dogma was when the Augustinians, following the lead of Cardinal Noris, an Augustinian himself, put forth a new view on the difficult problem of reconciling grace with free will. This naturally aroused considerable opposition. Enrico Noris (d. 1704), who ranked with Mabillon as the most important scholar of the seventeenth century, was possessed of great sagacity and, in the prime of his life, the strength to study fourteen hours a day ; he acquired an extensive knowledge not only of the history of theology, but also of secular history, archæology, numismatics, and chronology.² In his *History of Pelagianism* and his *Vindiciæ Augustinianæ* ("Defence of Augustine"), however, he made assertions about the doctrine of grace for which he was attacked in Germany, Spain, and France. Thus, according to him, unbelievers are incapable of good works, because only Faith can sufficiently direct actions towards their final end ; sufficient grace is withheld from many as a punishment for original sin ; and unbaptized children have to endure positive sufferings in eternity.³ Noris's great name won support for his doctrines, so that he became the founder of a new school of theology, which for a time was brought into prominence by his fellow-Augustinians Bellelli (d. 1742) and Berti (d. 1766).

It would be useless to deny that this school shows points of

¹ Benedict XIV. to Zaccaria, September 13, 1755, *Civiltà Catt.*, *loc. cit.*, 350 *seq.*

² HURTER, IV.³, 855 *seqq.* Cf. our account, Vol. XXXII, 642.

³ PORTALIÉ in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, I., 2485.

contact with Jansenism. With Baius and Jansenius, it regards supernatural gifts, especially sanctifying grace, not as completely free gifts of God, but as belonging to the equipment of the rational creature. The creature cannot demand them, but the goodness of God owes it to itself not to leave His creature without them. Also, according to the Augustinian school, grace confers on the creature not only the capacity for action but action itself; further, since the committing of original sin, free will has no longer the power to determine its own destiny; and finally free will gives way to the attraction either of grace or concupiscence, according to which attracts it with the greater sweetness; according to the Jansenists, however, free will gives way inevitably to this attraction, according to the Augustinian theologians freely, which is difficult to understand. Differing from Jansenius, the Augustinian school teaches that Christ died for all men; but it also teaches that God does not apply the merits of Christ to everyone, which is again in accord with Jansenistic thought.¹

The Augustinian school holds that these assertions are the teaching of Augustine, but it is possible that such interpretations of Augustine would never have been thought of had it not been for the Jansenists; they were probably conceived for the purpose of rescuing the Doctor of Hippo from the Jansenists; but that they are also capable of preparing the ground for Jansenism is obvious. It is not surprising, therefore, that the printing of Noris's history of the Pelagians was forbidden in France and was permitted in Venice only after much hesitation.² Noris's name was included in the Jesuit Colonia's "Jansenist Library" and when an extract from Colonia's work was attached to the 1747 edition of the Spanish Index, Noris was banned in Spain, too,³ whereupon the Spanish Augustinians appealed to Rome.

¹ PORTALIÉ, *loc. cit.*, 2486 seq.

² *Clarorum Venetorum ad Ant. Magliabechium nonnullosque alios epistolæ*, Florentiæ, 1745, ep. 16 of April 8, 1674, ep. 18, *ibid.*, p. 45; JEMOLO, 138.

³ MIGUÉLEZ, 91. The editors of the Index were the Jesuits

So far as can be seen, Benedict XIV.'s views on the question of grace were inclined to accord with the stringent doctrine of the Dominicans and Augustinians. In a Brief of March 31st, 1745, which the Spanish Augustinians presented to the Inquisitor General in vindication of Noris, he had praised the Augustinian doctrine and praised Noris as a resplendent light of the Catholic Church.¹ So long as the Dominican doctrine on grace was permitted in the Church, it was impossible to forbid the Augustinian view.

As soon, therefore, as the Pope was informed by the Augustinian General Gioja of what had happened in Spain he wrote ² to the Grand Inquisitor, Pérez de Prado y Cuesta, that even if Noris's works did show traces of Baianism or Jansenism, as had been maintained, unjustly, in the "Jansenist Library", one ought to refrain from condemning them so long after the author's death (in 1704), lest the Church's unity be disturbed by fresh disputes. The Holy See had acted in this manner on many previous occasions, said the Pope. Thus under Clement XI. the denouncers of the Jansenistic historian Tillemont had

Casani and Carasco (*ibid.*, 92), Casani and Guerrero (*ibid.*, 473 *seq.*); cf. E. DE URIARTE, *Catálogo razonado de obras anónimas y seudónimas de autores de la Compañía de Jesús*, Madrid, 1904, III., 344 n., 1023; II., 194 n., 2116. The MS. cited by Miguélez (94, 107, 149) is not by a Jesuit; see URIARTE, I. (1904), 280 n., 866.

¹ "Maximi enim omni tempore fecimus insignem huiusmodi familiam, tum propter eiusdem s. Augustini tutissima atque inconcussa dogmata ab illius alumnis tradita ac servata, tum propter eximios viros, quos edit pietate et doctrina præstantes et quorum instar b.m. Henricus . . . Norisius nuncupatus, cuius olim in minoribus constituti amicitia fruebamur, licet quarumcumque gentium linguis celebretur, a Nobis tamen sine speciali laude tamquam Romanæ ecclesiæ splendidissimum lumen numquam est nominandus." *Analecta Augustiniana*, XIII. (1929), 31.

² On July 31, 1748, *Bull. Benedicti Papæ XIV.*, Vol. XIII. (Suppl.), Mechliniæ, 1827, 105 *seqq.*; *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 554; *Anal. iuris pontif.*, XVII., 28; *Katholik*, 1884, I., 181 *seqq.*

produced much of his work that was deserving of censure¹ but the Holy See had kept silent. Clement XII. had pursued the same course in dealing with the Bollandists and with Bossuet's defence of the four Gallican theses. Much that was worthy of censure in Muratori's works had been discovered by himself or had been brought to his attention by others; nevertheless he had kept silent and would continue to do so. But in any case Noris was not deserving of any censure at all. At the time when his history of the Pelagians and his treatise on the five general synods outside Rome were about to be printed they were denounced on account of the alleged Jansenistic statements they contained. They had to be sent to Rome for examination, but no fault had been found with them there. After their publication the assertion was made that passages had been inserted in them after their examination by Rome, but Rome had replied by promoting Noris to be the chief curator of the Vaticana. When his nomination as Cardinal was under consideration, Innocent XII. had appointed eight theologians to examine his works afresh and had afterwards admitted him as one of the consultors of the Inquisition. Then, in 1695, as he was still being attacked, Noris had been forced to defend himself in five learned treatises, and that his apology was accepted was shown by his promotion to the rank of Cardinal and by his being made a member, in this capacity, of the Inquisition.

In view of these facts, continued Benedict, it was not the business of the Spanish Inquisition to re-examine Noris's works and still less to condemn them; the Grand Inquisitor ought therefore to be thinking of repairing his mistake. On the question of grace the doctrines of the Dominicans, the Augustinians, and the Jesuits were all tolerated. The Bishops and Inquisitors ought to be guided not by the censures which scholars passed upon each other in the course of their disputes but by whether these censures had been confirmed by the

¹ Tillemont had been denounced by Laderchi and defended by Justus Fontanini. *Clarorum Venetorum ad Ant. Magliabechium . . . epistolæ*, I., xlix.

Holy See, which allowed its freedom to each of the various schools. The Bishops and Inquisitors might well imitate the Holy See in this respect.¹

It need hardly be said that there were unpleasant consequences when this Papal letter was made public through a breach of confidence on the part of the Procurator General of the Augustinians.² Muratori protested to the Pope, and the Bollandists' complaints that they had been mentioned in the letter to the Grand Inquisitor were also brought before him; his reply to them was that the letter was a confidential one that had become public through an indiscretion and that there had been talk of attacks but not that these attacks were justified.³

The Procurator General's rashness had made it impossible to have Noris's name removed from the Index clandestinely. Once the affair had become a topic of general discussion it was naturally a point of honour for Spain to adhere to its original decision.

The Pope's next step was to declare invalid, by a Brief of February 19th, 1749,⁴ the Spanish censure of Cardinal Noris. The Brief was to be made public by the Grand Inquisitor or, in the event of his refusal, by the Spanish nuncio.⁵ The king, however, forbade both the Inquisitor and the Pope's representative to take any further action until he himself had remonstrated with Rome.⁶ In May 1749 the Spanish envoy to Rome, Cardinal Portocarrero, who was in Spain on business, had long discussions with the Grand Inquisitor.⁷ Ferdinand

¹ "Hæc [Sedes Apost.] libertati scholarum favet, hæc nullum ex propositis modis conciliandi humanam libertatem cum divina Omnipotentia usque adhuc reprobavit. Episcopi ergo et inquisitores . . . eodem modo se gerant."

² Fiorano on September 17, 1748, *Epistolario di L. A. Muratori*, ed. e cur. da Matteo Campori, XI., Modena, 1907, n. 5612, p. 5203; Brief of September 25, 1748, *Acta*, II., 396. Cf. above, pp. 198 seq.

³ FLEURY, LXXIX., 703; Brief of April 3, 1751, *Acta*, II., 81.

⁴ FABRONI, *Vitæ Italarum*, VI., 119.

⁵ MIGUÉLEZ, 112.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 120.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 122 seqq.

VI. wrote twice to the Pope about the matter¹ and received two replies.² The grounds on which the Spaniards defended their position are typical of their general attitude towards the Holy See: they assured it of their respect and obedience but clung tenaciously to the privileges which they considered to have been guaranteed by Papal investiture. The Spanish Inquisition, it was insisted, functioned independently of the Roman Index, in virtue of a privilege granted by the Papacy,³ but in any case there were reasons enough for not allowing Noris's views to take root in Spain. Up till then that country had been spared the evils of Jansenism and Quesnelism and there was no desire to jeopardize its orthodoxy for the sake of Noris.⁴ To ban his writings it was enough that they were undoubtedly suspicious; in France and Germany the authorities would have nothing to do with them; and the Jansenists had received Benedict XIV.'s letter to the Grand Inquisitor with a shout of triumph and had made him out to be an abettor of Jansenism. The peace of the realm, unity of Faith, and the honour of the Inquisition demanded that the banning of Noris be adhered to. The royal confessor, Rábago, was a prominent supporter of these views.⁵

Since the Pope could not reply by including in the list of forbidden books the whole of the Spanish Index of 1747 or even only its appendix (the extract from the "Jansenist Library" mentioning Noris), he restricted himself to having the source of the appendix, the "Jansenist Library", forbidden by the Roman Index.⁶

¹ On July 1 and October 28, 1749, *ibid.*, 399, 403.

² On September 10 and December 3, 1749, *ibid.*, 401, 405.

³ Ferdinand VI., *ibid.*, 400; Rábago, *ibid.*, 417, etc.

⁴ "que España a ignorado con mucha dicha suia las controversias de Jansenio y Quesnel, y que no quiere aventurar su religion por medio de Noris." *Ibid.*, 419.

⁵ "Puntos que . . . se deben presentar a Su Santidad," *ibid.*, 418 *seq.*, and Rábago's instruction to Portocarrero, *ibid.*, 412-18; Papeles del P. Rábago, *ibid.*, 412-442.

⁶ On September 12, 1749. Copy of the Index decree *ibid.*, 442. Cf. above, pp. 351 *seq.*

The Pope subsequently addressed several admonitions to Spain regarding the matter but at first always without success. In the end, however, he gained his point. In 1757 both the offices of Grand Inquisitor and royal confessor changed hands, owing to the king appointing the new Inquisitor General, Manuel Quintano Bonifaz, to be his confessor. These changes meant that the Noris question was now viewed in an entirely different light. Following a report by the new head of the Inquisition,¹ a decree of the Inquisition dated January 28th, 1758,² removed the Cardinal's name from the Index. On February 22nd Benedict XIV. was able to thank the king for this.³

(8)

Whether it was a bulwark against Jansenism, as some maintained, or whether it was a bridge leading to it, as was feared by others, the Augustinianism of the eighteenth century was important only for its relations towards the most dangerous heresy that was then rife in France. But after a period of rule among the upper classes of that country Jansenism had to relinquish its sceptre to yet another mode of thought : the complete denial of Christianity. The great destroyer was Voltaire ; he would not have the existence of God denied, as the idea of God was necessary to hold the masses in check, but with this proviso he set himself out to make a laughing-stock of Christianity with his quips and sneers. The creation of a new interpretation of the meaning of human existence was undertaken by Rousseau ; its main features are delineated in *The Confession of Faith of a Savoyard Vicar* ; in the *Contrat Social* he propounds a social order in which God plays no part ; and in his *Émile* he expatiates on the education of the child on a purely naturalistic basis.

¹ On December 23, 1757, *ibid.*, 468-479.

² *Ibid.*, 248 seq. ; translation in *Anal. uris pontif.*, II., 2656.

³ MIGUÉLEZ, 481 ; Ferdinand VI.'s reply, of March 14, 1758, *ibid.*, 482.

To understand the immediate welcome which was given to those new ideas we must seek its origin in the complete denial of religious authority contained in Protestantism and in its implied denial in Jansenism. Just as the principle of free inquiry held by the disciples of Luther and Calvin had led to endless quarrels and the formation of countless sects, so that many persons doubted more and more in the existence of any religious truth, similarly the contesting and the perversion of Papal decisions by the Jansenists resulted in many persons doubting the existence of any truth at all. The continual abuse of their opponents, principally the Jesuits, by the Jansenists led to a general disgust for religious controversy to which Voltaire gave expression in his wish that every Jesuit might be flung into the sea with a Jansenist round his neck, or that the last Jesuit might be strangled with the entrails of the last Jansenist.¹ Thus the way was prepared for a mode of thought that turned its back on every sort of controversy and was content with the simple truths of a natural religion. Another force which worked still more strongly in the same direction was the immorality of the France of Louis XV. ; the yoke of the Christian moral code had been thrown off and an attempt was being made to justify what was actually being practised. In addition, a distrust of what was old and traditional was astir. Natural science, then awakening, had been making breaches in the older natural philosophy, though the conclusion that the whole of the philosophy that had gone before was tottering was unjustified though understandable, especially as Descartes, Locke, and Condillac offered a substitute. Finally, so much which had formerly been held in reverence was shown by historical criticism to be only legend that the doubt was entertained whether the historical foundations of Christianity itself could stand the test.

To this new current of thought the Roman Index devoted little attention. The English deism of the first half of the eighteenth century, the father and the forerunner of French encyclopedism, was the concern of English Protestantism ;

¹ To Helvetius, May 11, 1761, in JEMOLO, xxx.

special prohibitions of the Index would only have drawn attention to it, and most deistic or obscene literature was already forbidden by the general rules of the Index and by the conscience of the individual. This explains why it was only on rare occasions that such writings were expressly condemned by Rome. Nor was it to be expected that a warning conveyed by a definite prohibition would have much effect on the writings of the French deists. As a rule, therefore, Rome contented itself with prohibitions issued through the medium of the civil power, with episcopal admonitions, and with refutations by Catholic writers.¹ Nevertheless, by its condemnation of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*² in 1745 the Roman Congregation of the Index anticipated the Sorbonne, which banned the book in 1760, and in 1753 Voltaire's works were forbidden.³ On the other hand, Lamettrie's *L'Histoire Naturelle de l'Âme* and *Pensées Philosophiques*, two works written in defence of materialism, were publicly burnt by order of the parliament in 1746, whereas it was not till 1770, in the pontificate of Clement XIV., that a Papal Brief was issued against the author.⁴ Montesquieu's *De l'Esprit des Lois* was dealt with gently in Rome inasmuch as no mention was made of the author's name when it was put on the Index on March 3rd, 1752.⁵

The same causes which underlay the rise of deism had led since 1717 to the development of freemasonry into an organization where the followers of the new ideas forgathered.⁶

¹ PICOT, III., 61, 93, 119, 139, 141, 163, 177, 195, 298, 308, 350, 381.

² *Ibid.*, 93. The English original appeared in 1714.

³ PICOT, III., 234 *seq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 119, 121.

⁵ C. CONSTANTIN in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, X. (1929), 2387. *Ibid.*, 2386, for the attacks on the book.

⁶ H. GRUBER in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, IX., New York [1911], 772 *seqq.* Literature *ibid.* and in BERTRAND VAN DER SCHELDEN, *La Franc-Maçonnerie belge sous le régime autrichien 1721-1794*, Louvain, 1923.

The new society was condemned by Clement XII.¹ but in spite of this it continued to spread. Benedict XIV. wrote on March 25th, 1744,² that the freemasons had held meetings at Nîmes and Montpellier at which they had gained fresh adherents ; that the party from Avignon which had attended the celebrations were intending to form a lodge in their own town on returning thither, having already attempted to form one under the title of the " Society of Happiness ", which had been prevented by the Archbishop ; and that Tencin was to represent to Louis XV. that the freemasons ought not to be tolerated and that they were being fought in other countries. On Italian soil it was especially in Naples that the association tried to secure a foothold.³ At the head of the lodge was the Prince of San Severo, who, according to Tanucci's report,⁴ had succeeded in convincing the king's confessor, Archbishop Bolaños, of the invalidity of the Papal censures of the association and in the privy council had shown it to be harmless. The army, the Government, and even the clergy were riddled with freemasons.⁵ On May 26th, 1751, Benedict complained⁶ that

¹ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV, 411.

² To Tencin, I., 28.

³ *Arch. Napolet.*, XXII., 404 seqq., 529 seqq., XXIII., 249 seq., 305 seq.; MERENDA, **Memorie*, 103, Bibl. Angelica, Rome; KELLER in the monthly publications of the Comenius-Gesellschaft, XIV. (1905), 169-189; E. FERRERI, *Le prime loggie di Liberi Muratori a Livorno e le persecuzioni del clero e della polizia*, Roma, 1911; B. MARCOLONGO, *La massoneria nel sec. XVIII.* (in Tuscany, Lombardy, Piedmont, Savoy, Genoa, Naples, until 1730), in *Studi storici*, XIX. (1900); *Le prime loggie dei Liberi Muratori a Napoli* [1749-1751], in *Arch. stor. per la prov. napolit.*, XXX. (1905).

⁴ *Tanucci to Corsini, January 9, 1751 (confidential), Archives of Simancas, Estado 5934.

⁵ " *Tutto l'esercito, la curia, la corte, la Chiesa ancora eran pieni du quei confrati." Tanucci to Finochetti, July 21, 1751 (confidential), *ibid.*

⁶ To Tencin (II., 118). A printed " Edicto [of July 10, 1751] contra los Francmazones en el reyno de Napoles: Carlo Re de due Sicilie " in the Archives of the Spanish Embassy to Rome.

San Severo had persuaded the king that there was nothing wrong with the lodges and that in Paris they were open to the public, which latter statement, the Pope admitted, had been confirmed by trustworthy witnesses. Tencin was to use his influence with the king to turn him against those sects which had crept into France from England, were not tolerated even in Holland, and could bode no good seeing that they were veiled in secrecy. Then in a special Bull ¹ freemasonry was again forbidden. The effect of this in Naples was that Charles III. took action against the freemasons: members had to promise in the presence of Government officials to resign, and those under suspicion had to promise not to become members. Tanucci tried to belittle the importance of the step by pretending that it had been instigated by caricatures against the monks and by writings against the supposed mysteries of the Order; he admitted, however, that the prohibition of secret societies was a just one.²

Benedict XIV. had also a personal motive for opposing the association. The rumour had been spread that he himself was a freemason in secret and that he had not confirmed the Bull issued against the association by his predecessor because he disapproved of its judgments and excommunications.³

Leonardo da Porto Maurizio expressed his joy at this (to Benedict XIV., on July 9, 1751, in INNOCENTI, 301); he knew of lodges in Nice and Provence (*ibid.*).

¹ Of March 18, 1751, *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 212 seq.

² To Del Riccio, August 17, 1751 (confidential), Archives of Simancas, *loc. cit.* To his confessor Tanucci wrote: " *Abbiamo qui fatto molto contro i Liberi Muratori. Iddio ha toccato il cuore del Re, e ha benedetto lo zelo del P. Pepe, a cui prego V.R. di ricordarmi servitore " (to Mico, July 15, 1751, *ibid.*). *Writing to Corsini on February 13, 1751 (*ibid.*), Tanucci scoffed at Pepe's opposition to the Freemasons.

³ GENN. MARIA MONTI, *Due grandi riformatori del settecento: A. Genovese e G. M. Galanti*, Firenze [1926], 117, n. 6; JEMOLO in *Riv. trimestrale di studi filosofici e relig.*, IV., 23; RIGATTI, *Un illuminista trentino del sec. 18*, C. A. Pilati, Firenze, 1923, 213 seq.; P. DUCHAINE, *La franc-maçonnerie belge au XVIII^e siècle*, Bruxelles, 1911, 41, 473. Cf. *Rev. d'hist. ecclés.*, XIII.

To the latter charge Benedict replied in his Bull that he had already given sufficient indication of his attitude but that nevertheless he now expressly confirmed the decision taken by Clement XII.¹ He, too, bore witness to the widespread extension of the sects.² In Belgium, for example, in spite of the Papal prohibitions, there were many clerics in the lodges, where members were asked to pray for deceased freemasons, and the hour of Sunday Mass was announced so that members could attend it before meeting at the lodge, and so on.³

In Spain, it has been said, the first lodge was established in Gibraltar in 1726, and in 1750 a list of ninety-seven lodges was handed in to the Inquisition.⁴ A memorial was laid before Ferdinand VI. by his confessor Rábago, in which it was pointed out that the principles adopted by the sects had as their object the overthrow of the State and the Church, and that the danger was underestimated by princes.⁵ As had already been done by Philip V., Ferdinand VI. issued on July 2nd, 1751, a sharply-worded prohibition of secret societies, citing the Bull of Benedict XIV.⁶ Even so, in 1757 there was recorded an action taken by the Inquisition against a French manufacturer of the name of Tournon, who was punished with a year's custody and banishment for the crime of freemasonry.⁷ After Charles III.'s arrival in Spain a new Grand Lodge is said to have been formed there, its Grand Master being Aranda, its chief dignitaries Campomanes, Nava del Rio, and Valle y Salazar.⁸

(1912), 153. Refutation of the rumour in VAN DER SCHELDEN, 412-17.

¹ Bull of March 18, 1751, *loc. cit.*

² "in quibusdam regionibus tunc [under Clement XII.] late diffusas atque in dies invalescentes."

³ Cf. VAN DER SCHELDEN, 297 *seqq.*; *Rev. d'hist. ecclés.*, XX. (1924), 291.

⁴ MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, III., 87 *seq.*; CUEVAS, IV., 402.

⁵ LEGUINA, *El P. Rábago*, 45 *seqq.*

⁶ MENÉNDEZ, III., 88.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 89 *seq.*

⁸ GALLERANI-MADARIAGA, 110 *seq.*; CUEVAS, IV., 102.

The Savoyard envoy, La Marmora, writing from Paris to his Court in Turin on February 21st, 1768, said that it was astonishing that Rome knew nothing or apparently wanted to know nothing of the revolution in ideas that had taken place in Europe some time ago.¹

Nevertheless the whole of Benedict XIV.'s government and attitude show that Rome was well aware of the new currents of thought and that it paid them due attention. Such new aspirations as were sound at heart presented no danger to the Church and could therefore be encouraged, as indeed they were. It was a very different matter, however, when movements were afoot which aimed at the total destruction of Christianity.

(9)

One of the chief obstacles that stood in the way of the anti-Christian movements of the time was the Society of Jesus, which, having almost a monopoly of the education of the young, had to be removed at all costs if the way was to be cleared for a thorough-going deism. The leaders of anti-religious thought were animated first and foremost by their hatred of the Holy See, of which the Jesuits had won for themselves the reputation of being the stoutest defenders. Hence the desire to annihilate the Order, and the means to do so was not lacking to its enemies, since no Cabinet of any Government was free of their influence.

To further their purpose the leaders of the various States found an ally in the Jansenist party. It has been said of the Jansenism of the eighteenth century that it spent itself in its hatred of the Jesuits. It can certainly be said that the bond of unity that held together the divergent elements in Protestantism, namely the rejection of the Pope and everything Catholic, was paralleled in Jansenism by the detestation of the Society of Jesus. The party embraced the most divergent views but besides their exaltation of Jansenius or

¹ " Il est bien étonnant qu'on ignore ou qu'on paroisse vouloir ignorer à Rome la révolution qui s'est faite dans les idées à cet égard en Europe depuis quelque temps." State Archives in Turin, Lett. min. di Francia, in TORTONESE, 129.

Quesnel all its members were agreed in their hostility towards everything characteristic of the Jesuits: Molinism in dogma, probabilism in morals, the principles of the "Exercises" in asceticism. A Jansenist has been defined as a Catholic who hated Jesuits or as an excellent man whom the Jesuits disliked.¹ From the beginning the Jansenist journal *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*² set itself the task of waging war against the Order and as time went on its hostility grew more and more acute until finally it was openly working not merely for the moral ruin of its enemy but for its complete destruction through suppression. During the fifties of this century, when the changing fortunes of the Seven Years' War, and philosophical and political controversies, were diverting attention from the questions of grace and predestination, it was above all by its campaign against the Society of Jesus that the journal succeeded in recapturing the interest of its readers.³ Through the editor, who was nothing more than their mouth-piece, the heads of the party relentlessly pursued their object of bringing about the destruction of the Order, until it was finally achieved.⁴ To the lower ranks of the clergy they portrayed the Jesuits as the instruments of Papal and episcopal tyranny, to the higher ranks they denounced their writings as containing anti-ecclesiastical doctrines, to the parliaments and secular powers they pointed out their seditious tendencies.⁵ In four years the journal published 157 anti-Jesuit allusions,

¹ Cf. our account, Vol. XXIX., 152. SAINTE-BEUVE (*Port-Royal* III.⁵, Paris, 1888, 211, n. 1), speaking of the necrology of Port-Royal, says that hostility to the Jesuits was sufficient title for admission to this roll of honour. " *Odioso nome di Giansenisti, che in sostanza non significa altro, secondo la diffinizione di un huomo savio che : vir egregius qui non placet Iesuitis " (to the nuncio to Spain, 13 October, 1680, Nunziat. di Spagna, 156, fo. 36^a, Papal Secret Archives). Cf. JEMOLO, XXXVIII.: "asserzione dei Giansenisti che questi pretesi eretici (they themselves) altro non fossero se non buoni cattolici poco amati dei Gesuiti." Cf. *ibid.*, 44 *seq.*, 99. GAZIER (I., Introduction), quoting no authority, attributes the definition to Cardinal Bona.

² Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV., 417 *seq.* ³ PRÉCLIN, 291.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 305.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 292 *seq.*

quotations, or articles¹; in one way or another the same question was always asked: "Is it possible, without gross neglect of one's duty to religion, the lawful authorities, the country, public order, the welfare of the nation—yes, even humanity itself—to allow to exist any longer a society that must be regarded as the common enemy of the whole of mankind?"² Even so violent an opponent of the Jesuits as Tanucci wrote in 1757 that the journal was allowing its prejudice against the Order to be too easily seen,³ ascribing as it did every evil in the world to the Jesuits, their system of morals, and their confessors.⁴ The journal's hatred of the Jesuits even outlasted their suppression. On having occasion to relate⁵ that among the victims of the rising of September 1792 were twenty-one Jesuits who "also gladly gave their lives for religion", it could not repress the comment, "Not a sign could be seen of any regret for having belonged to a society that has done more harm to religion than all the atheists in France." On account of the general policy of the journal, some of its issues were prohibited in Rome in 1740, and the journal as a whole in 1742,⁶ but without any effect. In spite of the Church's ban, protested Benedict XIV. in 1750, it was allowed to continue publication, and the king put up with it although it was causing much harm and confusion among the Catholics by its unbridled style of writing.⁷

In Catholic Southern Germany, Austria excepted, anti-Jesuitism was especially active in the diocese of Augsburg and the electorate of Bavaria. Next to Canon Bassi, the Augustinian Canon Eusebius Amort and the Bavarian court councillors Osterwald and Lori were most prominent in using every means to break down the influence of the Jesuits and to

¹ *Ibid.*, 305.

² *Ibid.*, 306.

³ " *Riesce un poco satirica la Gazzetta Ecclesiastica, e scuopre troppa aversione ai Gesuiti." To Cantigliana, July 16, 1757, Archives of Simancas, Estado 5948.

⁴ *To the Duke of Salas, June 28, 1757, *ibid.*

⁵ On September 23, 1796, *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, CXXIV. (1899), 645.

⁶ REUSCH, *Index*, II., 759 seq.

⁷ To Tencin, January 21, 1750, II., 4.

reorganize clerical studies on what they considered to be progressive lines.¹ Influenced by Amort and Bassi, the Prince Bishop of Augsburg, Landgrave Joseph of Hesse-Darmstadt, put into execution his predecessor's project of establishing at Pfaffenhausen a separate diocesan seminary under the direction of secular priests, and to this new seminary were assigned the diocesan *alumni* formerly boarded in the school of St. Jerome at Dillingen, which was superintended by the Jesuits.² To defray the cost of the students' maintenance he proposed to collect an annual subscription from the parishes and convents in his diocese. To obtain the necessary permits from the Pope he addressed a letter to Rome on May 6th, 1746, in which, to prove the necessity for the new institution, he painted the teaching capacity of the Dillingen Jesuits in the blackest colours. Though they held the most brilliant testimonials, he wrote, the students did not know as much about religion as was necessary for a layman. They were ignorant of the simplest truths in the Catechism; they knew neither the number of the Sacraments nor which were necessary for eternal salvation, nor how many natures and persons there were in Christ. They had no piety, no manners, and no respect for their Bishop. In the new seminary those subjects would be taught which the Jesuits refused to teach, namely exegesis, dogmatics, disputation, canon law, and the history of the Councils and the Church.³ The originator of this letter, which bears obvious marks of exaggeration and mendacity, was, as he himself acknowledged in a letter to Amort, Canon Bassi,⁴ who completely dominated the pious but weak-willed Bishop and was feared and detested throughout the diocese for his high-handed manner and his proclivity to slander. The cathedral chapter avoided his company and forbade its subordinates to have any dealings with him.⁵

¹ DUHR, IV., I, 248 *seqq.*; IV., 2, 565 *seq.* For Bassi, *cf.* DENGEL, *Garampi*, 44, 72.

² DUHR, IV., I, 250 *seq.*

³ FRIEDRICH, *Beiträge*, 60.

⁴ *Ibid.*, n. 3.

⁵ DENGEL, *Garampi*, 72.

In Rome, too, dislike of the Jesuits never died down,¹ once the Jansenists had gained a foothold there, which they did in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, thanks to Pontchâteau and Du Vaucel.² Cordara, in fact, suggests that the causes of the final suppression of the Society should be sought not so much in the Bourbon Courts as in the deep-rooted hostility of certain circles in Rome.³ Clement XIII., in the course of a conversation with the General of the Jesuits, let fall the remark that the greatest enemies of the Church and the Society had their home in Rome.⁴ Benedict XIV. was not, on the whole, unfavourable towards the Jesuits. Certainly he made them more often than others the butt of his good-humoured sallies, but on serious occasions he often spoke in praise of them⁵ and he availed himself of their services to such an extent that Cordara, who lived through seven pontificates, said that no Pope that he had known had so many Jesuits about him as Benedict XIV.⁶ At the same time Cordara admits that he never could be quite sure what was the Pope's real opinion of the Order, and it was generally thought that Benedict had little love for the Jesuits.⁷

Apart from the undeniable failings of individual members of the Society and its attitude in the Chinese and Malabar questions, the reason why it was disliked by so many persons, including Catholics, may have been its general tendency. Among the intellectuals of Rome, including those of the highest ecclesiastical rank, there were quite a number who gloried in their detestation of the Jesuits,⁸ who for their part took things more seriously than their opponents and, in the

¹ ALBERTOTTI in *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto*, LXXXII., 1079 seq.

² Cf. our account, Vol. XXXII., 429 seqq.

³ *Ibid.*, 1084, and *Denkwürdigkeiten*, III., 5, 12; MARONI, Ep. II., II, 31, 32, etc.

⁴ RICCI, **Espulsione dalla Spagna*, 63.

⁵ See above, pp. 307 seq.

⁶ *Denkwürdigkeiten*, III., 13.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁸ "Certains ecclésiastiques, même des premières dignités, qui pour faire les beaux esprits, disent et écrivent bien des pauvretés

literary sphere, notwithstanding the concessions they made in cultivating the vernacular, paid the greatest attention to the classical writers and Latin. Another concession made by the Jesuits was to natural science, for the sake of which a reform in their course of studies was inaugurated by the seventeenth general congregation of 1751,¹ the details being set out by the General, Visconti, in a general instruction.² Broadly speaking, however, they were reluctant to let go entirely of Aristotle. When a go-ahead young member of the Roman College, Benvenuti by name, pleaded the cause of experimental physics in his theses for disputation, to the almost entire exclusion of every other consideration, the General of the Society proposed to remove him from Rome, but on the instructions received from the Pope had to content himself with assigning him another faculty.³ If this clinging to what was old led to disagreements within the Society, it was only natural that it should be far more severely criticized by those outside it. The Jesuits' adherence to scholasticism offended not only the champions of experimental physics but also those who seemed to think that all knowledge was confined within the limits of critical-historical work. Nor could it be gainsaid that the Society represented a strong intellectual force within the Church. In 1749, according to a list printed in Rome, it numbered no less than 22,589 members, 11,239 of whom were priests, 5 assistancies (6 from 1755 onwards), 39 provinces, 24 professed houses, 669 colleges, 61 noviciates, 176 seminaries or *convitti* (boarding schools), 335 residences, and 273 mission stations.⁴ As a whole, the discipline

et se font gloire de haïr les Jésuites." Benedict XIV. to Tencin, December 27, 1752, II., 234.

¹ Decret. 13, *Institutum S.J.*, II., 436 seq.

² *On July 22, 1752, *Sylloge ordinationum et epistolarum Præp. Gen. II.* (1651-1763), 345 seqq. Cf. PACHTLER in *Monum. Germ. Paedag.*, IX., Berlin, 1891, 436.

³ Benedict XIV. to Tencin, September 28, 1754, II., 360; ROSA, *Gesuiti*, 339 seq.

⁴ DUHR, IV., I, 3. The figures in ROSA (*loc. cit.*, 335 seq.) show some slight differences.

of the Society was well maintained ; offences, whether grave or slight, though inevitable in so large a body,¹ were punished, and steps were taken to prevent their repetition ; these men in their thousands performed their various tasks in a spirit of enthusiasm common to all. When one considers the animosity and bitterness engendered by clashes between opposing currents of thought one can understand to some extent at least how even among Catholics there were some who worked for the destruction of their adversaries.

This was especially true of the Jansenist or pro-Jansenist party in Rome, whose power in that city and in the rest of Italy was particularly strong in the reign of Benedict XIV. and which found a not inconsiderable number of allies among the secular and regular clergy, among the members and the consultors of the Congregations, and even in the highest ranks of the hierarchy. Though the movement may not have supported all the errors of the Jansenists concerning grace and predestination, its adherents were certainly well-disposed towards the aims of the sects and were hostile towards the Jesuits.² It is related of Benedict XIV. himself, that before becoming Pope he frequently expressed the opinion that Jansenism was a chimera invented by the Jesuits and that it was they who had induced Clement XI.

¹ Benedict XIV. spoke of this in a letter to Tencin of November 12 1755 : " Vedendosi anche pubblicamente in qualcheduno di loro [the Jesuits] qualche specie di rilasciamento, che vien tollerato dai superiori per soggezione delle protezioni che si godono dai rilasciati " (Papal Secret Archives, *Miscell. Arm.*, XV., t. 157 ; HEECKEREN, II., 455). Similarly to Tencin on December 3, 1755 : " Quando era vivo il buon Visconti [the Jesuit General] pareva al buon P. Centurione che fosse un poco troppo mite, e che lasciasse nella Compagnia correre qualche disordine, che quantunque in sè non molto grave, col tratto del tempo però lo può divenire. Ora essendo venute nelle sue mani le redini del governo, vedrassi come lo maneggerà, e se bisognerà, che ancor esso pel quieto vivere tolleri ciò che credeva non doversi tollerare da chi prima di lui era Generale " (Papal Secret Archives, *loc. cit.* ; HEECKEREN, II., 459). Cf. DUHR, IV., 2, 483 *seqq.*

² ROSA, 336 ; CORDARA, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, III., 7.

to promulgate the Bull *Unigenitus*.¹ In view of the Pope's lively and unrestricted way of speaking, it is not impossible that he may have let slip some similarly sounding remarks which were eagerly seized upon, given greater point and misconstrued.² It is very possible that the reports of such remarks may have given the Jansenists cause for hoping that with the election of the new Pope their day had come. Benedict himself was painfully affected by these rumours. After condemning a Jansenist writing,³ he observed that it was a matter of conscience for him to take every opportunity of showing that he upheld the Bull against Quesnel. Many unfavourable opinions of the constitution uttered in Rome had been repeated in foreign countries, he said, but he had had no part in them. These opinions came from clerics, some even in the highest ranks, who wanted to appear "enlightened" and for this reason spoke and wrote many petty things and prided themselves on being Jesuit-haters. Outside Rome it was difficult to make men realize that these persons wrote without the connivance of the Pope. Hence the false reports which were in circulation.⁴

The leading spirit of the Jansenist and anti-Jesuit party in Rome was Cardinal Passionei.⁵ In 1706, at the age of twenty-four, Domenico Passionei, a glittering young diplomat, who spent his substance on making as fine a show as possible, was sent to Paris as the bearer of the cardinal's hat to the nuncio. During his two years' stay there he was surrounded by the flattery of the *beau monde* and became acquainted with such scholars as Mabillon, Montfaucon, and Renaudot, but

¹ CORDARA, 8 *seq.*

² Hints of such rumours in the Pope's letter to Tencin of May 17, 1743, I., 55 *seq.*

³ *Apologie de tous les jugements.* REUSCH, II., 237, 241 *seqq.*

⁴ To Tencin, December 27, 1752, II., 234. Cf. above, p. 379, n. 8.

⁵ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV., 408; GOUJET, *Éloge historique*, La Haye, 1763; VERNARECCI, *Fossombrone dai tempi antichissimi ai nostri*, II., Fossombrone, 1914, 744. A fairly full description of Passionei's character is unavoidable here.

also with the frivolous French wits. In 1714 he was the Papal agent at the conclusion of the peace treaties of Utrecht and Baden,¹ in 1730 he was nuncio in Vienna, where he officiated at the wedding of Maria Theresa and Francis I. in 1736, and in 1738 he was Secretary of the Briefs in Rome and a Cardinal. As a scholar he was as superficial as he was as a diplomat. The valuable library he amassed was partly composed of costly books he had simply appropriated on his travels beyond the Alps.² The villa he built for himself at Camaldoli near Frascati was so well stocked with art-works and antiquities that it acquired an international reputation and was visited as such by Popes and princes. This seat of the Muses, in which a statue of Minerva occupied the place of honour, he called his "Hermitage", but there was such a superfluity of comforts there, said Benedict XIV.,³ that it was a suitable place for the most pampered nabob to perform his spiritual exercises. Passionei, he said, gave more for his gewgaws in Camaldoli than his fortune warranted. Nor did Benedict's opinion of Passionei's judgment and knowledge coincide with that of his admirers. Passionei had taken it upon himself to deliver to the Pope the apology which Prades had composed for his dissertation. Benedict wrote afterwards to Tencin that he was hardly surprised to hear it. Passionei, he said,⁴ had his head full of titles of books and notes on their various editions; he had read much but he had never studied. He was, he wrote on another occasion, one of those scholars who are always reading and retain much in their memory; now and then such people managed to get along with some useful notes, but when they attempted to take a hand in practical life they were generally not only useless but harmful.⁵ In the same way as he had supported

¹ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIII., 95-107.

² VERNARECCI, II., 779 *seq.* Passionei's collection of valuable books, acquired by the Augustinian General, Vasquez, on December 19, 1762, now forms part of the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome. *Ibid.*, 781.

³ To Tencin, June 7, 1747, and April 17, 1754, I., 330; II., 334.

⁴ To Tencin, March 7, 1753, II., 250.

⁵ "Ma se non passano più oltre, riescono in atto pratico il

Prades, Passionei also acted on behalf of Montesquieu when his *L'Esprit des Lois* was being examined by the Index; he managed to have the prohibition of the book postponed and then to persuade the Secretary of the Congregation, Ricchini, to await the emendations which, as he said, the author was prepared to make.¹ In the event, however, as little attention was paid to the objections in the new edition of the work, the book was finally banned, both in the original French and in the Italian translation.² With the French Jansenists and free-thinkers Passionei kept up a lively correspondence; even before 1744 he was probably in touch with Voltaire, who on more than one occasion sent him a copy of one of his works. When Voltaire's writings were finally condemned in Rome, Madame du Boccage was able to report to France that Passionei approved of the condemnation of the works but admired their author.³ It was probably Passionei and his fellow-thinkers whom Benedict had in mind when he wrote to Tencin⁴ that he could not be held responsible for the conduct of the many Romans who exchanged letters with the enemies of the Church for the sake of appearing important and earning what foolish flattery they could. It must be said in Passionei's favour that he placed no difficulty in the way of scholars who wished to consult his rare books⁵ and many

più delle volte non solo inutili ma perniciosi. E nel numero di quelli (sia detto in confidenza) si debbon riporre i due card. Passionei e Monti e forse anche, se visse, Msgr. Fontanini." To Peggì, June 30, 1745, in KRAUS, 27 seq.

¹ *Passionei to Bottari, August 28, 1757, Bibl. Corsini, Rome, 2054.

² Montesquieu, however, was at peace with the Church when he died. FELLER, *Dict. hist.*, VI., 453 seq. Cf. *Gualtieri to Valenti, February 10 and April 21, 1755, Nunziat. di Francia, 493, Papal Secret Archives; *Valenti to Spinola, May 15, 1755, Nunziat. di Spagna, Registro 428, *ibid.*

³ VERNARECCI, II., 760 seq.

⁴ On March 12, 1755, II., 399.

⁵ GALLETTI, 179; VERNARECCI, II., 768.

instances of his beneficence have been related.¹ Nevertheless he was not a popular character ; on account of his arrogant bearing he was known among the people as " Cardinal Scanderbeg ", " the Prussian Cardinal," or, from his birthplace, " the Pasha of Fossombrone."²

Already when staying in Paris and then when residing in Belgium and Holland, Passionei seems to have been affected by Jansenism.³ As early as 1713 ⁴ Fénelon wrote him a long letter about the intellectual condition of France after the publication of the Bull *Unigenitus* and urged the young diplomat to remain loyal to the See of St. Peter. In his library Passionei collected works on Jansenism but excluded any books by Jesuits.⁵ While Winckelmann was reading Plato in the " Hermitage " at Camaldoli, the Cardinal, seated below a portrait of Arnauld, buried himself in Pascal's *Provincial Letters* ⁶; and it was on Passionei's suggestion that Goujet wrote the introductions to Arnauld's works.⁷ In a letter to

¹ GOUJET, 218 *seq.*; GALLETTI, 223 *seq.*; VERNARECCI, II., 778 *seq.*

² George Castriota (d. 1468), the " Lion of Albania ", the national hero, was also known by his Turkish title of Scanderbeg (Skander Bey = Prince Alexander). JUSTI, *Winckelmann*, II.³, 119.

³ His adviser in Utrecht was the Abbé Tosini, whose book on Jansenism (*Concordia*, 1717) was banned in 1728. REUSCH, II., 719.

⁴ On November 22 (FÉNELON, *Œuvres*, VIII., Paris, 1851, 198) : " En quelque endroit du monde que le père commun vous envoie, soyez-y un enfant plein de candeur, de désintéressement et de docilité," etc.

⁵ VERNARECCI, II., 765 *seq.*; JUSTI, *Winckelmann*, II.³, 112; *Vita del Papa Benedetto XIV. Traduzione dal Francese*, Venezia, 1783, 12.

⁶ JUSTI, *loc. cit.*, 114.

⁷ REUSCH, II., 660. It is related in a *letter from Florence of March 27, 1758, that the bookseller Gresset of Lausanne had reported on his way home from Rome that the Pope had sent for him and had earnestly advised him to publish Arnauld's works ; the misgivings which he had at first entertained as to the financial success of the proposal were dispelled when three Cardinals — Tamburini, Spinelli, and Corsini or Passionei — had

his confidant Bottari¹ he described himself as the head of the Roman Jansenists. Cordara bears witness to his being an open and honourable opponent of the Jesuits who made no secret of his attitude,² while Tamburini, Orsi, and Spinelli were more underhand in their work against the Society.³ The suspicion that Passionei was the chief author of the plot to destroy the Society of Jesus, Cordara goes on to say, is not

offered to guarantee it. Papal Secret Archives, Regolari Soc. Iesu, 58.

¹ Of February 12, 1752, in ROSA, *Passionei*, p. 11: "I calumniatori al solito [viz. the Jesuits] non sanno che il Priore [of the Hermitage, namely Passionei] e fra Giovanni sono capi de' Giansenisti di Roma, e che i Giansenisti non dicono mai bugia."

² "Iesuitarum amicus a prima juventute fuit. At contracta in Belgio consuetudine cum Gerbertuio aliisque eiusdem farinae doctoribus adeo mentem ac voluntatem mutavit, ut Societatem insectari deinde nunquam destiterit: hoc laudandus tamen, quod inimicitiam exercebat aperte atque, ut ita dicam honeste, non, ut alii quidam ex occulto et simulate" (CORDARA, *De suis ac suorum rebus*, lib. 11; ROSA, *Passionei*, 7). Gerbertuius cannot be the well-known Gerberon, who was in prison in Amiens and Vincennes in 1703-10 and died as soon after his release as March 9, 1711.

³ CORDARA, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, III., 11, 32 seq. For the anti-Jesuit Cardinals, see JEMOLO, 101. With regard to Tamburini it is stated in the *Vita del Papa Benedetto XIV.*, fo. 58^a: "il card. Passionei bramò sempre di vederlo Papa, considerandolo capace di finir tutte le dispute della Chiesa e di riconciliarsi la stima di tutti li sovrani." Of Spinelli, Tanucci wrote to Caracciolo on February 12, 1752, that he was an enemy of the Jesuits and the Bull *Unigenitus*, but in secret (Archives of Simancas, Estado 5941). On March 12, 1752 (*ibid.*) Tanucci *reported to Cantiglia that the French envoy Stainville (Choiseul) would like Spinelli to be Pope. During the conclave of 1758 he *assured the envoy Montealegre on May 30 (*ibid.*, Estado 5947): "Di Roma si dice che i Francesi vorrebbero un Papa giansenista e per tele abbiano posti gli occhi su Spinelli e Tamburini." Cf. *Tanucci to Cantiglia on May 20, 1758, *ibid.*; ROSA, *Passionei*, 53; BOUTRY, *Choiseul*, 224 seqq.

without foundation, seeing that he had come to an understanding on the matter with the Bourbon Ministers.¹

The Jansenistically-minded prelates Bottari and Foggini² were Passionei's friends and fellow-workers, and he was also on good terms with the anti-clerical Spanish envoy and future Minister, Roda, who deplored his death as a great loss.³

The anti-Jesuit movement was joined by many members of religious Orders who had been antagonized by intellectual or personal differences aggravated by the imprudent actions of individual Jesuits.⁴ Most prominent among these was the General of the Augustinians, Francis Xavier Vasquez, a Peruvian and a stormy character, who repeatedly incited Roda to take the offensive.⁵ From his friends Vasquez made no attempt to conceal his leaning towards Jansenism; in his view, the condemnation of the Synod of Utrecht was the work of the Jesuits, who in their omnipotence were striving "to destroy that noble portion of the Church of God".⁶ Many of his letters to Roda ended with the ironic formula, "in communion with the interpreter of Jansenism," or "greetings from the interpreter of Jansenius".⁷ In one letter to him he asked that the archbishopric of Valencia might be given to his fellow-religious Lassala; the Minister was invited

¹ "Suspicio haud vana fuit quod coquebatur inter ministros principum Societatis excidium, Passioneo praesertim auctore ac architecto deliberatum fuisse." *Denkwürdigkeiten*, III., 32.

² ROSA, *Gesuiti*, 363 seqq.

³ *Roda to Wall, July 26, 1759, and July 9, 1761, Archives of Simancas, Estado 4965 and 4966. Roda's proposal to buy Passionei's library for the Spanish Government came to nothing; it was acquired by F. X. Vasquez. *Vasquez to Roda, Bibl. S. Isidro, Madrid, *Cartas de Vasquez*, I.

⁴ CORDARA, *De Suppressione*, 41 seq., 69 seq., 95.

⁵ *Rábago to Portocarrero, August 24, 1751, Archives of the Spanish Embassy to Rome, Expedientes, P. Confessor.

⁶ "Se ha empeñado a destruir aquella noble porción de la Iglesia de Dios." Bibl. S. Isidro, Madrid, *loc. cit.* Varie nuove.

⁷ *Vasquez to Caprara, November 26, 1767, *ibid.*; *Caprara to Vasquez, November 5, 1767, *ibid.*

to use his customary dexterity to sway the hearts of those who had these favours to grant, "so that Jansenism might triumph and ignorance perish."¹ The Jesuits considered Vasquez to be as proud as Lucifer,² while Vasquez wrote to Roda that "the Society of Jesus is like a hydra; as soon as you cut off one of the monster's heads it grows another".³

Although to all appearances it was only the Jesuits who were the object of attack, in reality it was the Church itself and the Holy See, as was realized by persons of insight at the time and was to be shown more clearly in the near future.⁴ Both openly and, more often, secretly, the party caused to be published writings containing spiteful attacks on the Church's jurisdiction, which it tried to restrict and belittle in favour of secular princes.⁵ Among its various groups the Jansenist *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques* was passed without hindrance from hand to hand,⁶ and the members of the party kept each other informed of the latest writings against the Jesuits and Rome.⁷ The Jesuit General wrote to the confessor of the Spanish Queen-Mother that the campaign against

¹ "que con su acostumbrada destreza maneje los animos de los dispensadores de la gracia, de modo que triunfe el Jansenismo, y muera la ignorancia." To Roda, November 2, 1769, *ibid.* Cf. *Vasquez to Roda, October 18, 1769, and January 25, 1770, *ibid.*

² *To Roda, June 11, 1767, *ibid.*

³ *To Roda, June 6, 1768, *ibid.*

⁴ RICCI, **Espulsione dalla Spagna*, 63 *seqq.*

⁵ Vasquez attacked some theses on the Church's jurisdiction whose tone was very moderate and which had been defended in the Roman College, but since his attack was without effect in Rome he had printed in Portugal a memorial couched in violent terms: *Memorial del P. Geral da Ordem de S. Agostinho ao SS. P. Clemente XIII. sobre algunas conclusoens dos Jesuitas*, [1765], in Nunziat. di Spagna, 301, Papal Secret Archives. RICCI, **Espulsione dalla Spagna*, 12.

⁶ *Bandini to Foggini, November 22, 1763, Bibl. Corsini, Rome, Cod. 1607.

⁷ *On November 22, 1763, Bandini informed Foggini that a book had been published in Venice in which the Church's right of

his people was being carried on with such subtlety that even men of great intelligence and honesty were deceived.¹

The suppression of the Society was in fact the result of

asylum had been utterly disproved ; and on *April 18 he sent him a satirical poem directed against Zaccaria and the Jesuit morality (*ibid.*). “ *Le trasmetto due frontespizi di un libro assai terribile pubblicato a’giorni scorsi contro la Compagnia, e nel quale si cava fuori con un’arte assai sopraffina tutto il veleno che s’incontra ne’ libri pubblicati fino al presente contro la medesima. La cosa più curiosa si è che anno aggiunto in fine un gazzettino di vari fatti seguiti in diverse case de’ Padri. Quando ne voglia un pacchetto di esemplari, potrà esser servita. . . .” (Bandini to Foggini, April 29, 1760, *ibid.*). *On November 28, 1760, Orsini offered to send the Minister Tanucci *I lupi smascherati*, which he described as the cleverest book which had appeared for years, its purpose being to incite the Powers to dissolve the Jesuits. Archives of Simancas, Estado 4964.

¹ “ *Le circostanze del tempo siccome danno luogo a temere ogni cosa, così consigliano ogni prevenzione. Incomincio a sentire certe voci, le quali mi mettono in sospetto, che i nostri nemici, e ugualmente, anzi principalmente nemici della Chiesa e della religione siano per muoverci adesso guerra in coteste parti, risoluti di non desistere, finchè abbiano, se Dio il permetterà, ottenuta l’abolizione della Compagnia. Le loro arti sono sì varie e sì fine, che giungono ad ingannare e prevenire contro di noi anco persone di molta intelligenza, d’integrità, anzi di probità. Queste qualità convengono tutte al S. Emanuele di Roda . . . , ma per quanto mi asseriscono molte persone riguardevolissime, non abbiamo la sorte di meritare il suo favore. Siccome io l’ho trattato con tutto il rispetto, così egli ha trattato me con tutta la cortesia, onde non ho riprove immediate di ciò che scrivo, ma questo sentimento è comune. Ho una intiera fiducia nelle penetrazione e clemenza di coteste Maestà e so che finalmente le nostre sorti sono in mano di Dio, nè ci serà recato più danno di quel che egli per i suoi retti fini permetterà. Tuttavia egli pur vuole che si adoperino i mezzi umani. Perciò credo mio debito ragguagliare V. R. acciò ella faccia e procuri, che sieno fatte le prevenzioni che crederà opportune, non già facendo il minimo nocumento a veruno, ma solo per impedire le sinistre impressioni, nè mai per offesa, da cui per divina misericordia

a well-considered plan.¹ On a pre-arranged weekday the party leaders met in the Archetto, the house of the Prefect of the Vatican Library, Bottari. Nearly all were priests, both secular and regular, from outside Rome, a goodly portion coming from Tuscany. They were Cardinal Neri Corsini, the Augustinian General Francis Xavier Vasquez, the Abbé Antonio Niccolini,² the Oratorian Prospero Buttari, Foggini, and others, including the sixteen-year-old nephew of the Jesuit General, Scipione de' Ricci, a pupil of the Jesuits from the Roman Seminary, afterwards Bishop of Pistoia.³ Another

sono alienissimo, ma quanto solo è necessario per mera difesa." Ricci to Bramieri, April 25, 1765, *Epist. gen. secretæ*, in Jesuit ownership.

¹ "Non temere, non casu, sed consilio ac deliberatione res agebatur. Conveniebant certa die certam domum partium primipili, presbyteri ferme externi ac coenobitae ad consultandum, quid facto esset opus. Multa ponebantur in medio, sententiae rogabantur, acta ad Passionem cardinalem referebantur. . . . Illud videtur semel de communi sententia constitutum, viribus omnibus connitendum, ut exciderent Iesuitae hac existimatione, quam apud vulgus hominum obtinebant. . . . Ubi satis obscurata aut detrita penitus fuerit Societatis fama, tum demum de eius extinctione cum spe aliqua agi posse. . . . Hanc fuisse belligerandi formam in iis conventiculis praestitutam, non tam linguis ac literis quam ipsis rebus revictum est. Nam post id tempus tam multi diversis locis, tam probrosi in Societatem prodire libelli aut de novo conditi aut recusati, ut tota prope oppropriis Iesuitarum inundaretur Europa atque ad ultimos usque Americanos et Indos inundatio pervenerit." CORDARA, *De suis ac suorum rebus*, lib. 9; ROSA, *Passionei*, 8, n. 1.

² "il più mordace della Compagnia," "il più spietato avversario dei Gesuiti." Since he spoke so freely to Bottari of his "critiche mordaci al papato, le accuse ai procedimenti tenuti dalla Curia e dagli ordini regolari, le approvazioni entusiastiche ai ministri del Portogallo e della Francia", Bottari must have been of one mind with him. "Non per nulla del resto i Gesuiti accusavano il Bottari qual capo dei Giansenisti romani." RODOLICO in the *Rassegna nazionale*, CLXXXIII. (1912), 339.

³ "in questa conversazione [at Bottari's] non meno che in

of their meeting-places was the Oratorian convent at the Chiesa Nuova.¹ In Florence the anti-Jesuits met most frequently in the Biblioteca Riccardi, where their host was the learned Giovanni Lami, the chief representative of Jansenistic thought in Italy,² who through his periodical *Novelle letterarie* (1740-1767) was largely instrumental in propagating Jansenist ideas in Tuscany.³ At these meetings were discussed the measures to be taken against the Jesuits, and the decision was reported to Passionei: first, the reputation of the Society was to be undermined by writings on probabilism and the ritual dispute, and then, when this object had been attained, the suppression of the Society could be undertaken with success. Accordingly, from that time onwards, Catholic countries were flooded with anti-Jesuit writings. A list of publications inserted by the Venetian publisher Bettinelli in a work attacking Bellarmine's beatification⁴ included forty-seven large and forty-five smaller works written against the Jesuits, all printed in the one year, 1761.

Thus by incessant attacks and slanders the ground was prepared in every Catholic country. The first action to be taken was in Portugal, the occasion being the conditions in the missions.

quella dei Filippini [the Oratorians] . . . io cominciai a disingannarmi su molte cose relative a'Gesuiti." GELLI, *Memorie di Scipione de' Ricci*, Firenze, 1865, 8 (*cf.* 5, 13); RODOLICO, *loc. cit.*, 338.

¹ *Cf.* the foregoing note.

² " Rappresenta il Lami lo speciale atteggiamento dei liberali cattolici italiani a metà del 700 di fronte al pensiero giansenista francese." RODOLICO, *loc. cit.*, 344.

³ " Le *Novelle letterarie* concorrono così a divulgare in Toscana il pensiero giansenista francese." *Ibid.*, 343; documentation *ibid.*

⁴ *Voti* of Cardinals Barbarigo, Casanata, Azzolini (Ferrara, 1761), 59-64.

CHAPTER VI.

BENEDICT XIV. AND THE MISSIONS.

(1)

IN the history of the missions the period of Benedict XIV.'s pontificate was of great importance. On many of the occasions when he personally intervened in the course of events in his legislative capacity, his intervention was of permanent effect, and where conditions radically altered of their own accord they heralded a new era ; so that for either reason a comparatively full description of the situation seems to be essential.

One of the first governmental actions taken by the new Pope, on January 14th, 1741, was to entrust the nuncios in Vienna, Poland, Cologne, and Belgium with the visitation of the colleges which were maintained by Papal subsidy and whose object was the training of missionaries to work among the heretics and unbelievers.¹ In the exhausted state of the Papal treasury, said the Pope, he could not be so generous as his predecessors ; nevertheless in so far as it was possible, the colleges would not lack the care of the Apostolic See. The nuncios, therefore, were to ascertain the condition of the Papal seminaries by obtaining answers to a list of seventeen questions and to report the result to Rome. Pending the arrival of these reports the precedent set by Innocent X. would be followed : the payment of the Papal subsidies would be suspended. This Brief was amplified by a *Motu Proprio* published on February 8th, 1741.² At least forty years before, it was stated, a Congregation of Propaganda Cardinals had been in being whose task it was to superintend the Papal colleges. This Congregation was now revived as a permanent institution. It was to consist of five Cardinals who were to meet three times a year and who had full authority to further the spiritual and temporal welfare of the seminaries.

¹ *Ius pontif.*, III., 15-17.

² *Ibid.*, 17-19.

Information about the activity of the Congregation is contained in the archives of the Propaganda.¹ The Congregation for the colleges, we learn, was reconstituted here in 1640, and its last session was held in 1698. There was then appended a list of the subsidized seminaries, which were surprisingly numerous. Beyond the Alps, besides the Bohemian boarding school for poor students,² there were seminaries in Vienna, Prague, Olmütz, Fulda, Braunsberg, Dillingen, Vilna, Douai, and Cologne. All these, except that at Fulda and the Bohemian school, derived their financial support from the marriage dispensations granted by the Dataria. The Irish college in Louvain and the Armenian and Ruthenian colleges at Lemberg were financed by the Propaganda; the two seminaries at Avignon, the college at Como (S. Maria di Rondineto), and that at Graz were supported by the Pope. In Rome there were the Propaganda itself and the Irish, Scottish, Greek, German, Maronite, and English colleges; at Loreto was the Illyrian college, maintained by the Santa Casa. The following, though not strictly Papal seminaries, were dependent on the Propaganda: the Irish colleges in Lille, Douai, Antwerp, and Tournai, the Scottish colleges in Paris, Douai, and Madrid, the English colleges in Lisbon, Seville, and Alcalá, the archiepiscopal seminary and the Norbertinum of the Premonstratensians in Prague, the Greek college in Padua, and the Swiss college in Milan. It was also at the request of the Propaganda that the Chinese college in Naples and the college at Ullano for Italo-Greeks from Albania were first established.³ To these institutions, already numerous enough, must be added the colleges belonging to the various Orders. In Rome, the Discalced Carmelites had a college at S. Pancrazio, the Riformati at S. Pietro in Montorio, the Observants at S. Bartolomeo on the island in the Tiber, the Trinitarians at the Madonna delle Fornaci; at Assisi was a college

¹ *Visite 41, Archives of the Propaganda in Rome.

² In Prague; see KRÖSS, *Gesch. der böhm. Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu*, I., Vienna, 1910, 532 seqq.

³ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV, 467, 468.

of the Minorite Conventuals. Under the Generals of the Franciscans were S. Isidoro in Rome, the college of the Immaculate Conception in Prague, a college in Louvain, and another at "Boulaggio",¹ all for students destined for Ireland. The Franciscans were also in possession of missionary convents or colleges in Algarve (S. Antonio di "Barataxo")² and Mexico (S. Croce, at Querétaro), also other institutions in Varatoio, Brancanes,³ Guatemala, and Guadeloupe. The Benedictines possessed the Scottish seminary at Ratisbon, in which they were confirmed by the Holy See in 1737, and an English college at Douai. The institutions at Ghent, Liége, and St-Omer were in the hands of the Jesuits.

In a session held on February 18th, 1741, the five Cardinals appointed by the Pope to form the supervisory Congregation divided the colleges among themselves for the purpose of reporting on them. San Clemente (Annibale Albani) was given the institutions at Vilna, Lemberg, Braunsberg, and Assisi, Cardinal Petra those in Vienna and Olmütz, the Illyrian colleges at Fermo and Loreto, and the college at Assisi; Carafa took charge of Fulda, Dillingen, and S. Pietro in Montorio, Gentili the English college at Douai, the Irish college at Louvain, and the institutions at Cologne and Avignon and that on the island on the Tiber; Rezzonico took over Prague, S. Pancrazio, and the Bohemian school for poor students.⁴ All these institutions were treated by Rome as though they

¹ Boulages in the Champagne? Cf. "Boulaes" in MARCELLINO DA CIVEZZA, VII., I, 643.

² Baradoxa; cf. *Ius pontif.*, II., 52 n.

³ The names Brancannes (*sic*) and Varatoio in *Ius pontif.*, IV., 332.

⁴ The report of the visitation of Vilna and Braunsberg is to be found on p. 57 of the *Visite 41, that of Fulda on p. 181, Douai on p. 234; on p. 247 the "Informazione del collegio detto di casa salda in Colonia", on p. 253 the desire of the Bishop of Assisi to visit the college there. Several colleges could not be visited on account of the war. For the college at Vilna cf. the Brief to the Ruthenian Bishops of August 14, 1753, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 63.

were missionary colleges, even when their students were destined for pastoral work among heretics.

The Pope's solicitude for the colleges was shown also in other ways. The very scanty revenues of the Chinese college in Naples he increased by making over to it the Benedictine monastery of S. Pietro at Eboli,¹ afterwards transferring to it also a yearly income of 500 ducats which he had held back from the first donation. Besides its eight students from China and India, the college was to maintain eight more from Wallachia, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Albania.² He approved the rules drawn up by the rector of the Italo-Greek college in Palermo, whose students were to train for pastoral duties among the Albanians and as missionaries in the Near East.³ The Corsini College established at Ullano for the purpose of supplying pastors to the Greeks of the Two Sicilies, had enjoyed the usufruct of the former Benedictine monastery in that town; this privilege the Pope confirmed by re-conferring it on the director of the college.⁴ Duke Casimir of Nieswitz was thanked for the zeal he had displayed in supporting the efforts made to win back the schismatic Ruthenians, also for the foundation of a Ruthenian seminary.⁵ The Pope commended to the Duke's patronage the Ruthenian seminary at Lemberg.⁶ On the new missionary college for the Franciscan Observants which José de Moraes Sarmiento was proposing to establish in Portugal⁷ the Pope bestowed⁸ all the privileges

¹ Brief of August 31, 1743, *Ius pontif.*, III., 118 seq. The monastery was "sine cura et conventu", namely empty. In the Briefs the name of the place was written sometimes Ebulo, sometimes Embumbo or Embulo.

² Brief of October 6, 1746, *ibid.*, 364. Confirmation and extension of the privileges, of December 18, 1746, and December 28, 1756, *ibid.*, 310, 668.

³ On February 25, 1757, *ibid.*, 680 seq.

⁴ On January 2, 1743, *ibid.*, 94.

⁵ "seminarium svirnense" (Schweidnitz).

⁶ *Acta*, II., 67.

⁷ "in loco de Vinkaes" (Vinhaes). *Ius pontif.*, IV., 332.

⁸ On February 20, 1753, *Acta*, II., 126.

which had been granted by Innocent XI. to the convent of St. Antony at Baradoxa on December 23rd, 1679. To the Dominicans Benedict sent his congratulations ¹ on the foundation of a seminary for missionaries on the Monte Mario, near Rome.

(2)

Benedict XIV. was much occupied with the furtherance of Christianity in the East.² The first country to demand his attention in this respect was Abyssinia, which in his time was most difficult of access. When Count Le Roux d'Esneval was forming a trading company to open up the country, the Pope took the opportunity to write to the Negus Bakafa,³ who had been reported as having leanings towards Catholicism, recommending to him as a messenger of the Faith the Franciscan Michael Angelus de Vestigné. The project, however, came to nothing. In 1751 another attempt on Abyssinia was made by the Franciscans, this time at the express invitation of King Yasu II., who had written to the "Guardian of the Holy Sepulchre" in Jerusalem. A small band of missionaries reached Gondar on March 19th, 1752, and laboured so well that their expulsion was demanded and obtained by the Abyssinian clergy.⁴

For the Maronite Church the foundations of the reorganization of ecclesiastical affairs had been laid at the Synod of Lebanon, held in 1736⁵; meanwhile, however, much objection had been taken to them. The Congregation of Cardinals appointed by his predecessor to investigate the matter was confirmed by Benedict, and after a fresh examination by the Italo-Greek Rodota and two Maronites who chanced to be in Rome (the Archbishop of Cyprus, Gabriel Eva, and the

¹ On July 10, 1748, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 267; WALZ, 369.

² *Benedetto XIV. e le chiese Orientali in Roma e l'Oriente*, VII. (1914), 263-274; BALAN, *La Chiesa e gli Slavi*, 216 seqq.

³ On January 21, 1741, *Ius pontif.*, VII., 152 seq.; LEMMENS, 185.

⁴ LEMMENS, 185 seq.

⁵ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV, 468.

Abbot-General of the monks of St. Antony of Lebanon), the decisions of the Synod of Lebanon were approved at a final session of the Congregation of Cardinals held in the Pope's presence on August 7th, 1741. They were subsequently ratified by Benedict XIV., after he had taken cognizance of each one of them, in a Constitution of September 1st, 1741.¹ A further Brief contained particulars regarding the diocesan partition and the dues which had formerly been paid to the patriarchs on the occasion of the delivery of the consecrated oils; it was now laid down that the dues were to be paid at another time, namely the Sunday following the Assumption.² The Papal delegate to the Synod was attacked in various writings ascribed to the Maronite and Melchite patriarchs, but the controversy was brought to an end by a Brief issued by Benedict on February 16th, 1742.³

The bearer of these decisions was still on his way home when the Patriarch Joseph El-Khazen died, on May 13th, 1742. On May 15th the prelates who had been present at his burial elected as his successor the Archbishop of Damascus, Simon Avad, and then, when he had declined the office, the Archbishop of Arka, Elias Mochasseb. At this election no attention had been paid to the absence of the Archbishops of Cyprus and Tyre, who, annoyed at this neglect, promptly consecrated two new Bishops, and with their co-operation proceeded to elect a new Patriarch, their choice falling on the Archbishop of Cyprus, Tobias El-Khazen. Both of the Archbishops thus honoured appealed to Rome, and Benedict ruled that both had been invalidly elected⁴ and exerting his absolute power as Pope and in accordance with the law of the Western Church he declared the Archbishop Simon Avad of Damascus to be Patriarch.⁵ The Pope did not take this step without

¹ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 44 *seq.*; DIB in the *Dict. de théol. cath.*, X., 83.

² DIB, *ibid.*, 83, 123; *Ius pontif.*, III., 48; *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 66 *seq.*

³ *Acta*, I., 103 *seq.*

⁴ On March 13, 1743, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 146.

⁵ On March 16, 1743, *ibid.*, 147.

misgiving ; no notice of it was conveyed to the delegates in Rome of the two pretenders to the patriarchal throne and the execution of the Papal decisions, so far as the Lebanon was concerned, was entrusted to the Custodian of the Holy Land, the Franciscan Giacomo da Lucca.¹ However, the Maronites' loyalty to Rome withstood the test, and on October 11th, 1743, Simon Avad was enthroned, the secretary to the Papal envoy, Desiderio da Casabasciana, taking back with him to Rome a large number of declarations of obedience.²

• Very soon afterwards Desiderio had again to intervene as the Pope's confidential representative, this time in Syria, where five Bishops had disputed the jurisdiction of the Patriarch and had nominated an administrator of the Patriarchal power. On both parties appealing to Rome, it fell to Desiderio to restore harmony in the name of the Pope.³ In a consistory of July 13th, 1744, the Pope expressed his pleasure that this had been successfully accomplished.⁴

It was in the reign of Simon Avad that there first attracted attention towards herself a visionary who subsequently was a cause of disturbance in the Lebanon until nearly the end of the century. Anna Agemi,⁵ surnamed Hendiye, thought that she had been appointed by Heaven to call into being a Congregation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and she did in fact succeed in founding at Bekorki a convent in accordance with her wishes. Among the simple folk of the Lebanon the supposed visionary soon gained adherents ; even the Jesuits, one of whom was her spiritual director, supported her at first. The Patriarch confirmed the rules of her convent in 1750, and

¹ To Da Lucca on March 16, 1743, *ibid.*, 150 ; to the Maronites on the same day, *ibid.*, 152.

² Cf. DIB, *loc. cit.*, 85-8. Sending of the pallium to the Patriarch : Brief of August 4, 1744, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 207 ; praise of the Maronites : Brief of August 11, 1744, *ibid.*, 208 (with appendix of documents, 208-214).

³ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁴ *Acta*, I., 224-231.

⁵ We keep this form of the name which is in general use ; Dib writes Hendiye or Hendiyah (of the family of 'Ajeymi).

a priest instructed by Simon Avad to examine her spoke highly of her. Gradually, however, the Jesuits deserted her, but as the Patriarch was still faithful to her the opposition between the two parties became so acute that Avad forbade the Maronites to have any dealings with the Jesuits.

The affair was now ripe for the intervention of the Pope, to whom the Jesuits had appealed. In a Brief of January 4th, 1752, he reprimanded the Patriarch for taking such serious steps without consulting the Holy See, suppressed the new Congregation of the Sacred Heart, and ordered Agemi to be moved to another convent.¹ On December 9th he instructed Desiderio da Casabasciana to go to the Lebanon to undertake a further investigation of the matter. This lasted from May 18th to July 17th, 1753, and its issue was so favourable to Agemi that Desiderio thought it better not to carry out the instructions issued by the Holy See in her respect.² In a letter of March 12th, 1754, Benedict urged the Patriarch to provide the alleged visionary with suitable spiritual guides, while she herself was to seek a place of quiet and retirement where there would be no opportunity for indulging in vainglory or for giving rise to fresh disputes. At the same time he requested Desiderio to supply him with a detailed report consisting only of facts and of evidence which could be vouched for by Desiderio himself. Isidore Mancini, of the Order of Minims, was instructed to examine the writings on Agemi. Once again Desiderio declared himself in her favour, the other consultors in her disfavour. In January 1755 the matter came before a Congregation of Cardinals, and on the 25th the Propaganda wrote to the Patriarch that Agemi's ecstasies and visions were clearly self-delusions and that her spiritual advisers could not be spared the reproach of credulity.

¹ *DIB, loc. cit.*, 88 seq. The Brief is found in *Ius pontif.*, III., 482, with the date " 4. Ian. 1752 anno Pontif. 12 " and in the *Acta Bened. XII.* with the date " 4. Ian. 1748 anno Pontif. 8 " ; in both cases the source given is the Bullarium of the Propaganda, App. II., 160.

² *DIB, loc. cit.*, 89 seq.

Accordingly the Pope appointed a new adviser for her in the person of the Franciscan Observant, Carlo Innocenzo da Cuneo. Agemi made a pretence of accepting her new director but failed to break off relations with her old one, and Innocenzo soon left Bekorki.¹

Rome's verdict on Agemi's visions did not put an end to her cause. Propaganda had expressed no opinion on her person and still less on her Congregation; the former order for its dissolution seems to have been forgotten. This, added to the fact that the verdict on her visions was probably little known by the people, explains how it was that after Benedict XIV.'s death her repute increased to an incredible extent, especially as the Patriarch Tobias El-Khazen, who succeeded Simon Avad (d. 1756), though not particularly attracted by Agemi, did not actually oppose her.²

Benedict XIV. also espoused the cause of the Maronites by defending the holy monk Maro, from whom the Maronites derived their name, against the Greek Melchite Patriarch Cyril, who had had the pictures of Maro torn up, on the ground that he was not a Saint but a heretic. Benedict replied in a Constitution of 1753 that Cyril had mistaken St. Maro, to whom Theodoretus and John Chrysostom bore testimony, for a later Maro.³

To the Greek Melchite Patriarch of Antioch, Cyril VI. Tanas, Benedict XIV. had addressed a Constitution ten years before, for the purpose of replying to several misgivings which had been expressed in Rome under Benedict XIII. and Clement XII. They referred to the rites and usages of the Greek Church, particularly the celebration of Mass and the law of fasting, to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch as it affected his Maronite colleague and the Latin missionaries, and finally

¹ *Ibid.*, 90.

² *Ibid.*, 90 *seq.* For Tobias' election and its confirmation, see *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 273-8.

³ Constitution of September 28, 1753, *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 70 *seq.* An indulgence for the feast of St. Maro, of August 12, 1744, in *Bened. XIV. Acta*, I., 231.

to the religious Orders. It was decided that the Eastern rite was to be observed in all its details and was not to be altered by the Patriarchs.¹ Not only the Patriarch but the missionaries in the East were commanded to respect the foreign rites; the Easterns were to return to the unity of the Faith, but not to become Latins.² Nevertheless, in spite of the Papal reprimand administered to Cyril, Rome soon found itself obliged to some extent to come round to his way of thinking; the Pope was forced to grant a dispensation from several of the ordinances contained in his Constitution³ and to supplement it with an instruction.⁴ Cyril Tanas received the pallium with a Brief of February 29th, 1744.⁵ He died in the Lebanon, where he had taken refuge from the persecution of the schismatic Patriarch. The firman by which Cyril had been allowed the free exercise of his office had been revoked at the instigation of his rival and the Catholics had been abandoned completely to the latter's will. To set the matter to rights the Pope invoked the mediation of Louis XV.⁶

It was in the reign of Benedict XIV. that there came into existence the patriarchate of the Armenians of Cilicia and Lesser Armenia, in union with Rome. The Archbishop of Aleppo, Abraham Ardzivian, who had been elected Patriarch of Cis in Cilicia by three Bishops of his nation, came to Rome in person to declare his obedience to the Pope. Benedict XIV. conferred the pallium on him on November 26th, 1742. As

¹ Constitution of December 24, 1743, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 166 *seqq.* In accordance with this the Armenians were forbidden on December 29, 1755, to celebrate three Masses on Christmas Day, as is done in the West. *Ibid.*, XIX., 187 *seq.*

² The Holy See desires "ut diversae eorum [the Easterns] nationes conserventur, non destruantur omnesque . . . catholici sint, non ut omnes Latini fiant". Brief of July 26, 1755, *ibid.*, 151-166.

³ Briefs of March 7 and 10, 1746, *Acta*, I., 329, 331; *Ius pontif.*, VII., 188.

⁴ Confirmed on March 18, 1746, *Acta*, 336-344.

⁵ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 198 *seqq.*

⁶ On January 23, 1749, *Acta*, II., 34.

a pledge of his loyalty to Rome he took the surname of Petrus. Hard pressed by the heretics, he was forced to follow the example of his predecessors and take up his residence in the Lebanon.¹ His two successors, Petrus II. Jacob and Petrus III. Michael, also received the pallium, in 1750 and 1754.² Abraham Ardzivian may also perhaps be regarded as the real founder of the Armenian Congregation of the Monks of St. Anthony, which was promoted by Attar-Muradian³ and Jacob Hovsepian.

The history of the Uniat Armenians was also in the pontificate of Benedict XIV. a series of tragedies. The Porte recognized only the schismatic Patriarch as the civil head of the Armenians; which explains how it was that their own schismatic countrymen, rather than the Turks, were the oppressors of the Catholics; the only refuge left to them was the Pope, who on their behalf appealed in turn to Louis XV. and Augustus of Poland. In 1745 Benedict sent to Constantinople, as Visitor, the Archbishop Francesco

¹ RATTINGER in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, III. (1872), 36. LÜBECK, *Die katholische Orientmission*, Köln, 1917, 130; S. WEBER in the *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, I., Freiburg, 1930, 668; L. PETIT in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, I., 1911; GAMS, *Series*, 455; TOURNEBIZE in *Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclés.*, I., 183 *seq.*; Benedict XIV. to Tencin on November 30, 1742, HEECKEREN, I., 14. In the Brief of November 24, 1742 (*Ius pontif.*, III., 83), the name of the Patriarch appears as Petrus Abraham Vartabiet. — As the Patriarch was returning by way of Marseilles the Pope commended him to the Bishop there on January 14, 1743. *Acta*, I., 40.

² *Ius pontif.*, VII., 175 *seqq.*, and III., 576 *seq.* Petrus II. was lauded by the Pope as "vir magni meriti, archiepiscopalem Alepinam ecclesiam rexit multa cum laude, pro amplificanda fide catholica Galatae, Angorae et Aleppi plurimum laboravit multasque persecutiones ab haereticis excitas pertulit, cum ter carceribus inclusus et bis in exilium fuerit amandatus". *Ibid.*, VII., 177.

³ "le même sans doute qui est appelé par quelques auteurs Poresiph ou Porisacco." TOURNEBIZE, *loc. cit.*, 184.

Girolamo Bona, who was first to deliver with his own hand a Brief to the French monarch.¹ A second Brief to Louis XV. followed in 1753,² and two years later envoys from Constantinople again requested the mediation of the Pope.³ The intervention of the French king was successful more than once. On October 10th, 1742, he was thanked by the Pope for the restoration of their five churches to the Armenians of Aleppo and Ancyra ; the Pope also noted with pleasure that the peace of which they had been deprived by the bribery of the schismatic Patriarch had been restored to them by the French envoy and that the hostile Patriarch had been induced to keep silent in return for a sum of money. It would, he said, make a good impression on the Porte if the Latin Vicar Bona were to be received with due formality by the French envoy.⁴ But the peace did not last long. In 1751 news came from Aleppo that the Armenians there had had to suffer for their Faith imprisonment, fines, stripes, banishment, and the loss of their churches. On their behalf the Pope appealed to the king of Poland.⁵ He had already raised his voice in Paris for the sake of the Catholic Armenians and their Capuchin missionaries in Georgia in 1743⁶ ; later it was heard that the Capuchin missionary Damian a Leone had successfully appealed for their religious freedom to King Kulican.⁷

To the General Chapter of the Dominicans the Pope addressed an admonition to conduct their Armenian mission at Naxivan with greater zeal,⁸ and in 1758 the Armenians in Constantinople, who had hitherto been subject to the Latins, were given a Vicar Apostolic of their own, in the person of

¹ Brief of August 16, 1745, *Ius pontif.*, III., 232.

² On April 25, *Acta*, II., 134.

³ Brief of August 16, 1755, *ibid.*, 235.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 357.

⁵ On July 17, 1751, *ibid.*, 85.

⁶ To Tencin, August 23, 1743, I., 81 ; *cf.* 15.

⁷ Brief of September 15, 1753, *Acta*, II., 145. *Cf. Bull. Capuc.*, VII., 247 *seq.*

⁸ On April 10, 1748, *Acta*, I., 511.

Athanasius Merassian, who was subject to the Latin Apostolic legate.¹

Influenced by the Capuchins, the Georgian Catholicos Jesse went over to the Catholics in 1754 but was deposed by a Synod in 1755 and together with the Capuchins was banished.² According to a report made to the Propaganda in 1746, the missionaries in Georgia reckoned the number of Catholics in that country at 10,000.³

The Copts of Egypt also acquired ecclesiastical independence. Hitherto the Popes had tried to win over the Coptic-schismatic Patriarch to union with Rome, but, taught by long experience of the hopelessness of these endeavours, Benedict gave the Copts who were true to Rome a Vicar Apostolic of their own,⁴ in the person of the Bishop of Jerusalem, the only Bishop of his nation who did not cleave to its errors.

Also Elias Denha, the Patriarch of the so-called "Chaldæans", namely the converted Nestorians of Urmia and Cotchanes, wrote in 1751 and on many other occasions to the Pope, asking for union with the Roman Church.⁵ In Mesopotamia, Bagdad, which since 1720 had been the seat of a Carmelite mission and an Apostolic Prefecture, became the residence of a Bishop in 1742⁶; to Mosul, in 1750, came

¹ RATTINGER, *loc. cit.*, 40; LÜBECK, *loc. cit.*; TOURNEBIZE, *loc. cit.*, 339. Instructions for the Archbishop of Carthage, Apostolic Visitor in Constantinople, mentioned in HEECKEREN, I., xcvi.

² SCHMIDLIN, *Missionsgesch.*, 369; LÜBECK, *Georgien und die kathol. Kirche*, Aachen, 1919.

³ *Bull. Capuc.*, VII., 237; R. JANIN in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, VI., 1284. The rise of the Capuchin mission in Georgia began under Innocent XI., when king George, the Patriarch Entimius, and the Prince Barzim became Catholic (*Bull. Capuc.*, VII., 237, 240 *seq.*). Cf. our account, Vol. XXXII. 465.

⁴ On August 4, 1741, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 38. A decision on doubtful points in Coptic ritual, of May 4, 1745, *ibid.*, 292 *seq.* Cf. Brief of June 19, 1750, *ibid.*, XVIII., 165.

⁵ GAMS, *Series*, 456.

⁶ LÜBECK, *Orientmission*, 141.

Italian Dominicans who set up a flourishing mission there ; through them the Uniat Chaldæan Church was placed for the first time on a firm foundation.¹

For the benefit of the Holy Places in Palestine, Benedict XIV. ordered² in 1741 that at least twice yearly, and in 1743 that at least four times a year, the needs of the Holy Land should be recommended from the pulpit to the charity of the faithful. A firman, decreed in August 1757 and put into force in the following December, wrested from the Catholics the place of the Nativity and the basilica at Bethlehem, and the church erected over the tomb of the Virgin. In the Holy Week of 1757 the Greeks had forced their way into the Church of the Sepulchre, where they had broken the candlesticks and slashed the precious tapestries, and had held the Catholics responsible for the damage.³ To set in order the legal conditions of the Franciscans' custody of the Holy Land; the Pope instructed the Minister General of the Holy Land, Raphael a Lucagnano, to draw up statutes, to which he imparted the Papal confirmation.⁴ Roughly 160 Franciscans were to dwell in the Holy Land, of whom not more than two were to come from each province of the Order, and none of them was to stay more than three years in the Holy Places.

In other respects also Benedict took steps on many occasions to set to rights the conditions of the Christians under Turkish rule. After the Albanian National Council of 1703⁵ fresh abuses had crept in, and these were countered by a Papal Constitution.⁶ On the other hand, the seventeen pupils of the Propaganda and the Illyrian college at Loreto, who as secular priests saw to the cure of souls in the diocese of Scutari, received all possible praise.⁷ A difficult question arose in

¹ *Ibid.*, 142 ; WALZ, 371.

² On January 10, 1741, and August 20, 1743, *Ius pontif.*, III., 14, 118.

³ LEMMENS, 72 *seq.* ; *cf.* 69.

⁴ On January 7, 1746, *Acta*, I., 287-301 ; *cf.* 307 *seq.*

⁵ *Cf.* our account, Vol. XXXIII, 368.

⁶ Of February 2, 1744, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 173 *seq.*

⁷ *Acta S. Congr. de Propag. Fide a. 1750, Congr. 16 Feb.

connection with the church property which had come into the hands of Christians after its confiscation by the Turks or after the destruction of churches ; the matter was raised by the Archbishop of Antivari, Lazarus Vladagni and was settled by Benedict with his usual indulgence.¹

The Pope's desire to have the missions conducted uniformly led him in 1747 to give also the islands of the Greek Archipelago a Vicar Apostolic, in the person of the Capuchin Arturo Marturi.² Some Briefs of Benedict XIV. throw light on conditions in that vicariate. On Santorin the Christians were taxed exorbitantly and those unable to pay were faced with the prospect of the rod, prison, and chains. Their cathedral was threatening to collapse, they had no means to rebuild it, nor could permission to do so be obtained. Through its inability to pay its taxes the sole Dominican nunnery on the island was falling into decay. Appealed to for support by the inhabitants of the island, the Pope apportioned them a sum of money from the funds of the Propaganda and recommended the envoy to the island, Luca Barbarigo, to the king of Poland.³ The Reformed Franciscan Anton Bartuska, a Viennese by birth, who had been a missionary on Rhodes and Chios for seventeen years, had built several churches for the Catholics, the most notable one being in Chios, near the town, but both the Bishop of the island and the missionary saw their work threatened by the intrigues of the schismatics. On January 22nd, 1743, and again on January 20th, 1752, and January 22nd, 1753, the Pope turned for help to the Empress Maria Theresa, asking her to obtain permission from the Porte for the Catholics on Chios to celebrate divine service.⁴ On the island of Patmos the Catholics and the Basilians were threatened by pirates. To put a stop

¹ Brief of March 9, 1752, to the Secretary of the Propaganda, Lercari, *Bull. Lux.*, XVIII., 266, and of March 2, 1754, *ibid.*, XIX., 101.

² GAMS, *Series*, 448.

³ On October 16, 1744, *Acta*, I., 251.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., 88, 124.

to this the Pope directed the Archbishop of Chios¹ to excommunicate the pirates, by which means Innocent XI., Benedict XIII. and Clement XII. had in their time come to the assistance of the islanders ; for the benefit of the islands Tinos and Mykoni especially, the Pope, in a letter to the competent Bishop,² renewed the relative Briefs of Innocent XI. and Benedict XIII.

On Tinos, according to a visitation report of 1744, there were eighty-four chapels, a Jesuit church, and in every village a parish church ; on Mykoni, however, there was only one church. The Visitor Guarchi praised all the Jesuit missionaries, with only one exception.³ Two years later a report on Santorin was made by its Bishop. Praise was again accorded to the Jesuit missionaries, both on this island and on Chios and Naxos, also to the Observants of Santorin, where thirty-three Ursulines were working under the direction of the Jesuits.⁴ In 1747 the Bishop of Santorin, Razzolini, visited the islands of Thermia, Zea, Siphanto, Argentiera, Paros, and Antiparos.⁵ In one place on Siro there were, together with 100 schismatic Greeks, 2,000 Catholics with five churches ; the Capuchins preached in the cathedral,⁶ while the Jesuits there were so needy that they were thinking of giving up the mission.⁷

Concerning the Capuchins on the Greek islands there is a report by Romanus of Paris, of the year 1745.⁸ It confirms previous news of the mission. A noteworthy point is that the Capuchins had opened several schools in the archipelago.⁹ In Pera they owned a college where twelve boys were taught Latin, French, Italian, Greek, Armenian, and Turkish, and

¹ On April 8, 1741, *ibid.*, I., 45.

² Of May 27, 1756, *ibid.*, II., 266.

³ *Acta S. Congr. de Propag. Fide, 1744, n. 10.

⁴ **Ibid.*, Congr., February 28, March 29, and September 5, 1746.

⁵ **Ibid.*, Congr., February 27, 1747.

⁶ **Ibid.*, Congr., August 29, 1757.

⁷ **Ibid.*, Congr., November 12, 1753.

⁸ TERZORIO, *Missioni*, IV., 76, 141, 181, 241, 302.

⁹ *Ibid.*

were trained as interpreters.¹ From about the year 1750 onwards the Capuchins began to die out on the Greek islands.²

To the Slavs in Eastern Europe Benedict XIV. repeatedly devoted his attention. Through Propaganda he had empowered the Ruthenian Bishops to promote the union of the Basilians in one Congregation. In executing this commission the Bishops did not show overmuch zeal, fearing that their authority over a single Congregation would not be so great as over isolated convents. A statement made by the Pope³ calmed their fears on this score. In Lithuania and Poland the union in two Congregations had already been effected, and these were confirmed and more precisely regularized by means of statutes.⁴ The Bishops and archimandrites in Poland being chosen from among the monks, the Pope warned them not to attempt to secure these posts by means of intrigues, though he did not want them to renounce any such offices by formal vows.⁵ The authority of the Metropolitans and archimandrites over the monks was more nearly defined by a Constitution.⁶ The college founded by Gregory XIII. for Ruthenians and Russians having ceased for some years to accommodate pupils from Russia, Benedict allowed their places to be filled by Ruthenians.⁷ The Uniat Ruthenian Church was, as ever, the

¹ *Ibid.*, II., 106.

² *Ibid.*, IV., 302 (Andros), 338 (Milos), etc.

³ On November 27, 1742, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 120.

⁴ On May 2, 1744, *ibid.*, 198.

⁵ April 12, 1753, *ibid.*, XIX., 47.

⁶ On May 30, 1756, *ibid.*, 217.

⁷ April 5, 1753, *ibid.*, 63 *seq.* At the urgent request of the Capuchin Felix of Bologna in St. Petersburg, Propaganda tried to better the conditions of Catholics in Russia and for this purpose invoked the mediation of King Augustus III. of Poland. But, as the king predicted on May 11, 1743, no success was possible, although the Empress Elizabeth showed the Western missionaries many signs of friendliness (PIERLING, IV., 400 *seqq.*). The wish of Emperor Francis I. to replace the Capuchins in Moscow by other missionaries the Pope declared himself unable to grant, owing to the difficulty of finding others who could speak German, French, and Italian fluently. Brief of July 5, 1755, *Acta*, I., 234.

victim of plots on the part of the schismatics, which were all the more dangerous inasmuch as the Uniats were not considered as equals by the Latin Catholics. In a letter addressed to the king, the Bishops of Poland, the Bishop of Plock, and the Ruthenian Archbishop, the Pope exhorted them to support the rights of the Uniats to their churches and convents,¹ which were disputed by the schismatics, who thereby earned the favour of the Russian empress. Benedict had already written on this subject to the king and to Cardinal Lipski and to the Archbishop of Gnesen.² In fact he did everything in his power to protect the Union,³ especially by his forbidding the adoption of other rites, even the Latin.⁴ This measure was important, since the Ruthenians of superior birth or breeding inclined towards the Latin rite, as giving them the status of Poles. The Union thus became a religion of the peasants and its powers of resistance against Moscow were crippled.⁵ On the death of the Metropolitan it was the custom of the Ruthenian Bishops to recommend a successor to the king. Benedict ruled⁶ that the king was not to be bound by these proposals. The inhabitants of Borisov earned the praise of the Pope for having returned from schism to the Union and he congratulated the Ruthenian Metropolitan Hrebicki and the coadjutor of the Bishop of Vilna on contributing to this success.⁷ To the Bishop of Oradea Mare he gave a suffragan for the Uniat Greeks of the diocese.⁸

In Italy itself there was quite a number of persons of Greek or Albanian provenance who had fled across the sea from the Turks, and the question arose how they were to observe their Eastern rite in Latin dioceses. Paying due

¹ On April 25, 1750, *Acta*, II., 50-4.

² On September 19, 1744, *ibid.*, I., 233 *seqq.*

³ According to PELESZ (489).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 484, 489.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 482 *seqq.*

⁶ On April 1, 1748, *Acta*, I., 510.

⁷ August 8, 1753, *ibid.*, II., 143-5.

⁸ On August 30, 1757, *ibid.*, I., 559.

attention to decisions taken by former Popes, Benedict XIV. restored order in the situation.¹

A Brief affecting all the Churches of the East was issued by Benedict XIV. on February 24th, 1746.² As the regulations ensuring the election of suitable prelates to bishoprics in Christian countries could hardly apply to Churches in countries ruled by non-Christians, a questionnaire was compiled for the Churches in Albania, Macedonia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Persia, and Armenia, and another one for the islands of the Ægean ; these were to be answered by the Bishops, their primary object being to provide information concerning the state of Christianity in these parts. By means of other questionnaires it was sought to ascertain the suitability of candidates for the episcopate, their claims having to be backed by attested depositions.

A Bull³ of far-reaching importance for all parts of the earth was that by which parishes in missionary lands, even when they were administered by religious, were subject to the Bishops in all that concerned the cure of souls and the administration of the Sacraments.

(3)

In his decrees for the Eastern Churches, Benedict XIV. pursued the same aims on which rests his importance in the Christian missions in general, namely everywhere to remove legal uncertainties, to settle questions of long standing, and to establish principles for the regularization of difficult situations. This legislative activity was least noticeable in the missionary territory of South America, where, in the pontificate of Benedict XIV., there took place events of great consequence.

There was, however, at least one Constitution of Benedict

¹ On May 26, 1742, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 94 seq. Cf. PIETRO POMPILIO RODOTA, *Dell' origine, progresso e stato presente del rito greco in Italia, osservato da' Greci, monaci Basiliani ed Albanesi*, Roma, 1763.

² *Bull. Lux.*, XIX., 264 seqq.

³ Of February 24, 1746, *ibid.*, XVII., 1.

XIV.'s applying to South America which was of universal import: a Brief to the Portuguese Bishops in that country, upholding the human rights of the Indians. The owners of plantations, especially in Brazil, being persuaded that they could not succeed without slave-labour, had made slaves of the Indians and were buying and selling them.¹ Benedict XIV. now instructed the Bishops of South America² to forbid anyone and everyone,³ under pain of excommunication, to take part in the seizure and sale of Indians or to defend such action as permissible. This Brief, like the former one issued by Urban VIII., had been brought about through the representations of the Jesuits, who in South America had long defended

¹ ASTRÁIN, VII., 418, 474, *seq.*, 828; LEMMENS, 279.

² On December 20, 1741, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 58.

³ "Universis et singulis personis tam saecularibus etiam ecclesiasticis cuiuscumque status. . . et dignitatis etiam speciali nota et mentione dignis existentibus, quam cuiusvis Ordinis, Congregationis, Societatis, etiam Iesu, Religionis et Instituti Mendicantium et non Mendicantium ac monachalis Regularibus, etiam quarumcumque militiarum, etiam hospitalis, s. Ioannis Hierosolymitani fratribus militibus." The reason why some classes are here distinguished by the word "etiam" is that many Orders, on account of their privileges, have to be mentioned specially when they fall under the law. Thus, laws for the Orders in general do not automatically apply to the military Orders, nor do laws for the military Orders necessarily apply to the Knights Hospitallers. This is also the case with the Jesuits, as was stated on a certain occasion by Benedict XIV. himself: "in vigore de' medesimi ['privilegi' of the Jesuits] se non sono nominati [in the clauses of the law], non sono compresi" (see below, p. 450). That the Knights Hospitallers and Jesuits are specially mentioned in the above clauses affords no grounds, therefore, for presuming that they taught the permissibility of the slave-trade, still less that they themselves took an active part in it. Nevertheless, among the many calumnies against the Jesuits of the eighteenth century there occurs from time to time the accusation that they traded in slaves. ASTRÁIN, VII., 416. Cf. SCHEPENS in *Recherches de science relig.*, XI., Paris, 1920, 388 *seq.*

the liberty of the Indians.¹ In 1755 King Joseph I. of Portugal also declared the enslavement of Indians to be definitely at an end, though his purpose was only to force the planters to buy negro slaves from Pombal's trading company at high prices.²

Of fundamental importance also was a Brief addressed to the Bishop of São Paulo, Bernardo Rodriguez Nogueira, who shortly after his elevation had reported that there were several religious in his diocese who were living outside their convents with laymen and were devoting themselves to worldly business. Benedict XIV.'s reply³ was that such religious were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop, who could take action against them. Nogueira was the first Bishop of São Paulo; on December 6th, 1746, the Pope had created out of the excessively large diocese of Rio de Janeiro the bishoprics of São Paulo and Marianha and the independent prelatures of Goyaz and Cuyaba.⁴

As regards the rest of South America, there is extant a report on the missions in the Orinoco region, sent by the Audiencia of Santa Fé de Bogotá to the King of Spain on September 1st, 1754. According to this, there were, in thirty-four localities, 15,429 Christian Indians, 9,487 of whom, in sixteen localities, were under the care of the Jesuits; for the remainder, the Augustinians, Dominicans, and Franciscans had made themselves responsible.⁵ The report relates only to the territory of the Audiencia; the remote stretches along the Orinoco had been divided by arrangement among the Capuchins, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits.⁶

Also in the rest of Spanish South America the Jesuit missions in particular were in a flourishing condition in the pontificate

¹ The texts in DUHR, *Jesuitenfabeln*,⁴ 656, 660. Cf. SCHMIDLIN, *Missionsgesch.*, 400.

² SCHMIDLIN, *ibid.*; HERGENRÖTHER, IV., 162.

³ On May 27, 1746, *Bull. Lux.*, XVII., 28.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 93; GAMS, *Series*, 136; STREIT, *Bibl. Miss.*, I., 527-590.

⁵ ASTRÁIN, VII., 477 *seq.*, 833 *seq.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, 466 *seq.*

of Benedict XIV., that is to say just before their final abolition. In 1744, by royal command, the Bishop of Quito had to appoint a Visitor for the missions on the Marañon. He reported ¹ that forty-one communities there, comprising 2,939 catechumens and 9,970 Christians, were administered by eighteen Jesuits. The missionary Adam Widman received especial praise ; the Visitor, a parish priest from Quito, found his little church and everything necessary for divine service in good condition and the children of the parish well instructed. The only regrettable feature was the lack of missionaries ; to judge from the great success of the few that there were, all these peoples, he said, would be won over, if only there were Jesuits enough. The Visitor's representative reported that the Franciscans on the Marañon had five communities with five priests and a lay-brother and 500 Christians. A report of 1762 states that in the Marañon region there were thirty-five Christian communities, with twenty-four missionaries and 14,236 of the faithful.

In 1747 Superunda, the Viceroy of Peru, reported to the Spanish king on the state of the missions among the Moxos. The Dominicans, Augustinians, and Mercedarians were still in charge of the parishes which had been allotted to them in the first years of the Spanish conquest, but they were not devoting themselves to the conversion of the heathen. In their twenty-one settlements among the Indians the Jesuits were maintaining forty-six missionaries, including three lay-brothers ; the number of Indians they had converted amounted to 33,290, many of whom were still catechumens. It was impossible for the Jesuits to furnish more missionaries, as in the towns they had to maintain colleges and attend to the cure of souls among the whites. As most natives of South America were unable to bear the fatigue of missionary work, reinforcements had to be drawn from Europe. Nine Franciscans were caring for 3,000 Indians in three reductions. Information about the Chiquitos and Moxos missions was supplied to the king in 1754 by the Bishop of Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Juan Pablo de

¹ *Ibid.*, 428-432.

Olmedo. "I saw," he wrote,¹ "this young offspring of Christendom so faithful to the obligations of the Faith, so humble in submission to its teachers, and so careful in its habits, that one feels compelled to thank God for it. Among both missionaries and Christians I found nothing which I ought to have corrected as a judge, but only that which I had to admire as a father. In Santa Cruz and in both missions I confirmed 17,000 persons, and 45,000 in the rest of the province." For the seven missions among the Chiquitos the Jesuits had only two missionaries and it was "a miracle of the goodness of God" that these two indefatigable priests were able "to sow the seed of the Faith in the hearts of so many". A similar disproportion between the number of the faithful and the missionaries existed in the twenty-two communities of the Moxos, where the handful of Jesuits had to redouble their efforts to maintain the mission at its former level.

Important work was done in Peru by the Franciscan missionary Francis of St. Joseph, who laid the foundation of the missionary college of Ocopa in 1734. From Ocopa a similar institution for Chile was founded in Chillán in 1756; another for Bolivia had been started at Tarija in 1755.² Already in 1756 the Pehuenches were applying to Chillán for missionaries for their country east of the Andes.³ Tarija supplied the missionaries for the seventeen missions among the Chiriguanos of the Cordilleras; it was not till after 1765 that successes were obtained there by the Franciscan Francis del Pilar.⁴

The Paraguayan missions, especially under Benedict XIV., were attacked in defamatory writings, the object of which was to cause the missionaries to be suspected by the Spanish

¹ *Ibid.*, 369 seq.

² LEMMENS, 295 seqq., 310.

³ *Ibid.*, 311; ROB. LAGOS, O.F.M., *Historia de las Misiones del Colegio de Chillan*, Barcelona, 1908; [AL. CORRADO, O.F.M.], *El Colegio Franciscano de Tarija y sus Misiones*, Quaracchi, 1884; *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, XCV., 307 seqq.

⁴ LEMMENS, 319; SCHMIDLIN, 403.

Government. The adventurers who were arriving in the New World at this period for the purpose of acquiring wealth wanted to exploit the Indians on the plantations without restraint, and for this reason they hated the Jesuits as the protectors of the natives and their freedom. As early as 1715 the Spanish king had been handed a memorial by a French cleric, in which it was stated that the Indians in Paraguay numbered not about 300,000 souls—which was double the actual number—but 300,000 families, from which population the Jesuits drew a yearly revenue of five million pesos. It was also alleged that the Jesuits could put in the field a force of 60,000 armed men and that they were cheating the Spanish monarch of his dues.¹ The Dutch Protestant newspapers eagerly seized on this story, and from 1732 onwards a reprint of the publication was given consideration by Spanish statesmen,² seeing that even in Paraguay the reports by Aldunate and Barua in 1726 and 1730 had recommended the transference of the reductions to the civil authorities.³ Philip V. had the complaints investigated on the spot by Juan Vazquez de Aguero, who in 1736, after studying the question for three years, delivered a report which was favourable to the Jesuits and was approved by two Ministers.⁴ Nevertheless another examination was made by the Council of the Indies; it resulted in the royal decree of December 28th, 1743, which contained

¹ ASTRÁIN, VII., 612 *seq.* For MS. reports on Paraguay in Spain and Portugal, *cf.* ALFRED DEMERSAY in *Archives des missions scientifiques*, 2nd series, II., Paris, 1865, 363, 365 *seq.*, 571. As for the supposed silver-mines owned by the Jesuits Demersay says (365): "On sait aujourd'hui ce qu'il faut penser des richesses extraites du sol par la célèbre Compagnie et des informations positives ont mis à néant ces imputations gratuites." For Paraguay, *cf.* MARIA FASSBINDER, *Der Jesuitenstaat in Paraguay*, Halle, 1926; MOUSSY, *Mém. hist. sur la décadence et la ruine des missions des Jésuites dans le bassin de la Plata*, Paris, 1864.

² ASTRÁIN, VII., 613.

³ *Ibid.*, 545, 564 *seq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 613 *seqq.*

a complete vindication of the missionaries to Paraguay.¹ At the end of it the king expressed his joy that the false information and calumnies of Aldunate and Barua had been shown to be unfounded and his hope that the missionaries would continue to show the same zeal as before. Shortly before his death the Bishop of Asunción, José de Palos, also spoke in favour of the Jesuits in a report to the king: whatever was said against them was due to sheer spite; there were men who wanted to be the masters of the Indians in a greedy desire to turn their work and services to profit; he considered it to be the indisputable truth that without the Jesuits the province would be given over to ignorance and vice.² The Bishop of Buenos Aires, who travelled through the reductions in 1740, spoke in 1743 with real enthusiasm of the conditions which he had observed with his own eyes.³ From 1740 onwards the Jesuits had been trying to extend their work to Patagonia.⁴

But Philip V.'s decree of 1743, approving of the missionaries in Paraguay, failed to put an end to the calumnies against them. On the contrary, the accusations reached their highest pitch in 1756 when there appeared a publication bearing the title, *History of King Nicholas I., King of Paraguay and Emperor of the Mamelukes*. Although it was a pure invention that the Jesuits had set up a kingdom in Paraguay, the story found credence all over Europe.⁵

In spite of every calumny, however, the Spanish kings had hitherto shown themselves favourable to the mission. But on January 18th, 1750, King Ferdinand VI. agreed to a treaty with Portugal which was the heaviest blow suffered hitherto by the reductions in Paraguay. To put an end to the everlasting frontier-disputes between Spain and Portugal, the two

¹ *Ibid.*, 616-618.

² *Ibid.*, 619.

³ *Ibid.*, 620-2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 623-5.

⁵ DUHR, *Jesuitenfabeln*⁴, 234 *seqq.* A Franciscan from Paraguay was showing round in Rome a coin with the head of King Anthony (*sic*) of Paraguay. Benedict XIV. to Tencin, November 7, 1755, II., 452 *seqq.*

Powers agreed on a line running from the mouth of La Plata to the Orinoco and at the same time exchanged certain territories.¹ One of these was a large tract of land between the rivers Uruguay and Ibicuy in what is now the Brazilian state of Rio Grande do Sul ; not only was this ceded by Spain to Portugal but the seven Indian reductions it contained were to be removed to the other side of the Uruguay. Where exactly they had to go, the Indians were not told ; they simply had to desert their homes, with the estates and public buildings, and find another home on the other side of the river, somewhere in remote, uncultivated country, for the land immediately adjoining the river was already in other hands. As compensation for the property they were leaving, worth millions of pesos, and for the enormous cost of emigration, the Indians were to be paid 28,000 pesos, which did not amount to even one peso per head, seeing that there were 29,191 Indians in the seven reductions. For the exchange of territories lying more to the north it was arranged that the Indians should be allowed to remain or emigrate as they wished, but no such privilege was granted to the seven southerly reductions,² nor was there any mention of it afterwards.

The Jesuits now found themselves in the gravest predicament. They had already been accused by the Jansenists of a want of obedience, and now they were again faced with an order the execution of which would involve them in the most serious difficulties. In addition, the rumour was being spread

¹ DUHR, *loc. cit.*, 217 *seqq.* ; ASTRÁIN, VII., 536-689. Cf. DUHR in the *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.*, XXII. (1898), 689-708 ; HAFKEMEYER, *ibid.*, XXXII. (1908), 673-690.

² Text of Art. 13-16 of the treaty in ASTRÁIN, VII., 638-640. Cf. FASSBINDER, 136 *seqq.* Popular opinion in Lisbon was against the treaty, and it was hoped that it would not be carried out. Even Pombal thought it harmful. Thus, the Uditore *Ratta to Valenti, Lisbon, December 29, 1750, Nunziat. di Portog., 110A, Papal Secret Archives. Cf. *Ratta to Valenti, February 9, 1751, *ibid.* For Pombal's preliminary attitude of opposition, see *Instruction for the Spanish ambassador in Lisbon, March 30, 1753, Archives of Simancas, Estado 7239, 7378.

in France, England, Holland, Portugal, and Spain that they possessed such vast treasures in the seven reductions that they could only be made to surrender them by force of arms ; the king would do well, therefore, to include a threat against them in the treaty itself. Ferdinand VI., far from following this advice, as good as vouched for the willing obedience of the missionaries with his royal word. As if to heighten their distress to the utmost, the Superiors of their Order now seemed to turn against them : the General Retz and, on his death in 1750, his successor Visconti intimated that they too had to bind the missionaries to ready obedience ; it was Visconti's wish that the emigration should be completed before the arrival of the commission for the execution of the treaty of partition.¹

The missionaries took counsel among themselves but decided by sixty-eight votes to two that the emigration was impossible ; nevertheless representations in Madrid had no effect.² Accordingly a search was made for localities which might be suitable for a new settlement, but only a few tolerable spots were found. Their situation worsened when in 1752 the commission appointed to arrange the details of the frontier between the Spanish and Portuguese territories arrived in Buenos Aires, for they were headed by the Marqués de Valdelirios, who was firmly convinced that the resistance of the natives was due solely to the influence of the missionaries. To add to this misfortune, Luis Altamirano, who had been attached by the General of the Order to the commission as the highest authority over the Jesuits, was also of this opinion and he bound his subjects under the most serious obligation

¹ Visconti's letter, of July 21, 1751, in ASTRÁIN, VII., 644 *seq.* A letter from the Provincial of Paraguay, of August 2, 1753, to the royal confessor in Madrid, Rábago, in MIGUÉLEZ, 454 *seqq.* ; a letter from Altamirano, of July 22, 1753, to the same, *ibid.*, 461 *seqq.*

² ASTRÁIN, VII., 648-651 ; the Jesuit Province of Peru to the king, dated from Córdoba del Tucumán, March 12, 1751, Archives of Simancas, Estado 7377.

to perform orders which were scarcely possible of execution.¹

In June 1752 a beginning was made with the emigration² but it was soon seen that it was not possible to complete it. The inhabitants of several Indian villages started out on their journey but soon retraced their steps and in their indignation at the unjust demands that had been made of them rounded on the missionaries. On the natives of Santa Tecla declaring that they would allow the passage of the Spanish commissioners but not that of the Portuguese, the commission had recourse to force, and in an ensuing skirmish 1,311 Indians and Spaniards lost their lives. The seven reductions were taken by force, the Indians fled into the forests, and the few that stayed behind were compelled to emigrate. Finally, of the 30,702 Indians enumerated in the census of 1756, 14,284 were removed to the other side of the Uruguay.³

The events in Paraguay naturally supplied the enemies of the Jesuits with ample material with which to hasten the destruction of the hated Order. Being unable to put the plan of partition into execution, the commissioners of both Governments put all the blame for their failure on the missionaries. They complained, for instance, that on their halting at Santa Tecla they were opposed by an army of 8,000 men led by the Jesuits,⁴ and such reports as these were readily believed in Europe. In the Courts of Madrid and Lisbon the opinion was obstinately held that it was entirely the fault of the Jesuits that the Indians were unwilling to vacate their old settlements. Richard Wall, who had become the Spanish Minister in 1754, on the death of Carvajal, wrote to the Marqués de Valdelirios that the opposition to the Government was inspired solely by the Jesuits. Valdelirios was to act with firmness, especially against the missionaries, he was not to listen to their objections, and he was not to accept any proposal but that of

¹ ASTRÁIN, VII., 654 *seqq.* Altamirano's orders *ibid.*, 526 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, 661.

³ *Ibid.*, 685.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 667.

absolute obedience. He was not to believe in their innocence, even though they might defend themselves by taking the most sacred oaths, supported by apparently irrefutable arguments. He was to reply to everything that the king said the contrary and that the sovereign's word was the strongest proof that was recognized by law.¹

Better times came for the missionaries when a new general of the royal troops in Paraguay was appointed in the person of Pedro Ceballos. In his instructions² also the guilt of the missionaries was maintained, and even though everything might be settled peaceably he was to cite eleven Jesuits by name and to send them back to Europe, unless he could convince himself of their innocence by secret inquiry. Ceballos, an honourable, upright character, was so convinced. On May 25th, 1757, he wrote to Wall that no necessity had arisen to cite even one of the eleven missionaries and that they should refrain from the use of force and leave the emigration of the Indians to the peaceful influence of the missionaries. As Blasco Gascón, the secretary to the Marqués Valdelirios, wrote to Wall on July 6th, 1757, the new general frequently stated in his presence that he did not believe in the guilt of the Jesuits.³ To make the matter clear, Ceballos had a judicial inquiry opened in due form in 1759, at which over seventy Indians and various Spanish officials gave evidence under oath. The upshot of this inquiry was that the revolt was to be attributed to the Indians alone, and that the Jesuits had been in no way implicated.⁴

Meanwhile even the instigator of the treaty of partition, the governor of Rio de Janeiro, Gomez Freire de Andrade, had lost his desire to pursue the matter, probably because he had convinced himself that the ardently desired gold-mines were not to be discovered in Paraguay. On the death of

¹ Wall on October 7 and December 7, 1755, *ibid.*, 680 *seq.*

² Of January 31, 1756, *ibid.*, 681 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 686.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 687. Three reports from Ceballos, November 8 and 30, 1759, and November 30, 1765, *ibid.*, 835-9.

Ferdinand VI. of Spain in 1759 his brother and successor Carlos III. brought about the annulment of the treaty, and the Indians were allowed to return to their reductions.

Almost at the same time as in Paraguay the first troubles began in the missions in Maranhão. Until about the middle of the century the work of converting the Indians had made really gratifying progress. As late as 1752 the Jesuits Tedaldi and Machado had been appointed to missionary work among the Gamellas and Acoroas in the region watered by the Mearim,¹ and in the same year their fellow-religious Santos had founded the Indian village of St. Xavier on the Solimões, to which, by December 8th, he had brought eighty Indians from the wilderness.² It was about this time, too, that the mission procurator Fonseca, full of hope, asked the General of the Order for ten more missionaries from Germany and Italy.³

But hopes soon sank when Pombal's younger brother, Francisco Xavier Mendonca de Furtado, was made governor of the colony.⁴ As early as November 20th, 1752, the Rector of Pará, Alexius Antonius, reported to the General of the Order⁵ that the college and seminary were flourishing but that the new governor was putting the patience of the missionaries to a severe test by the difficulties he was creating among the slaves, Indians, and missions. A year later the rector insisted that he was doing all he could to preserve the peace; the missionaries were making friends of the Portuguese soldiers

¹ *Benedict da Fonseca to the General of the Order, Visconti, Lisbon, February 8, 1752, in Jesuit possession (also the Jesuit MSS. cited below).

² *Emanuel dos Santos to Visconti, Pará, October 20, 1753, *ibid.*

³ *Fonseca, *loc. cit.*

⁴ The nomination followed in 1750 (SCHÄFER, V., 242, n. 2). ROBERT SOUTHEY (*History of Brazil*, III., London, 1810, 507 *seq.*) describes Mendonca as a despot who upset the missionaries in various ways and at the same time sent to the Court frivolous complaints about the condition of the missions. HANDELMANN, *Gesch. Brasiliens*, 277; MURR, 18, n. 1.

⁵ *MS. in Jesuit possession.

and were supplying them with meat, flour, and medicaments, with the result that even their enemies had to acknowledge their kindness, but the question of the missions and the Indians was still a burning one.¹

In fact Mendonca was not only trying to deprive the missionaries of the temporal administration of the Indian villages² but was making the further spread of Christianity practically impossible. His officials were forcing catechumens and newly made converts to give their services as rowers without payment, the result being that many of them left the reductions embittered and returned to their forests.³ With the foundation of the Maranhão and Grão Pará trading company on June 6th, 1755, there began a veritable life-and-death struggle. The so-called "trading" of the Jesuits, who sold the surplus produce of their estates for the benefit of the missions, was regarded by the company as a threat to their monopolies.

To get rid of these obnoxious competitors it was now decided to have the missionaries expelled one after the other. "Were it not for the fear of arousing the anger of the king against the whole Order," wrote the missionary Francis da Veiga on July 1st, 1755, to the General of his Order, "we should do best by giving up the mission altogether and placing ourselves at the disposal of the Bishop."⁴ Francis da Toledo, who in view of the ever worsening situation had been appointed Visitor to the mission by the General of the Order, Visconti, reported to him on August 18th, 1755, that he had received from the Bishop a royal command of March 3rd to send back to Portugal the three missionaries Theodore da Cruz, Anthony Joseph, and Rochus Hundertpfund. The reason given for the command was that it was demanded by the service of God and the welfare of the Order; but after inquiries

¹ *Pará, 1753.

² *Vice-Provincial Emanuel Ferreira to Visconti, Pará, October 27, 1753.

³ *The Rector of Pará, Ignatius Xaverius, to Visconti, October 2, 1754; *Francis da Veiga to Visconti, July 1, 1755.

⁴ **Ibid.*

had been made it was found that the three men were not to blame for anything. To forestall complaints against him, he had had Baretta, a professor of theology who had let fall a sarcastic remark, transferred on his own authority to the village of Tremenbeen. But under Pombal's despotic rule they would have to be prepared for a wholesale expulsion.¹

This fear was proved to be well-founded. The parishes were taken away from the Jesuits and given either to secular priests or to other religious.² In the following year two more missionaries were sent back to Europe ; one was charged with having objected to the admission of Indians into the Order, the other with having set limits to the sale of flour, so as to be able to supply the troops with the prescribed quantity.³ Toledo bore the best possible testimony to the character of the two priests, and to that of the province in general. Were it not that the welfare of the Indians compelled the missionaries to protest against the oppression, they would bear everything in silence ; the governor, however, was a despot who accused the Jesuits to the king of disobedience, and he would not want for false witnesses. The General of the Order would do well to inform the king of the true state of affairs.⁴

On February 5th, 1757, the governor called a meeting of the missionaries and made known to them a royal decree of June 7th, 1755,⁵ by which it was henceforth determined by law

¹ According to *Da Veiga (*loc. cit.*) the first two were banished for utterances of no importance, Hundertpfund for having written to the Queen Mother, then deceased, about the conditions in Maranhão. According to *Toledo, the reason for the expulsion was the frankness with which he advocated the payment of the Indians for their services as rowers (to Visconti, August 18, 1755).

² *Toledo to Visconti, Pará, October 29, 1755.

³ *Toledo to the General of the Order, Centurioni, on October 12, 1756, *ibid.*; MURR, 23. The Bishop of Pará, Michael de Bulhões, informed the Visitor *on October 16, 1756, that the two Jesuits were to be taken to Lisbon in accordance with a royal decree.

⁴ *Toledo to Centurioni, October 17, 1756.

⁵ Text in [BIKER] I., 20 *seqq.*

that the temporal administration of the reductions had been taken away from the missionaries. The Jesuits, it was stated in the decree, were unfit to exercise an authority of this nature by reason of their vows, and as for the Capuchins, who were also in charge of reductions on the Marañon, this authority was out of keeping with the humility which was an essential feature of their Order. At a second meeting, on February 10th, the Bishop announced that complete jurisdiction over the religious belonged to him. The Jesuits' attitude to these two communications was described in a letter to the king from the Visitor, Toledo. With regard to the first point, they submitted unconditionally, but asked to be allowed to retain their property pending a contrary decision by the king. As to the second question, he had not directly denied the Bishop's claim, as had been stated, but he had put certain questions to the prelate, the answer to which would decide whether he would be able to allow his subordinates to continue to act as parish priests in the mission.¹

The mission was now in a hopeless state. The Visitor, utterly discouraged, wrote to the General that the work of conversion among the Indians was as good as paralysed. To address written complaints to the king was useless, as the letters were either confiscated or submitted to Pombal for his approval. The Bishop, too, he said, was unfavourably disposed towards the Jesuits.² Toledo's fears were only too well justified, for at the close of the year 1757 he and fourteen companions in distress were conveyed back to Portugal.³

One of the factors in the expulsion was the property administered by the Jesuits, though it was not so valuable as

¹ *MS.

² *Letter dated from Pará, April 1757. As early as *October 20, 1755, Toledo had expressed his fear that the colonial authorities were aiming at the destruction of the Jesuit mission.

³ *Letter of the Governor, September 14, 1757, in Jesuit possession; Nuncio Acciaioli *to Archinto, February 21 and May 2, 1758, Nunziat. di Portog., 198, Papal Secret Archives; MURR, 38.

had been thought. Their possessions, wrote a Jesuit in Maranhão to his General, were certainly large but they were not profitable, as they consisted mostly of worthless estates, which might well be sold and exchanged for smaller ones.¹ When the reduction of Trocano was taken from the Jesuits and, under its new name of Borha Nova, was handed over to a secular priest on January 1st, 1756, the governor, on January 2nd, made careful inquiries about the property belonging to the station but the Visitor could only inform him that it was saddled with a huge debt.²

Connected with the law of June 7th, 1755, by which the Jesuits and Capuchins were deprived of the civil administration of the reductions, was that forbidding the enslavement of the Indians, signed by the king on the previous day.³ The motive of this latter ordinance, however, was scarcely more philanthropic than that of the former. The fact was that the trading company in Maranhão had the privilege of trading in negro slaves, and the liberation of the Indian slaves compelled the planters to buy negroes at high prices from the trading company. The law was not proclaimed by Mendonca until the slave ships from Africa had arrived in South America.⁴

For the Jesuits in Maranhão the emancipation law had an evil consequence. The State, they maintained, having first sold Indians to the plantation-owners and then having forced them to set them free, was in justice bound to restore the purchase price to the planters.⁵ Pombal interpreted this opinion as obstinate opposition to the abolition of slavery, whereas in actual fact the Jesuits in Brazil had always upheld

¹ *De Roche, April 21, 1757.

² *Toledo, on February 23 and October 21, 1756.

³ Text in [BIKER] I., 14 seqq.

⁴ CAEYRO, **De exilio provinciarum transmarinarum Soc. Iesu in Lusitaniam*, libri III., f. 90 seq.; “ *Relazione di Msg. Ratta di quanto ultimamente è accaduto nel America ” (undated [October 4, 1756 ?]), Nunziat. di Portog., 113, Papal Secret Archives.

⁵ MURR, 25.

the human rights of the Indians, incurring much odium thereby.¹

The Jesuit mission to the Araucan Indians in Chile was also in a difficult position. An uprising there in 1723 had ruined everything, but in spite of this there were 112,296 baptisms in the mission in the years 1734-1762.² Both the suffragan Bishop of Concepción, Pedro Felipe de Azua, and the Dean testified to the good work done by the Araucan missionaries.³

No less difficult than in Chile was the missionary work among the Indians in California. As recently as 1734 two Jesuits had been murdered by malcontents and the whole existence of the mission had been threatened; but it quickly recovered from the setback.⁴ A survey made in 1742 enumerates fifteen stations, all of which were founded, not with State funds, but with charitable donations.⁵ In 1793 the viceroy De Revillagigedo estimated the number of Christian Indians in California in the years 1740-1750 at 20,000.⁶ The Spanish government would have liked to increase the number of missionaries but this was prevented by the lack of money.⁷

In Mexico the missionary work of the Franciscans and Jesuits continued to succeed.⁸ Conspicuous among the Jesuits was a German, Franz Hermann Glandorff, from Osterkappeln, near Osnabrück. He went to Mexico in 1719, even before he had completed his theological studies, and after his ordination he devoted himself untiringly for forty years, amid the greatest hardships, to the care of the Indians in the rugged mountains

¹ *John de Maia, Governor of Maranhão, to John V., September 10, 1725; official report of the royal commissary Edward dos Santos in WELD, 81; HERNÁNDEZ, *Organización social*, II., 27 seq.; " *Informatio Benedicti da Fonseca S.J. pro libertate Indorum tuenda ad regem Ioannem V.," of December 22, 1745.

² ASTRÁIN, VII., 711-737.

³ *Ibid.*, 734, 735.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 275.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 283, 812.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 284.

⁷ ENGELHARDT, 232 seq.

⁸ LEMMENS, 239 seqq.

of Tarahumare. In 1745, in view of the fact that they were maintaining in Mexico 120 mission posts in an area larger than Spain itself, the Jesuits proposed to the king that they should hand over twenty-two of these stations to the secular clergy. The plan, however, was not carried out until 1754, owing to the unwillingness of the Indians to part with their spiritual guardians.¹ In Florida only a pitiful relic remained of the Franciscan mission that had formerly flourished there.²

In Central America a personal intervention of the Pope has to be recorded, namely the raising of the bishopric of Guatemala to an archbishopric, with the suffragan bishoprics of Nicaragua, Chiapa, and Comayagua.³ In North America, so far as it was under English supremacy, there was naturally no question of any Catholic missionary activity. In 1755, when Acadia passed from French to English ownership on the conclusion of peace, the Catholics had to quit the country in a body, unaccompanied by their priests.⁴ In French Louisiana the Jesuits were maintaining missions among the Choctaws, Alibamons, and Arkansas, with little success; among the Illinois, however, the prospect was more promising.⁵ The mission to the Iroquois, who were concentrated in settlements similar to reductions in the environs of Quebec and Montreal, was hampered by the ill-will of the Government and the bad example set by the French.⁶ Prominent in their care for the scanty relics of the Huron tribe were De la Richardie and Potier.⁷

(4)

Of the African missions in Benedict XIV.'s time there is little to relate. The Lazarist Arnolph Bossu was appointed

¹ ASTRÁIN, VII., 321 *seqq.*, 815 *seqq.* For Glandorff, see KEMPF, *Die Heiligkeit der Gesellschaft Jesu*, Einsiedeln, 1925, 260, 275.

² SCHMIDLIN, *Missionsgesch.*, 412.

³ Bull. of December 16, 1743, *Ius pontif.*, III., 122 *seqq.*

⁴ ROCHEMONTEIX, II., 66 *seq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 382 *seqq.*, 388.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 55.

Vicar Apostolic for the Christians in Algiers and Tunis,¹ and he in his turn, on account of the vastness of the territory under his command, was to appoint the Capuchin Felix of Affori as Pro-Vicar for Tunis. In 1740² the French possessions on the " Bourbon Islands " (Mascarenhas) were entrusted by the Pope for ten years to Beaumont, the Archbishop of Paris, who was to send Lazarists there. In 1750 the Capuchins were maintaining six permanent residences in their Congo mission, and four in Angola.³ In Portuguese East Africa the Dominicans were still maintaining twelve stations with 2,630 of the faithful in the year 1751. Adults, however, they did not dare to baptize until they were on their death-beds, and the missionaries were generally hampered by their poverty.⁴

(5)

In the missionary activities in Asia Benedict XIV. frequently intervened in person, sometimes very incisively. The Shah of Persia, Tamas Kulikan, he congratulated on his victory over the Turks and was successful in his request that the Capuchins in Tiflis be exempt from taxes.⁵ Kulikan allowed the Christians freedom of conscience. The missions had been tolerated by his predecessor, Shah Nadir (murdered in 1747), whose confidence had been gained by the medical knowledge displayed by a Capuchin, and who had appointed a Jesuit as his first physician in 1746. Shah Nadir had had thoughts of founding a religion himself; he had the Bible of the Christians translated, listened to the disputations between them and the Mohammedans, and often decided in favour of the former. Under Kulikan's successor the Persian mission fell into decay; the last effort to revive it was made in 1755.⁶

¹ On July 11, 1746, *Ius pontif.*, III., 282 seqq.

² On October 6, *ibid.*, 6.

³ *Bull. Capuc.*, VII., 191.

⁴ SCHMIDLIN, *Missionsgesch.*, 374.

⁵ On January 30, 1742, *Bull. Capuc.*, VII., 247.

⁶ TERZORIO, *Missioni*, VI., 170 seqq.

The Capuchin mission in Georgia, on the confines of Europe and Asia, appeared at first to be developing favourably. Between 1750 and 1755 the Catholicos, who had been banished to Russia as a heretic in the latest persecution, came over to the Catholic Church and he was very shortly followed by a hundred Georgians. The conversion of a noble lady in the reign of King Taimuras, however, led to the persecution of the Catholics. The Catholicos was deposed and banished, the Capuchins were driven out of the country, and the churches fell into the hands of the schismatics. The efforts of Propaganda to obtain the mediation of the European Powers met with no success. It was not till 1767 that the mission was reopened in Tiflis and Gori.¹

Among the Armenians of Diarbekir and Mardin there began, under the influence of the Capuchins, a movement for union with Rome. In 1747 the mission was interrupted in a curious manner: an impostor acted the part of Papal nuncio and ordered the Capuchins to take their departure. At the order of Propaganda they returned.²

It was the Capuchins again who did their best to spread the Gospel in Tibet and the lands that bordered it.³ In 1733 the Prefect of the mission, Orazio della Penna, had journeyed to Rome to obtain fresh missionaries. After returning to Patna in 1739 he stayed some time at Bettia in Nepal, where he restored to health the son of the rajah; in consequence, the father, Durup, wrote to Clement XII., asking for more Capuchins for his country. On February 6th, 1740, Della Penna went on to Bhatgaon, also in Nepal, where he was received in very friendly fashion by the rajah Zaije Ranagita Malla Deva, who by a formal decree allowed the Christian

¹ *Ibid.*, VII., 272.

² *Ibid.*, VI., 195 *seqq.*, 201 *seqq.*

³ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIII., 385, 473; ADELHELM JANN, *Die missionarische und literarische Tätigkeit des Apostol. Präfekten von Tibet P. Franz Horatius Olivierius della Penna di Billi 1712-1745*, in the special publication for Gustav Schnürer, Paderborn, 1930, 128-207.

doctrine to be preached and who also asked the Pope for more Capuchin missionaries. Both rajahs were granted this request by Benedict XIV.¹ In 1740 Della Penna was back in Lhasa ; here King Pho-lha-nas, who had been in correspondence with Clement XII., assented by an edict of September 7th, 1741, to the Pope's desire for the official toleration of Christianity. When, however, a Christian refused to offer the requested marks of esteem to the Dalai Lama, the king changed his attitude, and a regular persecution ensued. In 1745 Mass was said for the last time in the chapel of the Assumption in Lhasa ; Della Penna retired with twenty-seven Christians of Nepalese origin to Khatmandu in Nepal, where the mission was continued. About a score of Christian Tibetans were banished. Della Penna died the same year, 1745.² He was the author of a Tibetan-Latin dictionary, and most of what was known about Tibet in his day was based on his reports to Propaganda.

In the realm of Pegu in Farther India the legate for China and Eastern Asia, Mezzabarba, had opened a mission at the instigation of the Holy See.³ This was developing well in the town of Syriam, especially after the appointment of the Barnabite Paolo Nerini as Vicar Apostolic of Ava ; there were in Syriam a boys' school, a girls' school, and a not unimposing church, to the cost of building which an Armenian had contributed.⁴ It seemed, however, as if these successes were being jeopardized by jurisdictional disputes. Syriam, with the whole of Pegu, belonged to the diocese of Meliapur, so that it lay outside the Vicariate Apostolic of Ava, which alone had been

¹ " *Illustri ac potentissimo regi Batgao* " and " *Illustri ac potentissimo regi Bittià* ", both Briefs of May 1, 1742, *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 92. Cf. JANN, 183.

² *Ibid.*, 206. Briefs of September 25, 1746 (dispensation from fasting for the Tibetan Christians), and September 13, 1753 (" *Praefecto Missionum Tibeti* ", authority to confirm), *Bull. Capuc.*, VII., 266 ; STREIT, 433.

³ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV, 70.

⁴ Cf. Brief of December 31, 1753, *Ius pontif.*, VII., 178 ; *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, II., 171. A Brief of the same date and on the same subject, to the king of Portugal : *Acta*, II., 174.

entrusted to Nerini. The Bishop of Meliapur felt himself obliged to exert his episcopal rights but for so doing incurred a reprimand from the Pope, who did not hesitate to take the Barnabite mission under his personal protection.¹

The missionaries in Farther India being of various Orders and nationalities, it was inevitable that differences should arise regarding the boundaries of their respective spheres of activity. The Visitor dispatched by Benedict XIII. in 1727 issued a decree on July 2nd, 1740, by which each Order was allotted its separate mission-field.² The Franciscans, who had been represented in this decree as interlopers, appealed to the Holy See, which at first, on September 29th, 1741, more than confirmed the Visitor's decision, but subsequently, on November 23rd, after receiving further remonstrances, ordered a fresh inquiry, which resulted in the Franciscans being given back their missions. By a Brief of November 26th, 1744, the execution of this decision was entrusted to the Vicar Apostolic of East Tongking, the Augustinian Hilarius Costa.³ There were also disputes between the Augustinians and the Dominicans over certain districts in East and South Tongking. To settle the matter the Dominican missionary Hernandez betook himself to Rome, where he obtained a favourable ruling for his Order.⁴

In Cochin China the preaching of the Christian doctrine was forbidden by royal decree in 1750 and again in 1753. The missionaries suffered much maltreatment and were driven out of the country but many of them managed to return to their missions in secret.⁵ Edmund Bennetat, the coadjutor of

¹ *Ibid.* Writing from Chandernagor on August 15, 1748, Nerini gave the Jesuit missionaries a *commendatory testimonial, saying that they were full of zeal and that they visited the huts of the pariahs. Archives of the Propaganda in Rome, Indie Or. e Cina, Scritt. riferite Congr. 25, n. 56.

² Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV, 194.

³ *Bull. Lux.*, XVI., 255; *Ius pontif.*, III., 192; LEMMENS, 114.

⁴ GISPERT, *Historia de las misiones Dominicanas en el Tunking*, Ávila, 1928, 251 seq.

⁵ LEMMENS, 115.

the Vicar Apostolic, was expelled several times. In reply ¹ to a letter of his written from Pondicherry in 1754, the Pope sought to encourage him by the prospect of a brighter future ; as he had suggested to him once before, ² the persecution of Christianity always bore within itself the pledge of a subsequent revival.

Firstly the Vicars Apostolic in India and then all Vicars Apostolic in general received instructions from Benedict XIV.³ to appoint in their lifetime a coadjutor with the right of succession or a vicar general with far-reaching powers ; this would obviate the confusion which might otherwise be caused by their deaths. It was emphasized by the Pope that the decisions of the Council of Trent concerning the rights of Bishops in relation to religious were valid also for missionary Bishops and Vicars Apostolic.⁴

In Southern Asia serious difficulties for the missions were caused by the rise of the Protestant maritime Powers. Thus in India the English East India Company, though not actively hostile towards the Catholic mission, as were the Dutch, nevertheless protected and thus encouraged the heathen cults.⁵ The Bishops of Cochin being prevented by the persecutions of the Dutch from landing in Ceylon, authority to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation was conferred by the Pope ⁶ on the Oratorians of Goa, who were working in Ceylon under the most difficult conditions. On the Dutch becoming supreme in Indonesia all the missions there were done away with. It was only on Timor and Flores that the Dominicans held out till 1754.⁷ In the Philippines, however, under the Spanish rule, Christianity continued to exist. As late as 1740 the Dominicans founded the large mission of

¹ On September 1, 1755, *Acta*, II., 239.

² On December 4, 1751, *ibid.*, 87 seq.

³ On January 26, 1753, and August 8, 1755, *Ius pontif.*, III., 519, 621 seqq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 217-221.

⁵ HERGENRÖTHER-KIRCH, IV.⁶, 158 seq.

⁶ On February 17, 1745, *Ius pontif.*, III., 135 seq.

⁷ SCHMIDLIN, 397 ; WALZ, 372.

Santa Cruz on the island of Luzon, and in 1750 they baptized the Mohammedan Sultan of Ioló. On the island of Mindanao the Jesuits were active.¹ To the work of the Augustinians in the Philippines the Pope accorded special praise.²

(6)

For some decades before the accession of Benedict XIV. the burning question as to what attitude was to be adopted by the Christians in China towards the national customs connected with the worship of Confucius and family ancestors had been fraught with ever growing confusion. Clement XI.'s Constitution, which was taken as the ruling pronouncement on the matter, had laid it down that only those customs were to be allowed which were of a purely civil, as opposed to a religious, nature. Which forms of the worship were to be considered as purely civil was to be left to the decision of the competent Superiors. The legate Mezzabarba accordingly declared to be permissible the laying out of food, the lighting of candles, and the burning of incense before the tablets of Confucius and ancestors and before the grave of the deceased, also obeisances in honour of ancestors or to the coffin, it being presumed there was no trace of superstition in the performance of these customs.³

As Mezzabarba wrote in 1740,⁴ Suarez, the noted Jesuit in China, would have liked still more concessions. This may refer principally to the non-extension of the "permissions"

¹ SCHMIDLIN, 395 *seqq.*

² On April 25, 1753, *Acta*, II., 135.

³ *Cf.* our account, Vol. XXXIII., 482 *seq.*

⁴ *To the Propaganda, dated from Lodi, October 10, 1740, Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or e Cina 1737-1740, Scritt. rif. Congr. 22, n. 49. The mandarin Chao commented thus on Suarez' dissatisfaction: "Questo è troppo. Che volete di più? Io voglio esser giusto. Queste permissioni bastano, sietene contenti" (*ibid.*). Mezzabarba *speaks (*loc. cit.*) of concessions "in Brevi pontificio ad Imperatorem Sinensem". *Cf.* our account, Vol. XXXIII., 473, n.

to the obeisances before the tablet of Confucius, that is to say to the worship of him such as was prescribed by custom for lettered people.¹

In other respects Mezzabarba's eight permissions were favourable to the Jesuits, and for this reason it was not to be expected that the opposing party would acquiesce in Mezzabarba's ruling and accept in silence that which they had formerly opposed. In the same way as the Jesuits had once resisted Tournon, their adversaries now resisted Mezzabarba. Hence the dissension among the missionaries, which was brought to a head by Clement XII.'s rejection of the Bishop of Peking's attempt to turn the legate's permissions into prescriptions.² Some were of the opinion that the tablets of ancestors and Confucius should be abolished then and there ; as the missionary Arcangelo Miralta wrote,³ that could be

¹ Scant satisfaction with the concessions was shown in a *letter from the Peking Jesuits to their General, of July 17, 1722 : " Certum tamen est, disseminatas permissiones proborum animis Christique fidelibus bonae voluntatis plus perturbationis quam solatii iniicisse alio quidem sensu ac quam innuit Ill^{us}. Ingemuerunt videlicet auditis illis, usque sibi aditum claudi filiisque suis ad literarios honores, ad officia publica ac magistratus gerendos ; usque constringi s. legem ad vilissimae sortis homines, et vel his ipsis despicabilem reddi, cum eius ingressu atque exercitio arceantur, quicumque in republica honorati et ingenui censentur " etc. The legate had brought nothing more " quam permissiones ' aliquot vix usui futuras, quia implicitas conditionibus, quas adimplere suo minime in arbitrio sit positum. Nostra enimvero cura fuit, ad patientiam et longanimitatem denuo hortari atque erigere, ex ore ipsius D. Patriarchae, qui iubeat illos bono animo esse spondeatque, se integre cognita Imperatoris voluntate nunc Romam pergere indeque quam citissime rediturum cum pleniore ipsorum solatio."

² Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV., 475.

³ *Letter to the Secretary of the Propaganda, from Macao, dated December 20, 1736 : From letters sent by Chinese missionaries the Propaganda could see " che veramente dai soli ministri, quando questi vogliono uniformemente, dipende il togliersi affatto le tavolette, progenitori e Confusio ; e il Breve

done if only the missionaries acted in concert; Clement XII.'s banning of the Peking pastoral letters¹ had been of no avail, he maintained; the Holy See must suspend Mezzabarba's permissions and then religion in China would be preserved in all its purity. Miralta did not consider as excessively severe the prohibition of the permissions by Saraceni, Bishop of Lorima.

A different opinion was held by the Franciscan Eugenio da Bassano, of Shan-si. On receiving Saraceni's prohibition he felt himself obliged to inform the Propaganda of his misgivings relative to the tablets and the table with food set before the coffins of the deceased.² Rochus Wohnsiedler, a Franciscan missionary in Shan-si, also described the rites that took place before the tablets of ancestors and the coffin, and added that it was extremely difficult for Christians to take no part in all these things.³ Juan de Villena, another Franciscan, went so far as to say that if the permissions were

di S. S^{ta} che annulla le due pastorali del quondam M^r Pekinense niuna specie ha fatto nelli impegnati con la tolleranza, che se li concede delle permissioni del M^r Mezzabarba, chiamate da cotesto M^r Fochet [Fouquet] 'mali radix'; quali, quando venghino sospese dalla S. Sede, si potrà conservare in Cina la purità della nostra s. religione. E dalle lettere sudette potrà scorgere altresì, se sii rigorosa o no la pastorale di M^r Lorimense" [the banning of the concessions; cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV., 475] (Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1733-36, Scritt. rif. Congr. 21, n. 61). A "Relazione dello stato presente, in cui si trova la missione di Cina" (*ibid.*, n. 62) is to the same effect: "Ritus, decreta, observatio facilis, ubi volunt missionarii. Dicitur, in quibus provinciis vigeat; non viget in provinciis, ubi sunt Patres Soc. Iesu."

¹ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV., 475.

² *On August 20, 1735. "Se recepisse epistolam circularem episcopi Lorimensis cum instructione a s. Congregatione ad istum missa et eiusdem responsum ad instructionem. Proponit dubia circa tabellas et mensas cum cibis et potibus ad feretra defunctorum paratas, quas describit." *Ibid.*, n. 40.

³ *Letter of June 6, 1736: "difficillimum esse, christianos ab omnibus abstinere." *Ibid.*, n. 56.

to be abolished he would return to his province, since without them consciences would be disturbed.¹

In these confused conditions it was inevitable that after Mezzabarba's embassy complaints against the Jesuits should continue. On acceding to the Papal throne Benedict found that he was expected to deal with a mass of these complaints, and he himself had often spoken harshly of the Jesuits.² A Visitor to the missions in distant Shan-si, the Franciscan Francesco Maria da Ferrere, had reported to Rome³ that the Jesuits of Peking had retained the superstitious tablets in spite of the Papal Constitution.⁴ From Bhatgaon in Nepal a Capuchin wrote that if the Jesuits were allowed to do as they pleased Christ would soon be worshipped in Nepal on one altar together with Shakiatula and Zongaba, just as in China this doubtful honour was paid to Him in the company of Confucius, and, as in Malabar, there was bound eventually to be a hotchpotch of paganism and Christianity.⁵ But these are not the depositions of eye-witnesses. More expert knowledge may be attributed to the dismissed Jesuit Fouquet, who said of his former French fellow-religious in Peking that they were still clinging obstinately to the condemned rites.⁶ That Fouquet's testimony was not considered valueless in Rome may be deduced from his promotion to the titular

¹ On August 5, 1734: " *Si dichas permisiones estan quitadas, desde luego me parto de mi mision, y me buelbo a mi santa provincia, porque sin dichas permisiones todo es inquietud de conciencia." *Ibid.*

² *To Tencin, September 1 and 7, 1742, Papal Secret Archives, Miscell. Arm. XV., t. 154 (not in Heeckeren).

³ *On May 8, 1727, Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1727-28, Scritt. rif., n. 13.

⁴ " *Patres Pekinenses de observantia Constitutionis quoad tabulas superstitiosas non curasse." *Ibid.*

⁵ **Ibid.*, 1733-36, Scritt. rif. Congr. 21, n. 10.

⁶ " *Supplicatio ad Papam," c. 1728. He says of the French assistant to the General of the Order, Joseph de Gallifet, that he was " intimo amico e l'appoggio di quei Padri francesi di Pekino, che hanno sostenuto et sostengono alla Cina il più pertinacemente i riti condannati." *Ibid.*, 1727-28, Scritt. 19, n. 38.

see of Eleutheropolis. Similarly, Visdelou, another Jesuit who opposed the rites in question, was created Bishop of Claudianopolis. But Fouquet's depositions were not impartial; on being dismissed from the Society he was embittered against it and became one of its opponents.

Contrary evidence, in favour of the party so keenly attacked, is also extant. The Bishop of Nanking, Manuel de Jesús Maria, wrote in a report on his diocese¹ that all the missionaries there observed the Constitution *Ex illa die* and in a strongly-worded letter he described the principal opponents of the Jesuits, the missionaries Guigues, Perroni, Appiani, and Pedrini, as disturbers of the peace and as the plague of the mission; they ascribed the guilt of individuals to the whole body.²

Pedrini, the chief accuser, addressed to Propaganda a letter of his own³ on the subject of the disobedience of the missionaries in China. It may be presumed that everything that could be said against them on this score is included in this missive. "I take it for granted," begins Pedrini, "that the Jesuits have submitted to Rome written defences of their conduct, purporting to show that they have obeyed the Apostolic decrees on rites. The Sacred Congregation is well aware of the number of letters they presented in the time of

¹ *Of December 31, 1728, *ibid.*, n. 82.

² *Letter of December 28, 1725, *ibid.*, n. 65. For Pedrini's final reconciliation with the Jesuits, *cf.* our account, Vol. XXXIV., 90; also the letter from the procurator of the Lazarists in Rome to Noiret (*Mémoires de la Congr. de la Mission*, VII., 403): "Elle [Propaganda] est bien informée du testament qu'il [Pedrini] a fait dans sa dernière maladie en faveur des Pères Jésuites et que lorsqu'il était moribond, il se leva et prit un bâton pour chasser de chez lui un missionnaire de la Propagande qui était allé pour l'assister." That he chased him out of the room with a stick is not true, but he did tell the missionary Centurioni who was worrying him with money matters to go away and let him die in peace (*ibid.* 436).

³ Of November 25, 1726, *Mémoires de la Congr. de la Mission*, VII., 202.

Clement XI., of the number of petitions for repeal that came from them, of the number of declamations they have distributed throughout the world—is this evidence of their willingness to obey? They have resisted to the last breath in their bodies and they are still struggling although they are half dead. They have moved heaven and earth, they have prevented the success of two Apostolic legations, they have rejected a Bull, they have turned the East and West upside down, they have deputed as ambassadors their Provanas and Gianpriamos, their Barros and Beauvolliers, in their attempts to avoid the duty of obeying these decrees . . . is this how one obeys? I should like to see those defensive writings. No one could answer them better than we who are on the spot; but although I have not seen them I can assure Your Eminence that they are full of lies or at least ambiguities. Here they have never made known to the Christians the Constitution *Ex illa die* on a day when there was a great concourse of the people, as they should have done. If any of them ever said a word about it to an individual Christian it was said under their breath or as it seemed good to them, and that is enough for them to say and swear that they have published the Constitution. Further, nothing has been seen here of any emendation made in any of their pestiferous books. Their catechists—as I have heard several Christians say—are still preaching the same doctrine. . . . Your Eminence must believe me when I say that they will certainly mislead the Congregation with their crafty writings. Unless supported by evidence from us too, they are scarcely to be believed.” Of the witnesses who had appeared in their defence, he asserted, Tomacelli and Chiesa no longer had the same opinion of them, and Roveda knew little about China.

The historian in search of solid facts will hardly be impressed by these arguments of Pedrini's. The first portion of his letter consists of mere declamations and generalities, and as for its particular complaints the publication of the Constitution was in the first place the duty of the Bishops.¹ The arraign-

¹ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIII, 463, 464.

ment of the Jesuits, therefore, could have no point unless they had disobeyed the instructions of the Bishops, and of this we hear nothing.¹ And in any case they could not possibly keep the Constitution from the knowledge of the Christians, seeing that they were not the only missionaries in China. As for the accusation that they failed to emend their books, some light is thrown on this by other expressions of opinion uttered by Pedrini and Mullener.² In Matteo Ricci's book, for instance, those sections ought to be changed, they said, which explained as designations of the true God the names Tien and Shang-ti which occurred in the classical Chinese books.³ But it is not at all clear that this demand was justified. The Congregation had passed no judgment on the theoretical question how the names Tien and Shang-ti in the Chinese classics were to be interpreted; it had only desired that in practice the name Tien-chu only should be used for the true God. Besides, the books could not be amended in a minute; in the meantime, whatever corrections had to be made with reference to the Constitution could be made by oral instruction. And even though it had been attested that several catechists of the Jesuits had been preaching improperly⁴ it need not necessarily be inferred that no action was taken against them.⁵

¹ Cf. below, p. 452.

² In THOMAS, 360 seq.

³ "Jusqu'à présent ils n'ont pas corrigé les livres qui sont presque tous infectés des caractères condamnés Tien et Schangti" (Pedrini, on October 17, 1725, *Mémoires*, VII., 196). "On distribue des livres avec les caractères Tien et Chang-ti" (MULLENER, *ibid.*, 201; THOMAS, 361).

⁴ On October 17, 1725, Pedrini made a report in this sense about a catechist of the family Ho, but on November 25, 1726, he himself wrote that the person in question was no longer in the service of the Jesuits (*Mémoires*, VII., 196, 202). Two others who let themselves be known as *former* catechists of the Jesuits "et mordicus ritus damnatos defendebant" are mentioned in the "*Relatio visitationis missionum provinciae Schansi mandato episcopi Lorimensis", of May 8, 1727, Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1727-28, Scritt. rif. Congr. 19, n. 13.

⁵ THOMAS, 361: "Le bienheureux Sanz, Vic. Apost. de

The Jesuits, therefore, did not consider themselves to be guilty of disobedience. Three years before Benedict XIV.'s accession they assured their General "most emphatically and in all sincerity" of their "constant docility, most respectful submissiveness, and blind obedience" to every ordinance of the Holy See, particularly the ritual decrees of Clement XI. In accordance with their vow they took the greatest care in administering the Sacraments to the newly baptized and in fulfilling the other duties of a missionary, "so far as we are concerned and so far as it is possible in these difficult times and amid the constant dangers arising from persecution."¹

Foukiën, ne pouvait obtenir non plus (en 1733) des Jésuites de sa juridiction qu'ils fissent le serment contre les rites et qu'ils exerçassent le ministère" (Journal de M. Connat [read : Connain] M. E. Op. cit. [*Mémoires de la Congr.*], VII., 360). Actually the Jesuits had all taken the oath and had resumed the cure of souls long before 1733. The truth of the matter, therefore, must have been that when Sanz asked help of the Jesuits for Fukiën they declined to take the oath *again* on entering another vicariate and gave up all claim to the cure of souls *in Fukiën*. For the question "utrum unica praestatio iuramenti coram uno episcopo vel vicario apost. sufficiat pro missionariis ex uno in alterum vicariatum transeuntibus, an coram omni novo vicario apost. debeat renovari", cf. Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, 1741-43, Scritt. rif. Congr. 23, n. 9 (see also n. 32, June 7, 1742); also *Collect. de Propag. Fide*, n. 350, p. 179.

¹ " *Admodum Reverende in Christo Pater! Nos infrascripti Societatis missionarii Sinenses coram Paternitate Vestra admodum Reverenda humillime provoluti, unanimi corde et ore omnique cum asseveratione ac sinceritate profitemur ac declaramus SS. Domino Nostro Sanctaeque Sedi Apostolicae constantissimum obsequium, reverentissimam submissionem et obedientiam caccam in amplectendis et exequendis, quaecumque per eandem S. Sedem decreta et imperata fuerint, iisque speciatim, quae circa ritus Sinenses a SS. D. N. Clemente XI. f. r. edita et constituta fuerunt. Quae quidem omnia integre, exacte et ad amussim iuxta iuramentum alias a nobis praestitum et iteratas saepius contestationes observamus et exequimur in sacramentorum erga neophytos administratione caeterisque missionariorum functionibus atque

This last restricting clause certainly deserves consideration. Even in Christian countries the eradication of ingrained habits requires the continuous exercise of the pastoral duty for several decades. In the country districts of China, however, even in times of peace, there were only travelling missionaries, so that it is easily understandable that when pastoral work was interrupted by persecution it was impossible to remove every irregularity at once. The Lazarist Mullener, Vicar Apostolic of Suchuen, wrote of the mission in Hupei¹ that the Christians were well aware of the Papal Constitution but that they had no clear idea to what it bound them and consequently retained much that was forbidden. But such evidence as this was no proof of the missionaries' disobedience.

In any case accusations levelled against the Jesuits from all quarters characterize the period preceding the suppression of the Society; even in Rome there was a considerable

exercitiis, quantum in nobis est et difficillimis hisce temporibus inter assidua persecutionum pericula fieri potest. Atque in praefato sensu assertaque obedientia cum divino auxilio perstabimus semper. Pekini 14. Maii 1737." Here follow the signatures of 31 Jesuits. Then: "Et ego Philippus Sibin Societatis Iesu Visitator provinciarum Iaponicae et Sinarum testor, omnes supramemoratas subscriptiones esse autographas, eidemque professioni, declarationi, protestationi nostrae cum omnibus articulis, punctis, clausulis in ea contentis sincere coram Domino etiam subscribo. Haec sunt, quae omnes firmiter tenemus, haec docemus, haec christianis nostrae curae commendatis per nos et catecistas nostros, quoad possumus, inculcamos; et si quis ex nostris Patribus contrarium aliquid supradictae Constitutioni Clementis XI. docere praesumeret, quod Deus avertat, eum tanquam non genuinum Societatis nostrae filium mente respuimus, animo aspernamur. Humillime interim et enixe supplicamus adm. Reverendae Paternitati V., ut sinceræ huic protestationi et declarationi nostrae omnem fidem adhibere ne dubitet. . . . Macai 12. Dec. 1737, Philippus Sibin m. p." Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, 1737-1740, Scritt. rif. Congr. 22, n. 5.

¹ On August 2, 1732, *ibid.*, 1720-1732, Scritt. rif. Congr., 20, n. 42.

prejudice against them. To the complaints made on this score by the Peking Jesuit Ignatius Kögler the General of the Society, Franciscus Retz, replied that he was not to take it too much to heart that accusations should be addressed to Rome and that certain measures followed in their trail. The lot of the religious was everywhere the same: after they had done all the work they were treated as useless servants and sometimes even as pests. Kögler must console himself with the example of Christ, who had fared no better.¹

Nevertheless, however much the Jesuits may have thought that adherence to Mezzabarba's "permissions" was not to be construed as disobedience to the Bull of Clement XI., the fact remained that the prescriptions of that Bull were still not being universally observed, in spite of the many Papal decrees. In leading circles in Rome, in consequence, belief in the disobedience of the Chinese Jesuits had taken root so deeply as to be almost ineradicable.² The Pope himself gave pointed expression to this view in a letter to John V. of Portugal, when the latter had proposed as Bishop of Peking the Jesuit

¹ " *Opto non nimis dolenter ferri, si contingat huc adversus nostros querelas scribi, maxime in rebus non magni momenti, ut saepe sunt, et tamquam creditis aut veris remedium adhiberi. Communis haec omnibus nostris conditio est, ut postquam faciunt omnia, tamquam servi inutiles et aliquando etiam ut noxii tractentur. Non sunt servi meliores Domino suo, ac proinde omnia, quae huic acciderunt, ab illis expectari debent. Accedit, quod priusquam illuc adveniat, vix eorum quae scripta sunt, hic memoria habeatur, nisi novis querelis refricetur " (Retz to Kögler, October 29, 1738, in Jesuit possession). — Against isolated cases of disobedience action was taken by the Superiors. Thus, the French Jesuit Du Halde had, despite the prohibition, discussed the Chinese rites in his *Description de la Chine* (Vol. 3, Paris, 1735). The General of the Order did not hesitate to "désavouer, reprouver et aboler" the work. *Anal. iuris pontif.*, II. (1857), 2648.

² " *Opinio de nostrorum Patrum inobedientia, quae aliunde multorum animis adeo hic insedit, evelli vix ac ne vix quidem possit." Retz to Carbone in Lisbon, January 21, 1741, in Jesuit possession (as are also the following letters from Retz).

Polycarp de Souza. He had, he wrote,¹ a sincere esteem and love for the Society of Jesus; he could cite as witnesses the Generals themselves, with whom he had had relations during the long period of forty years when he had been active in Rome. But some of the Fathers, especially those of Portuguese origin, were making it a point of honour and a subject of study to evade the Apostolic decrees and the Bull of Clement XI. against the rites. Taking their stand on ill-founded interpretations they confused the issue on the fine-sounding pretext of converting the unbeliever.

Propaganda also objected to Souza being elected Bishop of Peking,² and a memorial opposing him was presented by Castorano.³ For his part, Benedict XIV. was inclined to give ear to this objection, seeing that Souza had not distinguished himself by his obedience and Clement XI. had been against any Jesuit holding the see of Peking; nevertheless, to please the king of Portugal, he acceded to his desire.⁴

The Papal letter treating of the matter was communicated by Lisbon to the General of the Society, Retz, who in his reply

¹ On December 24, 1740, Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1737-1740, Scritt. rif. Congr., 22, n. 57, reproduced by P. A. KIRSCH in the *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1901, 377 seq.

² *Wednesday session of August 24, 1740, Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, 1744-45, Scritt. rif. Congr., 24, n. 63: The reports on Souza, which had been handed over to the Inquisition, were to be laid before the Pope, "ne de Souza in episcopum Pekinensem eligatur." The see of Peking had been vacant since 1734; already on August 20 and September 2, 1738, the Inquisition had *voiced its opposition to Souza's election. *Ibid.*, n. 57; *cf.* n. 58 seq.

³ *On September 20, 1740, *ibid.*, n. 60: "non convenire, ut Iesuita sit episcopus, ob praxim antiquam Iesuitarum quoad ritus. . . ." Under the same date Castorano addressed a *report to Perroni, who was then the assessor of the Inquisition (*ibid.*, n. 61). Like Pinheiro and Fridelli he was accused of having omitted several ceremonies (the use of saliva) from the baptismal rite (*ibid.*, n. 62).

⁴ *Letter of December 24, 1740, *loc. cit.*

to Portugal¹ wrote that it was but another sign of "how difficult a situation we are in here. At every turn we have to listen to similar complaints against us, and we shall never be rid of the deep-seated prejudice against us until our envious rivals cease their accusations, and of this there is little hope." The king's reply, however, was, he said, a consolation. In this reply John V. had agreed to the Pope's request for his support of Clement XI.'s Constitution, and added that his belief was that the Portuguese missionaries had always been obedient.²

That John V. had put in a word for the Jesuits was apparent from the Pope's reply, in which he tried to rebut the charge of prejudice against the Society of Jesus or any other Order. He was fond of the Dominicans, he wrote,³ but he condemned the attitude of some of them who in France and Flanders rebelled against the Papal Constitutions against Jansenism and Quesnel. To prove the sentiments he had entertained towards the Fathers of the Society of Jesus he could call well-informed witnesses out of their own ranks, who would testify to all the assistance he had given the Society during the forty years he had been working in Rome and the ten years he had been Archbishop of Bologna. But when day after day it came to

¹ *To Carbone on June 11, 1741: "Quam arduo ac difficili loco res nostrae hic sint, potuerit Rev. V. affatim ex scripta illuc epistola ac mecum communicata colligere. Similes de nobis querelae in omni occasione audiendae sunt, nec habemus modum eximendi alte de nostris impressam opinionem, nisi finem de nobis querendi invidi aemuli nostri fecerint, quod tamen sperandum vix est. Interim non modico solatio adiecta copia responsi digna sane conditione scribentis."

² "Se semper curasse et procuraturum observantiam Constitutionis . . . et putasse, missionarios lusitanos obedisse" (letter of February 4, 1741, in KIRCH, *loc. cit.*, 380). This is followed by further reference to Souza and other Jesuits. Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, n. 58; another copy, *ibid.*, 1741-43, Congr., 23, n. 3.

³ "Ex arce Gandulphi" on June 15, 1741, *ibid.*, 1737-1740, Congr., 22, n. 55; KIRCH, *loc. cit.*, 381.

his ears that some of them were unwilling to obey the Constitutions of Clement XI. and XII. on the rites of China and Malabar, and when he saw that there were many among them who, when convinced of the truth of the charge, merely shrugged their shoulders and deplored the obstinacy of their fellow-religious, it cut him to the heart and led him to suspect that this was why these missions had so little success and that it was precisely for this reason that either no conversions were made at all or were made in a discreditable manner. The Apostles had preached the word of God in its purity and simplicity, not wrapped around with the subterfuges of provisos and mental reservations.¹ Against the French Dominicans he had appealed to the king of France; against the Jesuits in China he appealed to the king of Portugal.

To Benedict XIV.'s reference to the primitive Church, John V. retorted² that there was a difference between Apostolic times and later conditions. Other remarks made by the king referred to Mezzabarba's "permissions",³ the proposed condemnation of which had been announced by Benedict XIV. to the Court at Lisbon. John V. pointed out that the Jesuits in China were strongly in favour of their retention and that the decisions made by a legate of Clement XI. invested with full authority ought to be upheld.

The royal plea on behalf of Mezzabarba had been made at the request of the Jesuits. The discussions which had been held on the subject of the legate's concessions in the reign of Clement XII. and which had not been brought to a conclusion had been resumed⁴ under his successor at the beginning of August 1741 and were threatening to result in a verdict unfavourable for the Jesuits. Benedict XIV. seems to have

¹ " non coperta col raggio di occulte intenzioni e di mentali restrizioni " KIRCH, *loc. cit.*, 382.

² Cf. Benedict XIV. to John V. on August 11, 1742, in KIRCH, *loc. cit.*, 384.

³ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIII., 482.

⁴ " *Intellexi etiam sub secreti fide, proximo die lune initium dandum examini permissionum circa ritus Sinenses." Retz to Carbone, August 5, 1741.

held the preconceived opinion that the concessions were legally invalid and that consequently the Chinese missionaries' appeal to them was inadmissible ; had he not held this view he could hardly have accused the Jesuits in China of disobedience, seeing that they would have been covered against Clement XI.'s prescriptions by Mezzabarba's concessions.

Apart from the Pope's attitude towards the question, many other circles in Rome were against the ratification of Mezzabarba's modifications, and many of them were vigorously active in their opposition. For this reason Retz, the General of the Society, had tried to obtain the mediation of John V., though without much hope of success ; there was no other course left open to the Society, he wrote, than to obey the decisions, whatever they might turn out to be, and to trust in Providence.¹ He was appealing to Lisbon, he said on another occasion, because the Jesuits had not a single friend in Rome who had the ear of the Pope and who had the courage

¹ " *Videmur quidem post terminatum feliciter . . . negotium episcopi Pekinensis . . . sperari posse ac debere, quod . . . res illius ecclesiae tranquillius processuræ sint ; id tamen polliceri vix audemus ob multitudinem ac gravitatem oppositionum, quæ etiamnum fiunt contra notas declarationes Constitutionis ' Ex illa die ' factas a Clemente XI. s. m. Unde a viris magnæ auctoritatis ac Societati faventibus insinuatam mihi fuit, opportunum fore, Ser. Lusitani regis hac in re auctoritatem ac patrocinium implorare, ut nempe Maiestas S. res ecclesie Sinensis SS. Pontifici commendet eumque roget, ut afflictam illam missionem protegat, nec permittat, nova obstacula inici propagationi fidei et Sinensium conversioni. Id quod tamen fieri deberet generatim solum, non facta distincta mentione declarationum, multo plus missionariorum Societatis, ne alioquin plus nocumenti quam commodi afferatur ac confirmetur opinio de nostrorum Patrum inobedientia, quæ aliunde multorum animis adeo hic insedit, ut evelli vix ac ne vix quidem possit. . . . A nobis [in Rome] nihil videtur illi [missioni] hic præstari posse auxilii, neque aliud in præsentibus circumstantiis agere poterimus, quam caecæ iis quæ decreta fuerint obedire, quaecumque illa sint, ac cætera divinæ providentiæ commendare." Retz to Carbone, January 21, 1741.

in the time of need to put in a word on their behalf.¹ The General was no doubt intending to prepare his subjects in China for what was to come when he wrote to the Vice-Provincial there, Domingo Pinheiro, that under the reigning Pope the Society was suffering from the prejudice that it was not sincerely and loyally submitting to the decrees against the rites, and that this prejudice was so deeply rooted that it would not be possible to remove it or even to lessen it by means of exculpations but only by deeds and by the exact observance of Papal ordinances. That this would be done he had often pledged his word, both to Benedict's predecessor and to Benedict himself, so that he now exhorted the Vice-Provincial with the utmost urgency to demand obedience, to insist on it, and to impress it on his subordinates. The General concluded by expressing the hope that the Vice-Provincial would take every opportunity of relieving him of his anxieties.²

Meanwhile the discussion of the problem by the Inquisition was continuing. Former missionaries and even four young

¹ " *Maxima qua laboramus [inopia] habendi hic minimum amicum, qui aure, gratia atque autoritate apud SS. gaudeat, quique rerum nostrarum curam aliquam gerere et verbum aliquod in casu necessitatis pro nobis loqui non vereatur." Retz to Carbone, March 10, 1742.

² *Letter of November 8, 1741: " Praejudicium, quo apud hodiernum Pontificem laboramus, de minus sincera ac fidei observantia decretorum in materia rituum, tale ac tantum est, ut nullis excusationibus, sed factis solis et accurata in iis exequendis obedientia imminui aut eximi posse videatur. Cuius cum me tum apud illum, tum apud eiusdem praedecessorem vadem saepius constituerim, nequeo non sollicitissime commendare Rev. V^{ae}, ut illa ab omnibus efficaciter exigat, urgeat et inculcet. Expecto suo tempore a Rev. V. tam circa hoc punctum, quam circa alia supra exposita aliquod sollicitudinis meae levamen." The "supra exposita" were thanks for comforting news, praise for the love shown to the missionaries of other Orders, and the exhortation to practise simplicity, lest the usual accusation of having great wealth be brought against the Jesuits.

Chinese were questioned, not only on Mezzabarba's concessions but also on the worship of Confucius and ancestors in general. On the subject of the concessions the Cardinals and consultors failed to reach an unanimous verdict. The majority gave it as their opinion that they did not clash with Clement XI.'s Constitution, but many of those who made up this majority considered that the concessions had been couched in too general and indefinite terms, so that they paved the way for the actual transgression of Clement XI.'s prescriptions.¹

With the Bull *Ex quo* of July 11th, 1742,² the ritual controversy was finally brought to a conclusion. The document contains first the confirmation of the Inquisition's decree of 1710 and of Clement XI.'s Constitution of 1715,³ which were repeated word for word in the new Bull. After so solemn a Constitution, it went on to say, which, in Clement XI.'s own words, put an end to differences of opinion, those who inscribed on their banner their outstanding devotion to the Holy See ought, in justice and equity, to have submitted humbly and refrained from seeking further means of evasion. But certain disobedient and captious men⁴ thought that they could avoid the exact execution of the Constitution. First they maintained that in its title the Constitution described itself only as a precept (*præceptum*) and concluded from that that it was not a matter of an inviolable "law" but only of an ecclesiastical "order".⁵ They then considered the Constitution to be limited by Mezzabarba's concessions.

With regard to the first plea Benedict XIV. now emphasized that Clement XI.'s decree was concerned with the purity of Christian worship, which was to be kept free of any blemish of superstition. No one therefore might treat the Constitution lightly, as though it contained no decision of the Holy See and

¹ BRUCKER in the *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II., 2387.

² *Ius pontif.*, III., 73-82.

³ Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIII., 455, 460.

⁴ "inobedientes et captiosi homines" (§ 9).

⁵ For the difference between "law" and "order" cf. our account, Vol. XIV., 257.

as though its contents did not refer to religion but was something of no importance or was merely a regulation of ecclesiastical discipline subject to alteration. This conception was rejected as false and Clement XI.'s Constitution was confirmed and reinforced.¹

The Pope then turned to the "permissions". Mezzabarba's decree on the subject was also inserted in full, as was also Clement XII.'s Brief against the Bishop of Peking, who wanted to introduce the permissions as obligatory. Mezzabarba's action was excused on account of the embarrassing situation in which he found himself, but his permissions were declared to be null and void and it was forbidden to make use of them. The vow which had been imposed on the missionaries to China by Clement XI. was now extended. Formerly they had to swear obedience only for their own persons; now they had to promise to urge submission on the Chinese Christians also and not to attempt to avail themselves of Mezzabarba's concessions.²

In the accompanying letter which he sent with his Bull to John V. of Portugal, Benedict XIV. assured the king³ that the greatest care had been taken in its preparation. In the end, however, the Pope's view of the matter had developed into the conviction that Clement XI.'s Constitution was inalterable, that Mezzabarba's permissions tended to invalidate it or to destroy it altogether, and that either the Patriarch had exceeded his authority or that his statements had been amplified or had been viewed in a false light by those who wanted to set aside the Clementine Constitution. God was his witness that he had been actuated only by his zeal for the purity of God's worship. The prospect of death would have filled him with terror if he had left unsettled a matter of such far-reaching importance. The Jesuits were not cited in the Bull as its adversaries; it spoke only of missionaries in general. It was only in those passages where obstructive privileges were restricted or abolished that the Jesuits were

¹ § 9-10, p. 76.

² § 23, p. 81.

³ On August 11, 1742, KIRSCH, *loc. cit.*, 383.

mentioned by name ; this had to be done because in virtue of their privileges the Jesuits were affected by an order only when they were expressly mentioned.¹ The Pope ended his letter by asking the king to extend his protection to the Bull. With this request the king complied in a letter of September 27th, 1742.²

It was only right that the Jesuits should have been treated with consideration in the Bull, inasmuch as they were not expressly mentioned as the wrongdoers in the complaints and accusations made therein, but "disobedient and captious men" were harsh epithets and there was no doubt for whom they were intended.

For his treatment of the Jesuits in the Bull *Ex quo* Benedict XIV. did not escape reproach from certain quarters. Cardinal Tencin seems to have represented to him that the French Jesuits in China were not disobedient and that the Jesuits in France were the Pope's army. Benedict replied³ that neither as Archbishop nor as Pope had he omitted any opportunity of showing his good will towards the Society and individual members, and he intended to maintain the same attitude in the future. But that did not preclude his using the whip when one or other out of so great a number strayed from the right path. If the French Jesuits or all the Jesuits in China were not disobedient, his Bull did not apply to them, for he did not speak therein of Jesuits in particular but only of disobedient Chinese missionaries in general⁴ and the reproach had

¹ Cf. above, p. 411, n. 3.

² *Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1741-43, Scritt. rif. Congr., 23, n. 21. *Ibid.*, *Letter of September 26, 1742, to the Bishop of Peking and "ad capitaneum generalem V.-' Regem ' Indiae Marchese de Lourical". *Ibid.*, Congr., 23, n. 20, the news that the Constitution had reached the Apostolic Vicar of East Tongking, Hilarius Costa.

³ To Tencin, October 6, 1742, I., 3 *seq.*; KIRSCH, *loc. cit.*, 387 *seq.*

⁴ "Se nella Cina non v'è verun Padre della Compagnia che sia mai stato o sia disobbediente, nemmeno si è parlato de' Gesuiti della Cina." KIRSCH, *loc. cit.*, 388.

more reference to the past than to the present. His expression "disobedient and captious men" the Pope endeavoured to justify in a letter to the Bishop of Coimbra, Michael of the Annunciation,¹ who on the occasion of the despatch of eighteen Jesuit missionaries from Coimbra had complained to the Pope that the Constitutions on the customs in China and Malabar were being used as evidence of Papal disapproval of the Jesuits. The report was being spread by "malicious persons", wrote the Pope, that these words were intended for the members of the Society of Jesus,² but he was only saying what had already been said in the time of Clement XI. If Clement XI.'s words were not construed as evidence of disapproval, why should his? Besides, his expressions were directed against recalcitrants in general, whether Jesuits or secular priests.³ Against the reproach of unfriendliness towards the Jesuits, Benedict defended himself by a long enumeration of the marks of favour he had shown the Society.⁴

If the Bull gave offence to the friends of the Jesuits, the Jesuits themselves were hurt still more. They did not feel themselves to be guilty of disobedience, and their General was hard put to it to prevent their protests and expressions of discontent from becoming generally known, which would only have called forth fresh accusations.⁵ Retz sent the Bull to China

¹ Of June 26, 1748, *Acta*, II., 392-6.

² "verba huiusmodi [concerning the 'inobedientes et captiosi homines'] ab hominibus malevolis contendatur pro religiosis viris Societatis posita fuisse." *Ibid.*, 394.

³ *Ibid.*, 396.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 392-5.

⁵ "Non sine multa aedificatione perlegi carissimam R. V^{ae} epistolam 18 Sept. ad me scriptam: ut quae digna quovis genuino filio s. parentis nostri sensa atque consilia mihi exhibere videbatur. Utinam eorum similia omnes nostri foverent: non maneremus certe expositi tot tamque gravibus inobedientiae accusationibus, quot nunc impetimur. Hanc ob causam nihil frequentius, nihil diligentius commendare conatus sum, quam sinceram ac fidelem observantiam Decretorum ac Constitutionum Apostolicarum. . . . Dolorem omnem inter nostros ac lamenta

with an accompanying letter on October 25th, 1742, and both documents were immediately communicated to his subordinates by the Superior there. He assured the General that in the matter of the rites the Jesuits in China had observed the precepts of their immediate Superiors, so that the sharply worded expressions and the denunciations in the Constitution did not apply to them, or, if it did, it applied also to the Vicar Apostolic. In the archives of the Propaganda there should be a letter from the Vicar Apostolic, Mullener, in which after his visitation to the Christians in the care of the Jesuits he had attested that with regard to the rites he had found nothing objectionable in the communities he had visited. As the General had written to China, the letter had been communicated to him at the time. And indeed the missionaries had observed the instructions of the Vicar Apostolic so exactly that to fall in with his varying wishes and not without great inconvenience they had already on four occasions changed the form of the ancestral tablet and the attached declaration.¹

cohibere non potui, cum non deessent, qui iudicarent, de quo agitur in tempus opportunius reiici aut certe mitiori aliquo modo confici potuisse: Cum tamen diligentissime ne ullum doloris publicum signum daretur [operam dedi], et ad impediendum omnem suspicandi occasionem, ab adeundis amicorum cardinalium palatii consulto abstinui. Optandum nunc est, ut illi, ac illi ad quos observantia atque exsecutio pertinet, et ipsi dolori suo modum ponant, neque sinant obligationibus suis illum praevalere; sed hoc sperare iuvat, praecipue ubi intellectum fuerit ipsam regiam Maiestatem protectionem suam ultimae Bullae addixisse."
Retz to Carbone, November 10, 1742.

¹ " *Constitutionem Apostolicam et adiunctam V. Paternitatis epistolam absque mora notam feci paucis meis subditis hic praesentibus, ac ceteris meis subditis Pekini et per provincias degentibus ea misi diligentia, qua his in terris uti possumus. Omnium iuramenta venire ad me non posse ante navium discessum certo certius est." He would send the rest to Europe at the first opportunity. . . . " Quis futurus sit effectus Constitutionis, vaticinetur qui voluerit. Interim debeo certiore facere Paternitatem V., meos subditos in provinciis, circa ceremonias sinicas, accurate et constanter eam secutos fuisse

The Vicar Apostolic of Yunnan, Joachim Enjobert de Martillat, Bishop of Ecrinea, who, his health broken, returned to France in 1745, bore witness in Rome in 1749 that the Jesuits were not the cause of the persecution and that the Papal Constitutions on the rites of China and Malabar were being faithfully observed. It is significant of the prevailing atmosphere, however, that the Pope advised him not to speak about these matters, as his statements might be misconstrued.¹ The Jesuit Louis Marie Dugad wrote from Huquam on November 3rd, 1752, that so far as he knew there was not one of his brethren who was not obeying the Papal Constitutions and the precepts of the Vicars Apostolic in the most exact and almost scrupulous manner and that nothing could be more painful to the

proxim, quam superior ecclesiasticus immediatus praescribat, ac proinde vel non cadere in meos gravissimas illas seu querelas seu obiurgationes, quae in Constitutione leguntur, aut eas cadere pariter in Vicarium Apostolicum. Exstat Romae aut exstare debet in Archivo Congregationis de Propaganda Fide epistola Ill. ac. Rev. Dñi Mullener b. m. iam a multis annis scripta, quae post visitatas nostras christianitates testatur se nihil in iis invenisse, quod reprehenderet circa ceremonias sinicas, de quo Ill. Praesulis testimonio scivit V. Paternitas ex s. Congregatione et nos tunc temporis monuit. Et vero nostri missionarii tam accurate inhaerebant Praesulis directioni, ut, non sine molestia satis gravi, necesse habuerint ad inconstantem praesulis nutum quater mutare formulam tabellae emendatae et adiunctae declarationis." He wanted to make this known to the Father General so that it might reassure him (Autograph [?] of Julianus Placidus Hervieu, Macao, December 30, 1743). *Cf. Roman Hinderer to the Vice-Provincial Pinheiro on August 29, 1734: " *Quoad tabellas defunctorum R. P. Mendez, tunc Vice-provincialis, statim post intimationem praecepti apostolici ' Ex illa die ' impressit [had printed] formulam, quae multis millibus exemplarium per omnes Societatis missiones dispersa fuit, monitis neophytis, ut iuxta praefatum praeceptum suas tabellas antiquas corrigendo et novas scribendo formam illam observarent, nec defuimus nostro officio, ubi omissum invenimus, debito modo instando et urgendo."*

¹ Benedict XIV. to Tencin, April 23, 1749, I.; 478.

missionaries than to be decried in Europe as insubordinate.¹

Along with the General of the Jesuits, the Generals of the other Orders wrote special letters to the Propaganda promising their obedience to the Bull.² But immediately afterwards there arose another dispute as to the scope of Benedict XIV.'s prescription. For much had been allowed by Clement XI.'s Bull and later by Mezzabarba; for example, the tablets with just the titles of the deceased and an attached explanation. Now that Mezzabarba's concessions had been declared null and void, was one no longer allowed to practise what had been conceded previously by Clement XI.? The Vicar Apostolic of Shan-si and Shen-si, Eugenio Piloti, Titular Bishop of Portimaea, the Jesuits, and Pedrini maintained that Clement XI.'s concession still held good; on the other hand, the reformed Franciscan Gabriel of Turin, who had formerly allowed a simple obeisance to the deceased ancestors, would have none of any such distinctions and asked for permission to

¹ " *Circa obedientiam pontificiis decretis, quod caput esse intelligo eorum quae Rev. adm. Paternitas V. avet rescire, nullum ex nostris scio, qui non accuratissime atque, ut ita dicam, scrupulose SS. Pontificum Constitutionibus atque Vicariorum Apostolicorum statutis respective plenissime obedientem et morigerum se praebeat, prout conscientiae suae rationes et Societatis nostrae bonum postulant. Certe nihil gravius nos percellit, nullaque in opere evangelico poena gravior nos exercet, quam quod in Europa haberi nos e traduci tamquam Sedi Apost. inobedientes audiamus." In Jesuit possession.

² *Thus the General of the Dominicans, Thomas Ripoll, on September 15, 1742; the General of the Augustinians, Felix Leoni, on September 21; the Vicar General of the Discalced Augustinian Congregation for Germany and Italy, Alexander of the Passion of our Lord, on September 25; the Theatine General Cajetan a Laurino, on September 29; the General of the Regular Clerics Minor, Anton Nuñez, on September 29; the Superior of the Paris Missionary Seminary, Combes, on November 12, 1742. Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1741-43, Scritt. rif. Congr., 23, n. 45-6, 48-51.

return to Europe if he was not to be allowed merely to obey the Pope.¹

For some time there were no further developments of the dispute. When the same doubts came to the fore again a few years later, Propaganda condemned the more lenient view and complained that the Papal decisions were again being deliberately misinterpreted. To honour the deceased all that was allowed was burial, the preservation of their portraits and their insignia of office, the setting up of inscriptions recording their achievements and offices, and, if the deceased was a Christian, all the ceremonies which it was the custom of the Catholic Church to perform. All other practices were to be extirpated by the missionaries when instructing the neophytes. If a penitent in good faith and through ignorance was still practising the forbidden rites, or was clinging to Mezzabarba's concessions, and the confessor saw that neither instruction nor admonition would be of any avail, he was not on that account to forgo the admonition. Christians were not to take part in burial feasts at which the food offered to the dead was eaten.²

The submission of the missionaries to the decision of Benedict XIV. did not by any means entail to a corresponding degree the disappearance of the forbidden rites among the Christians.³ The Bishop of Peking, Polycarp de Souza, wrote

¹ *Letter from Gabriel of Turin to the Propaganda, *ibid.*, n. 46. for Pedrini *cf. Mém. de la Congr. de la Mission*, VII., 411 *seq.*

² To the Apostolic Vicar of East Tongking on January 14, 1753, *Collectanea of the Propaganda*, 228, n. 386. Thus, by this decree the bowing to the coffin of the deceased was also forbidden, as was declared by the Congregation on June 30, 1757 (*ibid.*, 258, n. 406). — In other ways, too, the Congregation was inclined to be strict with the newly converted. For instance, the first three days of the new year were celebrated in Tongking and it was thought that the faithful would be released from fasting and abstinence on these days, but on February 28, 1760, the Inquisition refused to grant the dispensation which had been solicited on this account (*ibid.*, 276, n. 425).

³ Mouly, the Administrator of the diocese of Peking, wrote as late as 1857: "comme les chrétiens sont encore portés à quelques

to the Pope on May 5th, 1744, that in the prevailing circumstances there was no hope of obtaining from the Christians the necessary obedience since the preaching of the Gospel was not so much restricted as entirely suspended. The Christians, he wrote, were driven into the temples of the idols by force and intimidation, so that it looked as if the whole mission would come to an end. In such circumstances the abandonment of ancestor-worship was clearly dangerous, since by so doing one betrayed oneself as a Christian. For this reason, Souza surmised, the Christians would continue to practise their old abuses and would not expose themselves to torture and other penalties for the sake of the Apostolic Constitution. The Pope replied on December 19th, 1744,¹ that he had not been able to delay the publication of the Bull and that persecution would have come even if Mezzabarba's concessions had been allowed to remain. Souza had written previously to the Pope² to defend himself against the accusation of disobedience, which he called a calumny and which he sought to rebut by

superstitions envers les morts, et qu'ils ne s'en abstiennent qu'à cause de la défense du Saint-Siège et non pas pieusement parce que c'est une chose mauvaise en soi . . ." *Mém. de la Congr. de la Mission*, VIII., 1101.

¹ *Ius pontif.*, III., 210 seq.; Collectanea of the Propaganda, 178, n. 349; THOMAS, 377 seqq. On p. 376 Thomas, on the authority of evidence given by Rinaldi in the *Mém. de la Congr. de la Mission*, VII., 198, writes: "Les chrétiens des Jésuites étant habitués dans leurs anciennes pratiques, beaucoup désobéirent, partie par malice ou faiblesse, partie faute d'exhortations." But Rinaldi's letter in the *Mém.*, VII., 198, is of November 4, 1725, and has therefore nothing to do with the Bull of 1742. Moreover, Rinaldi, in the passage referred to, did not write "beaucoup désobéirent" but "peu parmi eux sont vraiment obéissants en fait". Of the citations in Thomas we have checked only those on pp. 317-321 and 359-361; these swarm with inaccuracies and arbitrary assertions. For a criticism of his work cf. above, p. 439, n. 5, and our account, Vol. XXXIII., 394, n. 1, and 412, n. 1.

² On January 5, 1744, Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1744-45, n. 51.

means of testimonials in his favour.¹ In the following year, 1745, Arcangelo Miralta of the Order of Minor Clerics reported that the publication of the Constitution *Ex quo* had caused some disturbances at first but that they had died down.² The German missionary to China, Augustin Hallerstein, afterwards President of the Mathematical Tribunal in Peking, wrote to his brother in Vienna on October 6th, 1743³: "You will want to know what the effect has been here of Benedict XIV.'s new instructions regarding Chinese customs. My answer is: what it was bound to be. We have accepted them and sworn to

¹ From the Jesuits Kögler (of June 4, 1743) and Pereyra (of June 3), from the Discalced Carmelite Sigismund of St. Nicholas (June 26, 1743), and from Pedrini (June 5, 1743), *ibid.*, n. 48. On November 1, 1743, Souza sent his own "Iuramentum de sua constanti et zelosa obedientia erga Constitutionem 'Ex illa die'. In manibus meis Hilarius episc. Macaensis" (*ibid.*, n. 47). On November 28, 1744, the Roman Inquisition demanded from the Propaganda "documenta super aliquas inobservantias Iesuitarum in China et in specie Patris de Souza episc. Pekinensis" (*ibid.*, n. 55.).

² "La Costituzione 'Ex quo singulari Dei providentia' nel principio della sua pubblicazione cagionò bastanti disturbi dalli osservanti delle permissioni, però prontamente sono cessati, passandosi in silenzio detta Costituzione" (*loc. cit.*, 1746-48, Congr., 25, n. 23). "Il [Pedrini] m'écrit [on August 25, 1744] qu'il y avait eu dans la province de Chansi des troubles parmi les chrétiens au sujet de la nouvelle Constitution 'Ex quo', mais qu'il les croyait présentement entièrement assoupis." ENJOBERT DE MARTILLAT, Journal, in *Mém. de la Congr. de la Mission*, VII., 411.

³ PRAY, III., 320. "La charité parmi eux [the Jesuits of Peking] va de pair avec l'obéissance au Saint-Siège, et cette obéissance est totale et parfaite. Le Saint Père a parlé, cela suffit. Il n'y a pas un mot à dire; on ne se permet pas même un geste; il faut se taire et obéir. C'est ce que je leur ai souvent oui dire et récemment encore à l'occasion du nouveau Bref" (P. [?] Attiret à d'Assant, Pékin, November 1, 1743, *Lettres édif.*, III., 794). Attiret was one of the lay-brothers, so that before them at least the priests were careful in their speech.

carry them out, and we shall do so. Indeed there are not by any means the same difficulties in the matter as before, since the Christians in China consist almost entirely of people who hardly have any food or shelter. There is no question, therefore, of their procuring the customary gifts for their ancestors, or of erecting special buildings for this purpose." ¹

What Hallerstein says of the Chinese Christians of his day is more or less true of subsequent times also. With the decisions of Benedict XIV. the ritual question was settled once for all, and the oath of loyalty to his Bull taken by all missionaries to the Chinese prevented its revival. The spreading of Christianity was not made impossible by the Constitution, for to-day there are ten times as many Christians in China as in the time of Benedict XIV. The original plan, however, of winning over first the upper classes and with them China as a whole, had to be abandoned; in the rare event of a literate person turning towards the Christian faith he is not baptized nowadays until he is on his death-bed. The failure of this plan in the reign of Benedict XIV. need not be regretted too keenly, since the suppression of the Society of Jesus and the breaking up of the Orders in the turmoil of the Revolution would have in any case brought it to nought fifty years later. The Papal prohibitions of the Chinese rites thus diverted the missionary work into another channel without inflicting on it any permanent injury.

The situation in the time of the persecution that followed the death of Kang-hi was conceived more or less in these terms. Owing to the unfavourable circumstances, it was necessary to make use of native catechists, it being difficult for European priests to conceal their identity. A training institute for these

¹ Under Kanghi also most Christians were of the common people, but, as the Peking Jesuits *wrote to their General on July 17, 1722: "audivit [Mezzabarba], quantum nobis divina bonitas praeparavit catechumenorum numerum, etiam ex suprema nobilitate tartarica, ex comitum ordine, ex regia imperante familia, qui et auctoritate sua columnae, et exemplo ac fervore apostoli queant esse novellae in hac aula ecclesiae . . ." In Jesuit possession.

catechists had been established in the capital of Siam by the Paris seminary for missionaries ; on their reaching the age of forty and after having acquitted themselves creditably they were consecrated priests, and thus the mission continued to progress in spite of the lack of European missionaries.¹ Before coming to China, wrote a missionary in 1759, he thought the mission there to be barren, but now he considered it to be one of the most successful, especially in the country districts. In Canada the savages had first to be turned into human beings, whereas in China the people were already possessed of sufficient intelligence and honesty ; thus religion was steadily spreading, although a probationary period of two or three years was demanded before baptism.² Another Jesuit³ was of the opinion that there were even advantages in the altered situation : for the missionaries the work was more of an apostolic nature and they had a greater share in the Cross of Christ through having to wander about with no fixed abode. Many of them had been incarcerated and tortured in the most fearful fashion. Both the Dominicans and the Jesuits had had their martyrs. Few persons of wealth or position had withstood the storm, but among the remainder brave witnesses

¹ Letter from Macao, September 14, 1754, *Lettres édif.*, IV., 36. Cf. *Journal d'André Ly, Prêtre chinois, Missionnaire et Notaire Apostolique 1746 à 1763*, edited by A. LAUNAY, Paris, 1906.

² Lamathe to Brassand, August 20, 1759, *Lettres édif.*, IV., 83. For the successes of the Dominicans in China see WALZ, 375, of the Franciscans, see LEMMENS, 146 ; MATHIAS DE S. TERESA Y ALCAZAR, Ord. Min., ex-miss. apost. de Cochinchina y actual de Cina : *Mission seraphica española de Xantung en este Imperio de la gran China perteneciente a la santa y apost. provincia de S. Gregorio de la regular y mas estrecha observancia de N.S.P.S. Francisco en las islas Filipinas*. The account (of his missionary journey, lasting from November 29, 1756, to July 9, 1757, and undertaken from Tsi-nan-fu) is dated September 5, 1759 ; a copy of this rare MS. in the Archives of the Spanish Embassy in Rome, III., 9.

³ Roy to the Bishop of Noyon, September 12, 1759, *Lettres édif.*, IV., 89.

to the faith were not rare. Hallerstein wrote in a similar vein ¹: "There is no lack of heroic souls, even among the weaker sex, who show their unshakable courage in the most glorious fashion."

Here as elsewhere there distinguished itself by the number of its martyrs that Order which, according to Papal records, was in the habit of winning the crown of martyrdom—the Dominicans. The Vicar Apostolic of Fukiën, Peter Martyr Sanz, Bishop of Mauricastro, gave his life for the faith at Fogan in 1747. We read of him in a letter of about this time ²: "He was a holy prelate, I hear, whose canonization is going forward in Rome." With four other members of his Order, who shed their blood in the following year, he was in fact beatified in 1893. Benedict XIV. sounded their praises in the Consistory of September 16th, 1748,³ and addressed a Brief about them to the Dominicans in the Philippines.⁴ He wrote a letter of encouragement to the Chinese missionaries and wrote also to the Emperor of China on their behalf, while the king of Portugal, at whose request he had just nominated Francis Xavier as patron of the missions, was to support the Pope's representations in Peking.⁵

In Indochina also messengers of the Faith met with bloody deaths. Thus the two Dominicans Gil Federich and Matthias

¹ On November 28, 1749, in PRAY, III., 336.

² Of September 14, 1754, *Lettres édif.*, IV., 36. For Sanz's martyrdom *cf. ibid.*, III., 800 *seqq.*; for the death of the Jesuits Henriquez and Athemis, *ibid.*, 825 *seqq.*, and E. MASSARA (Cividale, 1908). In Kiangsi a Silesian member of the Franciscan Order was executed for "seducing the people by false doctrines". PRAY, III., 336.

³ *Benedicti XIV. Acta*, I., 560-2. *Cf.* the letter to Tencin of September 25, 1748, I., 431.

⁴ On December 2, 1752, *Acta*, II., 116. Ferdinand of Spain also wrote about these martyrs to the Dominicans (*ibid.*). For the Dominican martyrs *cf. Bull. Benedicti XIV.*, Vol. XIII., Mechliniae, 1827, 167 *seqq.*, 174 *seqq.*, 185 *seqq.* (allocution on the martyrdom of Francis Serrano), 191 *seqq.*, 195 *seqq.*

⁵ All three letters of February 24, 1748, *Acta*, I., 487 *seqq.*

Leziniana were beheaded at Tongking on January 22nd, 1745.¹ They had been preceded in 1737 by a number of Jesuits.²

In Indochina, moreover, there were almost the same difficulties regarding the prohibitions of rites as in China proper. For West Tongking the Vicar Apostolic, Louis Néez, Titular Bishop of Cermania, testified on October 29th, 1744, that every missionary without exception had taken the oath of loyalty to the Constitution.³ In East Tongking the Vicar Apostolic, Hilarius a Jesu Costa, titular Bishop of Corycus, made a similar statement.⁴

(7)

Thanks to the Pope's energetic action the ritual question was thus settled so far as China was concerned, and he was only acting in accordance with his character in undertaking the solution of the disputes in Malabar.

The Briefs of Clement XII. issued in 1734 and 1739 had not succeeded in quietening restless spirits in Southern India. The Vicar Apostolic of Verapoly, Giambattista Maria of St. Teresa, titular Bishop of Lirima, forwarded on December 8th, 1740, the forms of oath signed by the missionaries and promised to apply himself with redoubled energy to the task of removing all remaining traces of paganism ; but he spoke of those also who defended the old way of things and who maintained that they had not been given a hearing in Rome ; their opposition, it seemed to him, would make it very difficult to extirpate everything.⁵ The Archbishop of Cranganore, the Jesuit

¹ *Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, 1744-5, Congr., 24, n. 9 ; WALZ, 643. They were beatified on May 20, 1906.

² *Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, 1737-1740, Congr. 22, n. 35. Cf. our account, Vol. XXXIV., 473.

³ **Ibid.*, 1744-5, n. 54. *On January 16, 1745, Néez repeated : " Omnes missionarii iurarunt in Constitutionem ' Ex quo ' " (*ibid.*, n. 68) ; similarly on July 12, 1745 (*ibid.*, n. 76).

⁴ On July 16, 1745, *ibid.*, n. 78 : " omnes utriusque vicariatus missionarios obedire Constitutioni ' Ex quo singulari ' ."

⁵ " *Con l'arrivo del P. Florentio . . . ho ricevuti li Brevi . . . ,

Antonio Manuel Pimentel, reported on November 4th, 1740, that he had received the letters of the Propaganda,¹ and on January 2nd, 1741, he related what three Jesuits² had written to him some years previously regarding their "complete submission". Nevertheless the Vicar Apostolic of Siam, De Lolière-Puycontat, reported on the authority of a letter written by the Capuchins on August 17th, 1740, that the Jesuits of Malabar, in spite of their oath, were not conforming to the prohibition of the rites, on the plea that it was not a matter of faith and that the Holy See was badly informed.³

The Capuchins, however, were not a disinterested party in

la executione de' quali, quanto appartiene a tutti noi, non sarà negligentata, come vedranno nei giuramenti sottoscritti; e con tutto che da' nostri missionarii sempre si sia travagliato in estirpare quel che puol essere di gentilicio, con più accuratezza si farà con la pubblicazione che si farà fra breve tempo de' sudetti Brevi, quali più riguardano le missioni di Majasul [Mysore?], di Madure e Carnati, nelle quali col battesimo si ricevono tali riti gentilici, che per estirparli par mi sarà molto difficile, atteso che gli assertori si difendono di non esser stati uditi, come più volte li habiamo uditi; spero in Dio, che si potrà porre qualche rimedio, instruendo li christiani dell'ordini, che si mandano." Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, 1737-1740, Scritt. rif. Congr., 22, n. 51. Cf. *ibid.*, 1744-5, Congr., 24, n. 11: "*Scritture circa i riti malabarici dopo la spedizione del Breve emanato nel 1734 e ciò che si sia poi risoluto nella Congregazione del s. Officio." *Ibid.*, 1746-8, Congr., 25. *Letter from the Archbishop of Cranganore, October 15, 1740: "se declarationes factas supra decreto card. Tournon circa missiones Madur., Maissur. et Carnatensem cum effectu executioni dedisse, et P. Franc. Cardoso provincialem Soc. Iesu sibi scripsisse, quod omnes Patres Soc. Iesu scripto se obligaverint ad publicandas etc. easdem. Contrarium qui dixerit veritati adversari."

¹ **Ibid.*, 1737-1740, Congr., 22, n. 51.

² *Franc. Cardoso on May 25, 1736, from Travancore; Salvador dos Reys, from Serrinha, on June 16, 1736; Manuel Henriquez, from Mysore, on September 17, 1736. *Ibid.*, 1741-3, Congr., 23 n. 2.

³ **Ibid.*, n. 22.

the Malabar dispute, and the expressions used in their reports are not to be taken literally. Benedict XIV. testified in his Bull on the customs of Malabar that all the Bishops and missionaries had sworn to observe exactly the decrees of his predecessor, and that the certificates regarding this oath had come into his hands on the death of Clement XII. The missionaries protested that the accusation of perversion brought against them was unjust.¹ It is a fact, however, that the Jesuits in Rome had been working for a dispensation or, rather, since one had already been granted for ten years, for a continuation of it. The Bishop of Meliapur, Joseph Pinheiro, asked the Congregation on October 12th, 1740, for a dispensation from the use of saliva and insufflation at baptism and from entering the houses of pariahs, which would mean the ruin of the mission.² The draft of a letter in reply contains a severe censure for the petitioner, who is commanded to be obedient.³ Similar drafts of replies to Archbishop Pimentel of Cranganore and the Bishop of Cochin complains of certain missionaries allowing or taking part in a superstitious rite.⁴ On November 19th, 1742, Archbishop Pimentel again approached the Pope. Tournon's decree, he wrote, had been published except for three points: the use of saliva and salt and insufflation in baptism, the admission of women in certain circumstances to the sacraments, and the entry into the houses of the pariahs. The observance of these things, he said, would mean the ruin of the mission.⁵

Benedict XIV. had no need to be informed about the disputes in Malabar. As Consultor to the Inquisition in the reign of Clement XI. he had already composed a survey of their development and had discussed the question with the

¹ *Ius pontif.*, III., 175, § 14-16.

² *Congr., 23, n. 26.

; **Ibid.*, n. 27. Whether this "piano di lettera" was executed and dispatched is not apparent.

⁴ " *qui permittunt aut practicant aliquem ritum superstitiosum." *Ibid.*, n. 28.

⁵ " *Haec enim observata ruinent missionem." *Ibid.*, n. 55.

emissary of the Jesuits in S. India, Brandolini.¹ When Pope, he settled the matter once for all by a solemn Bull.²

On this occasion his manner towards the Jesuits was far more lenient than it had been two years before, when he condemned the Chinese rites. As he wrote to Cardinal Tencin,³ he had kept the Bull on his desk thirteen months before publishing it; God knew, he wrote, how much pains it had taken him not to give offence and at the same time not to fail in his Apostolic office. He had discussed everything with the Jesuits and had done his best to point out to them clearly the moderation and reasonableness of his decision. They had no right to complain, therefore, at least not openly. Their General himself had expressed his gratitude to him. They might murmur to themselves, he wrote to Peggi,⁴ but it was an impertinence to expect the Pope to turn the seat of truth into a seat of concealment merely so as not to offend the Jesuits.

The Bull against the customs of Malabar deals principally with three requests made by the missionaries. Firstly they had complained that they had been bound to obedience by oaths and excommunications. This was an oppressive and unbearable burden which involved them in the most grievous difficulties of conscience. Being in continual fear of losing their own souls they could hardly give a thought now to the saving of others.⁵ The Pope, however, would not consider any

¹ "qui de nostro agendi more modoque se nobis valde devinctum ostendit" (Benedict XIV. to the Bishop of Coimbra on June 26, 1748, *Acta*, II., 392). Under Innocent XIII. he took care to see that "omnia pontificiae tolerantiae et benignitatis officia reipsa impertirentur" (to the Jesuits) (*ibid.*).

² "Omnium sollicitudinum," of September 12, 1744, *Ius pontif.*, III., 166 *seqq.*

³ On December 19, 1744, HEECKEREN, I., 167.

⁴ On October 17, 1744, KRAUS, 20. Cf. *Fragmentum vitae Benedicti XIV.*, *ibid.*, 243.

⁵ The embarrassing situations may have been caused more by the unduly stringent administration of the censures than by the censures themselves. The following case, though from China, not India, may serve as an example. At the denunciation of the

alleviation in this respect. The oath which had been imposed upon the missionaries was, he said, the best way of ensuring unity among them and was the best safeguard against arbitrariness in thought and interpretation. The censures affected only infringers of Papal laws and perverse persons who were not to be kept obedient by any other means.

Secondly, the missionaries had asked again to be dispensed from the use of saliva in the rite of baptism and not to have to use insufflation too openly. This request had already been granted in 1734 for a period of ten years, and in 1744 Benedict XIV. granted another postponement for ten years, but this was to be the last one and the dispensation was to be used only in case of necessity. He expressed, however, his displeasure that he had not been able to note that the missionaries for their part had exerted themselves to overcome the distaste of

Bishop of Peking proceedings were instituted at Tsi-nan in Shantung against sectarians whose doctrines had been widely disseminated also in Ho-nan and Kiang-nan and who were hatching revolutionary schemes under the guise of Christianity. As a result of the proceedings the true Christians also appeared in a suspicious light, and as the Emperor had sent a plenipotentiary to obtain information about the revolutionaries the matter threatened to have fatal consequences. Luckily, the viceroy was favourable to the Christians and when it happened that funeral rites were about to be performed for a deceased missionary he offered to take part in them, accompanied by his mandarins. The missionary of Tsi-nan, the Franciscan Michael Fernandez, was now in a dilemma. To reject the viceroy's offer would be tantamount to an insult; to accept it would be equally hazardous, on account of the ritual prohibition. Fernandez thought to overcome the difficulty by explaining to the viceroy in a written exposition that he looked on the rites merely as civil ceremonies and that he was setting out this view by an inscription in large letters on the catafalque. But the missionary was treated by the episcopal vicar general as if excommunicated and his missionary activity was consequently brought to a standstill; three years passed before news came from Rome that his case had been judged. *K. Stumpf to the General of the Order, Peking, 1718, in Jesuit possession.

the natives. If the Indians obstinately held to the opinion that these ceremonies were reprehensible in themselves they had not the disposition necessary for the worthy reception of baptism.

The third petition of the missionaries concerned the question of the pariahs: the prejudice held by the Indians that a missionary who entered a pariah's hut to administer the sacraments to him was to be considered as polluted, so that he was no longer able to converse with the higher castes. To circumvent this difficulty the Jesuits had offered to appoint special missionaries who were to devote themselves permanently and exclusively to the service of the pariahs. The Pope accepted this offer. An account of its execution would have to be rendered to the Holy See in five years, and another relating to the baptismal ceremonies within ten years. If the Jesuits failed to carry out these ceremonies other missionaries would have to attempt what they, not through their fault, had been unable to perform. For the replacements which would possibly be necessary the Pope was already making his arrangements.

After replying to these requests the Pope spoke of other abuses which had already been forbidden by Tournon but which were still being practised. To his unspeakable dismay he had heard that many missionaries were still allowing the wearing of the *Taly* with its objectionable representation of a heathen marriage-god as the evidence of a consummated marriage; that at weddings the future was still being foretold by the breaking of a coco-nut, and this with the consent of the missionaries; and that at certain times women were forbidden to enter the house of God.

In spite of its softening expressions the tone of the composition was undeniably sharp when referring to the Jesuits. This was justified by the reports from India which had been rendered to the Pope and on which he had to rely. But probably much in these reports was exaggerated. The superior of the French Jesuits in S. India, Gaston Laurent Cœurdoux, immediately he received the Papal Constitution, ordered an inquiry to be made into the use of the *Taly*. Among 8,000

Christians there were found only two of these prohibited amulets.¹

The situation in this respect seems not to have been so good among the Indians of Madura, where, however, Benedict XIV.'s instructions were fully executed. The Jesuit Thomas Celaya wrote to the General of the Order on August 25th, 1746, that the last Papal decree had met with a willing obedience on all sides. Throughout the mission the *Taly* had been replaced by Christian symbols. Six Jesuits had been appointed by the Provincial for the exclusive service of the pariahs, and four of them had already entered on their duties ; in public they wore different clothes from those of the other missionaries. Saliva and insufflation were used in baptism and whoever would not submit to these ceremonies were not admitted to the sacrament. Fortune-telling by means of broken coco-nuts was forbidden and had been practically abolished.² On July 14th, 1747, the Visitor to the Jesuit missions in Malabar, Angelo de' Franceschi, bore witness to the obedience of all the Jesuits, especially with regard to four points on which they had been accused,³ and on November

¹ " *Praecepti duobus missionariis, ut disquisitionem facerent circa Taly : inter octo millia christianorum reppererunt solum duas tesseras reficiendas et quae certe contracti matrimonii die datae non fuerant. Certe si in tali numero totidem in adulterium aut in ipsam idololatriam incidisse deprehenderentur, num missionariorum vitio merito vertatur ? " Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, 1746-48, Scritt. rif. Congr., 25, n. 21.

² " *Ultimo decreto pontificio exacte obeditum est ab omnibus. Tessera nuptialis dicta Taly in omnibus missionis Madurensis partibus mutata est. Parreis dumtaxat curandis sex socios designavit P. Provincialis ; ex iis quatuor iam ea provincia fungi coeperunt, eorumque domos palam ingrediuntur ac procedunt alia induti veste ac ceteri missionarii, qui nobiliorem tribum curant. Saliva et insufflationes iam modo adhibentur in baptis-mate, quo non donabitur in posterum, nisi qui his sacramentalibus, deposito salivae horrore, se subiicere velit. Fractio fructus dicti Cocco in ceremoniis matrimonii ineundi iam prohibita est et paene abolita est." *Ibid.*, n. 20.

³ **Ibid.*, n. 39.

9th this evidence was confirmed by the Archbishop of Cranganore, Pimentel.¹ Lucas da Costa Cravo, Vicar General of the Augustinian Bishop of Meliapur, spoke to the same effect.² The Bishop himself wrote in 1750 that the French and Portuguese Jesuits had been the first to publish Benedict XIV.'s Constitution.³ When, in 1759 and 1764, after the abolition of the Portuguese and French Jesuit provinces, the missions in Malabar passed into the hands of the priests from the Paris Seminary, the latter found that the prohibited customs had been almost entirely extirpated in the communities which the Jesuits had been able to control more closely.⁴

The introduction of special missionaries for the pariahs did not endure. In the eyes of the Indians it created two distinct Churches and confirmed the higher castes in their pride. The distinction between the missionaries to the pariahs and those to the Brahmins gradually lessened, and with the suppression of the Society of Jesus the arrangement ceased altogether.⁵

So far as the native Christians were concerned, wrote the Carmelite Giambattista Maria of St. Teresa,⁶ the condemnation of the Malabar rites was accepted by them without demur, except on one point: the sign of the ashes.

The consequences which followed the Papal prohibitions were not so bad as had been feared. It may be that many

¹ **Ibid.*, n. 43.

² " *Patres Soc. Iesu missionis Madurensis omnia ad normam Constitutionis peragere." *Ibid.*, n. 68.

³ " *Fr. Ant. ab Incarnatione O. Erem. S. Aug. episc. Meliapurensis testatur 22 Sept. 1750 Patres Soc. Iesu gallos et lusitanos primos fuisse missionarios, qui Constitutionem ' Omnium sollicitudinum ' publicaverint illosque in executione omnium mandatorum ceteris missionariis posteriores non esse." Archives of the Propaganda, Indie Or. e Cina, Scritt. rif. Congr., 26, n. 85.

⁴ AMANN in the *Dict. de théol. cath.*, IX., 1734.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1734 seq.

⁶ *Verapoli, on September 21, 1744, Archives of the Propaganda, *loc. cit.*, 1744-45, Congr., 24, n. 10.

members of the higher caste now fell away, but in the years that followed the prohibition of the rites the increase in the number of Christians was almost as great as before. It is true that in 1840 the number of Christians in Malabar was no greater than a century before but this lack of increase is easily explained even when the prohibition of the rites is left out of consideration.¹ In the end, therefore, the Pope was proved to be right in countering the fears of the missionaries by referring them to the inward strength of Christianity and to the duty of obedience.

The severe accusations made at first by Benedict XIV. on account of the disobedience of the missionaries in China were not subsequently maintained by him. Already in preparing the Bull on the customs of Malabar the tone in which he dealt with the Jesuits was considerably milder² and nine years later he paid a handsome tribute to the obedience of the Order.³

(8)

When writing to Cardinal Tencin about the settlement of the Malabar question, Benedict XIV. closed with the remark that the Capuchin Norbert had had no influence on the judgment, for he knew him for a confused thinker and a trouble-maker.⁴ But Norbert took good care to see that the disputes in Malabar had an unpleasant aftermath for the Jesuits.

Pierre Curel Parisot, born in 1697 at Bar-le-Duc, became a Capuchin at the age of seventeen and took the name of Norbert. He was pugnacious by nature and his whole life was fatally affected by his attitude towards the Jesuits. As a missionary in Pondicherry he came into conflict with his Bishop, a Portuguese Jesuit, on account of excessive independence in his pastoral duties and in his direction of an Ursuline

¹ AMANN, *loc. cit.*, 1735 *seq.*

² See above, p. 464.

³ See above, p. 308.

⁴ “*Rispetto poi al P. Norberto Cappucino esso non ha avuto che fare nella Bolla, conoscendolo ancor Noi per un uomo torbido et imbroglione.” To Tencin, March 19, 1744, Papal Secret Archives, *Miscell. Arm.*, XV., t. 154; HEECKEREN, I., 167.

convent which he had founded.¹ His relations with the French colonial authorities at Pondicherry he undermined by the violence with which when speaking from the pulpit he attacked the attitude of the Jesuits in the ritual dispute. This was on the occasion of an address he gave on the life of the Jesuit Bishop Visdelou² (died 1737) who on account of differences of opinion on the ritual question had lived apart from his fellow Jesuits, with the Capuchins. In February 1740³ Norbert left the mission. In Rome, where he arrived in April 1741, he found the situation favourable for further attacks on the Jesuits, who at that time were unpopular in the city. Documents from the archives of the Propaganda were actually placed at his disposal⁴ for the writing of a memorandum on the dispute between the Capuchins and Jesuits at Pondicherry.⁵ On receiving a copy of the work,⁶ the Pope replied that he would read it through and would deal with the trouble ; meanwhile he sent him the Apostolic blessing. Norbert then set about publishing a work on the ritual dispute in Malabar,⁷

¹ [PATOUILLET], *Lettre sur le livre de P. Norbert*, [no place of publication], 1745, II, 14.

² Reproduced in Norbert's *Mémoires historiques*, Lucca, 1744, III., 241-307.

³ This date is given by Norbert himself in his *Mémoires historiques apologétiques*, III., London, 1751, 410. Cf. P. A. KIRSCH in the *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift*, LXXXVI. (1904), 368, n. 2.

⁴ Benedict XIV. to the Brussels nuncio Crivelli on November 11, 1747, in the *Civ. Catt.*, 1930, I., 513 ; French text in FELLER, *Journ. hist. et litt.*, 1787, 340-6.

⁵ *Mémoires utiles et nécessaires, tristes et consolans sur les missions des Indes Orientales*, Avignon and Lucca, 1742.

⁶ On June 9, 1742, in FAURE, *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, Venice, 1746, 343 ; NORBERT, *Mém. hist. apolog.*, III., 427.

⁷ *Mém. hist. présentés au souverain Pontife Benoît XIV. sur les missions des Indes Orientales*, 3 vols., Lucca, 1744. The Italian translation, which appeared simultaneously, is by the Capuchin Agostino da Parma (REUSCH, II., 775). The work was re-issued more than once : *Mem. hist. apolog.*, 3 vols., London, 1751 ;

which appeared in French and Italian at the end of July 1744, in Lucca, where on the recommendation of two Roman Cardinals he had had no difficulty in obtaining the Archbishop's permission to print the book. It had been passed by two Roman theologians, the Piarist Ubaldo Mignoni and the Observant Carlo Maria da Perugia, Qualificator of the Inquisition and Consultor of the Index, and it had been warmly commended by the Dominican Stefano Maria Mansi.¹ The work comprised a number of documents, accusations, and attacks on the Jesuit missionaries for their attitude in the ritual dispute, and on account of these invectives it enjoyed an unusually large circulation in Rome. It was smuggled into

also an edition in 4 vols. published simultaneously in Nuremberg and Lucca in 1754. Of the last-mentioned there is a reissue in 8 vols., published at Lucca in 1760, the author's name appearing as Abate Curel Parisot Platel; Vols. I.-IV. correspond to Vols. I.-IV. of the Lucca edition of 1744. The Lisbon edition of 1766, in 7 vols. (*Mém. hist. sur les affaires des Jésuites avec le Saint-Siège*. Par l'abbé C. P. Platel, with a dedication to the king of Portugal and a portrait of him is a revision.

¹ *Mém. hist.*, I., xii-xix. KIRSCH's assertion (*loc. cit.*, 366) that the book had been approved by the Pope also, is due to a misreading of the following passage from Benedict XIV.'s letter to Tencin of February 6, 1745 (Papal Secret Archives, Arm. XV., t. 154, p. 519 *seq.*): "Alcuni religiosi a'quali fu comunicata in Roma, benchè ne abbiano [the MS. is quite clear] fatta un' approvazione assai cautelosa . . . , sono stati però da Noi represi." For "abbiano" Kirsch read, in error, "abbiamo." Cf. HEECKEREN, I., 177 *seq.* MERENDA'S **Memorie* (in KIRSCH, *loc. cit.*, 364, n. 1), which, among other things asserts that the Pope had accepted the dedication of the book, merely repeats the rumours that were current in Rome. Norbert himself asserts that he had presented the book to the Pope and that he had accepted it with pleasure (*Mém. hist. apolog.*, III., 502). Merenda and others confused the *Mémoires utiles*, of 1742, with the *Mémoires hist.*, of 1744. Norbert relates that permission to print was politely refused by the Maestro di Palazzo, who recommended Lucca as a place of publication. *Mem. hist. apolog.*, III., 493, 497 *seq.*

the city and it was not until two copies had been left in the Papal antechamber that the Pope had any knowledge of the book or of its dedication to himself.¹ He immediately reproved the censors who had sanctioned the work and ordered its examination by the Inquisition. With the Pope's concurrence, Norbert received an order from the French envoy Canillac to quit Rome. Feeling that he would not be safe in his convent he took refuge at nightfall with Cardinal Neri Corsini, and at the beginning of February 1745 he fled to Florence.

By this fresh attack the good name of the Jesuits was of course jeopardized once more, and they doubted that any assistance would be forthcoming.²

Norbert had his friends even in the Congregation which was to pronounce judgment on his publication,³ and it needed the personal intervention of the Pope to ensure its condemnation at the decisive session of April 1st, 1745. For several hours speeches were made and opinions were expressed in support of varying views until at last the Pope spoke, whereupon Norbert's supporters also voted for the book's condemnation.⁴ The grounds for this were set down in the Congregation's decree⁵: Norbert had composed his book in Rome and had had it printed outside the city without the permission of the

¹ Benedict XIV. to the nuncio Crivelli, in the *Civ. Catt.*, 1930, I., 513 *seq.*; to Tencin, February 6, 1745, I., 177 *seq.*

² "grave interim vulnus accepit fama nostra ex vulgato a certo P. Cappuccino, Norberto, contra Societatem libro. An medelam obtenturi simus incertum." The Jesuit General to Fr. Carbone in Lisbon, January 19, 1745, in Jesuit possession.

³ *Benedict XIV. to Tencin, May 26, 1745, Papal Secret Archives, Miscell. Arm., XV., t. 154 (not mentioned by HEECKEREN); to the same, March 20, 1745, HEECKEREN, I., 185.

⁴ To Tencin, April 7, 1745, I., 190 *seq.*; KIRSCH, *loc. cit.*, 365. Passionei and Corsini were prominent in their support of Norbert. *Mém. hist. apolog.*, III., 627.

⁵ Of April 1, 1745, *Anal. iur. pontif.*, I., 1257. The continuation of Norbert's work was prohibited (on June 16, 1746), as was also the edition of 1751 (by a decree of the Inquisition of November 24, 1751, *ibid.*).

Maestro dei Sacri Palazzi, which was an offence against a decree of Urban VIII.'s which had been renewed by Benedict XIV. on September 14th, 1744. Further, on December 19th, 1672, Propaganda had forbidden any work on the subject of the missions to be published without its consent. This prohibition had been confirmed by Clement X. on April 6th, 1673, but had been disregarded by Norbert. It was impossible to sanction the work without giving scandal to worthy people and endangering souls. The decree condemning the work was drawn up by Benedict XIV. himself. The Jesuits, he wrote to Tencin,¹ might well complain of the bungled composition ; he would see that justice was done to them. Although he had disagreed with the methods they employed as missionaries he had no desire that so worthy and meritorious a society should be calumniated. Pater Norbert was an "obstinate fool" who meddled in matters which did not concern him ; his book had been condemned on account of its effrontery, its falsehoods, and its insults. He had fellow-workers in Tuscany, but as for his Roman friends, they could only applaud, having neither the courage nor the ability to work. Among the Jesuits the belief was current that they had to thank the king of Portugal for the condemnation.² The Paris nuncio Durini had to prevail

¹ On April 14, 1745, I., 192 *seq.* ; KIRSCH, *loc. cit.*, 365, n. 3.

² *Retz to Carbone in Lisbon, April 14, 1745 : "Mirum, quantum crevit ex opportunitate beneficium, quod satagente R. V^a serenissimus Rex tamquam clementissimus protector missionum Societati contulit permovendo Summum Pontificem, ut notum infamem Cappuccini librum a compluribus defensum, tandem efficaciter prohibere vellet." Thanks to Fr. Carbone and to the King. — Retz to Carbone on May 1, 1745 : "Cum elapso die lunae ad pedes SS^{mi} osculandos accessissem, ultro mihi in commissis dedit, scriberem ac significarem R. V^{ae} nullatenus per D. Commendatorem Zampaio stetisse, quominus per decretum famosus liber P. Norberti Cappuccini citius prohiberetur : instituisse ipsum septem saltem vicibus, sed moras ac difficultates aliunde obiectas fuisse ; cupere proinde, ut hanc Ministri sui diligentiam ac sollicitudinem, si necesse videretur, constare faceret serenissimo Regi R. V^a atque impleti in hac

on them not to write against Norbert, lest by so doing they might merely fan the flames ; the steps taken by the Pope were a sufficient defence.¹

When Pater Norbert felt himself unsafe in Florence also, his superiors assigned him a residence in a convent in Switzerland. From there he soon fled to Holland, where he prided himself on being in correspondence with the Holy See. In a letter to Cardinal Corsini he assured him of his attachment to the Catholic religion ; it was only anxiety for his personal safety that had driven him to Holland. He then asked for money, on the ground that heretics would be scandalized at seeing a man who had sacrificed himself for the Church forced to beg. The Pope replied to the Cardinal that he regarded the monk as an apostate but that he would extend to him his charity if Norbert would choose a convent in a Catholic country for a permanent residence.

In a further letter the fugitive described his efforts to bring the Dutch Jansenists back to the Church.² Benedict replied to Cardinal Corsini that the offers made by the Jansenists did not go far enough, that Pater Norbert was not the right man for such negotiations, and that he ought to leave Holland ; his association with the Jansenists there was giving scandal.³ Further, he said, Norbert, on the strength of Corsini's letters,

parte officii testimonium eidem praebeat." The Pope desires to be informed of Carbone's reply. In Jesuit possession.

¹ " *Sarà molto lodevole l'opera e l'industria di V. S. Ill., se arriverà a far tacere i Gesuiti rispetto al libro del Padre Norberto Cappuccino. Di grazia, non accendino maggior foco e lascino alla Santa Sede la cura di mortificare i loro avversari. In voler difendersi si esporranno a tutte quelle ripartite, che con tanto buon giudizio ha V. S. Ill. posto loro in considerazione. Non è piccola disapprovazione del libro l'esiglio dato al Padre e la condanna seguita ultimamente del medesimo libro." The Secretary of State to Durini, April 14, 1745, Nunziat. di Francia, 442, f. 151^v, Papal Secret Archives.

² Cf. above, pp. 289 *seq.*

³ Benedict to Crivelli, *loc. cit.*, 514 *seq.* ; to Tencin, October 16, and November 27, 1748, I., 435, 445.

had succeeded in making the Brussels nuncio believe that everything was being done in the name of the Pope, who wanted to keep in the background. Finally, he said, if the Dutch authorities had driven Pater Norbert out as an impostor, the mission would be well rid of the pest.¹

The further vicissitudes of the wayward adventurer scarcely deserve to be mentioned in a history of the Popes. Driven out of Holland, Pater Norbert tried his fortune in England, as a director of a carpet factory,² negotiated with the French Minister D'Argenson for his entry into France, caused attempts to be made in Rome to bring about his reconciliation with the Church,³ and published a further volume of his memoirs, which attacked the Jesuits even more bitterly than his previous one.⁴ Probably on account of the outbreak of the Seven Years' War, he left England for Germany, residing

¹ To Tencin, I., 445; cf. II., 234.

² HEECKEREN, II., 429 n. Cf. *Gualtieri to Valenti, July 8, 1754 (Nunziat. di Francia, 492, Papal Secret Archives): "Mi è stato riferito, che il rinomato P. Norberto Cappuccino seguita a dimorare a Londra, assistendo ad una manifattura di quella città, che ha seco una nipote o sorella, ch'egli è ben veduto da quel Duca di Courbelland [Cumberland], e che mesi sono non gli fu permesso di dire la messa, com' egli voleva, nella capella di quel ministro di Toscana per mancanza di dimissorie; e qualcuno venuto di fresco di colà mi ha detto, che non vive con gran reputazione di esatezza, talmente che a taluno si rende sospetta la sua religione." A *Letter of Norbert's to Benedict XIV., towards the end of 1750, in the antiquarian catalogue, 336, by HIERSEMANN, No. 2171.

³ Extract from three letters from Norbert to D'Argenson (January 12, February 9, June 19, 1755) in HEECKEREN, II., 429 n. Benedict XIV. was not disinclined to grant him permission to transfer to a less strict Order (to Tencin, July 30, 1755, II., 428 seq.). It was about this period that Norbert wrote his *Lettre à Mgr. le Prince de . . . au sujet des guerres présentes*, Anvers, 1757. It includes a commendatory letter sent him by Benedict XIV.; see the *Hist. Vierteljahrschrift*, 1930, 467 seq.

⁴ Thus, he accuses the Jesuits of having tried to poison Tournon; *Mém. hist. apolog.*, III., Lisbonne, 1766, 99-149

in Wolfenbüttel and Berlin, and while in Germany in 1759 he received permission from Clement XIII. to live as a secular priest.¹ After a short stay in France, he betook himself, now known as the Abbé Platel, to Portugal, in 1760, to enter the service of Pombal as a pay clerk.² In 1763, however, he deemed it better to return to France, where he published an enlarged edition of his memoirs. Towards the end of his life he resumed the habit of his Order but is said to have again laid it aside. In July 1769 the unhappy man died at Commercy in Lorraine.

(Angelita's account, extract in THOMAS, *Hist. de la Mission de Pékin*, Paris, 1923, 186 seq.). Cf. DUHR, *Jesuitenfabeln*⁴, 776 seq.

¹ Lettera del Sign. Abate Curel Parisot detto per l'innanzi il P. Norberto, con cui indirizza all' Ordine de' Cappuccini il Breve di Clemente XIII. che gli permette passare allo stato di prete secolare, Venetia, 1760, 4. *Ibid.*, p. 12, he calls himself "consiliarius actualis ser. Ducis Brunsvicensis et Luneburgensis". The permission had been obtained for him by Cardinals Passionei and Corsini. *Passionei to Foggini, July 31, 1759, Bibl. Corsini in Rome, 2054.

² *Acciaioli to Torrigiani, Badajoz, August 29, 1760, Nunziat. di Portogallo, 117, Papal Secret Archives; DUHR, *Pombal*, 25-8. Norbert is suspected of having written the lives of St. Anne and Antichrist for which Malagrida was condemned. MURR, *Gesch.*, II., 256.