

HISTORY

OF

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT


FROM THE FRENCH OF

L. F. BUNGENER,

AUTHOR OF "A SERMON UNDER LEWIS XIV." ETC.

WITH THE AUTHOR'S LAST CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS
COMMUNICATED TO THE TRANSLATOR

SECOND EDITION, WITH COPIOUS INDEX.



EDINBURGH: THOMAS CONSTABLE AND CO.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN: J. M'GLASHAN.

MDCCCLIII.

BX830

1545

B9

Reel
c

not located

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

IF it be our highest civil privilege and indefeasible right to have law deduced from the purest known fountains of morality, and enforced by the strongest known sanctions, the British constitution is deservedly most dear to us. For its morality is that of the Holy Scriptures, and the sanction of its laws is that of the Divine Authority as revealed there.

Viewed in this merely civil light, all religious bodies which proclaim the Holy Scriptures to be the sole and sufficient rule of faith and duty, whether they be endowed by the State or not, are eminently conservative of our civil constitution. For the more widely spread, and the more powerfully inculcated the principles, the motives, and the sanctions of the Bible, the better our warranty for security without despotism, liberty without licentiousness, mutual toleration without infidelity and indifference.

The Church of Rome does not rest on that foundation; its influence cannot be deemed conservative of our civil constitution; yet it is eagerly bent on having a powerful organization within our commonwealth. Its success must prove the reverse of conservative to all that we hold most dear—to all that we can most legitimately claim. Its morality has not the purity of Holy Scripture, and even where most pure, being sanctioned,

not by God addressing us in his Word, but by a body weakened by a thousand associations with human fallibility and corruption, it has of necessity a comparatively feeble purchase on the conscience and the life. Hence, wherever it reigns, no security without despotism, no liberty without licentiousness, no mutual toleration without infidelity and indifference.

To acquaint ourselves, then, with this antagonistic organization of the Roman hierarchy, its doctrines, its laws, its administration, may be regarded as henceforth an indispensable part of a sound and complete education.

And if important in a merely civil point of view, how infinitely more so in the religious and theological?

For this end it is not enough that we know something of the Decrees and Canons of the last solemn Council of the Roman Church, and of the Catechism drawn up and published after its close. New translations of both have lately issued from the London press,¹ and testify to the interest widely felt in the subject. It is still more necessary that the history of that assembly which, after having both added to and taken from the Word of God, characteristically closed its sittings with reiterated anathemas to all who differed from it, should be known, the vagueness and variableness of its doctrines exposed, and the tendency of its errors to gather force with time demonstrated by the advance made in some of the worst of them since.

I had long meditated some such work when that of M. BUNGENER was put into my hands by a valued relative. It came highly recommended, and at once recommended itself by

¹ The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, with a Supplement, containing the condemnations of the early Reformers, and other matters relating to the Council. Literally translated into English, by Theodore Alois Buckley, B.A., of Christ Church, Oxford. London, 1851.


The Catechism of the Council of Trent. Translated into English, with Notes, by the same Author. London, 1852.

a clearness, truthfulness, and vigour in the narrative, an acuteness and terseness in the reasoning, and a spirit of Christian fidelity and charity, which I am sure my countrymen will appreciate, if I have at all succeeded in doing it justice in the translation.

It was no small encouragement, that, though personally unacquainted with the author, happening to learn how I was engaged, he wrote me expressing his satisfaction, and offering to send me his last notes and additions. These I have since received and incorporated, so that the work in English is more complete in this respect than the original one in French.

DAVID D. SCOTT.

ST. ANDREWS, *May* 1852.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

PREFACE.

THE Author of this History had been for some time engaged on it, when the newspapers informed him that preparations were in progress for celebrating, in 1845, throughout all the Churches of Roman Catholicity, the three hundredth anniversary of the opening of the Council of Trent.

This news not a little surprised him. He could hardly comprehend how an appeal could thus be made to so stormy an epoch. Rome is surely too much interested in having the Decrees of Trent regarded as oracles, to be in the least desirous to have their history too narrowly scrutinized. Amid the chaos which we were engaged in elucidating, and which we could see at a glance was replete with matter as little creditable to papal authority as it was to that of Roman Catholicism in general,—the Church of Rome, thought we, must have strangely reckoned on the ignorance of some, and on the infatuation of others, when she could present herself ultroneously to be tried by such an ordeal.

There was some risk, in fact, of the trial proving a rough one. Some popular author might take up the subject. His book, which he could easily render amusing without making it untrue, might make an immense impression. The Council of Trent began to be talked of in the social circles of Europe, and this

surely was not what had been thought desirable when instructions were issued for having it recalled to men's minds.

The anniversary came. Nobody took advantage of it to tell the world what that famous assembly was. It would seem that the Church of Rome had herself taken it to heart, and had seriously pondered the subject. Whether the festival was countermanded we do not know; we have had no news as to that. At Rome, in particular, not a word was said about it. It was the day on which the Pope had an interview with the Emperor of Russia.

Be that as it may, we proceeded with our task, and now commit it to the public.

We will not say that there has been any generally felt want of it. To say this, would not only be, as it always is, ambitious; it would be untrue. Who now dreams of the Council of Trent? Truly, the public has something else to do than to ransack the acts of a council.

But although the want of some such work may not be generally felt, it is felt, nevertheless, by some, and it would be felt by many, were the idea but suggested to them, and were they but offered the means of satisfying it without too much trouble. Statesmen, public writers, numbers of Roman Catholics, Protestants of all the Churches which Roman Catholicism now renders restless and uneasy, alike in religion, politics, and morals, by the feverish revival to which it calls our attention—all at this day are interested in knowing what took place, and what was done, in the assembly at which that Roman Catholicism was definitively constituted.

Father Paul Sarpi and Pallavicini, the only two historians of the Council down to this day, are little read, and we cannot well expect them to be so. Differing profoundly in their qualities and in their views, they are but too much alike in their

faults. In both we find diffuseness and dryness; no plan, no philosophy; an absence, in fine, of all that is now looked for in an historian. Sarpi's work is nothing better than a long satire, lifeless and insipid; often, too, inaccurate and unfair: Pallavicini's is but a long and dull apology, more accurate in its details, but feeble in its reasonings, and in the aggregate childish and false.

Sarpi has been put on the Index Expurgatorius; Pallavicini ought to be there. His puerilities, his absurd reasonings, often say more than the attacks of the opponent whom he thinks he is refuting. After having read the former, who blames everything, you dread being too severe; after having read the latter, who approves of everything, you are reassured. The weakness of the defence clearly enough attests the weakness of the cause. You feel that severity is only justice.

We would fain hope that we have been just. The pretensions of the Council of Trent, and of its foolhardy heirs, authorize our sifting its claims. But when will they be sifted by those who have been fashioned into obedience to them? A colossus with feet of clay,—those on whom it treads might make its fragility better known than we can do, and might labour more effectually towards its downfall.

CONTENTS OF BOOK FIRST.

Introduction—First wishes—Saint Bernard and Luther—Awakening—Antipathies—Leo X.—Illusion—Twenty-four years to wait—Adrian VI.—His theory of Indulgences—Projected reforms—Projected exterminations—The Popedom in Germany—Admissions made by the Pope—The hundred grievances—Clement VII. and the Diet of Nuremberg—Counter-diet—Charles V. and Francis I.—Battle of Pavia—Two letters—The Colonnas—The Throne and the Tiara—The Constable de Bourbon—The Sack of Rome—Hypocrisy—Reconciliation—Interview at Bologna—The Augsburg Confession—Christ and Belial—There is no fear of the heavens falling—The League of Smalkalde—The Turks—Geneva—Paul III.—Ten years yet—The Sons of the Pope—Negotiations—Difficulties—Mantua—Vicenza—Trent—War breaks out again—Hostilities cease—The Council is about to open—Retrospect.

The arrival—Three years' indulgence—Scruples—Four hundred seats and no bishops—*Parturient montes*—The imagination of Father Biner—Simple arithmetic—A notable admission—Œcumenical Councils—The Church's Representatives—Jerusalem and Trent.

Diplomacy—Had the Protestants promised obedience—Every epoch has its fixed idea—Luther's trepidation—The real object of his wishes—Vicious circle—Where was the doctrine of Infallibility—Affairs of Cologne—Who was in the wrong—Complications—By what did the Council hold.

The Procurators—Infallibility by Delegation—Charles V. and heresy—The Pope's offers—The priest-king—The Morals of the Popes—New Scandals—*Of happy memory*—Papal Infallibility—Certain questions—The Popedom at Rome.

People begin to be impatient—13th December 1545—Formidable task—What Catholicism had been hitherto—Bossuet and St. Augustine—Progress in Religion—Reasonable Inconsistencies and absurd Logic.

A wise Decree—In whose name was it to be published—Pope and Council—*Presidentibus Legatis*—Foxes—Second Session—Protests—Were appearances really saved—People know not where to begin—Indecision and Alarm—"Day of Battle! Glorious Day!"—Dangerous medley—What the weak-minded may think—The Queen of the Virtues—*Credo*—Third Session—An able General—The Italians at Trent—Their Oath—The Consent of the Church.

Luther dies—Shut, shut the Bible!—Let us open it—The question of Authority—Its bearing exaggerated—What is Authority in Religion—What can it be—Dilemma—What, at bottom, is the Submission of those who think—What is Authority without Force—*God might have, God ought to have*—What know you of that—Three Objects—To regulate the faith, to preserve the faith, to maintain unity—*Regulate the Faith*—What that supposes and to what it leads—*To preserve the Faith*—Have they succeeded—Variations—An eternal burthen.

Unity—Does God intend it—Conclusion.

HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

BOOK FIRST.

THE history of a council is not confined to the circumstances amid which it was called, and which have marked its proceedings. It properly commences with the first of those expressions of the general feeling which led to its being assembled, and with the wants which it had to satisfy.

But these wants and those feelings may possibly have had their nature insensibly modified by time. If there are ideas in which the essence remains although the forms vary, there are those also in which the essence changes without any alteration having taken place in the forms. *Liberty*, for example, has hardly anything now in common with what was once understood by the word; and when our modern demagogues speak of a Leonidas, or of a William Tell, it is most frequently a mere play of words.

When he spoke of a council for the reformation of the faith, was Luther, as Bossuet¹ alleges, pursuing quite a different path from Saint Bernard, when, four centuries earlier, he called for a reformation in discipline? We think not.

“Who will give me,” exclaimed the Abbot of Clairvaux,² “who will give me the satisfaction, ere I die, of seeing the Church in the condition she was in in her early days!” But in the twelfth century, at an epoch essentially practical, and with a man who had above all things a genius for organization, the

¹ Variations, B. I.

² Epistle to Pope Eugenius III.

perfect ideal of the Church was also, above all things, an ideal of order, of practical faith, and of purity of manners.

It is thus that we should account for the faith being apparently left out of consideration in that appeal to antiquity. It remains to be seen whether serious attempts to answer that appeal could have left the question on the domain where people thought they had placed it.

Attempts there were ; but serious attempts, or at least seriously pursued, there were none. That the Councils of Basle and Constance had not answered the desire expressed of old by St. Bernard, may be seen from the fact, that the nations had not ceased to call for a reformation—a council, and that people spoke generally as if nothing had as yet been done.

This being the case, can it be admitted that a serious, learned, and impartial council, such, in fine, as the Bishop Durand de Mende fixed the basis of at the beginning of the fourteenth century,¹—that such a council, even in the twelfth, would not have been led off, in spite of itself, into the domain of the faith? And had it really entered on it with the desire of seeing the Church again “such as she was in her first days;” had it, in harmony with that wish, frankly placed Scripture again above all traditions, who will say that discipline and morals alone would have appeared altered? We are now about to have a proof to the contrary almost at every page.

Nevertheless, this work, which so many councils had been unable or unwilling to undertake, nations and doctors had been silently accomplishing without being aware of it. The instinct of the former, and the logic of the latter, equally revolted against that strange abstraction, of a church infallible in its doctrines yet increasingly fallible in its manners; people had believed that they were only sighing for a disciplinary reformation, and, lo! a single shake was all that was required in order to the half of Europe arousing itself from its lethargy, and sighing for a reformation of the faith.

But, down to this time, the very word council was hateful to the Church of Rome. In vain had it attempted to palm off a deception, by itself adorning with that name some petty assemblies held in Italy by the Popes. Council, in the language of Europe, no longer meant anything short of general, universal council. Rome struggled to put people off with courts of an

¹ *Tractatus de modo concilii generalis celebrandi.* Reprinted at Bruges in 1545, and dedicated by the Jurisconsult Probus to the Fathers of the Council of Trent.

inferior grade, but from all other quarters there arose the cry for the supreme court, the States-General of Christendom.

Pallavicini has endeavoured to prove that the popes were less afraid of it than people said; but truth wrests from him, from time to time, admissions that more than suffice to overturn all the rest. "Just as in the pupil of the eye, the smallest grain of dust causes extreme uneasiness, so, when things of the highest value are in agitation, the remotest dangers give occasion to the cruellest alarms."¹ Sarpi himself never said more or spoke better. The breath of public opinion had set in motion enough of those "grains of dust" so menacing to the eye of the popedom. Could it proceed, then, and place itself without alarm in the midst of the whirlwind; Basle and Constance had not allowed it to entertain any doubt as to the immensity of the danger that threatened it.

Be that as it may, when the question had undergone the change that we have indicated, the Court of Rome seemed reconciled for a moment to the idea of a council. On the field of doctrine, it believed itself sure of victory. So in fact it was. Not a single bishop had as yet deserted it; Leo X. would have thought it a fine thing to reply to the Saxon monk, by the imposing voice of the whole Christian episcopate. This illusion lasted but a short time; and, to tell the truth, few had shared it. Leo X.'s advisers were frightened at his confidence. They were right. Whatever importance dogmatic questions had acquired, it was soon easy to see that people had not on that account laid aside their old complaints or their old longings. The secular princes of Christendom spoke more than ever of setting limits to the encroachments of the clergy; their subjects talked more than ever of their unwillingness to receive in future any but men of respectable character for their pastors; and bishops spoke, too, of insisting on the restoration of those rights of which Rome had gradually deprived them. In fine, Luther and his friends, after having called so warmly for a council, had not been slow to add the expression of their desire, that it should not be convoked or presided over, or directed by the Bishop of Rome. To that the pope could only reply as a pope might be expected to do: he caused him to be excommunicated.

Leo X. considered himself nevertheless as engaged, if not to the Lutherans, at least to the princes who had supported their first appeal. In 1521, and even before that, we see him occu-

¹ Pallav., *Introd.* ch. x.

pietied about the selection of a city in which the council might be conveniently held. But towards the close of that same year he died, very far probably from suspecting that twenty-four years would elapse before matters should be in a train for the accomplishment of such a purpose.

Adrian, his successor, was a man of honest intentions; he desired a reformation of abuses, but he desired to see it effected by the pope; as for reformation in matters of faith, he could not conceive how any one could have so much as the idea of such a thing. In his eyes, it was all one to deny the mass and to deny that the sun exists; and Luther, he thought, was less a heretic than a madman. All the Roman dogmas had for a long time been struck at by the axe of Wittenberg, when he believed that they were still at the question of indulgences, and spoke of arranging the affair by giving explanations on that point. With this view he proposed to proclaim to all Christendom, as pope, a doctrine which he had taught before as a divine. According to him,¹ the effects of the indulgence purchased or acquired, are not absolute, but more or less good, more or less complete, according to the dispositions of the penitent, and the manner in which he performs the work to which the indulgence is attached. A bull to this effect was said to be ready for publication; but alarm seized all the pope's circle, and not without reason, for their master would thereby employ his own hand in opening the door by which all Luther's ideas had been successively introduced into Germany. In vain would the indulgences continue, according to the bull, to be powerful means of salvation; for it is clear that if their virtue—it matters not in what degree—depends on the dispositions of the believer, it is very difficult to avoid the conclusion, either that the indulgence, received without piety, is null, or that piety, from the moment that it is true and solid, may dispense with the indulgence. In either case, it is not easy to see what value indulgences can have by themselves, and what is, in reality, the power of granting them. We shall have to return to this subject at another place.

The pope's counsellors, accordingly, resolved to leave the question at rest. He confined himself to reforming, but very quietly, and with a most careful avoidance of any apparent concession, some part of what had been most criticised in the traffic of indulgences.

This first step in the path of the reforms, by which he had

¹ Commentary on the Fourth Book of *The Sentences*.

flattered himself that he was to stop the progress of Lutheranism, was almost the last which he was to succeed in effecting. We shall also have to show elsewhere, with more details, what the best-intentioned popes had to encounter on every side in the way of resistances, obstacles, and inextricable embarrassments. There were then at Rome, according to Ranke's calculations, two thousand five hundred venal charges, the property of titulars, whose incomes ought to have corresponded to the interest of the capital sunk in purchasing them. They were created in batches, according as the exigencies of the treasury required; one day twenty-five secretaries, another fifty registrars, and all acquired the right of living at the expense of Christendom; unless the purchase-money were repaid, which it would have required enormous sums to do, they could not be touched; to diminish the revenue would therefore have been unjust. "Yes, dear Leo," wrote Luther in 1520, "you remind me of Daniel in the den, and of Ezekiel among the scorpions. What could you do alone against all those monsters? Let us add, moreover, three or four learned and virtuous cardinals:—Were you to hazard attempting a remedy for so many abuses, would you not be poisoned? O wretched Leo, seated on that accursed throne! If St. Bernard felt compassion for his pope Eugenius, what shall not be our lamentations for thee, after a farther four hundred years' increase of corruption!—Yes, thou shouldst have to thank me for thy eternal salvation, were I to succeed in bursting that dungeon, that hell in which thou dost find thyself imprisoned." Leo X. alas! did not think himself so very ill off in that frightful prison. He did his best to embellish it with all that was festive and magnificent; with those farces,¹ in short, that had made it the most splendid and amusing Court in Europe; but one may readily conceive what a pious and serious man must have suffered, while lying in that den and unable to extricate himself, on seeing it the prolific source of all the Church's murmurs, and all its evils, and all its causes of offence. Adrian had not been three months on the throne when he groaned to think how wanting he was in ability to accomplish his fondly-cherished reforms; and he had not been in it a year when, in the bitterness of disappointment and vexation, the extermination of the Lutherans seemed the only feasible means of having done with them.

¹ Pallavicini, B. I. ch. ii. It was to provide the money required for these farces that Leo X. himself erected nearly twelve hundred of the offices we have mentioned.

He began, accordingly, to sound the dispositions of the princes of Germany; but he found them generally far from zealous in a cause which they had long been accustomed to identify far more with the interests of the pope than with those of religion and the Church. Those sovereigns that were farthest removed from Lutheranism, were less afflicted at its progress than secretly gratified at the disappointments of the Court of Rome; and old Germany had not forgotten the humiliating spectacle of her emperor grovelling for three days in the snow at the bottom of the walls of Canossa.¹ The remembrance of Henry IV. weighed heavily on all the electoral and ducal crowns. "Luther is a demon," the pope exclaimed to them. "Ay," thought they, "but he is an avenging demon." And they were in no haste to lay an arrest on his proceedings.

The diet was about to meet.² Did the pope hope to obtain from the princes in a body, what each individually had all but refused? If he flattered himself with this prospect, he was soon to be undeceived. Meanwhile he neglected nothing that could help him to break with that hated past of which he felt himself the heir. All the disorders with which the Court of Rome was reproached, he humbly confessed; to every reasonable and useful proposal he engaged to apply his endeavours; but in spite of all this, he did not even succeed in having his demand for an anti-Lutheran crusade taken into consideration. These engagements, it was seen, it was beyond his power to keep; those confessions were admitted to be sincere, but this was only one proof more of the immensity of the evil. All he gained by them was the censure of his Court, where he was openly charged with weakness, cowardice, and folly; and Pallavicini, though he uses milder expressions, seems to have been sufficiently of this opinion. He came to the conclusion that Adrian was a holy priest but a wretched pope, and, in short, a poor creature.

The diet, accordingly, replied, that before proceeding to extirpate heresy, measures must be taken for extirpating that which was the cause, or at least the occasion, of heresy. It had seen, it said, with the liveliest satisfaction, that the pope seriously thought of this. It had no doubt of a council-general being in his eyes the first and the best of means.

But we have already seen that one of the pope's reasons for testifying to his readiness to undertake so many reforms, was precisely this, that it might put it quite out of people's thoughts

¹ 1077. Disputes with Gregory VII.

² At Nuremberg, November 1522.

to dream of obtaining them by means of a council. Strong in the consciousness of his good intentions, he had supposed himself in a better position than any one else for preserving, in all its fulness, the absolute power which he confessed had been so much abused. And the diet had not only asked for a council, but a *godly, free*, and Christian council, convoked as soon as possible, and with the emperor's consent, in one of the cities of Germany; thus comprising, in the compass of a few lines, all that was most contrary to the pope's views and interests. And the Italians could but say, with redoubled murmuring, "He has got only what he has brought upon himself."

Ere long the secular princes proceeded to still greater lengths. About twenty years previous to this period, the Emperor Maximilian had caused ten of the main grievances of Germany against Rome to be put into a regular form; and this document, although expressed with much reserve, had produced an immense sensation. The time for such reserve had now gone by. Maximilian had noted ten grievances; the princes proceeded to note a hundred. This formed the famous *Centum gravamina*—a writing which, in the course of a few days, found its way over all Germany and Europe.

The diet had separated in March (1523). In September, Adrian died. Enjoying the esteem of his enemies, but detested by those who formed his immediate circle, he congratulated himself on his death-bed, on his escape from this labyrinth of tormenting reflections, and his friend Cardinal Enckenwort could write upon his tomb,—Here lies one, who in his life found nothing more miserable than his being called to reign.¹

The heir to his embarrassment began to pursue quite a different course. As for obstacles, Clement VII.² was resolved to act as if he saw them not; abuses could never draw a sigh from his breast; affronts he would contrive to devour in silence, at least as long as he felt that he was not in a condition to revenge them. Accordingly, in a new diet,³ he caused it to be seriously asked, what people complained about; and on being referred to the *hundred grievances* of the preceding year, he replied that he did not know what people were saying. He recollected, said Cardinal Campeggio, his ambassador, that a certain writing of that kind had been in circulation; but he would have considered himself guilty of insulting the princes in attributing such a pamphlet

¹ . . . Qui nihil sibi infelicius in vita duxit, quam quod imperaret.

² Julian di Medici, cousin of Leo X.

³ Nuremberg, 1524.

to them. As for the rest, added the legate, he was ready to give every satisfaction to the Germans; and he, Campeggio, had full powers to that effect. He was then asked, where he proposed to begin? On this he shewed the plan he meant to follow, comprising some good enough reforms, but confined almost entirely to the lower clergy. The diet replied, that it was ridiculous to think of healing the leaves, or at most some branches, while the trunk was left sickly and cankered. In an edict of the 18th of April, it did not confine itself to declaring, as it had done before, that it were good to call a council; it decreed that a council should actually be called, and that as soon as possible.

Campeggio now lifted the mask. As the emperor¹ was in Spain, his brother, the Archduke Ferdinand, represented him in the diets, and in his name exercised a part of the imperial functions. The legate contrived to persuade him to convoke at Ratisbon a kind of counter-diet, where an attempt might be made to amend the decrees of that which had been dissolved. The meeting did take place, but not a single elector was there. Some had positively refused; the rest had hesitated; and, in short, no one came. There were present only two dukes, one archbishop, two bishops, and the deputies of nine others. Certainly it had been the wisest course for them quietly to dissolve the meeting; but the cardinal insisted. On the 6th of July, they decreed that the old decree of Worms against the Lutherans, should be put in force; and on the 7th, they adopted the project of reformation, which the diet had rejected as insignificant and ridiculous.

Charles V. could not openly give his sanction to decisions taken without regard to legal forms; but as it was of consequence, on account of his squabbles with France, to remain on as good terms as possible with the pope, he blamed the peremptory tone of the Nuremberg decree. It lay with him, he said, and with him alone, to demand a council. The diet might request him to use his good offices with the pope; but as for acting of itself, it had no right to do so. And as it had farther decreed to meet again at Spire, in the last months of that same year, to see how matters went, and, if need were, to hasten their progress, the emperor prohibited any such meeting.

He was soon to speak another language. Conqueror at Pavia,² master of the fortunes of Francis I., his victory had made him master of Italy. He no longer stood in need of the pope, who

¹ Charles V.

² 1525.

was now no more to him than one of the petty potentates who shared that country among them. In June 1526, while the diet was sitting at Spire, he himself sent an order to deliberate on the affairs of the Church; and it was decided, in conformity with his views, that he should be besought to endeavour with the utmost expedition to have a council-general, or failing that a national council, convened in Germany.

This was a new step; and it was a great one. If the court of Rome so much dreaded a council open to all its friends and to all its influences, what would it not apprehend from one altogether German?

Driven to extremity, the pope did not wait until the demand should be presented to him. Certain imperial decrees, more or less hostile, on some points, to the rights or to the pretensions of the Church, furnished him with an occasion for speaking out. On the 23d of June he wrote a violent letter; on the 25th, it was followed by a brief in much milder terms, full of flatteries and of promises, and without any allusion to the other. Charles did the same. In a first letter, meant as a reply to the first brief, he boldly recriminates; he will appeal from it, he says, like the Lutherans, to a universal and free council. In another, written also two days after the first, he seems to have forgotten the first altogether; he protests his respect for the pope; his love of peace, his desire for the fraternal union of the two powers. In a third letter, in fine, it is to the cardinals he addresses himself. It is for the cardinals, says he, to convoke the council, should Clement persist in refusing.

He knew to whom he spoke. A powerful party, sustained and encouraged by him, had been labouring for some time in Rome itself, to bring down the pope. Cardinal Pompey Colonna, head of the family of that name, had declared himself on the emperor's side. It was the destiny of his family, he would say, not only to be hated by the popes, but also to deliver the Church from them. "If his ancestors had made a Boniface VIII. tremble, he would contrive to bring a Clement VII. to reason." And it was not only by violent measures that he had it in his power to torment the unhappy pope. Clement's election had been signaled, it would appear, by some dishonourable doings. There had been cabals, and promises of money and of places; not at all uncommon, generally speaking, in the elections of those days, yet strictly prohibited by the canons of the Church, and consequently sufficient, should the emperor concur, for effecting

the deposition of a pope on the ground of his being an illegitimate intruder. Add to this an illegitimacy of another kind, that of his birth. The son of one of Julian di Medici's mistresses, he had never been able to prove that his father had married her. In creating him a cardinal, Leo X. had caused a solemn sentence to be passed, in which his legitimacy was acknowledged; but this was only an additional proof that it had till then been at least doubtful—and people had continued to doubt. Now, the ancient canons had likewise forbidden the elevation, even to the priesthood, of any one whose birth had not been legitimate or regularly legitimated.

The storms were now gathering overhead; but the pope on his part had lost no time. Before breaking with the emperor he had made sure of the support of France. All the oaths which the royal prisoner of Pavia had been made to swear, in his prison at Madrid, for the recovery of his liberty, he had been secretly loosed from by the pope. Secretly leagued also under his auspices against the emperor's encroachments, the princes of Italy were ready to rise at the first signal.

They rose accordingly. The pope then sent all his disposable forces into Lombardy; but no sooner was Rome left defenceless, than the Colonnas approached its walls with all the soldiers and banditti they could muster. They entered the gates. The pope wanted to wait their coming, seated on his throne, with the tiara on his head, and the cross in his hand, like Boniface of old. 'Let us see,' he said, 'whether they will dare to lay hands on the successor of St. Peter!' Peter himself would hardly have known who he was, in such a dress and with such appurtenances. Let us be just notwithstanding; there was something fine in Clement's purpose. But his friends took fright, and advised him not to be so confident. The Colonnas were not the men to go down on their knees; they had seen the popedom too close at hand; they knew what fir-work there was under the velvet of its throne, and what pasteboard under the gems of its tiara. Clement fled to the Castle of St. Angelo, and the Colonnas pillaged the Vatican. Repulsed by the people, they proceeded to encamp outside the gates, whither the King of Naples, at his own instance, or upon orders from the emperor, sent them daily reinforcements. The pope capitulated; he engaged to recall his troops, and the Colonnas were to retire. But hardly were his troops on their way back when he excommunicated the Colonnas, their adherents, their friends—all in fine who aided, or should in

future aid them. This was neither more nor less than to excommunicate the emperor. Taking refuge in the house of the Viceroy, Pompey Colonna appealed "to a future council," and the appeal was found mysteriously attached one morning to the church-doors in Rome.

Ere long, from the north and the south simultaneously, the tempest approached. Here the viceroy demanded a reason for the excommunication of the Colonnas; there it was Charles of Bourbon, the general of the imperial army, who advanced, no one knew why—a minister of the evil one, according to some—the minister of God, according to others, to chastise Rome, and there to perish. No one knew at the time whether he had any order, and it is a problem to this day whether he had any. Certain it is, that he had none to the contrary, and that he was never seriously disavowed.

Clement upon this offered again to reinstate the Colonnas. The viceroy accepted this offer and returned; Bourbon made no reply, and behold him ere long at the foot of the walls of Rome! On the 6th of May 1527, the assault is given; the general is slain, but the city is taken, and fourteen thousand Germans, almost all Lutherans, are left to see to the emperor's being avenged. From the top of the towers of St. Angelo, the pope looks on while his city is pillaged. He sees his cardinals led in procession, mounted on asses. The bells sound, salvos of artillery are fired. It is Luther whom they are proclaiming pope. An old soldier crowned with a tiara, is by way of burlesque enthroned in his name.

Meanwhile, from one end of Europe to the other, all that still cling to Roman Catholicism, and to the Roman Church, are indignant at the very idea of an imprisoned pope. But the first to utter groans on the subject is Charles V. He orders processions for the pope's deliverance; he intermits the festivities at Valladolid on account of the birth of a son; there is but one thing that he forgets, and that is to issue orders for his troops to quit Rome, and set the pope at liberty. Infamous farce; and yet it lasted six whole months.

As for the rest, as regards dissimulation, Rome is never far behind. Clement proceeded to present an example less odious, indeed, but still more extraordinary.

The princes who were leagued against the emperor had now at last some success. A French army occupied the kingdom of Naples. The pope was free. Now was the time, if ever, for excommunicating Charles V., combining with his enemies, and

giving freedom to Italy. Warmly urged to declare himself, Clement hesitated, drew back, refused. In secret he could find no expressions strong enough for cursing the emperor; in public he flattered him, and loaded him with civilities; he seemed like one who never dreamed for a moment that Charles had had anything to do with the siege of Rome, or his six months' captivity.

Why this change? The cause of it was an enigma to nobody. Florence had availed itself of the pope's reverses for the purpose of shaking off the yoke of the Medicis, and Clement was bent, above all things, on its recovery. To this we must ascribe his meekness, and the attentions which he paid to the only one who had the power to accomplish that object. Besides, nothing but a sense of danger and resentment could have united him, even momentarily, with his neighbours. He well knew that it was not in Germany that he had the worst enemies to fear; and that he had more need of the emperor to aid him against the princes of Italy, than he had of those princes against the emperor.

Charles, on his side, began to need the support of the court of Rome. Never having acknowledged himself the author of the pope's reverses, his pride was not engaged in having the pontiff kept in abasement; and so, no sooner were negotiations commenced, than one would have supposed that their mutual friendship had never been clouded for a moment. The pope promised all that was required of him; Charles V. made all the returns that were asked, and engaged, in particular, to put Florence again under the power of the Medicis. One point alone remained in suspense, and that again was, the grand affair of the council. Charles had mentioned it, but without any urgency, and it was clear that for the moment he had ceased to care about it; and Clement, who cared about it still less, had said neither Yes nor No in reply.

In March 1529 a new diet was held at Spires, and much debating took place. An edict was passed, bearing that the innovations already received might be tolerated by the princes, but that new ones ought not to be authorized. Against this decree six princes and fourteen free cities protested; and hence arose the name *Protestants*, which was ere long to become common to all the Reformed.

The pope and the emperor were now reconciled; nothing seemed wanting but that they should embrace each other before

the eyes of all Europe. In November, accordingly, we find them met at Bologna, lodged in the same palace, and eating at the same table. How laughable would be those grand scenes on the stage of human politics, were not their chief characteristics most deplorable and most immoral! But let us proceed with our narrative, and cease to judge. We shall have enough to judge ere long.

The conferences between the two potentates lasted four months. The emperor, from all that appears, had seriously returned to the idea of a council. He insisted on having it, and was almost at the point of exacting it. Nevertheless, Clement succeeded in diverting him from his purpose. He demonstrated—what, indeed, had begun to be evident—that a council could only serve to interpose a gulf between the Church of Rome and the Reformed. It was necessary, before setting about having one, either to bring back the Reformed, or to crush them. It was in this spirit that Charles V. set out for Germany. A diet was about to be opened at Augsburg, and Campeggio, the papal nuncio, was to precede him there.

Though sure of the emperor's concurrence,—as far, at least, as any one could safely trust in the promises of Charles V.,—still Clement was not without alarm. It was much to have rid himself for the moment of the dangers of a council, but the grand object was to prevent the far worse evil of the diet constituting itself a judge in matters of faith. To this, even without desiring it, it might be led at last. The Lutherans had announced their having drawn up a confession of faith, and this was to be presented by the Elector of Saxony. But what reception would it be proper that it should receive? If not at once condemned, people everywhere would say that it was approved; if condemned at its reception, this would imply that the diet was acting as a council. If the diet should refrain from meddling with it, to whom should it be sent? To the pope? Clement would fain hope not; and not without reason. To a future council? In that case one must be called, and this is what the pope desired above all things to avoid. Meanwhile, the confession made its appearance; and already it had come to be commonly called the Confession of Augsburg. But what was to be done with it?

By dint of great caution and contrivance, the nuncio succeeded at once in concentrating the dispute between the divines of the two parties. "I learn," wrote Luther to the Elector of Saxony's

chaplain, Spalatin, "that you have undertaken an admirable task—that of bringing Luther and the pope to agree. Should you succeed I promise to reconcile Christ and Belial." On some points, nevertheless, the two parties agreed; at least they believed that they were agreed. Melancthon, in his ardent desire for peace, had hazarded certain concessions, which neither Luther nor the Lutherans could ratify. Moreover, even had those first points been got over, there were quite enough left on which it was evident that they never could hope to come to a common understanding.

The conferences now began to languish; nothing more could be expected than that they would be broken up as soon as the chief points in dispute should be brought forward. The emperor had been too much accustomed to act to permit his remaining long a mere spectator. In a first edict he allowed the Lutherans six months to make up their minds to become Roman Catholics; in a second, he regulated and determined, with the air of a pope, what men were to believe and teach, until the approaching council, on all the controverted points. To the refractory he denounced imprisonment and death.

And, amid the general stupefaction, at a time when all the human props of the Reformation seemed ready to fall away, "I saw, not long since," cried Luther, "a sign in the heavens. I was looking out of my window at night, and beheld the stars and the whole majestic vault of God held up, without my being able to see the pillars on which the Master had caused it to rest. And yet, there was no appearance of its being about to fall. There are some men who look about for those pillars, and would fain touch them with their hands. And because, forsooth, they cannot, they begin to tremble anon and to lament. They fear that the sky may fall. . . . Poor souls! Is not God always there?"

To the contraveners, then, the prospect was that of imprisonment and death.

The conclusion suited the pope admirably,¹ but not the premises. No doubt the imperial edict was rigorously Roman Catholic; Charles V. said nothing in it that Clement would not have said in his place. But was it for Charles to speak on this occasion? What right had he to say, "This is the faith, and that is not the faith?" After his having made himself pope in

¹ "One has a right to destroy those venomous plants with fire and sword," said Campeggio, in the name of the pope, in his "Instructio data Cae. ari in dieta Augustana."

one sense, the Elector of Saxony, or any other prince, might equally make himself so in another.

Clement took the best course, by quietly leaving to be presumed that nothing had been done without his approval. He himself wrote to all the princes, recommending them to execute the edict. The Protestants among them refused; and as the emperor talked of resorting to compulsion, they resolved to unite for the common defence of their states and their faith. Such was the origin of the League of Smalcalde (1531.)

Notwithstanding the League, Charles still found himself strong enough to act against them; but the nearer the moment for action approached, the more repugnant did he feel to fight as the mere soldier of the pope. It was from a council only, thought he, that he could with any decency receive the sword with which he, the emperor, was to march against the Lutherans. Hence arose a fresh pressure on the pope, and fresh tergiversations on his part. He consented to the calling of a council, but on condition that it should be held in his, the Papal States. He consented to the Protestants being heard, but on condition that the bishops, according to use and wont, should alone have the right to vote. In a word, it was easy to see that were all these demands to be conceded, it would only be at the last extremity that he would yield his consent and co-operation.

The emperor now began to be impatient. The Turks were all the while making rapid advances, and a few days more would find them at the gates of Vienna. Charles V. required all the forces that Germany could furnish, and the Protestants refused theirs unless the Edict of Augsburg was revoked. This point was conceded; the pope reclaimed in vain; freedom of conscience was granted, but the decree ran thus, "until the council." The summons was to be issued in six months, and the opening was to take place in a year. And so, when hardly done with the conquest of the Turks, we find Charles again in Italy. New conferences followed with the pope, and new tergiversations, so that the parties separated almost in a quarrel.

The pope now returned to the French alliance, and Germany and France being at peace, Clement could closely unite himself with the king without breaking ostensibly with the emperor. The negotiations went on prosperously. Catherine di Medicis, the pope's niece, was to marry Henry, second son of Francis I., and that monarch, on his side, was to employ all his influence with the Germans, in order to prevail on them either to renounce

altogether the idea of a council, or to consent to its being convened in Italy. He tried this, but found them intractable. By dint of solicitation he obtained their promise, that they would consent to a council being held out of Germany, provided it were not to be in Italy.

Where then should it be held? The French ambassadors suggested Geneva as the proper place, on which the pope asked if his ally were jesting with him, by proposing a city in which Catholicism was at the lowest ebb. Shortly afterwards Clement VII. fell sick, and his last days were embittered by the defection of England. He died, he said, without any regrets; he had done his duty in opposing Henry VIII.'s divorce. Possibly so, and Roman Catholic historians have sufficiently praised him for it; only it is forgotten, that before condemning that famous divorce, he had long shown himself quite favourable to it. The very act of approval had been drawn up. Pallavicini denies, while Guicciardini affirms this, and Burnet¹ proves it by the production of pieces which clearly suppose either the existence of the brief or a formal promise to publish it.

Paul III., Clement VII.'s successor, had been cardinal under six popes; no man was more deeply conversant with all the secrets of Roman policy. He saw that for the moment resistance was impolitic; and, accordingly, hardly had he taken his seat on the throne when he began to speak of the council as the sole remedy for the evils of the time. He made it his own affair, and outstript all men's wishes for it.

Ten years, notwithstanding, were destined still to elapse between words and deeds. It is true that people were not long of seeing what they had really to expect from him. Amid the plans of reform which he took a pleasure in unfolding, and for the execution of which he desired nothing better, he would say, than the support of a council, two youths, the one sixteen, the other hardly fourteen years of age, were at once created cardinals—and these youths were his own children.²

In spite of this scandal, or, perhaps, because of this scandal, and in order to lessen the noise it made, he declared (January 1535) that the convocation was about to meet. Vergerio had

¹ *Letters of Henry VIII. and Wolsey.* Burnet, *Collection of Records.* See also Herbert's *Life of Henry VIII.*, and Rankc's *Popes.*

² His grandchildren, Alexander Farnese and Gui-Ascagnio Sforza, the issue the one of his son Lewis Farnese, and the other of his daughter Constance. The follies of his youth had been such, that his mother had found it necessary to have him shut up in the Castle of St. Angelo, from which he escaped by letting himself down by a rope.

set off for Germany. He was to see all the princes, all the men of influence: the Roman Catholics, to keep them from opposing a council held in Italy; the Protestants, to prevail on them to engage to observe its decrees; Luther, Luther most especially, to keep him from opposing it. What idea, then, could have been formed, we do not say of conscience, but of mere human self-respect, by these men, when we see them capable of imagining that, after eighteen years of warfare, Luther could still have remained accessible to their seductions? Vergerio saw him only once, for a very short time, according to some, and for a very long time according to others. What is certain is, that he gained nothing, and that some years afterwards this "great *mignon* of the pope," as a chronicler calls him, went himself over to the Reformation. As for the princes, the Roman Catholics were unanimous in declaring that they had no wish for a council held in Italy, and the Protestants, that they had no wish for one held in Italy or anywhere, if the pope was to be at the head of it.

From all this, Paul would have gladly allowed himself to conclude, that it was no longer to be dreamt of; but he was pushed on in spite of himself. "A council," reiterated the emperor, "a council we must have! . . . I charge myself with the execution of its decrees." He consented, besides, in spite of the princes, to its meeting in Italy. Thus there was no longer any pretext either for refusal or delay. Paul submitted, and fixing on the city of Mantua, the 7th of May of the following year (1537) was appointed for the opening.

Hardly had the bull of convocation appeared when it was evident that it would end in nothing. Germany, France, England, Italy itself, were all in a ferment with protests. Nay, the very Duke of Mantua, of whom Paul had reckoned himself so sure, started a thousand difficulties with respect to the favour proposed to be shown to his city. Paul then fixed on Vicenza. This involved a sacrifice, for Vicenza belonged to the Venetians, who were often at enmity with the Court of Rome; and so the pope took advantage of this change to put off the opening for a year. He fixed it for the 1st of May 1538.

On that day his legates¹ were at Vicenza: there they waited for the arrival of the bishops; no bishops came. As for those of Italy, a word from Paul would have sufficed to send a host of them; but he felt that he was bound to wait until some, at

¹ Campeggio, Simonetta, and Alexander.

least, appeared from other quarters. The legates waited three whole months, still nobody, actually nobody, appeared. It began to be evident that the emperor himself had no longer any wish for a council, for there were plenty of bishops, both in Spain and Austria, whom he might at once have sent. Upon this the pope recalled his legates, but without revoking the summons of convocation. He fixed the opening for the month of April 1539; afterwards, in a final bull, the time was adjourned indefinitely.

We shall not enter into the details of the negotiations of all sorts which occupied the years 1538, 1539, and 1540,¹ for we should only have to behold anew, under almost identically the same forms, all that we have had hitherto to observe. We should see the same feelings of repugnance, the same obstacles, the same oscillations. We hold ourselves bound to omit nothing that is essential, but by no means to say everything. The preliminaries of the council fill a whole book in Sarpi, and three in Pallavicini.

It was in 1541, at a new interview between the pope and the emperor, that the city from which it was to derive its name was first spoken of as that in which it was to meet. Trent, in the heart of the Tyrol, offered the advantage of being one of the most central cities of Europe. It was neither so very Italian as that the Germans should refuse to repair to it, nor so very German as to make the pope despair of remaining master of any assembly that might be held in it.² He only thought it very far from Rome; but after so many disputes and altercations he had reason to think himself fortunate when other parties were content. Time, besides, was pressing. The diet had again decreed, at Ratisbon, that something absolutely must be done, and that if there was to be no council-general, one must be convened in Germany. Accordingly, the bull of convocation appeared early in 1542, and the 1st of November was fixed for the opening.

While these things were transacting, war again broke out between the emperor and France. It was meant, nevertheless, that matters should proceed. The pope sent his legates, and

¹ It was in 1538 that there appeared the famous *Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia*, addressed by Paul III. to the Commission, which he had charged with drawing up a statement of the disorders of the Church. To it we would refer beforehand those of our readers who may think we exaggerate matters in what we shall have to say of the evils signalized in that memoir. It bears the signatures of all the most respectable Romanists of the time, Contarini, Sadoleto, Giberto, Alexander, &c.

² Trent was a dependence of the Empire, but the bishop held the government of it.

the emperor an ambassador and some bishops. After waiting seven months without any one else appearing, those who had come went away, and all was broken off anew.

Who, shall we say, was in fault? Francis I., it was said, for it was he that broke the truce. Francis I. took revenge on the Protestants; he was resolved to shew, that if he had broken up the council, he was not on that account the less a Roman Catholic. The victims he sent to the stake would soon have regained for him the friendship of the pope, much disposed as the pontiff was otherwise not to allow his irritation to go too far against anything that contributed to delay the great affair. Charles V., besides, had united himself with Henry VIII., that excommunicated heretic and personal enemy of the Pope; the Diet of Spires had passed an edict so frightfully tolerant, that it seemed to have been dictated by the Protestants. The pope reclaimed, urged, and threatened. The emperor held his peace, and followed his own course.

Peace, in fine, was proclaimed between Charles and Francis, and one of the articles of the treaty (24th December 1544) bears that they were to unite their efforts for the meeting of the council. Paul anticipated them. A new bull was published; the council was to meet on the 15th of March. It was the emperor now who was angry; he thought it strange that he had not been consulted about the fixing of the time; but as he made it a point that he should be able to say, that to him, and to him alone, the world was to be indebted for the council, he himself became the grand mover in the matter; and in all the courts of Europe his ambassadors eagerly urged that the bishops might be sent to attend it. Paul appointed his legates; there were still to be three, but three new ones. These were the Cardinals del Monte, Santa-Croce, and Pole. This last (Reginald Pole) was of the royal family of England. The two others we shall hereafter see occupying the papal throne. Europe now began to believe that, for this time at least, the council would not pass off in smoke.

And now, before proceeding farther, shall we pause for a little, and take a retrospect of what had been done? We have been rapid enough in our narrative for the attentive reader to seize its general features, and to deduce its legitimate consequences. Mutual distrust, intrigues, misapprehensions, and quarrels of all sorts, acts of violence and acts of baseness, together with the most inextricable mingling of interests, views, and passions, all

manifestly and grossly human,—such was the chaos from which the council was to emerge; such was the basis on which that seat was to be constructed from which God himself was to be considered as about to speak. Meanwhile, he who had been contemptuously called by Leo X. “a clever fellow,” had been permitted by God to see Europe pervaded with his doctrines; and that council which Luther had called for in 1517, and which he might have dreaded in 1520,—in 1545, even before it had been opened, had altogether ceased, before he descended to the grave, to give any serious ground of alarm to the Reformation. It had lost its charm before it met. Twenty-five years of delays had proved superabundantly—

To some, that Rome did not wish for the Council, never had seriously wished for it, and could not have any wish for it;

To others, that the princes who had most called for it, really cared very little about it;

To the Protestants, that no concession whatever would be made to them;

To the Roman Catholics, that small abuses would be amended, and the great ones preserved;

To all, in fine, that it would not be the Church's council, but the pope's council.

And as for those, if there still were such, who persisted in hoping something from it, can it be imagined that they would at that time have dared to promise to its dogmatical decisions the authority which has been given to them since? No; the human springs of the machine had creaked too long and too lamentably. They were destined still to creak too long. The authority of the Council of Trent commenced, in fact, only after its close. This we shall prove, and without difficulty; but this is just what we think it of most importance to prove well.

The grand day of the opening approached at last, and all eyes in Europe were fixed on the small town which was to be rendered for ever memorable by the proceedings of that day.

On the 13th of March 1545, two of the legates, the Cardinals del Monte and Santa-Croce, arrived at Trent. They came armed with two papal bulls: the one public, merely appointing them to preside in the council; the other secret, authorizing them to dissolve it, should the pope's interests seem so to require. This was nothing new. Martin V. had taken the same precaution when the Council of Pavia met.

A vast crowd greeted the cardinals on their arrival, and being received as princes, they responded to the popular enthusiasm, as princes indeed, but as princes of the Church. *Three years' indulgence* was bestowed on all who were fortunate enough to see them pass. Then came a scruple to perplex them. Every indulgence proceeds from the pope, but among the powers conferred upon them, that of granting indulgences had been omitted. Legitimately, therefore, they could grant none—no, not for three days; and yet they had granted one for three years. What, then, was to be done? They wrote to Rome. The pope could ask for nothing better than to have to confirm what his legates had done. Three years! what is that to him? Thirty or three hundred years would have cost him no more. But, behold, he also finds a scruple to annoy him. It was all very easy to give validity to the indulgence for the time that had to run; but was it possible, even for him, to declare it available for the time during which it had been absolutely null? God himself cannot change the past. Let people do as they might, there must always have elapsed a certain time during which the faithful must have believed that they had what they had not. If any of them had died during that interval, they must have passed into the other world with a false passport. This apparently childish embarrassment proved really a most serious affair for a Roman casuist. There was no getting rid of it directly; but it was evaded by sending the legates a brief, antedated by several weeks, and which they were presumed to have brought with them from Rome. Pallavicini has been at great pains to put this historical incident in a proper light, but has succeeded only in proving that he himself thought it very strange.

There had been a crowd, then, at the arrival of the legates, but people began to ask themselves where was the council. Not a bishop had appeared except Cardinal Madrucci, the bishop of Trent, who had preceded the legates in order to do the honours of his city and of his palace. Four hundred seats were nevertheless prepared in a place set apart for them in the cathedral. Although the legates were far from having any desire to see all these filled, yet such a huge void could not fail to be disquieting, and to have much the appearance of an affront. The pope felt greatly annoyed. He was well aware that a number of bishops, particularly in Italy, had thought to pay court to him by not repairing to Trent; but he felt at the same time, that their absence would be attributed to him. How was

he to contrive to bring together enough without there being too many?

The 14th of March had now come, still there was nobody; the 15th—still nobody, and the opening was adjourned. On the 23d, Diego de Mendoza, Charles V.'s ambassador, arrived at Trent, and begged that they would hasten proceedings. The legates held council as to what should be done. Three bishops had arrived, were they to open the council? But how open a general, œcumenical, and universal council with three Italian bishops! Let us wait, they said, for a few days. These few days were to be prolonged to nine months.

We refrain from repeating the jests that passed from mouth to mouth when people began to see the ridiculous issue of this solemn convocation of Christendom, after being twenty-five years of coming to the birth. Romanists and Reformed could not avoid meeting on the common ground of an ancient apologue, already suggested, no doubt, to our readers, and to which the name of the premier legate, Del Monte, or Of-the-Mountain, gave a burlesque application. But let us not laugh. This is a history, not a squib. It may, however, be very seriously remarked, that among so many persons to whom the Council of Trent has never appeared as anything but an immense and majestic assembly, there is surely more than one with regard to whom these first details must make us suspect at once, that the imagination has had something to do with what they have said of it. "The Council of Trent," says one of its apologists,¹ "was composed of all that was most illustrious in Germany, Italy, France, Spain, Hungary, Bohemia, England, Ireland, Portugal, Poland, Sweden, Belgium, Moravia, Illyria, and Greece." We shall soon see what all this amounted to. When the *imagination* takes such a flight as this, it is very near deserving another name.

And since we have touched on the question of number, we crave leave to say a word on the subject.

We shall not go so far as to maintain that a council cannot be properly called general, unless composed, literally, of all the bishops of the Church; but from this generality to that of the Council of Trent, the distance was to prove so wide, that one might well ask, in good faith, if no conclusion was to be drawn from it. We do not think, indeed, that a more numerous assem-

¹ Father Biner, a Jesuit.

bly would have voted differently; the doctrinal decisions probably would have been the same. But, after all, had we as much sympathy for the results, as we have little, it would always remain to be seen whether those results may be considered to have been legally and honestly obtained.

In all deliberative assemblies, law, or custom, has fixed a minimum of members entitled to vote. It may be the half, the third, or at the least, a fourth part of the total number; below that proportion there can be no voting. In councils, although there is no formal law on the subject, the dictates of common sense are plain enough to make anything else unnecessary. If you summon together a hundred persons, and there come only ten, no doubt you may allow such a meeting, strictly speaking, the name which it would have had, had it been complete; but it is clear that this would be a fiction. Now, let us see what happened at Trent.

There were three convocations in all:—the first (1545), under Paul III., the second (1551), under Julius III., the third (1562), under Pius IV.

In the last, the number of voters rose, towards the close, to two hundred and fifty. This was a considerable number; still, it was but a feeble minority of the bishops of Christendom. Italy alone reckoned more than two hundred and fifty bishops.

Yet this number, relatively so small, was nearly fourfold what had appeared at the two other convocations. On the day of opening, there were only five-and-twenty; afterwards we find sixty, at most seventy, but rarely all met at once; in several of the sessions they were even under fifty. And yet that was the period at which were regulated and fixed, such fundamental points as scripture, tradition, original sin, grace, the sacraments, &c. “What madness,” said Paul IV. one day, in an access of ill-humour and candour, “to have sent threescore bishops, from among the least capable, to a small city among the mountains, there to decide so many things!” It is true that this *madness*, according to him, consisted in not having simply left the matter in the hands of the men of ability, of whom, he added, “Rome is full;” but if his conclusion is not ours, his exclamation about the threescore bishops is not the less worth recording.

Nothing can be less clear, moreover, than the distinctions by which Rome has come to endow councils with the imposing title œcumenical,¹ or to deprive them of it, according as it suits her

¹ Universal, met from the whole inhabited earth, which, in the Roman system, implies infallibility.

to accept or reject their decrees. What legal difference will she show us between the Council of Nice condemning Arianism, and the Council of Tyre, ten years afterwards, condemning the faith of Nice? That of Tyre, you say, was composed only of the enemies of Athanasius. An Arian will reply, that neither were there in the other any but the enemies of Arius.¹ But at Nice there were delegates from the pope present; at Tyre there were none. No more were there any at Constantinople in 381. That council, nevertheless, is admitted as œcumenical, although there was but one Latin bishop there against a hundred and forty-nine Greeks. At Nice, there had been three against three hundred and fifteen; at Chalcedon, there were again three against three hundred and fifty. The greater number of œcumenical councils have been, numerically and geographically, much smaller than many of those to which that title has been denied.² "They became œcumenical," it is said, "by the sole fact of their having been universally approved." This is a mere playing with words; a particular assembly does not become a general assembly in virtue of the fact alone of its decisions having been generally received; at the most, it will be said, that it is equivalent to a general assembly. Then, is it well considered in this theory, to what it leads? If the number and the nationality of those present prove nothing—if four hundred bishops, come from all parts of the Church, can form only a particular and fallible council, whilst another with forty, may become œcumenical, infallible,—what then are they both at the moment of their taking their decisions? Why, nothing. Their authority depends on the posterior judgment of the Church. Until the Church shall have pronounced, at least by its silence, on all the points regulated by the assembly, neither the faithful, nor the assembly itself, know whether they can, in conscience, admit what has been decided. In this manner, therefore, you escape from the objection founded on the small number of bishops; and had they been no more than ten, the council might have been œcumenical; but you can do so only by admitting that every assembly of this kind, were it to be composed of a thousand bishops, has no authority of itself. It is only a consultative commission. Its judgments may be reformed. Infallibility comes to it from elsewhere.

"Was the Council of Trent," says an author,³ "infallible of

¹ Be it remembered, that we are here engaged in a question of legal right, (*droit*) of forms, and we are not called upon to pronounce, for the moment, either for or against any dogma.

² See Jurieu, *Réflexions sur les Conciles*.

³ Boyer, Director of the Seminary of Saint Sulpice.

itself, or in virtue of having been subsequently accepted by the Church? This we may regard as a useless question." Yes, at the close of three centuries; but we have now to do with 1545. We make ourselves spectators of the first proceedings of the council; here then there is a question of right, which we cannot allow to be omitted. Now, then, there can be no middle course; either an œcumenical council is infallible of itself—but it is not so unless it be veritably œcumenical, universal; or it becomes infallible by virtue of the general assent of the Church, in which case until this assent is ascertained, its decrees are only opinions not yet clothed with the authority of decrees.

This last concession, from which so many Roman Catholics recoil, is made, on the contrary, by the ultramontanists with the utmost eagerness. They view it, and with reason, as conducting right on to the superiority of the pope over councils, and consequently to his infallibility. But as this part of the question was debated at Trent itself, we shall recur to it at the proper time and place.

To the question of the number of the bishops in attendance, should be added, in justice to the subject, that of their assumed exclusive right to sit in councils.

No society whatever can logically have for its representatives any but men chosen by itself. Now, are bishops chosen by the Church? Twelve hundred years have past, during which the people of Roman Catholic Christendom have had no part in the choice of their chief pastors. Were it otherwise, still it would be no more than an ecclesiastical and human affair. Assuming that you have proved the Church's infallibility, you will not have thereby proved that the bishops are its only organs. Assuming that you have proved the infallibility of councils-general, you have still to demonstrate what is maintained at Rome,—“That it is by Divine right that councils are composed of bishops.”¹

On this subject one may well be confounded at seeing with what assurance the most important doctrines and the most formal theories are sometimes deduced from a phrase, from a word,—while conclusions from the plainest facts, and the most circumstantial details, are obstinately resisted. You would call by the name of council, and liken to posterior councils, the humble meeting held by the apostles at Jerusalem.² Be it so. That meeting having said,—“It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost

¹ Father Biner.

² Book of Ac's, ch. xv.

and to us,"—here, as you will have it, is the intervention of the Holy Ghost in the decrees of all legitimate councils. You cannot well put them on the same footing, seeing that the apostles were individually inspired, and that the bishops, you admit, are not. But let this too be granted. Take these words, if you will, but then, at least, take all of them. "Then *pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole Church*, to send," &c., so the passage runs. Hence, it seems to follow, plainly enough, that the inferior ministers, and even the laity, intervened. Pallavicini is very merry at the expense of those who would insist that the Church, the whole Church, that is to say, several thousands of persons, took part in the deliberation, and asks where in all Jerusalem a place could have been found large enough for such a meeting? "Evidently," he concludes, "there was only a certain number, a small number of the laity." What does it signify? If a small number was there, is this less embarrassing than a great? The author is compelled to add, in order to escape from this embarrassment, that they did not intervene in the decision. But this is a pure invention, contradicted at once by the general tenor and by the details of the narrative. The more you shall have sought to represent the apostles, not as the merely spiritual founders, but as the legislators and organizers of the Church, the better right would you give us to regard nothing as having emanated from them, but what they appear to have made it a matter of conscience clearly to teach. Had the author of the Book of Acts had the least idea that the laity should be excluded from councils, who will believe it possible that he could write, as the winding up of his narrative,—"*Then pleased it the apostles, and elders, with the whole Church?*" . . . That, as a general position, the laity would do better to leave doctrinal questions to the decision of the pastors, is incontestable; that the Church, in convoking councils, has done well in calling only bishops to them, may be plausibly maintained; but if there has been a single council which was not prevented from being legitimate by the intervention of the laity, and if this council be precisely that whose history has been transmitted to us by an inspired author,—then it cannot be of Divine right that bishops alone enter those assemblies, and thereby have seized the monopoly of infallibility.

"Scripture," says the Roman Catechism, "often enough employs the word Church in designating those who are its pastors, and who preside in it. It is in this sense that Christ has said,

if he whom you reprove, does not listen to you, tell it to the Church,—for here it is evident, that by the Church he means the pastors of the Church.” What is evident is just the contrary. “Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church.” Thus, first of all, thou, quite alone; next, one or two persons; then the entire community. The citation, we see, is doubly false; we might even say triply false. False, because the whole flock, with or without its pastors as you choose, is spoken of; false, because here the word *Church* does not mean the Church in general, but that of which each is specially a member; false, in fine, when one would find here an argument in favour of the dogmatical authority of the Church, seeing that the case in hand is that of a quarrel between two individuals, not at all a question to be resolved.

And now, let us return to our history.

By the end of March there were still but four bishops, and two spoke of going away. To give them something to do, and keep them there, a kind of provisional committee was constituted, which the legates, as a matter of form, consulted on a certain number of affairs. Into this Mendoza was admitted. Ere long this committee, having the air of persons setting themselves to a task in good earnest, and viewing themselves as the commencement of the council, it was necessary to find some means of checking, without giving offence, a course of procedure which could not fail to cause uneasiness as soon as the meetings were at all numerous. There was an understanding, accordingly, between the legates and the pope, that there should always be two despatches, the one confidential and secret, the other containing no more than those parties were willing should be communicated to the bishops. “Such was the preparation made for receiving the communications of the Holy Ghost.”¹ To be sure they were only human affairs that were as yet treated of; and no doubt a sovereign has a right to send confidential notes to his ministers. But this, in courts, is a thing admitted and known to everybody; in the case before us, the bishops knew nothing about it. There

¹ Jurieu.

was deception, then, in their being left under the impression that everything was submitted to them. We shall see anon whether political affairs were to have the pitiful honour exclusively confined to them, of having double despatches and notes secret or in cipher.

We shall not stop to review the angry disputes that arose in the course of April on the subject of ranks and precedencies. With these we do not charge the council as a crime; it was no fault of the bishops or of the pope, if Charles V. by his ambassador, compelled them to make those matters the subject of regulations. Still, let us note the fact. The more the council came to resemble a purely human convention, the better right have we to ask in what respects it was the work of God.

Meanwhile the diet had met at Worms. The emperor was still uncertain whether he should march against the Turks or the Protestants.

The first thing done was to cause the convocation of the council to be intimated to the Protestants, and this to remind them of these two things: first, that they had been the first to speak of a council; second, that the truce was about to close, seeing that, according to the terms of the decree, it was *until the approaching council* that they were to be allowed toleration and peace. On this last point any warning was superfluous. They could not doubt that the emperor, to whom the pope was writing letters upon letters, was really prepared to attack them the moment he ceased to be disquieted on the side of the Turks.

On the other point, their sentiments had long been known. It was to make a mere jest of them to say—"You wanted a council; here it is. You promised to submit to it; now submit." It was evident that in asking for a council, and in promising to surrender and obey, Luther had never meant, nor could have meant, a council held by the pope, composed of bishops subject to the pope, and, in fine, manifestly assembled not to examine, but to condemn. Nevertheless, who could believe it? this reproach of inconsistency and bad faith, addressed then to the Protestants on their openly refusing beforehand to accept of the decisions of Trent, has been repeated in our hearing, in our own day. It has been alleged that seeing they craved that council, it argued a want of good faith to persist in repelling it.

They might reply, first, that these are not things in which the engagements of the fathers can bind the children. Next, they might ask if it be indeed true that they had promised obedience.

Could they have seriously promised it? One may engage to *do* a thing, but not to *believe* a thing. Is it fair to suppose that men profoundly hostile to such or such a doctrine, could engage to admit it so soon as a council should decree it anew?

Anew, we say; for one of the best proofs that there could not have been any promise to obey a council of this sort is, that the greater number of the doctrines then denied, had been solemnly admitted by councils quite of the same kind. Transubstantiation, with all that is attached to it, had been definitively voted as true under Innocent III., at the fourth council of Lateran. The depriving the laity of the cup had been confirmed at Constance, in 1414; and the number of sacraments fixed at seven, at Florence, in 1438. Could it possibly have been hoped that all these decisions, when corroborated by time, would be annulled by a court that was to meet with the same views and under the same influences? What, then, did the Protestants mean, or rather, what had they wanted when they asked for a council?

Evidently they had formed to themselves no clear idea either of the thing itself, or of the means by which it was to be accomplished. Every epoch has its own fixed idea; every minority is naturally led to take advantage of that idea. Luther had found the word council in all men's mouths, and the desire for a council in all men's minds, and all their hearts; he forthwith laid hold of it. Shall we suppose that he really shared in all the illusions of which other men were the dupes with respect to that alleged remedy for all the church's ills? Perhaps he might; but it was rather from the need he felt of emboldening himself in his audacity, by indulging the vague prospect of an authority which should pronounce in the matter. Even Luther had trembled, and had trembled long, before raising the standard. "No one can know," he wrote long afterwards, "what my heart suffered those two first years, or in what depression, in what despair, I may say, I was often plunged. Even at this day, the pope's splendour and majesty sometimes dazzle me, and it is with trembling that I attack him." "Oh, how much pains it cost me," he wrote in 1521, to the Augustinians of Wittemberg, "to justify me to myself for having alone ventured to rise against the pope! How often did I in bitterness of soul oppose to myself that argument of the papists,—Art thou alone wise? Can all besides have been deceiving themselves, and been deceived for so long?" This responsibility frightened him. He felt that, at

any price, he must have something behind which to shelter himself.

But he had traced the ideal to himself of that council amid which he was to make his audacity disappear; he intended it to be "free and Christian;" he meant, above all, that people should proceed on an engagement to judge only according to Scripture. There lay the illusion; there began the impossible. To propose shutting out Rome from the arsenal of tradition, was to require that she should lay down all pretensions to the primacy, that she should cease to be *the Church*, so as to be no more than *a church*, the sister, the fellow of those new churches, born but as yesterday according to her, and whose very existence, according to her, was no better than a permanent crime. In brief, it was to require that Rome should commence by embracing, if not the Reformation, at least the fundamental principle of the Reformation.

But if the one party erred in misplacing the question, or, to speak more correctly, in not perceiving that it was insoluble, the other party were still more in the wrong, in believing that they exclusively were called upon to decide it. To have the council convened by the pope, and to have it meet under the direction of the pope, was to assume as admitted and incontestable the most contested of all the points in question, namely, the supremacy of Rome. This was the vast and vicious circle in which Europe was to be driven about for twenty years.

All this, however, leads to an important conclusion, which has been too much forgotten: that the doctrine of the Church's infallibility, so boldly advanced in our times by the Romish doctors as the basis of the whole edifice, was at that time, we do not say unknown, but certainly very far from being held so rigorously as it has been since. Had it been a positive tenet that Rome could change nothing, absolutely nothing, of aught she had once decided in points of doctrine, it is evident that the idea of an appeal from her, in the matter of dogmas, to a future council, never could have entered any one's head, and no more that of Luther than of any one else. To whom could such a thought suggest itself at the present day? What Protestant would now dream of asking Rome to change or even to modify her creed on a single point? If, therefore, there were demands of this sort in the sixteenth century, and if such demands could be preferred without its being felt that what was asked was an impossibility—what, we repeat, is the inevitable conclusion, but that the

Church's infallibility was not yet a formal dogma, and the pope's still less so? Of this we shall hereafter have proofs of another kind.

When the Lutherans, in protesting against all that was to be done at Trent, craved an indefinite prolongation for the truce granted until the opening of the council, the emperor replied, that it did not belong to him to withdraw them from whatever might be the judgment of that supreme tribunal. His proper part would be to attack them as heretics, solemnly condemned, rather than as his own proper enemies; all he desired was, that the condemnation might be delayed until the state of his affairs should admit of his giving effect to it. On this side, therefore, he was well content that there should be no precipitation. But, on the other, numerous embarrassments were accumulating. Though in no haste, for the moment, to see sentence pronounced on the Reformed in general, still there was one individual who gave him much disquiet, and of whom he was eager to be rid. This was Hermann von Meurs, Archbishop of Cologne. A secret partisan of Luther, he had introduced into his diocese a certain number of reforms, at first disciplinary, then, by little and little, some that touched more or less on doctrine. The defection of Cologne would have been a terrible blow, and the movement that had commenced required to be checked at any cost. So intent was Charles V. upon this being done, that he forgot that a council was expected, nay, he seemed to forget even that there was a pope. It was before himself, the emperor, that he caused the archbishop to be summoned, nor did he even speak of delivering him afterwards to the judgment of the Church. From the council not having yet done anything, he seemed to conclude that all questions remained untouched, and that it remained for him to determine the grounds on which Hermann was to be condemned. Once more, accordingly, he appointed a public conference to be held, of certain doctors of both parties, and even went so far as to give instructions for an abstract of the discussion being laid before the diet the following year. This was a plain enough intimation, that in the case in hand he was to make the diet serve as council. As for the pope, he was entirely left out of view.

Paul said nothing, and contented himself with summoning the archbishop also. He devoured the affront in secret; but the council narrowly escaped being dissolved by it. The fifteen or twenty bishops who happened to be then at Trent, asked themselves what they had come there for, if the emperor employed

himself in summoning prelates, drawing up articles of faith, and acting as council and as pope. These complaints found their way to Rome, where it was not easy to know whether they should be encouraged or suppressed. In itself the dissolving of the council could not but gratify the pope; but was he sure that he would have restored to him, intact, that authority of which he was partially deprived by the convocation of a council-general? The future diet might, at the voice of the emperor, act as heir to the rights of the council, after it had expired at its birth. The affair of Hermann might also call for an explanation on the subject of the limits of the two powers, and the emperor seemed little disposed to have all his rights comprised in that of sending the archbishop to the pope. It was better, therefore, for the latter that no such explanation should take place, and, in order to that, it was requisite that the council should continue in prospect, even although it should remain indefinitely thus.

Whom shall we pronounce to have been really in the wrong? we cannot but admit that it was the emperor. Whatever might have been his opinion in the everlasting dispute about the superiority of councils over popes, or of popes over councils, he could not seriously believe himself authorized to pronounce on the orthodoxy of an archbishop. In protesting, the pope would have done no more than his duty. His councillors urged him to it; his silence was called treason. It is not for us to blame him for having persisted in it; but as we hold ourselves bound to collect, in passing, all that can throw light on what some were interested in leaving in the shade, we would here remark how much the authority of the Church and of its head was still vague, obscure, and little understood. It was rather a fact than a right. As a fact, the strong made a jest of it; as a right, from the moment of its not being an absolute right over everything and everybody, no man knew exactly how he stood with regard to it. Men took the place of principles. A strong pope encroached on the civil power; a strong prince on the spiritual. At Rome, a priest took away kingdoms: at Cologne, a prince spoke of taking away an archbishopric. And amid all this, that council which Rome represents to us as a citadel built upon the rock, is shewn by all the histories of the time, even the most Romanist of them, to have held by a thread, a hair, a nothing—to have been dependent to an incredible extent on the wretched springs of political intrigue and human passion. If in all this, some see only one farther proof of the Divine intervention such as alone,

in their opinion, could have removed so many obstacles—do we not reverence God more, when we say, with this history in our hand, that it would have been unworthy of Him to have veiled the august action of the Holy Ghost under such a tissue of human frailty and selfishness?

Erelong there arose a new difficulty.

The kingdom of Naples had about a hundred bishops, the greater part of whom were devoted to the pope, and ready to repair to the council as soon as he should signify a wish to see them there. Now, the viceroy¹ having proposed that four only should go—these four acting at once for themselves and for all the rest, to this they refused to agree. The matter was referred to the pope, who pronounced them in the right.

In the Roman point of view, and in regard to a council, the viceroy's idea was absurd. Nothing more legitimate or more simple than to vote by procuration in a matter where a man's self, his own interests, and his own rights are concerned; but who could reasonably dream of such a thing as to concur in the same way by procuration, in dogmatical decisions, and in decrees viewed beforehand as infallible? In fact, it is in the body of the bishops that infallibility is supposed to reside. There could be no assurance that each mandatory would vote on all points as his constituents would have done. The viceroy had never thought of this. And here we see a fresh proof of what we have just remarked, as to the obscurity in which, in the sixteenth century, those grand theories still fluctuated, which are represented in our days as dating from the earliest times of the Church.

But was this theory, obscure to a statesman, clear at least to the understanding of the pope? His bull makes no mention of it. Nevertheless, that would have been the best way to make it displease nobody. "The episcopal body," he might have said, "cannot err; but every bishop is fallible. Each, therefore, can represent only himself. To allow one to vote for several, would be to trench upon the infallibility of the body." As for representation by procurators who should not be bishops—for this question also had been raised, the pope would have had even less difficulty in demonstrating that it was impossible. "*It is of Divine right,*" he might have said, "that a council should be composed of bishops. It is through them that the Holy Ghost reaches it. We cannot, therefore, make Him pass through

¹ Peter of Toledo.

channels in which we have no warranty that His influences will not be tampered with and altered." Such is the manner in which one would reason at the present day.

Instead of reasoning, the pope confined himself to mere defence, and condemned the idea, not as absurd, but simply as bad. People settled down generally into the conviction that his first, and perhaps his only motive, was the fear that the foreign bishops might take advantage of it to secure for themselves the majority in the council. Such even was his alarm that he declared every bishop suspended and interdicted, *ipso facto*, who should dare to vote by proxy. The legates thought the bull so absolute and so harsh, that they durst not give the actual text. They craved that the pope would allow them to publish the meaning only, and even that with much softening of its pungency.

It was well that they did so, for it was to happen with this, as with so many other bulls, which, notwithstanding the severity of their terms, and the pretension of speaking in the name of God, had accommodated themselves admirably to all the exigencies which Rome had not the courage, or the ability, directly to confront. Hardly had it been received at Trent, when, behold, the procurators of Albert of Brandenburg, archbishop of Mayence, arrived; and although he could not have purposely violated the pope's order, since he knew nothing of it, they did not venture to apply it to him. No time was lost in assuring him that the prohibition could not concern so eminent a person—a cardinal-prince—as he was. An unjust distinction this, any way, but passing strange when viewed in the light of the council's Divine mission. The members are equal—all share in the council's infallibility; but, if you are a mere bishop, it is lost unless you exercise it yourself; if you are a prince, you may transmit and delegate it.

Dispensation followed dispensation, until at last the procurators that were admitted, became sufficiently numerous. At the close of the council we find forty-nine.

In the beginning of May, the preparatory committee being a little more numerous, various matters of form, costume, ceremonies, &c., were regulated. After that, the opening of the council was spoken of. The majority thought that this should be done. It was said that it would be the best way to get those bishops to come who desired to do so, but who grudged risking a fruitless journey; and, further, that it would be the best method also of putting a stop to the liberties in which Charles V. was

disposed to indulge. The legates decided that they must wait for Cardinal Farnese, who was now papal nuncio at the court of the emperor. But they did not fully speak out their mind.

This was because to the palpable difficulties of their position, there was now daily added one or other of those which would not bear to be openly avowed, and yet were all the more vexatious. The pope could do nothing without the emperor; the emperor wanted nothing better than to dispense with the pope, and what he had already done sufficiently indicated what he might prove capable of doing, were the occasion to offer. His love for the Church, which he was constantly parading, did not prevent his entering perpetually into conferences with those heretics that were so heartily cursed by Rome, and he was more or less severe, more or less insinuating, just in proportion as the Turks avoided or approached the Austrian frontiers. Sometimes he merely pressed them to agree to the council, promising for the rest, that he would act mildly; sometimes, renouncing the idea of religious unity, he went so far as even to propose to them that it should be dissolved immediately, provided they would sincerely resume their places within the sphere of that political unity of which he was resolved, above all things, to be the chief. Was it his purpose, as the Protestants generally thought, to crush them afterwards? This is possible, and even probable: but the pope felt that this accord, were it to last no more than two months, could only be at his expense. It was necessary, therefore, at any cost, not only to retard it, but to make it impossible; and for this it was indispensable that war should commence without any longer delay. Cardinal Farnese, accordingly, had received orders to labour to that effect to the utmost of his power. On the pope's part he offered twelve thousand men and five hundred horses.

Let us, on this subject, repeat what has been so often said, or written, on this strange and fatal transformation of a bishop into a king, of a priest into a warrior, of the professed father of Christians into a man having soldiers to furnish by the twelve thousand, and who offers them—we have seen for what purpose! It is annoying that so many mere declaimers should have meddled with the theme, and that so many infidels should have laid hold of it for their own purposes. So much virulence has been shewn in exclaiming against the pope and the clergy, that sober people have almost been condemned to say nothing of a certain number of complaints, well-founded, no doubt, but too often and too ambitiously repeated. Happily, a

truth is not the less a truth though often harped upon. Should we take advantage of the occasion to say again that the temporal power of the popes has often been as odious in practice as it is illegitimate and anti-Christian in theory,—would this be any the less true, because Raynal and Diderot have demonstrated it before us?

The same may be observed with respect to the morals of the popes; for here, too, we might have an excellent opportunity of speaking of those morals. Amid so many cares to engage and distract him, Paul did not forget his family. We have seen how he raised his two grandsons to the cardinalship; but his son was still nothing—nothing but a burden on his purse. Paul had no wish to die without having first secured for him one of the first, if possible the first, place among the princes of Italy. So early as in 1538, he had asked that he might have the Dukedom of Milan.¹ In despair of being able to obtain this, he had dreamt of that of Parma and Placentia. This last was a dependence of the domain of the Church; but the consent of the emperor also, as lord-paramount, had to be obtained. Besides, it was at the outset a question of no small gravity, if a pope, possessing the usufruct of what was called St. Peter's patrimony, were authorized to erect any portion of it into an independent sovereignty. If he could give Parma to his son, he must also have had it in his power to give him Rome. This was the emperor's objection. In point of law he had nothing to answer; but Cardinal Farnese was not the man to leave the question on this ground. The pope's son was his father. Now, he hoped, that once he were the son of a duke, people would perhaps forget to reproach him with being the son of a bastard and the grandson of a pope. "If you give us Parma," said he to the emperor, "you will see the dukedom in the possession of a family which will be indebted to you for its elevation, and for ever devoted to you; if you leave it in the hands of the pope, who shall answer for Paul III.'s successor not being your enemy?" In fine, Octavius, the heir of Lewis Farnese, had married Margaret, Charles V.'s natural daughter. Thus, in consenting to the elevation of the Farneses, the emperor secured the rank and fortune of his own daughter. Yet he yielded only with reluctance. The pope, in the beginning of August, solemnly gave Lewis the investiture of the dukedom.

¹ This fact, denied by Pallavicini, has been proved from incontestable documents by Ranke

On this occasion the Protestants were not the only persons to exclaim against the shamelessness of Paul III. Bitter reflections were cast upon him throughout all Italy, at Trent, at Rome, and even among the cardinals; those even who were too much accustomed to the pontifical disorders to censure them in the name of religion and morals, not the less regarded the success achieved by Paul as imprudent and fatal. In other times it would only have been one scandal in addition to many others; but at a moment when all eyes were fixed on the court of Rome, when a council was just about to open, when even those nations that were most opposed to any reformation in the faith, loudly called for reformation in the morals of the Church,—Paul's conduct was that of a person out of his senses and mad.

For the Protestants that madness was a triumph. Such an affair as this told more against the pope and the popedom than all the folios of the doctors; they asked themselves whether people would not be compelled by seeing him scandalously fallible in so many things, to end with admitting that he might be fallible in all.

And we, too, ask ourselves the same thing.

It is true that we have no longer scandals of such magnitude to appeal to. But of what consequence is this? The theory of papal infallibility has undergone no change since the faults of a Paul III., or the orgies of an Alexander VI.; on the contrary, it is taught at the present day with less reserve and more generally than ever. If the present pope is a respectable man, so much the better; but he might not be so, and yet not the less be pope.¹ Nothing, consequently, more illogical than the ignorant charity of those people who profess not to understand how we reproach the popedom of the present day with the faults and vices of the popedom of three centuries ago. Whatever changes for the better the court of Rome may have effected in its own immediate circle, the question remains, and will for ever remain the same. Should we find in the whole series of the popes but

¹ Would the reader like to know how M. le Maistre, in his book entitled *Du Pape*, tries to elude this objection? "At a time when courtesans, monsters of licentiousness and wickedness, taking advantage of the public disorders, disposed of all things at Rome, and contrived to place their sons and their lovers on the seat of St. Peter, I most expressly deny that those men were popes." Very convenient, no doubt; but if every one has a right to decide who have been, and who have not been popes, to what does this lead us? If there have been no lawful popes but such as have owed nothing to corruption and to intrigue, the Church must then have remained for whole ages without a head. Much more; as every election, even the best, may have been secretly indebted to some disgraceful motive, it would follow that we cannot be sure of the legitimacy of any pope.

a single man decidedly too bad for reason and conscience not to revolt at the idea that he could have been infallible in point of doctrine, we should be authorized to refuse, even to the best, a privilege which has necessarily belonged either to all or to none.

What more curious, on this subject, than the embarrassment into which they themselves are thrown when they have to speak of such or such a pope among their predecessors? It is the usual practice, in official acts, that the name of every bygone pope should be followed with the words "*of happy memory*;" but as there are several to whom those words very ill apply, how do people think it is contrived to avoid openly depriving such popes of the title? Why, they are quoted in notes. Thus Gregory XVI., in his encyclical letter of 1832, having occasion to speak of bad books, mentions first Leo X., then Clement XIII., as the authors of certain decrees on the subject, and the words *of happy memory*¹ failed not to accompany these names; but Alexander VI.,² a bull of whose issuing, under the title *Inter Multiplices*, ought to have figured in the first line, was named merely in a slight reference. There, as the formula was not strictly required, its omission was a matter of no difficulty. And so, though to this man the heir of his throne is obliged to refuse not only his esteem, but even the hackneyed homage of a vain formula,—yet even to him, O pope, under the penalty of reducing yourself to nothing, you are compelled to say to his face, that the Holy Ghost was in him. That mind teeming with so many infamous ideas, had only to wish it, in order to its being put into a condition for sounding the most unfathomable mysteries without a chance of error. That hand, which was so skilled in the management of poisons, it depended only on himself to employ in tracing lines as holy, as venerable, as infallible as those of a St. Paul or a St. John. That body rendered impure by every vice,—but no; you would not dare to do so. You would find it hard to say whether it would be most odious or most absurd. And yet, if you recoil, all is lost. The cause of Borgia is identified with yours. On the pontiff's throne every stain is indelible.

Are those Roman Catholics who reject the doctrine of the pope's infallibility in a better position than others for declining our conclusions? We shall elsewhere examine whether it be

¹ Felicis recordationis predecessor noster.

² "A great rogue," says De Maistre.

true that a man can be a Roman Catholic without believing in that infallibility, and whether he has only to deny it, in order to escape from the difficulties which it involves. It is incontestably an article of faith for a great part of their Church, for those countries that have the reputation of being most Roman Catholic, for Italy, for Rome, for the cardinals, for the pope, inasmuch as we are not aware that the popes of our age have ever withdrawn the decrees in which so many bygone popes openly arrogate that privilege. As for those persons who would say, 'We don't believe in it, your objections do not affect us,' we might always prove to them that in refusing to answer those objections, they only make them recoil with augmented force—upon whom? Why, upon the pope and upon those whom the pope regards as his best, indeed as his only true friends. It is known that Rome would never listen for a moment to the middle terms, imagined by certain Romanists, for the purpose of getting rid of the papal infallibility, without having the air of denying it. Jansenius having said that "the Holy See sometimes condemns a doctrine solely for the sake of peace, without thereby meaning to declare it false," his assertion was formally reprov'd by Clement VIII.

As for those even who, while they admit the pope's infallibility in matters of doctrine, think to render that position more tenable by denying that he is infallible in point of discipline,—we might prove to them also, that this denial has never had the consent of Rome. The Church cannot err, says the *Roman Catechism*,¹ either in the faith, or in the rule of manners. In that same encyclical letter of 1832: "It would," wrote the pope, "*be criminal*² and altogether contrary to the respect due to the laws of the Church, to carp at the discipline which it has established." Shall it be said that the pope, in this passage, seems rather to ordain respect for established discipline than belief in its infallibility in general? Let us hear: "As it is certain," he goes on to say, "to use the words of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, in their thirteenth session, that the Church has been taught by Jesus Christ and His apostles, that she is under the constant teaching of the Holy Ghost, it is altogether absurd to moot the idea of a restoration, of a regeneration,—as if she could be thought capable of falling." Behold discipline put positively under the safeguard of the general infallibility admitted by the Council of Trent; and as the pope, in that document, puts no difference betwixt the laws of the Church

¹ Chap. ix.

² Nefas esset.

and the laws of the popes, as, moreover, discipline is the work of the popes much more than it is the work of the Church, all that he has said of the Church he has virtually said of the popes; to them, as well as to the Church assigning that disciplinary infallibility quite as much as the infallibility in matters of faith. Deny it; say that it is a mistake, that you have only to make the same objections as ours on that point—all well! But remember, let us once more be allowed to say, that you then send them back more strong, more direct, more crushing—to whom? To the pope, to the head of your Church, to all who, according to him, exclusively hold the truth.

Of those last then,—and we have already said that their numbers are on the increase in the Roman Church,—we would ask what they would make of Pope Liberius, who for four years was an Arian; of Liberius excommunicating Athanasius, the author of the Roman Symbol; of Liberius, to whom Bishop Hilary of Poitiers, champion of the Nicene Creed, wrote on that occasion: “I anathematize thee, Liberius, both thee and thine. I anathematize a second and a third time, Liberius, the prevaricator!”

We would ask them what they make of Innocent X., who, shortly before condemning Jansenius, said: “Let me be left at peace; this is no business of mine; I am old; I have never studied theology;” which did not prevent him, however, from pronouncing, and leaving others to teach as infallibly true, what he himself had never taught but hesitatingly.

We would ask them what they would make of Innocent XII., approving, praising, admiring a book,¹ and then, on being solicited by a king, and after two years of resistance, condemning it?

We would ask them where infallibility resided when there were two, three, or four popes, all at once, a thing which happened, not once or twice as is generally thought, but twenty-four times;² where, when those popes mutually condemned and anathematized each other; where, when their rights—or their crimes—were so equally balanced, that there was no means of distinguishing the true pope from the anti-pope, and the direct chain of succession from the violent and intrusive one?

We would ask them,—but to what purpose multiply these questions?—one or a hundred, what does it signify? The

¹ Fénelon's *Maximes des Saints*.

² In 250, 336, 418, 498, 530, 686, 687, 767, 824, 855, 963, 984, 996, 1012, 1033, 1058, 1061, 1073, 1118, 1130, 1159, 1316, 1378, 1431. From the third to the fifteenth century, one only did not witness a schism, and the eleventh saw five.

objection is the same. And who might best multiply these questions, if not those who are brought into immediate contact with Rome, and the popes, and the circle around the popes? It is in Italy, in fact it is at Rome, and in the palace of the popes, that the idea of their infallibility must have had to encounter, it would seem, most opposition. At a distance, people see only the head of the Church, the vicar of Jesus Christ. His words never reach them but in august phraseology; he finds no difficulty in gaining and preserving a certain grandeur in the popular imagination. Close at hand, be he ever so respectable as an individual, still he is a mere man; often all that is to be seen is a worn-out old man, a poor shrivelled body, a sinking mind, a failing memory, a master, in fine, who has ceased to see, to hear, to think, and who lives only in the persons of his servants. What! you may have seen this old man last night; you may have conversed with him familiarly; you may even have corrected him in a mistake, and contradicted him, as will sometimes happen in all the conversations in the world; he himself may sometimes have admitted that you were in the right, and may have politely said, "Very true—I was mistaken." And lo, at the close of this colloquy, he may have dictated some lines on questions which the greatest genius would only study with trembling. Now, these few lines you present to me as infallible and sacred; as a decision which I cannot attack without revolting from God himself. Further, who knows after all whether it be really from him? Who knows but that it may have been you, his counsellor, who suggested, nay, perhaps, who dictated the whole of it? Elsewhere, ministers are responsible, and the prince alone is irresponsible; at Rome, in everything not political, it is the pope alone who is responsible. A fallible and irresponsible monarch may, without compromising himself, put his signature to what is done in his name; an infallible doctor cannot avoid assuming the responsibility of all that he signs. But those who direct him; those who prepare his decrees, those who put the pen into his hand to sign them; those who can say, "Such or such an article of faith was made by me;"—how can they, unless indeed they believe themselves to be infallible—how can they seriously teach the pope's infallibility? Pallavicini, our historian, was one of the very men who pushed on Innocent X., old and tremulous, to the condemnation of Jansenius. He himself has preserved for us the details of the pope's hesitations. "When he placed himself,"

says he, "on the brink of the ditch, and measured in thought the space he had to clear, he paused, and could *not be made to go farther.*" What language! What a comment on our reasonings on the authority of the pope! Ah, however annoying it may be to mix up a charge of bad faith with calm and serious arguments, how can we but feel convinced that the folks at Rome, those who proclaim most loudly the pope's infallibility, are certainly, of all Roman Catholics, those who believe it least, and who can least believe it?

But why do we speak of the folks at Rome? Beyond the circle of those who have an interest in allowing the fundamental principle of ultramontaniam to live and revive to the utmost, there is not a place in the world where the general body of professing Christians is farther from according to the pope any supernatural and divine authority. On arriving from France, Germany, or Switzerland, where so many bow at the mere name of our *Holy Father the Pope*, where those even who least believe in him, generally speak of him with respect—one is confounded at the boldness with which the lowest shopkeepers in Rome, the moment their tongues are unloosed, express themselves with respect to his character, his person, the people he has about him, and his doings. The very police, generally so active and so susceptible in matters affecting the civil power, are much less so with respect to the Head of the Church and God's representative. They make no long speeches against his infallibility; they have never asked themselves theoretically what it means, and whether they believe in it; but the less they have reflected on it, the less do they try, as so many Roman Catholics do elsewhere, to conceal from you, and to conceal from themselves, that they cannot believe in it. And how could they? With what powers of abstraction would they not need to be indued in order to their seriously accepting as infallible, sacred, above all attack, what they see emanating from the same source with the decrees, political, or others, which they may have attacked, criticised, possibly cursed? Were you to force them to reason, to draw conclusions, think you that you would find much difficulty in wresting from them the confession of that which, without their being aware of it, is really at the bottom of their thoughts? Think

1 "Rome knows this: it is long since the pope's authority has been nowhere less deeply rooted than in Italy. Not that the people do not, from habit, respect it in all that does not traverse their own ideas, or their favourite passions, or their interests; but, above the people, one hardly finds any but censurers and enemies. Not only does nobody believe in it, but they scout it and hate it."—Lamennais, *Affaires de Rome*.

you, to return to our history, that those who were so scandalized at the decree by which Paul III. gave a dukedom to his son, could have been really and intimately convinced of his infallibility in such or such a decree, published perhaps the same day, subscribed perhaps with the same pen, and on the same parchment? No, we will venture to say, they did not believe in it. No more do those who are about the pope at the present day believe in it; or if they do believe in it,—for it were too painful to suppose there could be hypocrisy so long persisted in,—it is because they are self-blinded; it is because from the strong feeling they have of the need there is for a pope in order to their reigning over people's consciences in his name, they end at last in submitting their own consciences to him.

Could those men who took part in the opening proceedings of the council, have any more believed in the infallibility of councils? Let us proceed with our narrative; that will be a sufficient reply.

The year was now drawing to a close. The bishops were beginning to lose patience; the legates had exhausted their means of amusing them. It had even been found necessary to grant some assistance in money gratifications—not pensions, the legates would say, for it was of essential consequence that the pope should never be obnoxious to the charge of having members of the council in his pay. By and by people became less scrupulous.

Cardinal Farnese had returned from Germany, but without having obtained more than the emperor's consent to his father's elevation to the dukedom. Charles V. had refused the offer of 12,000 men; the news of an agreement between him and the Lutherans was what might at any moment arrive. Then no more council; but the pope preferred risking its chances, to seeing it break up in a manner so humiliating for him. Resolving, therefore, to be beforehand, he begged that a choice of one of these three might be made, the suspension, the translation, or the immediate opening of the council. Now, the suspension of the council could not suit the emperor, as long as the agreement with the Protestants remained unconcluded, and it was of importance that he should continue to have it in his power to threaten them, if not with the council—for they had no great fear of it, yet at least with the crusade which it would be sure to ordain against the refractory. No more did it suit his views that the council should

be transferred to another place; he knew that the pope would never consent to its being held in a town at a greater distance than Trent, and Trent was only too near Rome. There remained the opening; and the emperor had always less and less cause to be eager for that. In the end he offered to oppose it no longer, but upon one condition; namely, that the assembled bishops, at least, in the first stages of their proceedings, should occupy themselves with matters of discipline, should omit all decision of doctrinal questions, and, in one word, abstain from everything that might offend the Protestants.

The pope's patience was now exhausted. In asking that all cause of irritation to the Lutherans should be avoided, Charles let it be seen clearly enough, that, should he come at last to an accommodation of his differences with them, he would no longer permit their being anathematized; and what a strange part then would be that of a council, forced to remain mute in presence of such a schism! Without either refusing or promising, Paul hastened to send to the legates, on the 31st of October, the order to commence on the second Sunday of December. In the bull, he confined himself to saying, that the council should proceed "in full liberty." We shall see what was the real extent of this "full liberty," promised, and even ordained, as the privilege of the assembly.

On the 13th of December, accordingly, twenty-five bishops, clothed in their pontifical robes, went in procession to the cathedral church, and Cardinal del Monte, the first legate, celebrated mass there. Then, after a sermon by Cornelio Musso, Bishop of Bitonto, and an address composed by the legates, the council was declared to be opened, to the glory of the holy and undivided Trinity—for the extirpation of heresies, the peace and the union of the Church, the reformation of the clergy and the people, the suppression and extinction of the enemies of the Christian name.¹ In fine, it was decided that the second formal meeting should not be held until the 7th of January (1546). This, said the legates, was on account of the Christmas holidays; but the truth was, that they had nothing in a state of readiness, and that people knew not where to begin.

The task, it must be allowed, which these few doctors were about to undertake, that, too, under the burthen of an immense

¹ "Ad laudem et gloriam sanctæ et individuæ Trinitatis—ad extirpationem hæresum, ad pacem et unionem Ecclesiæ. ad depressionem et extinctionem hostium Christiani nominis."

responsibility, in the face of embarrassments and obstacles of all sorts, and of innumerable uncertainties and obscurities, was truly formidable. For it was to no purpose that they advertised themselves as the organs of the Holy Ghost; not the less did they feel what poor weak creatures they were when they came to handle certain questions. Amid the labours which this history has cost us, we have repeatedly forgot at once our antipathy to their pride and their errors. The pen has dropt from our fingers; we have felt that we could only pity them; we have thought they must have had punishment enough in the frightful labours of these endless eighteen years. Down to that period, in fact, Roman Catholicism had never seriously attempted the systematic arrangement of its doctrines and its laws. For more than a thousand years, decisions, on each occasion when they had been promulgated, had hardly touched more than one or a small number of points; councils and popes had never dreamt of looking beyond the interests, the perils, and the desires of the passing moment. Let Roman Catholic historians say what they please,¹ it is not true that the dogmatical theology, or the unity of Trent, was that from which the Protestants separated. It is true, no doubt, in this sense, that what was about to receive the force of decrees at Trent, had already been, on the whole, the Roman faith; but to say that Luther had had such a teaching body to break with as has existed since, would be an anachronism. The Roman unity of the present day dates from the Reformation; its first cause, as well as its strongest bond of union, must be sought for in the re-action against the Reformation.

Down to this period, then, each workman had but brought his own stone to the mass, and, accordingly, it was not before an edifice, requiring repair and completion, that the council had to set itself to work, but only before a heap of materials. And these materials they were not even allowed to sift. To reject a single stone would have been to unsettle the right of all the rest to be employed in the edifice; whether the builders desired it or no, it behoved that all should be taken in. But, perhaps, the plan had been clearly traced, and the foundations positively laid! Not at all: the plan existed only in fragments, and in fragments of different proportions, varying with the different ages of the Church. The only entire plan they possessed was that of the Bible, and that they would not have; it was but too evident that they could not find places for all their materials

¹ See in particular Moehler's *Symbolicon*.

there. They were about to pronounce a curse on all who had dared to take up that plan anew, and to hold to it. What a complexity! And well surely may we forgive some trepidation in those who had to disentangle it, and those, in particular, who had to superintend and direct the operation.

“Heresy,” says Bossuet,¹ “feeble production of the human mind, can constitute itself only in ill-assorted pieces; catholic truth, proceeding from God, is perfect from the outset.” How many things must have been forgotten before a man durst write these words! What a defiance to history—to that of the first fifteen centuries of the Church, to that of the council whose gropings in the dark are about to interrupt our progress at every step! What! perfection stamped from the first those dogmas which we behold, one after another germinating, growing up, struggling for admission, and at last, but only at the close of six or ten centuries, effecting an entrance into the domain of the faith! Those doctrines were perfect, forsooth, from the outset; doctrines which we shall see were admitted at Trent only after debates without end, numerous modifications, and final votes carried by a bare majority. And to give but one example, one, however, which comprehends all, “perfection from the outset” belonged, forsooth, to that grand fundamental dogma, that infallibility, which the council itself declined to encounter face to face, although it had occasion to meet it at every step, and in which it has left the capital point undecided. Even although it had decided that point, we should still have had to confront Bossuet’s allegation with the words of a man often quoted, but who in our opinion ought to be quoted oftener still, for he is sometimes the least Roman Catholic of the Fathers. “With respect to Scripture,” says he, “there cannot be either discussion or doubt on what it evidently teaches; but the letters of bishops may lawfully be reprehended by what may happen to be the wiser discourse of *any one* more skilled in the matter, and by the weightier authority of other bishops, and by councils.”² Here, truly, we have what has very little resemblance to the infallibility of the Fathers. They might be reprehended and set right, not only “by other bishops,” but “by the opinion

¹ Preface to “the Variations.”

² “Quis autem nesciat Sanctam Scripturam canonicam omnibus posterioribus episcoporum literis ita præponi ut . . . ; episcoporum autem literas . . . et per sermonem forte sapientiorum *cujuslibet* in eâ re peritioris, et per aliorum episcoporum gravorem auctoritatem; et per concilia licere reprehendi.”—August. de Bapt., contra Donat. l. ii. 1.

of one more skilled," bishop or not. They might be so, especially "by councils." Augustine, accordingly, would have been not a little surprised to see them so often cited, and himself among the number, in the decrees of many a council, as of the same authority with Scripture. "National or provincial councils," he goes on to say, "ought to yield without more ado to councils-general; *but it often happens that councils-general are themselves amended by posterior councils*, when experience opens what was shut, and makes known what lay hid."¹ Change one or two words here, and you have one of the ideas which the Roman Catholicism of the present day treats with most indignation,² that of perfectibility in men's views of the faith. Proceeding from God, revelation in itself is perfect; delivered to man, it is necessarily perfectible in this sense that posterior studies and meditations may always modify the manner in which it shall be understood, whether in its details, or in its totality. This mobility, with which Protestantism has been so often reproached, is accepted by Augustine as one of the necessities of the human mind; and while we see Protestants themselves complain of it, and throw themselves, out of spite, either into infidelity, or into Roman Catholicism, the good bishop of the fifth century speaks of it without a word of regret. In vain would you seek to limit by other passages the disquieting latitude of the above, and never could you so restrict its meaning as to admit of St. Augustine having been a Roman Catholic when he wrote it. He seems to admit, indeed, that in passing through this series of sifting processes,³ the truth will become more and more (whilst according to our apprehensions, it has often become less and less) complete and pure; but that is of little consequence; if such was his belief in the Church's infallibility, he did not believe in it at all, and he was quite as far as we are from admitting, with Bossuet, that the Romish system of doctrine was perfect from the outset.

Strange to say, at the opening of this council, which was to be followed by the prevalence of the idea of an absolute infallibility, it was rather according to St. Augustine's view that

¹ "Et ipsa concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias sunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritate quæ fiunt ex universo orbe sine ullis ambagibus cedere; ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat. et cognoscitur quod latebat."—August. de Bapt., contra Donat.

² See Lamennais' preface to the second volume of his *Essais sur l'Indifférence*.

³ Mark, let us observe in passing, the omission of the pope. Had Augustine assigned to him we do not say infallibility, but a simple doctrinal supremacy, how could he have left him out in this enumeration?

the legates had composed their exhortation. That address, bating certain forms, breathed throughout a high Christian spirit; too high, as we might easily demonstrate, to be considered strictly Roman Catholic. After a frightful picture of the corruption of the clergy—the first authors, according to them, of all the evils of the Church, the legates declared that the first thing to be done was to repent and abase themselves. “Without this profound sense of our failings,” they added, “in vain shall we enter the council, in vain have we invoked the Holy Ghost. We cannot receive him.” Nothing more wise, but what then were they thinking about? If infallibility depends, in however small a degree, on the religious and moral dispositions of those who are to be the organs of the Church, to what council, to what pope can we trust? Let a pope be notoriously immoral—we should then be authorized to refuse him any dogmatical authority. And as for a council,—how shall it be known whether a meeting of two or three hundred bishops shall have presented, on the whole, enough of good individual dispositions, to secure the direction of the decisions of the majority, by God himself, who alone sees men’s hearts? Nobody remarked this. The exhortation was extremely praised, and deserved to be so. We shall have here and there more than one example of these passing returns to good sense and the gospel. These were involuntary and illogical; but what would you have? When people start from false principles, it is only by reasoning ill that they have any chance of being reasonable.

The Bishop of Bitonto, in his sermon, reasoned much better, at least much more logically. “The moment is come,” he said, “God must speak, and he will speak.” Next, like the legates, he exhorted all the bishops to repentance and humiliation. “But,” he added, “were you even to remain in impenitence, don’t go on to imagine that thus you would have it in your power to shut the mouth of God. Happen what may in that respect, the Holy Ghost will find it easy to open yours, and employ it in his service.” In other terms: “If your hearts are pure, so much the better; if they are not, still the voice of the council will not the less be God’s voice.” This was absurd. Let us rather say, it was impious. But was it anti-Roman Catholic? Quite the contrary. Listen to Pallavicini:—“If the illumination of the Holy Ghost can be looked for only in a council of men inwardly sanctified, that sanctity being invisible and uncertain, their authority and their decisions remain in like

manner uncertain."¹ Cornelio Musso's sermon, then, was only, after all, the candid expression of the system, on the strength of which the council was about to fix and command the faith. People, generally, however, were shocked at it.

They were no less so at the ultramontane ideas with which its author had interspersed it, with a garnishing, too, of conceits and oddities of all sorts. Even at Rome people give him no thanks for this stupid and unseasonable frankness. In an apostrophe to the mountains that rise around Trent, he called on the rocks, the woods, and the torrents, to proclaim to the whole universe, that all ought to submit to the council; "And if it do not," he added, "one might say with reason that *the light of the pope hath come into the world,*² and that the world hath preferred darkness to light." This was tantamount to a plain, and withal ridiculous avowal, that nothing more was meant at Trent than a mere consultative commission, an opaque star receiving its light from the rays of Rome. Pallavicini does not see, so he says, why one should be so indignant at the expression *lumen papæ*. Does not all the world know that *papæ*, in Latin, is merely an exclamation signifying *alas!* What more natural, then, than to have said, "The light, alas! hath come into the world, and the world," &c.? We leave our readers to pronounce on the fairness of this elucidation. Were they even to admit it, not the less will it remain, and Pallavicini confesses it, a detestable play upon words. There were many besides. To open the gates of the council is to open the gates of heaven, whence was to descend the living water which shall fill the whole earth with the knowledge of the Lord. Jesus Christ will be present there. How could he refuse this favour to St. Vigil, the vigilant patron saint of this blessed city? At another place he indulged in a grand eulogy of the pope, the emperor, the king of France, several other sovereigns, and also of the legates; but as for these last, it was their names and surnames that furnished matter for his praise. Behold the Cardinal *del Monte*, turning his heart and his eyes towards the *mountain* which is Christ; behold his colleague della Santa Croce, *Politian*,³ and who now for a long time has applied himself to the reformation of *political* affairs among Christians; behold the virtuous Polus, "*Anglus* by birth, but who should be called *Angelus* rather than *Anglus*." "In fine, seeing the council is open, let all who have the right,

¹ Book v. ch. xviii.

² *Lumen papæ venit in mundum.*

³ *Politianus*, born at Polizio, in Sicily.

hasten to repair to us, *as if into the Trojan horse.*" This last stroke of eloquence had no doubt some profound meaning which escapes us, and which we shall not, like Pallavicini, take the trouble to look for. Only, on reading so strange a production, we are apt to say to ourselves, that surely a man of good taste must needs make great efforts before he can sincerely consent to having among the supreme arbiters of his faith, one who was capable of thinking and of writing thus, and who exercised, nevertheless, a very great influence on his colleagues.¹ In vain should we be told, that "such was the taste, such the eloquence, of the time. Luther has done sometimes worse." Not in the pulpit, we might observe. And even were it so, what of that? Betwixt a play upon words by the fallible Luther, and those which we must listen to in an infallible assembly, no comparison can be instituted. Luther, by himself, is nothing. When you accept the articles of his creed, it is because, on inquiry, you find there are good reasons for doing so. If some are set off in bad taste, so much the worse; but that proves nothing either way. With infallibility everything becomes serious. With the man who commands you to believe, the smallest mental aberration, be the object of it what it may, is an argument against the authority which he arrogates to himself. He who makes bold to build for eternity, more or less compromises his work by every imperfection in the materials.

Most of the bishops had been displeased by the adjournment to the 7th of January. After waiting so long, they thought it singular that no plan for the preparation of the questions had ever been dreamt of. It was proposed to them, indeed, to begin with a decree on the private conduct of members of the council. This they thought a good idea, but they also thought that it was no great matter for the occupation of a whole month, all the more as they did not see to what they were next to apply themselves. Meanwhile the decree passed with much applause. It is full of excellent prescriptions, excellent counsels; and we may add, that from this time forward, in what respected morals, it was religiously observed. The Reformation was beginning to bear its fruits. The scandalous debaucheries of the Council of Constance were no longer either permitted or possible; a

¹ "He it was who, on this theatre of Christendom, had raised the curtain by pronouncing the opening discourse, and, after that, being always employed on the gravest deliberations, was no longer a mere ordinary member: he was the right arm of that whole body."—Pallav. l. viii.

small part of what was tolerated then, would have been sufficient now to deprive the meeting of all respect, and perhaps to compel its dissolution.

The prelates, accordingly, had no difficulty in coming to a general understanding on the tenor of the decree; but the next thing to be done was to publish it, and then their embarrassments began. That of the first session had been drawn up in the form of a minute: "Is it your pleasure that the holy Council of Trent should be declared opened? To which the prelates replied, Yes!"¹ All explanation respecting the nature and the rights of the assembly, and in particular of its attitude with regard to the pope, had thus been avoided. But now there was required a formal decree and a preamble. In whose name were they to speak? In whose name was the decree to be published? In the name of the council alone, or of the pope alone, or of the pope and the council, or the council and the pope? for the very order in which they were to be put, in case of their both being introduced, was a matter of moment. Whatever form they might adopt, a question had always to be determined, in one sense or other, which it was felt could not be determined without slaying the council. As for that assembly's being superior to the pope, this was what Paul had said he would rather die than proclaim. Then, as for the pope's being superior to the council, it was known that a decree to that effect would bring down upon its authors the most dangerous protestations from Germany and from France. Three centuries have past, and the question still remains undecided. That which you can read at the head of all constitutions, even the most incomplete, to wit, *what is the source of authority*, here you find an infallible Church has never yet succeeded in putting at the head of her's. She who has decided so many mysterious, so many useless points; she in whose name so many victims have been burned alive for having desired to remain free in the midst of misery, behold her permitting free opinions—on what? On the question on which it would have been most natural, and was most necessary, that she should pronounce a clear decision.²

¹ *Placetne vobis?—Responderunt: Placet.*

² "What are we to think of that famous session where the *Council* of Constance declares itself superior to the pope? The answer is easy: the assembly talked nonsense. . . . Men of fine genius in the following centuries reasoned no better."—Jos. de Maistre, *Du Pape*.

Those men of fine genius who *talked nonsense* were Bosuet, Arnold, Pascal.

"And if certain persons persist," continues the author, "we, instead of laughing at that session alone, will laugh at that session, and at all who refuse to laugh at it."—Unity! unity!

One feels curious to know what would be the reply of a Roman doctor to an honest peasant of his Church, who, happening to hear of these details, should come to him with the simple question, "Instead of puzzling itself so much as to the particular manner in which it was to word its decree, why did not this council, of which it had been said that God would speak by its mouth, begin by deciding, once for all, the question itself?" Ah, poor peasant! it was just because saying and believing are different things. It is easy to say we are infallible, and to give ourselves the air of being so, as long as all we have to do is to condemn, and when we are sure of being agreed; but to believe ourselves infallible, and seriously to act as such, when well aware that we cannot speak without raising in the very bosom of the Church contentions that would rend it asunder, this is a very different thing, and then the very boldest men recoil. But we shall have again to return to this.

The pope had thought of the matter. A commission of cardinals, recently created by him for directing, from Rome, the operations of the assembly, had long tried to find a formula for the decree which might satisfy all, or, at least, offend none. They thought that they had succeeded at last. *The most holy Council of Trent, legitimately assembled under the conduct of the Holy Ghost, the three legates of the apostolic see presiding at it, decrees,*¹ &c. To the words *most holy council* might be added, should there be a request to that effect, the words *œcumenical and general*.

The majority appeared satisfied; but a numerous minority required, if not a formal admission of the pope's inferiority, at least a clearer declaration of the equality of the two powers. The words *præsidentibus legatis* might, in fact, be very well understood as implying, not only a mere presidency, in the ordinary meaning of the word, but an authority superior, supreme, and indispensable to the existence of the council; and it was very well known besides, that such was the meaning which the Italians attached to it. It was proposed, accordingly, that the word *œcumenical* should be superseded by *representing the universal Church*.² These words being placed before *præsidentibus legatis*, the presidency of the legates ceased to be clearly indicated as indispensable to the legitimacy of the council. An

¹ *Sacro sancta Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata, in ea præsidentibus tribus apostolicæ sedis legatis.*

² *Ecclesiam universalem representans.*

Italian called those members *foxes*¹ who supported such an alteration; and, to say the truth, amid these contests in which no one spoke out all he thought, that was an epithet which the members might, in all justice, have given each other every day.² The majority, however, were inclined to grant, if not the thing, at least the words; but, in consequence of orders from the pope, the legates made such a work about it, that this was refused. More than that, the words *œcumenical and general* were deleted. "What purpose could they serve?" said the legates. "Is it not sufficiently stated, in the pope's bull, that this council is œcumenical and general?" In a word, the first hankering for independence made them withdraw even the concessions already made. We find these words, however, reoccur in the decree of the third session.

The opposite party did not hold themselves defeated. On the 7th of January, when the cathedral was at the fullest, after the reading of the decree, they repeated their demand, and obliged the others to repeat their refusal.

Now this public protestation against a decision of the majority was a serious matter, especially at the commencement. It had been understood that all should proceed as at the Council of Lateran, under Julius II., that is to say, that all discussion should be interdicted except in *congregations*, or meetings with closed doors. The public assembly or *session* was to be exclusively for the publication of laws elaborated and voted at the congregations. This was, in fact, the only means of keeping out of sight the divisions that might exist among the members, and of giving themselves, in default of a more real authority, that, at least, of unanimity.

Accordingly, in the following congregation (13th January) the legates made bitter complaints. They were at no loss to shew that the greatest enemies of the council would do it less harm than its own members, however little they might renew such scenes in public. Nothing more true; but in saving appearances, why not also avoid the reality! Congregations with shut doors! why, we know almost all that past. Sarpi's revela-

¹ *Vulpeculas*. De Vargas's Memoirs.

² "There happened on this occasion what commonly makes endless debates: the reason expressed by the legates was not that which touched them most, so that to oppose them with arguments was to attack the shadow and not the substance. They themselves sent word to the pope, that what had made them reject with horror that denomination (*representing the universal Church*) was, that they thought of the addition that had been made to it at Constance and at Basle, viz., that the council has *received immediately from Jesus Christ a power to which all dignity, even that of the pope, is bound to submit.*"—Pallav. B. v. ch. ii.

tions, often inexact, compelled Pallavicini to publish a mass of facts which would otherwise have remained in the archives of the Vatican; and the cardinal's corrections have already furnished us, and will yet furnish us, with more weapons than the monk's assertions have done.¹ We shall abridge much; yet there is not a discussion, not a vote, on which we shall not have it in our power to give a thousand details, and this will not be without our having many a time asked ourselves, as we have already done, where there is to be seen any difference at all between the deliberations of the *holy* council, and those of any ordinary and merely human meeting. And who can doubt that differences of sentiment, but for the immense interest which all alike—Italians, French, and Germans—had in appearing united, particularly on questions of doctrine, would have been exhibited with far more persistency and noise?

To return to the 13th of January. The discussion of some plan of operations was looked for, for it was said that the legates had been occupied with laying its bases, and were about to submit it to the assembly. Great, then, was the surprise that was felt when they confined themselves to simply reminding the members of the three leading points noted by the pope in the bull of convocation: the extirpation of heresies, the reformation of discipline, the re-establishment of peace. And when their advice was asked on the course that was to be pursued, "Yours shall be ours," was their reply. "Reflect and pray to God." Excellent advice; but unhappily it was too clear that the grand object all the while was to gain time. The legates had received no directions from Rome, and knew not what either to propose or to do. Such, as several bishops said in the face of the whole assembly, was the whole secret of their humble declaration. Meanwhile, against all but the unanimous opinion of the members, they obtained this point, that the council should not seal its decrees and its letters with a seal of its own. They urged, "that there was no engraver at Trent that could make one. It was necessary to send to Venice;

¹ Pallavicini, at this very passage, is much more curious than Sarpi. In his statement of the reasons alleged against the titles which the minority wished to give the council, "Imitate," he makes the premier legate say, "imitate much rather the pope, who, though entitled to the reasonable assumption of the sublimest names, prefers keeping to the very humble title of servant of the servants of God." "Besides," he makes others say, "the emphasis of that epithet (*acumenical*) would ill suit an assembly composed of so few bishops, and so poor in ambassadors. The Lutherans would be sure to recall the old proverb, that *little men are apt to stand on their tiptoes*."—Pallavicini, B. v. ch. vi.

Have we said anything else?

that would cause too long a delay. It would be seen to afterwards." And nothing more was said about it. The seal of the premier legate served for all. Even down to the smallest matters, the council was condemned to exist only by and for the pope.

On the 18th of January there was the same silence on the part of the legates, the same indecision on the part of the assembly. The discussion was opened, but came to no result. The Italians wanted the council to begin with the settlement of doctrines; to that the imperialists objected then, as always, that the extirpation of heresies was not to be thought of until scandals were first extirpated. The meeting adjourned itself to the 22d, and then rose.

A majority now began to take shape, but it was on the German side. Had the vote been taken at once, the matter would have been at an end; reforms were taken up; they became the grand affair. The pope was aware of plans being in agitation against his court, and against himself. The council once embarked in that course, what was he to do?—"Make an inglorious surrender; permit the council, which he himself had convened against heresy, to do him more harm than heresy itself? Or should he resist? Was he to deprive of all its credit the very assembly whose sole weapon against heresy was the public veneration? Was the general to quarrel with his army at the moment of engaging in battle? Was he to renew the troubles of Basle, the results of which would be all the more to be feared, inasmuch as the materials being still more ready to catch fire now than they were then, the smallest of these sparks might make them burst into a flame?"¹ His whole hope lay in his legates, whom he treated, however, very ill, for having so imprudently left the decision to the assembly.

On the 22d of January, the members were almost unanimous in requiring that reforms should be taken up first, and doctrines afterwards. This compelled the legates to raise the mask, and to state plainly that such were not the views of the pope. The council might well have asked why the pope had not explained himself sooner; they did not care, however, to allow themselves to be drawn off to that ground. But said the legates, "Has not the emperor spoken of convening a council himself for the purpose of putting an end to the present disputes? And who

¹ Pallav. B. v. ch. viii.

will keep him from doing so, should we put off questions of faith?" This argument prevailed. Indirectly charged with delaying doctrinal questions for the mere purpose of giving the emperor an opportunity of breaking with the pope, the imperialists dared not hold out any longer. "Day of battle! glorious day for the apostolic see!" wrote the legates in transmitting to Cardinal Farnese the details of their victory. Such, in their view, had been the greatness of the danger.

And yet this victory was not complete. It had been found necessary to yield so far as that the questions of discipline should be mingled, as much as possible, with the doctrinal ones. The bishops recollected Constance and Pisa, where, on the latter being decided, the councils had been dismissed without having had it in their power to occupy themselves with the former. They had taken their precautionary measures, it remained for the pope also to take his.

To the dangers which he suspected, there was added one which he hardly dreamt of, but which time has made evident. We refer to the intermingling of disciplinary and doctrinal decrees. For those who regard both as infallible there is nothing untoward in this, but as respects those who do not believe in disciplinary infallibility, it supplies a serious argument against them. In that case, in fact, what an odd medley is presented by the decrees of the council! Here we find one on discipline: that is fallible. Next comes one on doctrine: this is infallible. They stand side by side, lie parallel, and are closely connected together;—what of that! The one is the work of man, the other is the work of God. *This* you must receive at the peril of your salvation; *that* you may reject. And let us not forget there are those—we shall see several—in which some articles are doctrinal, others disciplinary. In that case behold the fallible and the infallible, the mutable and the immutable, mingled, interlaced, and running into each other, in the same chapter, on the same page, sometimes even in the same phrase. No, there is no middle course! Either be frankly ultramontane, and we shall know with whom we have to do; or admit, that if a council is fallible in one of the halves of a chapter, of a page, of a phrase, it cannot be infallible in the other.

The third session, fixed for the 4th of February, was now approaching, and yet nothing, absolutely nothing to be done at it. Had they set to work immediately, it was impossible to have any decree sufficiently matured for that date. The bishops mur-

mured; forty had now arrived, and though that was but a small number for a council, yet they were no longer the small body which it had been found possible to keep so long idle. Already, to prevent the irregularities that were dreaded, the Fathers, says Pallavicini,¹ "had been adroitly separated into three several congregations, which were to meet at the houses of the three legates respectively. The *apparent* reason adduced by the legates for this was, that in three different places more business would be done in less time. . . . But in their own secret hearts, they proposed to themselves three other advantages. One was that of being better able to lead the whole body, when weakened by division, into three separate brooks, instead of being allowed to gather into a river. The other . . . &c., &c." Here we find a Jesuit frank enough. He adds, accordingly, that *for some weak minds*, this might seem to furnish arms to the enemies of the council's authority. We confess we are such *weak-minded* persons, who have the unlucky humour of calling intrigue—intrigue; and thinking that where there is intrigue, there the Holy Ghost is not. "But," says the author, "is there intrigue, then, in the pope's desiring to preserve intact that sovereign authority, of which God has made him the depositary? And if such a preservation is to be blamed because it is at the same time agreeable to himself, we must blame the man also who eats to live, because no more can one eat without gratifying one of the senses. . . . And, as for his ministers, the more address they showed in their efforts, the more praise do they deserve; for prudence, that queen of the moral virtues, consists precisely in the art of attaining an honest end by using only allowable means." True; it only remains that we be sure that all that is *allowable* in politics, is allowable also in a council, and that even policy would sanction all that the legates had to do. This we shall have occasion more than once to ask themselves; and the cries of their conscience, their remonstrances to the pope, and their confessions to intimate friends, will sufficiently prove to us, either that they did not consider prudence to be *the queen of the virtues*, or that, even in their own eyes, they had been something else than prudent.

Already, notwithstanding its having been decided that doctrines and discipline were to be taken up simultaneously, they cleverly contrived to prevent this plan from being indicated in a decree. "To what purpose would you write it out?" said they.

¹ B. v. ch. vii.

“Is it not enough that you follow it?” Nothing being in readiness for the session, it was proposed that it should be devoted to the solemn reading and acceptance of the confession of faith, called the Athanasian Creed, forming part of the canon of the mass. Several councils, it was said, had done this. It was like arming themselves with a buckler before marching to the attack of heresies. Several had, in fact, placed it at the head of their decrees; but there never had been an instance of a session having been devoted to it, especially after having had two months to prepare for something else. Besides, the singularity of proceeding with great pomp, to read what people could hear every day at all the masses, it was objected that that creed was not attacked by the Protestants, and furnished no arms against them, if, on the contrary, it was not even in their hands, a weapon rather against the Church. In fact, the circumstance of a creed having been admitted at Nice as complete, having been maintained afterwards without addition, and being still read daily in all the churches of Catholicity, containing nothing, or almost nothing of what was attacked by the Reformation, was one the bearing of which could hardly be dissembled. But what was objected most, was that, after having promised to bring forward discipline and doctrine abreast, they should commence with doctrine alone.

Here, as in all cases, the legates carried their point. A preamble was drawn up, in which it was said that the Fathers, under a conviction of the immensity of their task, felt how needful it was for them mutually to exhort each other to take, according to the saying of an apostle, “the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit?” Consequently, they thought they could do nothing better than repeat, word for word, (*totidem verbis*,) that ancient and venerable symbol, “by means of which alone, on some occasions, infidels have been converted and *heretics overwhelmed*.” A piece of pure fanfaronade at that moment, seeing that the heretics of the day declared their belief in it.

The session was held, accordingly, and the 8th of April fixed for the next.

Two months seemed a long time. Many of the bishops complained; but it was replied that several foreign prelates were on their way, and that it was proper that they should wait for them. In point of fact, the parties meant were twelve Spanish bishops sent by the emperor.

The pope, on his side, was about to send much the same number of Italians. We shall see that Italy never ceased to be at all times in the majority in the assembly, but that no more did the number of its bishops much exceed that of those from other countries. Like an able general who knows the exact number of soldiers required for each affair, Rome sent or recalled her partisans, according to the necessities of the moment. Certain of victory, she did not wish to give herself the air of being able to overwhelm her foes.¹

Notwithstanding this precaution, and although there were always some independent men among the Italians, there is no fact shown by the annals of the time to have been more frequently or more universally alleged, whether against the council, or against the pope. On the least check, the foreign (non-Italian) bishops wrote to all Europe, that they could do nothing, that they were nothing, that the Italians voted as one man; on the least discontent being felt against the pope, the secular princes exclaimed with still more vehemence, that he was the master, the only master; and that the Italians swept all before them.

Now, what are we to think of this?

In point of right, it could be no objection. The council was open to all bishops; all had been invited in the bull by which it was convoked. Had there been but one foreigner against a hundred Italians, the assembly was regular, and its decisions legal.

In point of fact, the matter stood quite otherwise. If injustice was done to the Italians, when they were accused of being always Italians above all things, it is incontestable that they brought with them ideas more or less peculiar to their nation, and the constant triumph of which, in a council-general, might easily appear contrary to the very end and essence of such a council. The independence of which some gave proof, hardly lasted longer than the first few months; and when these were over, we see them openly form a party. Private meetings, compact votings, reproaches of treason against all who refused to follow the torrent—nothing was wanting. While, however, we blame the Italians, we nowise mean to exculpate others. Each of the nations showed plainly enough, that it only wanted appearing in sufficient number, to do likewise. “Count not up the Fathers

¹ We have calculated, on this occasion, the total number of bishops or abbey-men who figured at Trent. It was about 450; of whom there were 180 foreigners, and 270 Italians; 27 to 18, or 3 to 2.

at Trent," says one of its apologists;¹ "*ask them not from what country they come; a Christian's country is the universe.*" Fine words these, of which the whole history of the council is nothing but a perpetual refutation; and which of the two are we to believe, the author who at the close of three centuries has pictured to us this magnificent unity, or the members themselves of the council, who never passed a day without mutually accusing each other of violating it? And all were right. It was impossible to be more French than were the French,—more German than the Germans,—more Italian, to return to them, than the Italians. How could it be otherwise? The Lutherans, it is true, asked for what was impossible, when they would have had the bishops, first of all, loosed from obligations by oath to the pope; but the oath which many Italian bishops had to swear, comprised, even in the eyes of some who were not Lutherans, clauses that were incompatible with the liberty which every member of a deliberative assembly ought to enjoy. It ran thus: "I engage to preserve, to defend, to augment, to advance the rights, the honours, the privileges, and the authority of the holy church, and of our lord the pope; not to take part in any deliberation, any act, any transactions, in which there is set on foot, against our said Lord, or the said church, anything whatsoever contrary to, or to the prejudice of, their rights, their honours, their position, and their authority."² Such had been the oath sworn on the day of their consecration, by the numerous prelates of the papal states; and the same formula was in use, with but a few words of difference, in other states of Italy. Those prelates, then, were in the hands of the pope, not only as subjects are which have merely sworn to be faithful, and are left free to see, in their own conscience, in what this allegiance consists,—but fully, absolutely. Whatever displeased, or might displease the pope—whatever his ministers combated, or even did not support, all this they could not, without perjury, either accept or allow to pass unopposed. This does not prove that they were always kept, in point of fact, in this absolute incapacity for doing anything, or wishing anything, of themselves; but it is not necessary that a judge should have been actually deprived of his liberty: it is enough that he *might* have been deprived of it, in

¹ The Abbé Prompsault, almoner of Quinze-Vingts.

² Jura, honores, privilegia et auctoritatem Sanctæ Rom. Ecclesiæ et domini nostri papæ conservare, defendere, auzere et promoverè curabo. Neque ero in consilio, vel facto, vel tractata in quibus contra ipsum dominiuum nostram vel eandem Rom. Ecclesiam, aliqua sinistra vel prejudicialia juris, honoris, status, et potestatis eorum machinentur.

order to a legal exception lying against his decision. Accordingly, we see that in all that has been written, in a legal point of view, against the council of Trent,¹ this oath taken by the Italian members is the first alleged ground of nullity. Will it be said, with an author already quoted,² that they remained free in the discussion of matters relating to the faith? No! the pope as dogmatical head of the Church was then more than ever mixed up and confounded with that same pope as head of the hierarchy. Granting that if those bishops remained free in some points not as yet definitely settled, it is clear that they were no longer free on those upon which the pope had pronounced a decision; the slightest resistance to his doctrinal decisions would have been an insult, a rebellion, of much more serious consequence than the most vigorous assaults by word or deed against his usurpations as a sovereign. Nor was this enthrallment of the faith so peculiar to the Italians, as that a still more general juridical nullity might not be deduced from it against the acts of the council. All had sworn to believe what the Church taught; all were bound beforehand to a certain course, both as respects the general result, and the details of the process.

As for us, we attach little importance to these considerations, all the more as they have not been left without reply. Illegal or not at the date of its being held, the council has been accepted by the Roman Church. Have not the ample folds of her infallibility been thrown over all irregularities, intrigues, and nullities both of form and principle? If, then, we have to complain of the enthrallment of the members of the council, it is of another enthrallment that we would speak; it is that which bears down and trammels the pope as the ultimate bishop or priest. There is something stronger than an oath, stronger even than conscience. Habit, interest, *esprit-du-corps*, true or false shame, the impossibility of retracting on one point without retracting on many more, the desire of unity for the sake of domination, and of domination for the preservation of unity,— here we see what would explain to us much better than an oath to the pope, both the council and its votes, and the maintenance of the Roman system. How ridiculous, be it said in passing, this pretended approbation of the Church as the last seal of infallibility! At the consecration of the kings of France, just as the crown was placed on their head, a herald proceeded to the

¹ Gentillet, Dumoulin, Ranchin, Spanheim, Heidegger, Jurieu, Leibnitz, &c., &c.

² Prompsault.

gate of the church and called aloud, "Are the people content with the king that has been given them?" On this the crowd called out, "Yes;" and the herald returned to say that the people had signified their approval. Such is the history of many articles of faith, except that the crowd has not always even heard the question put to it, whether it approved or not. It has said nothing, and that has been held enough; its consent is inferred.—As if from the moment that an idea has made some progress, and that Rome appears to favour it, it were not morally impossible that a bishop should venture to write, or even to speak against it! For we all know that the Church means the bishops. Rome admits to the right of protesting those only whose position guarantees their never exercising that right. She has never even acknowledged their right to do so. The popes have submitted, when necessary, to the doctrine of the consent of the bishops, but they have not acknowledged it, and still less have they taught it. The pure ultramontanists laugh at it. "This right," says De Maistre, "was exercised in the case of Fénélon, *with a pomp that was quite amusing.*" Such is the very episcopate in the Roman system.

In fine, for the first time (it was now the 22d of February) the council met to deliberate in good earnest. The legates appeared radiant with smiles. Why so? Nobody could tell. Could it be because the council was now about to put itself in motion, and because, after having held a session for the *Credo*, they would not be obliged to hold one for the *Pater*, as was remarked by some mischievous wits? This was doubted. The legates had not hitherto looked like men who were eager for the council proceeding to business. Could it be that the emperor had at last consented to declare war against the Protestants? possibly so; a courier had arrived from Germany that very morning.—No. It was because of something else; something better still—Luther was dead!

Yes: the veteran father of the Reformation was dead—if the Reformation had any father but God, any mother but the Word of God. He was dead, but only after having viewed with a smile of pity the grand projects and the small intrigues of men, so infatuated as to think of arresting by their decrees the movements of human thought and the very breath of God. And see now how glad they are, these very men! Even when

feeble and dying, the old monk of Wittemberg still terrified them. One might have said, that they could never turn round to look at Germany without their eyes meeting his, and without quailing before that eagle glance which had once embraced all Europe from the top of the donjon towers of the Wartburg. At Trent, at Rome, at Vienna, wherever the partisans and champions of the popedom were to be found, never could they meet by two or three, without a voice, at once serious and sarcastic, seeming to pierce the wall, to overawe theirs and to silence them. Now, then, ye oracles of the council, you may proceed at your ease. Shut, shut the Bible! Luther no longer lives to open it. Poor insensate creatures! see you not, that once opened, no human power shall shut it? "My good princes and lords," said Luther shortly before his death, "you are truly far too eager to see me die—me who am but a poor man. You fancy, then, that after that you shall have got the victory!" But no; they did not think so, for they proceeded to close their ranks, and to advance more vigorously than ever against the book which he had used as his own buckler, and that of his adherents.

Now, then, let us open that Bible, and let us not take our eyes off it, we who, after the lapse of three centuries, are about to relate the doings of that famous assembly which laboured so hard to have it closed. If it is by history and reason that we can shake the authority of the Council of Trent, it is by the Bible only that we can hope to subvert it altogether.

Here our First Book should close. The council was about to open, questions of quite another kind will now present themselves. It is by design that we have brought together in this first part, at the risk of weakening its interest, all the preliminary objections bearing on the convocation and the composition of the assembly, on its relations with the pope and the secular sovereigns; in a word, on its position, and the part that it had to perform in the Church. But there is another question which is paramount to all the rest, and with which we shall close this first series of our observations—the question, to wit, of the council's authority.

Let us say frankly at the outset, that there has been a little, if we may not rather say a great deal, of exaggeration in the importance people have given to it. One thing strikes us in the preaching and the writings of the Roman Catholicism of our day: it is the care with which it avoids discussions in detail,

and controversies positively doctrinal. The course almost invariably pursued by the great preachers of the day,¹ is to preach authority, the Church, and then to assume as admitted all that the Church teaches. Think you that they have proved transubstantiation to the thousands whom they sometimes, in large cities, succeed in inducing to communicate? Not at all. After long discourses on the authority of the Church, they have not even said to them, "She teaches transubstantiation; *you ought* therefore to believe in it." That *you ought* would have spoiled all. They feel that the smallest objection of detail which they could not fully overmaster, would instantly deprive the principles they had so laboriously laid down, of all worth, all force. In vain would you have led people to say with you that there must be an authority, that there actually is one, and that it is that of the Church: should there happen to be a single point in what you shall have taught them in its name, which they cannot decidedly admit, it will be all one as if you had done nothing.

Such is the sense in which we would say that the importance of the question of authority is at the present day exaggerated. People start with the idea that it is everything, when in reality it is nothing. Although we should commence here with the confession that we have not a word to say in reply, in theory, to such or such a book, in which this system is eloquently set forth, a Roman Catholic doctor would not the less be bound, under the penalty of yielding to us with one hand the victory carried off by the other, to reply to all which we shall afterwards object in detail to the decisions of Trent. Let him then be beaten on a single point, and we shall be entitled to say to him, "Your authority has been mistaken; what you have told us of its infallibility, therefore, is necessarily false. It makes no answer to objections; in fact, it exists only for the man who renounces objecting." Shall we after this discuss in detail the texts which the Church brings in support of her infallibility? "The Church," she says, "is, according to St. Paul, the pillar and stay of the truth." "The gates of hell," according to Jesus Christ himself, "shall not prevail against it." And is it not Jesus Christ, too, who promised to St. Peter, to pray for him—*that thy faith fail not!*

Much might be said about the very meaning of these declara-

¹ It is also, in general, that of Wiseman in his *Confessions*: "This sole demonstration," says he, "suffices to put beyond the reach of attack all the points on which we have been accused of being in error."

tions, and of that last one in particular ; for *faith*, in the Saviour's discourses, means generally confidence, fidelity, devotedness, not belief in such and such doctrines. But had we no such objection, it is a question on which texts of Scripture prove nothing more than *a priori* reasonings do. If Jesus Christ has said to his apostles,—“I am with you always even to the end of the world;” it is he also, who declared, that “wherever two or three are met together in his name, there is he in the midst of them;” if he has promised to his Church the aids of his Holy Spirit, he has said by the mouth of one of his apostles, that “God giveth the Holy Spirit to those who ask him.” What would you reply to him who, resting on that last passage, should insist that he is infallibly in the right? Would you object to him that he has asked for the Holy Spirit, but that he cannot affirm that he has obtained it? No, he will say, for the promise is express: “God *giveth* the spirit to them who ask it;” and Jesus Christ has elsewhere said,—“Whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he will give it to you.” We should find, in short, as many and more passages in favour of individual infallibility than of the infallibility of the Church. If the former are evidently figurative, the latter may be so too. In order to prove that they are not so—that God has promised to his Church never to suffer it to err, we must ever revert to the proof that it has not erred.

Of what avail, in fine, in this question, can be any appeal whatever to Scripture? To quote it, is neither more nor less than to assume the very contrary of what one wants to establish; it is to call us to the exercise of the right that is refused to us. We are told that we must renounce our own individual judgment; that to the Church alone belongs the right to interpret the Bible;—and, lo, the first thing done, is to give us the Bible to interpret. If the passages adduced seem insufficient, what shall be done? Should they appear conclusive, should the Church, happy to see us enter into her views, tell us that we have judged rightly,—we then come to a very simple conclusion, which is this: that if we have made a good use of our judgment once, we cannot believe ourselves incapable of making an equally good use of it another time.

Thus every demonstration of the Church's infallibility is, of itself, a vicious circle. Infallibility gains converts by imposture, not by demonstration.

We might ask then, in the first place, if the Roman authority,

if any authority whatever,—in the *Roman* sense of that word,—can be anything but a word, a misconception, an illusion?

“My body is in your hands,” said a philosopher to a tyrant. “You may sew up my mouth, shut me up, load me with chains, reduce me to eternal immobility; but my soul is free, and will remain free.”

For twenty centuries and more these words have been admired, not only as courageous, but also and above all as profoundly true. Well, then, if the philosopher was right before a pagan tyrant, could he be wrong before an inquisitor?

The only being to whom we cannot hold this language is God. For man, with respect to all that pertains to thought, the sole means of his acting upon man, is persuasion. To this add two indirect methods; the one, to habituate the mind to be silent; the other, to constrain it by external acts of violence.

Let us first demonstrate—and it will not take us long—that none of these three means, the only means possible, is really *authority*.

Logically, we have said, the only one possible is persuasion. And, accordingly, we do not see that our adversaries are unwilling to place it in the first line, be it ever so little feasible, or though there be the means of doing otherwise. They will not tell an atheist to believe in God because the Church ordains him to do so; and even, whoever the person may be who is to be convinced, before proceeding to the grand argument, “*the Church has said it*,” they will always put forward, at least for form’s sake, some rational arguments.

Then, of two things, one must happen: either these arguments suffice for conviction, or they do not suffice.

If they suffice, you then submit; but how? Precisely as you would to any mere man, who alone, armed with nothing but his reason, should labour to inculcate his ideas on you. On this field, the priest’s authority is just that of every man who reasons. That of the Church is not required. If these arguments do not suffice, you resist. Then you are told to believe, for so the Church ordains. But here, again, of two things we have one: either you make up your mind to believe, or you persist in not believing. If you persist in not believing, the man who has addressed you in the name of the Church, finds himself exactly in the same position as one who should have addressed you in his own name, and failed at last for want of new arguments. If you make up your mind to believe, will it be, really and truly,

because you have been commanded to do so? No; it does not depend on you to obey an order of this nature. What then has been the result?

First of all, it is possible that the testimony of the Church may have reinforced in your eyes the reasons which you had previously found wanting in force. But, then, it is still to reasons that you yield; the Church's part is reduced to that of every person of weight placed in a position to augment the probability of an opinion, by his example and his words. It is an *authority* in the vulgar sense of the word; it is not *authority* in the Roman sense.

It may happen, in the second place, that, without ceasing to consider the reasons weak, you come at last to distrust yourself, and to think it more prudent, more conformable with Christian humility, more convenient also, to bow the head and be silent.

It is this—Rome makes no secret of it—it is this disposition which Rome chiefly requires, and which she has constantly sought to maintain, both among individuals and nations. Thus we come to the second of the three means indicated above: the habituating of the mind to silence and to keep aloof.

It is the surest of the three; and the Roman Church has largely and ably employed it. She found it attended with two advantages: first, it enabled her to reign; next, to reign without obstacle, without having the air of oppressing, without seeming to rest on anything but the unanimous assent of her members. Can it be said that her doctors and her chiefs have really had among them a regular, positive, invariable plan for the enslavement of mankind? No; her doctors and her chiefs themselves, as we have already remarked, have merely yielded to that mysterious spirit under whose influence their part has been at once active and passive, haughty and humble. If there was any calculation, it was a calculation altogether of instinct. They were sufficiently aware, that in order to demand submission with effect, they must begin with submission on their own part. Hence the astonishing docility of which so many men of fine genius have given proof towards the Church of Rome; hence that respectful silence which they have shown on so many difficulties, which we could not conceive their not having seen as we see them, and even better than we.

But Rome has not always succeeded in obtaining this silence so completely as that we should not be able to analyze it and discover its true meaning. "*God has permitted a bad success,*"

wrote Fénelon,¹ on learning that he had been condemned by the pope. Certainly the man who says, "*God has permitted me to be condemned,*" is far from having abjured, in his own secret heart, the ideas for which he has been condemned. "I hold my peace, but not the less convinced am I that I was right;" such, according to this letter, and several others,² was what Fénelon's submission came to at last.

Listen to Luther as he expressed himself in 1518:—"I present myself to you, and throw myself at your feet, Most Holy Father, myself, and all that is in me. Bestow life or death; call, recall, approve, disapprove.—I recognise your voice as the voice of Christ, who speaks and reigns in you." The voice spoke—and Luther remained none the less Luther.

Listen to Lamennais in 1831:—"O Father, condescend to look down on some of thy children who are accused of being rebels against thine infallible authority. If one thought, one single thought of theirs, departs from thine, they disavow it, they abjure it." The voice spoke—and Lamennais not the less became, what he is, an infidel.

Accordingly, we repeat, authority exists for him only who has the wish, for him only who has the power to submit to it. Direct influence it has none. Even with the most ardent desire to be docile under it, still this may be beyond your power. In that case, either you submit, but with a submission altogether external, altogether in show, like that of Fénelon, of the Jansenists, and many more;³ or, like Luther, like all whom reason, right or wrong, has kept from obeying,—you resist.

In that case there remains the third means—constraint. This is the natural, the indispensable complement of the Roman system; and it is in fact always associated with it, everywhere, at least, wherever it has the power. Unaided by the civil authority, it is clear that the Church's authority is in the same conditions as every other intellectual and moral authority: a little weaker, a little stronger, according to individuals—that is all. Let the humblest plebeian get some new idea into his mind: twenty popes, twenty councils, the whole Christian world leagued against him, will not change his conviction by commanding him to change it. If he persist in calling for proofs, you must give them to him; if you have none, or if he think

¹ Letter to the Abbé de Chanterac, his agent at Rome.

² These will be found in his *Œuvres*, by the Cardinal de Bausset.

³ The pope threatens us with thundering constitutions. A good intention, with little enlivenment, is a great evil in high places.—Bossuet, *Letter to the Abbé de Rauzé*.

them bad, what can you do? Imprison him, torture him, you may; convince him you cannot. Accordingly, now-a-days, in those countries where the secular power is not at the service of the Roman Church, what does its authority amount to? Does it arrest the progress of a single idea? Where are there printed most immoral and infidel books—at London or at Paris? Where are religion and its ministers subjected to most contemptuous ridicule? Although Rome should succeed in reconquering, without any external aid, all the power she has ever possessed only through the assistance of physical force, still this would be a fact which could prove nothing in point of right. Although you were to shew us the entire world laid prostrate before the Roman infallibility, not the less might we say, “It may rise again to-morrow, and, should it rise again, it escapes from you.”

To recapitulate: If you persuade me by dint of reasons, you deal with me on a footing of equality. There will be no authority there. If you habituate me to dispense with reasons, no more do you exercise any empire over my understanding. It holds itself aloof, but it does not submit. The proof of this is, that at any moment it may rise again with all its rights, all its audacity, all its doubts. Neither is there *authority* here. If you have recourse to physical force,—you have, then, to do with my body; my soul is, and remains free. Still less is there *authority* in this case. The best way, therefore, of combating authority, such as Rome arrogates, is to deny it. Legitimate or not, infallible or not, one word decides all; it is impossible. Either there is persuasion, or there is nothing, nothing but a brute force which the first tyrant that comes may quite as well put forth to the advantage of any idea, any ambition whatever. But if the authority of the Roman Church, let people do what they please, reduces itself necessarily to two means altogether human, persuasion or constraint,—does not this prove at once that it has not received that authority from God? God would have trifled with the Church had he authorized her to impose creeds, without at the same time enabling her to operate internally on men’s souls so as to make them accept those creeds. But the Church has never pretended to be endowed with any such power. She has only had that of persecuting, and that, it is clear, God never gave her any more than he had given it before to a Nero or a Diocletian. He left her to do as she pleased, as he had left them to do as they pleased. *Patiens quia æternus.*

After this, what becomes of reasonings *a priori*? What do

they prove at bottom, even although all we have said should go for nothing? If there has been a revelation, it is said, there ought to be an authority accompanying it. How reconcile the idea of a revelation given by a God, with the idea that revelation has not been secured, from its origin, against all alteration? How could Luther have been able to believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, and yet doubt for a moment that that same Jesus behoved to guard, and knew how to guard his religion against all which . . . &c.¹ This we find reiterated in every form, from the pulpit, in books, everywhere.

Let us see. We, too, venture to reason. "How can you reconcile the idea of God's holiness with the idea that the creature of his predilection, the creature *made in his image*, man in short, has not been secured from his origin, against all invasion of moral evil?" Well, then, if evil had not been there, evident, palpable, we might defy any one to demonstrate wherein this reasoning is less conclusive than the former.

God *might have!* No doubt. God *ought to have!* What know you of that? Are there not enough of other things which, to our poor human eyes, seem necessary, and which God, nevertheless, has not done?

An authority *is necessary*.—Why? For three things, we are told.—to regulate the faith; to preserve it; to maintain unity. One word on each of these three points.

To regulate the faith.—This presupposes, 1st, the insufficiency of written revelation; 2d, the possibility of remedying that insufficiency.

Now, let us go back eighteen centuries. Suppose yourself at Rome; a pagan, but, like Plato, sighing for an illumination from above. Suppose the history of the Jews, of the Saviour, of the apostles, to be entirely unknown to you. A book is announced to you, and in that you are told is to be found the desideratum you have longed for.

What idea would men naturally form, before being acquainted with it, of the much desired volume? Some would figure to themselves a book of philosophy; others, a dialogue between God and man; these would expect to find it a course of theology, those a positive and compact code of laws. In a word, each would construct the work after his own manner, and put into it his own ideas, his own tastes, perhaps even his own passions.

¹ Robelot, *Influence de la Réformation de Luther*.

But if there be one idea which, according to all probabilities, would never enter any one's head, it is that the book should not be for everybody, and that there should be men exclusively commissioned to read it, and to impose upon others what they shall have believed that they have found in it. "There will be some," people would naturally think, "who shall make it their special study. And to such men it will be natural for people to listen with the deference due to their superior intelligence and their labours; but not the less must the book remain the common property of all. To study it must be considered as the right of all and the duty of all."

Here, too, we admit, there is an argument *a priori*. We draw no conclusion from it. Let us only see what shall be thought of it afterwards by those who shall have formed it.

What shall they think of it? They will not even have any occasion to return to it. When they come to read the book, will they find in it a single word likely to suggest a doubt as to the justness of their anticipations? Will they find a single word indicating that the instructions which it contains must necessarily pass through the mouths of certain men? A single word, in fine, which does not appear to be addressed to everybody, in order that each may take from it whatever his mind, his conscience, his heart shall have found in it. No; it required several ages and all the perspicacity of ambition to discover in some of the Master's words, the germs of that power which Rome has arrogated to herself. Even although we should accept, as addressed to *her*, all the promises of aid and inspiration made to the Church in general, still she would be far from having received as many of them as the Jewish Church, of which God was so long the head, and almost the visible head, so direct was his intervention in the smallest details of that Church's destiny. Was the Jewish Church, on that account, exempt from error? Did Jesus Christ find nothing to reproach her with? Did she open her eyes to that new light which had been announced to her for a thousand years? The Jews called themselves "the chosen race," and hence they concluded that the truth could never depart from among them. What less reason had they for this, than Rome has at the present day? If they erred, nothing will demonstrate that Rome may not err.

Thus, although there were as much proof as there is little of the insufficiency of the Bible, still nothing could prove that the Roman Church is charged, and alone charged, with the task of

supplying what is wanting in it. And what if, passing to facts, we should now inquire how she has done this? With what has she filled up those vacuities which she has thought good to perceive in written revelation? Are those doctrines of which, according to her own admission, there are few, and according to our conviction, no traces in the Bible,—are they, at least, so much in accordance with the spirit of the rest, that one can readily believe them to have emanated from the same source? What! the God who could dictate several hundreds of pages without there being a single word in them about such and such Roman doctrines, it is He who long afterwards dictated the decrees by virtue of which those doctrines have obtained a place;—and what place! often the first among the doctrines of Christianity! But let us not anticipate. We have here to do with a question of principles, and must say nothing that is not followed up with proof.

Nevertheless, it would be by facts that we should again be able best to reply to the second thing alleged, that authority is necessary *for the preservation of the faith*. We would ask ourselves how it has preserved it; we would call upon it to justify, one by one, the alterations of all sorts to which it has lent itself, and, as we said at the commencement of these reflections, one single unjustifiable point would suffice to annihilate the very strongest pleas that could have been urged in favour of authority. This is just what we have had chiefly in view in the composition of the present history, and here we can but refer the reader to it.

As long as Christian doctrines preserved their primitive simplicity,—as long as the Scripture was in every one's hands,—as long as the pulpits resounded with invitations to study it,—we do not see that the idea ever entered any one's head of setting up that abstract being, the Church, as the regulator and the preserver of doctrine, still less of granting her any right to lord it over the conscience and the reason of her members. There were councils; be it so; still there was none in the course of the first three centuries. But it is one thing to meet for the purpose of coming to a common understanding as to what is to be taught, to condemn accidentally such or such an opinion which is believed to be mischievous, and quite another thing to arrogate, as with Divine authority, the absolute right of teaching and condemning. We deny that this right was arrogated. If there was in the third, the fourth, or even the fifth century, any-

thing resembling it, what could be the meaning of those constant calls on the part of the Fathers, to the reading, the study, the examination of the Holy Scriptures? Accordingly, it was not till after having admitted certain articles of faith, which, to say the least, were hazardous and controvertible, that it was found necessary to fall upon some means of binding them up with those which nobody contested; in short, the protection of that which was not sufficiently protected by the authority of the Holy Scriptures, was the desideratum which gave birth to the authority of the Church. By little and little this protection was extended to the Bible itself; it was no longer from the hands of God, but from the hands of the Church, that men had to believe they got the sacred volume. Henceforward the two authorities were merged in one. And this fusion, altogether to the advantage of the Church, became every day more complete; the Bible disappearing as, when a building is finished, the first laid stones disappear in the foundations. At this very day, three centuries after the Reformation, there are people whom an appeal to the Bible profoundly astonishes; whom a quotation from the Bible, even when they have no reply to make to it, does not in the least shake. And yet they will not tell you either that it is wrong, or that it has been abrogated; they very well know that their Church sometimes quotes it; but to quote it otherwise than the Church does, is a novelty which confounds them. Why should that Bible interfere? No doubt, the instrument is good; but just because it is good, why should it produce any sounds different from those that the Church extracts from it.

We admit, on the credit of science, things quite contrary to the evidence of the senses, the earth's motion round the sun, for example; why, then, not admit, on the credit of the Church, something different from what seems to be said in the Bible? So, then, this is the way in which some remain Roman Catholics, although they see clearly in the Bible the contrary of what they believe.¹

¹ It is an observation, which we will take the liberty of recommending to Protestant controversialists, that they forget too much, in general, that they have to do with people for whom the Bible is nothing,—nothing at least by itself, from the moment it does not seem to be in accordance with the Church; they make it too much their only battle-axe, and are not aware of the slight effect of their heaviest blows. Were these only blows that had missed their proper aim, one would only have to take a surer aim the next time. But the worst of it is, that by having recourse to the Bible against people who have not yet recognised its supreme authority, we are always habituating them more and more to recognise it only as a secondary authority, and not to look upon it as pronouncing in the last resort. Thus in all polemics with people who have not yet approached the Bible with the most profound respect, call not in the Bible to your aid, until you have in some sort driven them from all other

Yes, doubtless, an authority was necessary, absolutely necessary, for the preservation of so many things which reason, conscience, and most of all, the Gospel, would so soon have exploded; but, would that same Gospel, abandoned to itself, delivered into men's hands as it came from the apostles, with nothing but its divine beauty to defend it, without other means of constraint than are to be found in the majesty of its doctrines, and the resistless charm of its morality,—would that Gospel run any risk of being lost? Would it not always have been there, an inspired guide, an immutable regulator, to keep people in the way of truth, or to bring them back to it? Throw into one heap all the variations, all the divergences, all the modifications, to which the Gospel may have been subjected among those countless sects which have been made a matter of reproach against the Reformation,—and let it be shown us, with the Bible in our hand, whether all of them taken together, have altered it more than Roman Catholicism alone has done. With authority the Bible was eclipsed; with liberty never, whatever some men may have said or done, never have men's eyes ceased to be fixed on it. Amid the most violent disputes, amid troubles and convulsions, amid attack and retaliation with the pen and the sword, it has kept its place on the altar, ever circled about with men's homage, ever studied, ever pondered, ever ready to produce its fruits of peace and salvation. Read those eloquent counsels of a Chrysostom, of a Basil, of an Augustine, of all the Fathers, in fine, on the duty of seeking in the Book of Life the daily food of our souls, and say if ever there was an epoch in which their counsels were better followed than in the first times of the Reformation. By way of answer we are told to look at the picture of the extravagancies occasioned, in some places, by this superabundance of religious and theological life; but though some minds, on being set free by the Reformation, may have here and there given birth to things that by no means embellished its history, would it be difficult, on the other hand, to find in that of Roman Catholicism, vagaries which it would fain obliterate? To subvert authority, say you, is to surrender the faith to all the caprices of the human mind; but you may long ransack the annals of the Reformation before you shall find anything there

positions on to it, by means of every other argument that you have been able to find; do not allow the sword of God to be employed in uselessly beating the air. Let this observation, at the same time, be our excuse, with such as may find fault with this book for not being biblical enough. For Protestants it is sufficiently so; for Roman Catholics, it is better to have it no more so than it is.

to equal the lucubrations of your mystics, the ecstasies of some, the macerations of others, the stigmata of this saint, and the miracles of that. When the infidelity of the last century gathered in with so much care all that could throw ridicule on Christianity, on what field did it collect the largest harvest? Besides, let us not forget, that nothing then gleaned in the field of the Reformation had ever been so sanctioned by it, as to make it responsible for such scandals; they could permanently affect the character of the particular sect or individual only that was guilty of them. But you have canonized by hundreds your illuminati, your innumerable dreamers of every age, of every country, and of either sex; and though there may not have been any approval of follies, there has always been a bond of attachment which Rome will never break. While interdicting all discussion of the essence of doctrines, the mind has been allowed a frightful latitude in the way of analyzing them, diving into them, and setting them off with a thousand fancies. What has been lost in liberty in one sense, has been regained, for better or worse, in another; and the Church has shut her eyes, like a sovereign who allows his subjects to sing, provided they obey and pay. What a strange book might be made by collecting the products of this passive and hampered half-liberty! The mind of man cannot remain inactive. Authority, while it prevented it straying to the right, was compelled, by doing so, to tolerate much erratic movement on the left.

“Did Protestants,” says Bossuet, “really know with how many variations their confessions of faith have been framed, that Reformation of which they boast would inspire them only with contempt.”¹ We could wish that some one would explain to us, once for all, what is proved, in good logic, by the argument drawn from the variations of Protestantism. When, for example, it shall have been demonstrated that Protestants have not been all, and always, agreed on the subject of the Eucharist, what weight will this have taken from any single direct argument of theirs against the mass? When it shall have been proved, that with a pope they would have been more united, in what will this have weakened their historical and doctrinal attacks against the popedom? “Before accusing us of variations,” says Bossuet again,² “let them begin with clearing themselves.” To what purpose? The two positions are totally different. After having written four volumes on the variations of Protestantism, a system

¹ Preface to the *Variations*.

² *Ibid.*

of liberty, you have made less progress than he who shall have found a single variation in Roman Catholicism, a system of authority and infallible unity.

With liberty, any party whatever,—individual, congregation, or people, that momentarily loses the true doctrines of the Bible, never loses, at least, the thread by which it may be led back to them. The Roman Catholic, if he reject one single error of his Church, must break with a past, extending over twelve centuries—must repudiate a whole world of traditions, and sever ties of every kind. The child of the Reformation, should his ancestors have erred, is not rivetted by any such chain to their errors; these had not at their side, like the Roman Catholic's ancestors, an immutable power ready to stereotype all their imaginations. In all churches it may constantly happen that Christianity may be mingled with more or less alloy, according to times and places. With authority, the alloy and the metal are thrown into one; it would be rebellion and sacrilege to separate them. With liberty, the alloy, should any remain, ever lies in the crucible of the Bible, and is ever subject to the action of that divine fire which alone is capable of separating it and expelling it.

This operation, which Rome does not desire, should be left to proceed of itself with the aid of the Bible; she must, wherever she is not as much mistress of men's bodies as she desires to be of their souls, allow to proceed of itself, and that, too often, under the empire of the most untoward passions. Do people suppose that Voltaire, had he had the Bible put into his hands from his earliest years, even admitting that he might have become an infidel, would have persecuted it so ruthlessly? Witness Rousseau, who at bottom believed in the Bible no more than Voltaire did. A Protestant may become an unbeliever, but not an impious blasphemer. He may abandon, he may attack Christianity, but he will not hate it; he will not call it *the infamous wretch* (*l'infame*); he will not insist on crushing it (*l'écraser*). Without the deplorable identity which authority had established between that of the Bible and that of Rome, never should ignorance, never should dishonesty, have gone so far as to charge religion itself with whatever might be found ridiculous, or odious, in its history. Established for the purpose of conservation, authority behoves to preserve everything, and this is the greatest evil she has done to religion and to herself. At the present day, among so many new obstacles, does any believe that she would not think herself all too happy could she but lay down part of the

burthen which she has bound herself to carry to the end of time? She does in fact so far make it lighter, by the care with which she allows so many ideas to fall out of notice, the mere announcement of which would ruin her for ever; but all that she thus abandons without its being perceived, we are entitled to gather up and replace on her shoulders, and at the same time to repeat to her, that unless she would repudiate herself, she must take it with her to the last.

But, we are told, without authority there can be no unity.

This argument, from which so much is attempted to be drawn every day, is, in itself, the most incorrect of the three. It assumes as admitted and incontrovertible what has first of all to be demonstrated. Has it entered into God's purpose that there should be an entire unity of faith in the Church? This is the question. Authority is required to maintain unity. Be it so. But is unity itself necessary?

Let us not be misunderstood. That it is desirable, infinitely desirable; that we ought to be disposed to concur towards it with all our efforts, all our prayers, all the concessions that conscience will permit, is what we suppose none will deny. Who doubts or ever doubted it? A Church at once zealous and peaceable, is one of the most ravishing spectacles the earth can present; and the day on which all Christians shall unite to form but one will be the brightest that shall ever have shone on this scene of discords and contentions.

But what do we say? The brightest of days has already shone on the world. It was the day on which the earth beheld the arrival of Him who was announced as the Saviour of men; *of men*, mark well the word, that is to say, of every man, of every soul. What is the Church, after all? The Church, in the eye of God, means the individuals who go to compose it; for it, as the Church, no more than for a nation as nation, is there responsibility, or judgment, or a future, or a paradise, or hell. Promises and threatenings, all that you read in the Scripture, all that you hear from the mouth of Gospel preachers, all is from time to time pressed in vain under a collective form; there does not, and there cannot exist any responsibility but that of the individual. Religion, let people do what they please, remains an affair between each individual and God. If my religion be in conformity with that of my fellow-citizens, so much the better, and I ought to wish it may be so; if it be not, it is an evil, an evil which I ought to combat, as far as may be, with charity and

forbearance; but any real, direct, logical relation between the salvation of my soul and the greater or less conformity there may be betwixt their views and mine, is what I cannot in the least perceive. United or not united with others in this world, each of us will not the less be judged alone, condemned alone, saved alone. Though unity have important advantages, though it powerfully concur towards obtaining many of the objects of religion here below, such as union, peace and civil order,—it is not the less clear, that it is not indispensable as respects the first, the greatest of all those objects—the essential object, the sanctification and salvation of each individual soul.

If it is not indispensable, nothing authorizes us to affirm that God behoves to have desired it. And now, have we facts to support the affirmation that God has desired it?

“God is holy. God has made man. God, therefore, must have desired that man should be holy and should remain holy.” Such is the reasoning, the falseness of which, we have already said, cannot be logically demonstrated. What, then, should we do to refute it? We should say,—“ Evil exists. There are vices, there are crimes. Then, God has not wished that there should not be either vices or crimes.” Why has he not wished that there should be neither? This we cannot tell. There stands the fact; the argument to the contrary vanishes. *Facto cedit argumentum.*

Well, then, when we see the Christian world so profoundly divided, when we see all that is factitious in the Roman unity, and all that is atrocious in the means which it has been found necessary, nevertheless, to employ for maintaining that unity for good or evil; when we say to ourselves that so many anxious thoughts, so much vigilance, so much blood, have not prevented Rome from losing a third, almost the half of Europe, and that a reduplication of horrors was required in order to shut the gates of Spain and Italy on the Reformation, countries the conquest of which would have been the death of Roman Catholicism,—we think it proved to demonstration that unity, meaning thereby the system to which that name is given, is a human invention, a mere dream, very fine in theory, often most hideous in practice, and the realization of which, if it is to take place at all, pertains only to the Great Master of all hearts.

The question, then, remains entire. Nothing proves to us, in theory, either the authority or the infallibility of the council. Let us see how far it will itself prove it by its decrees and the history of its decrees.

BOOK SECOND.

Homage to the Bible—What is Tradition—Limits to credibility—What the Fathers thought of it; and the councils—What it had hitherto been—Papal aberration—Of what is Holy Scripture composed—Why had this still to be decided—The divines at the council—The apocryphal writings—Three opinions—Strange omnipotence—The Vulgate—Its history down to the time of the council—The decree would admit no delay—Results—The Vulgate as it stands—Whose province is it to interpret Scripture—Demi-liberalism—Absolute bondage—The god of Epicurus—Historical question—The Old Testament—The New—The Fathers—The last of the Fathers—Saint Augustine and the Bible Societies—A false quotation—Decree on the reading and the interpretation of the Bible—Fate of this decree in the hands of the popes—Deadly Pastures—Port-Royal—Liberty in Roman Catholicism—Sophisms—Difficulties in drawing up the decree—The Anathemas—Historical aspect of the case—Hesitations in the council—Decrees on the faith—Decrees on reformation—Alarms—Precautions—Fourth Session—The pope's confirmation—What had been gained—Perpetual compromise—External difficulties.

Altercations about the choice of subjects—Preaching—The bishops and the monks—Mutual recriminations—Indemnifications to the bishops—General relaxation of morals to the advantage of the popes—Lutheran opinion—Question of original sin—Four problems—Infants dying without baptism—The Roman catechism—All explanations but by anathemas, abandoned—Reflections on this subject—Five canons—The immaculate conception—Historical views—Fluctuations—How the Roman dogmas establish themselves—Fifth Session—Disputed votings—The ambassadors—Peter Danes—Holy War—Jubilee—Miscalculations—Alarms on the side of Trent—Projects for transferring the council to another place—Victories of Charles V.—Fresh altercations on the choice of subjects—Residence—Historical view—The legates severe at the expense of the bishops, and the bishops severe at the expense of the pope—Grace—Two extremes—What is in truth the Romish doctrine—Warm disputes—What we are to believe respecting grace—Draft of the decree—Herculean task—Inconsistency and audacity—Quarrel betwixt Soto and Catherine—No solution.

Benefices—Historical view—Pious donations—Origin of the quarrel about the Divine right—Efforts to keep the pope out of it—Decree on residence—Abuses without end—Samson's courage—Sixth Session—To be still and adore—Question of the Sacraments—The number seven—Historical and dogmatical difficulties—Oddities—*Omnia a Christo* instituted—How this decree was twisted—The sacraments—Their necessity—Inaccuracies and sophisms—Intention necessary—*Occasions* or *causes* of grace—Warm disputes—What does the Roman Church really teach—The intention of the priest—Objections—What is to be done?

Baptism—Baptism of heretics—Holy Chrism—Confirmation—Historical view—Anathemas—Whose province is it to confirm—Receiving the holy Chrism—Gratuitously—Historical view—Sad realities—Twenty-seven anathemas—Water of baptism—Human arrangements.

Pluralities—Historical view—Unions and commendams—The pope, always the pope—The eleven articles of the Spanish prelates—Reference to the pope—Replies—*Salva semper*—Results—Roman immutability.

Seventh Session—Projects of translation—The plague—Great hurry—Decree of translation—Eighth Session—Minority—Resistance—To obey in order to be obeyed.

THE selection that had been made of the subjects that were first to be treated, implied an homage, no doubt very involuntarily paid, to the supreme authority of the Bible, and to the

opinions of the man whose recent death had been thought so auspicious. Met for the purpose of systematically arranging and fixing the Church's creed, why should not the council have, first of all, defined the right in virtue of which they were to proceed to do so? This question, like that of the relative position of the pope, was not yet so clear but that many of the faithful, those even most disposed to obedience, would have been happy to receive some new light upon it. But with whatever sincerity the assembled prelates may have believed in the divine authority of their mission, they could not fail to see how strange it would have looked for them to issue a declaration, amounting in fine to this,—“We are infallible, because we affirm that we are infallible, and our affirmation is true, because we are infallible.” An inevitable sophism, with regard to which, as well as so many others, men may indeed delude themselves, but which, even insincerely, one would hardly venture openly to propound.

The assembly, therefore, passed at once to the question which ought to have stood second,—“What is the source of the faith?” And to this the reply had to be,—“It is Scripture.” Luther could hardly have spoken better.

This, accordingly, was not the point at which it stopped. Is it Scripture alone? A Roman council which should reply, Yes! and which at the same time would prove its consistency, could have had no other course than to break up and disperse. The reply, therefore, as might be expected, was this,—*Scripture and Tradition.*

But what is tradition? Nothing more easy to define, provided you keep to vague description. The New Testament is not a large book. But the apostles spoke and preached for a course of years and in many churches; it follows, therefore, that we do not possess in writing all the words that fell from their lips. Several of the apostles even wrote nothing; nothing at least that we possess. Tradition, consequently, is the entire body of those apostolical instructions and facts which have been transmitted, or were capable of being transmitted, otherwise than by writing, otherwise than by the New Testament, in the state in which it has reached us.

Here all, it will be observed, seems very simple; and yet even here, without departing from the vagueness in which people would appear to be so nearly agreed, we find already, if not positive objections, at least improbabilities, of little less weight than arguments. That the apostles may have given expression.

in their oral discourses, to ideas which unhappily we do not find in their writings, is possible ; still, it is very little probable that a single truth of any importance can have been omitted in four gospels and so many epistles. But this possibility has limits, and very narrow limits too. Had the worship of the Virgin, for example, occupied in the primitive Church, we do not say the place it has at this day in the Roman Church, but any place, however insignificant, can it be admitted that the apostles would have failed to say one word about it? Utterly improbable this would be, had even no more of their writings come down to us than four or five epistles, of four or five pages each. Were the primacy of Rome and of the pope an apostolic idea, who shall explain to us how St. Paul could have written, from Rome itself, to several important churches, without making the slightest mention of any tie established, or to be established, betwixt them and it? Shall it be said that God has thus permitted it, and that it is not for us to ask why? God has permitted it! Still this would not be enough. In order to their having been able to omit things of so much importance, it is not enough that God may have permitted it; it must be maintained that he himself commanded their silence in such a case.

Is tradition at least favourable to itself? And could we forget the evil that Scripture says of it,¹ does it appear in the Fathers, and in the decrees of the first councils, with a part at least of that supreme authority which it was to assume at Trent?

No. Never did Luther or Calvin appeal more formally to Scripture, and to Scripture *alone*, than did the authors of the four first centuries. "This gospel," says one of them, "was first preached by the apostles; then, *by the will of God, they wrote it, in order that it might become the foundation and the pillar of our faith.*" Who is it that speaks thus? Why, it is Irenæus,² a disciple of a disciple of St. John. He who had received the instructions of an apostle so fresh from their first source; he it is, further, who thus writes in a homily,³—"We must necessarily appeal to the testimony of the Scriptures, *without which our discourses are entitled to no credit.*"

"Let the disciples of Hermogenes," says Tertullian,⁴ "shew that what they teach is written; and if it be not written, let them tremble at the anathema pronounced on whosoever takes from or adds to Scripture."

¹ Matt. xv. 3. 6. 9.

² Against heresies, b. iii. 1.

³ Homily I. on Jeremiah.

⁴ Against Hermog., ch. xxi.

“It is necessary,” says St. Basil,¹ “that every one instruct himself, by means of the divine Scriptures, in the necessary verities, both that he may make progress in piety, and not accustom himself to human traditions. . . . What is written, do thou believe; what is not written, seek thou not after.”

“If you take away, or add ought,” says St. Ambrose,² “this seems to be a prevarication. . . . When the Scriptures do not speak, who shall speak?”

And now, mark what Augustine says,—“Let us not stop at what I have said, or you have said, but at what the Lord hath said. We have the Lord’s books . . . there let us look for the Church.”³

Mark Chrysostom: “When impious heresy shall occupy the churches, know that then there will be no proof of true faith, but by Holy Scripture. Have recourse, therefore, only to it, for those who go elsewhere shall perish.”⁴

In fine, to that oft-repeated assertion, that there behoves to have been some means of preserving what was written by the apostles, it is Augustine again who will lend us his answer. “Under pretext of the Lord’s having said, ‘I have yet more things to say to you,’ heretics try to give a plausible colour to their inventions. But if the Lord has not said, who among us will venture to say, It is this, it is that! And if he is rash enough to say it, how will he prove it? And who will be presumptuous enough to affirm, without any divine testimony, that what he says, even although it were true, is precisely what the Lord meant to say.”⁵ Does the author, doubtless, proceed to add, that though individuals have no such right, yet the Church has it? No; there is not a word of restriction. The expressions are as precise, as absolute as possible. And if he grant elsewhere, as was quite natural at that epoch, a certain authority to traditions guarded by certain warranties, these lines, as well as many others, sufficiently prove that he had no faith, either in infallible traditions, or in the possibility of discerning them infallibly. Athanasius, before him, had been still more precise. “The Scriptures suffice, of themselves alone, for making known the truth. . . . We are resolved to listen to nothing, to say nothing, beyond what has been written. . . . It is a

¹ *Moral Rules*, Quest. 95. Homily on the Trinity.

² *On Paradise*, ch. xii. *On the calling of the Gentiles*, ii. 3.

³ *On the Unity of the Church*.

⁴ Homily XLIX. on St. Matthew.

⁵ Ninety-seventh Treatise on St. John.

mockery to raise questions or discussions on what has not been written."¹

Thus did the hero of the Council of Nice express himself. Do we find any trace of that council and those following having thought otherwise? Not the smallest. It was not until the sixth² that it was decided to be necessary to recur, in case of need, to sources not written. This must not be understood, it is true, as if people had never yet allowed themselves to recur to these; but as little do we find anything that approaches to an official recognition of them; and the passages we have adduced sufficiently shew how far they were from anything of the sort. The decrees of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, are framed as resting on Scripture alone, and as being incompetent to rest on anything but Scripture; if here and there we find appeals to tradition, it is never except in the form of an accessory; the council would never have had the idea of proving anything by it that should not have been sufficiently demonstrated already. Now, even had the Church all the power that Romanists arrogate for her, still it would be matter of doubt if she could exercise that power in favour of tradition. Not to grant it in the first ages, and at a short distance from its sources, more than a restricted and conditional authority, was this not tantamount to interdicting herself from granting it any more a thousand years after? There is no middle position: either tradition has always been one of the legitimate sources of the faith, and then we beg to know why the fathers made so little account of it; or it was not so originally, and then, being human and alterable, it never could be so.

Whatever, in point of fact, it from of old had been, its position, in point of right, had never been regulated. Popes, doctors, councils, had vied with each other in drawing from it; but on this point there did not exist, as yet, either special decrees or precise rules. As for rules, no one could dream of making them; for how could it be exactly determined at what degree of credibility a point of tradition shall become an article of faith? As for a special decree, one was made, but not without difficulty. However accustomed people had become to regard tradition with as much, and even more respect than Scripture, many felt reluctant to declare this. The way had first been opened by the Council of Florence, but in 1441, at a

¹ Against the Gentiles. Treatise on the Incarnation,—Epistle to Serapion.

² Constantinople in 680.

time when it was disorganized, and when doubts might have been felt as to the validity of its decrees; besides, that was not a council-general, and its sentence could not be held as definitive. Several bishops, accordingly, gave expression to their scruples. A few went so far as to call for a decree declaring the inferiority of tradition, when it was suggested that it were better not to say anything about it. Those even who desired as explicit and as favourable a decree as possible, were far from being agreed on what should be inserted in it. The very word *tradition*, in the vague and absolute sense which it has since taken, was then unknown. People did not say *tradition*, but *the traditions*, and this plural seemed to require that they should be enumerated, that they should be arranged at least under several heads, for the council could not reasonably seem to sanction, with their eyes open, every kind of tradition. The discussion accordingly was very long. Sarpi and Pallavicini are not at all agreed in the details they have given; but the latter says, that "there were almost as many opinions as there were heads."¹ Let us pass over the details, then, curious as they are. Let us do no more than remark how far these tentative efforts are from indicating that confidence with which "tradition" is now spoken of by Romanists, as a Protestant would speak of "Scripture," or as an advocate speaks of "the law."

It is true, that on the decision being once taken, Rome was not slow to give precision, for her own interest, to what the council had left in it vague and obscure. The council went no farther than to say, "that the truth being in the traditions as well as in Scripture, they were received with equal piety."² Equality—this was a great step; but it was not enough. Already, in 1520, Prierio, one of the first theologians of Leo X., had said, "He is a heretic whosoever does not rest on the doctrine of the Roman Church, and of the Roman pontiff, as the infallible rule of faith, *from which Holy Scripture itself derives its force and its authority.*"³ A year after the close of the council, a bull of Pius IV. fixes the oath to be taken by all ecclesiastics. "I admit," they behoved to say, "I firmly embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all the constitutions of the mother Church; *moreover*, I admit holy Scripture, according to the sense which the said Church holds,

¹ Book vi. ch. xi.

² *Neon traditiones ipsas . . . pari pietatis affectu ac reverentione suscipit et veneratur.*

³ *A qui etiam Scripturæ sacre robur trahit et auctoritatem.*

and has held, to which Church it appertains to judge," &c. *Moreover!* Here we see the principal formally become the accessory. The door was opened; divines rushed into it; and ere long you will see them as far removed from the decree itself of Trent, as that decree had been already from the view entertained by the fathers. "We shall endeavour to demonstrate," says Bellarmine,¹ "that the Scriptures without the traditions are neither sufficient, *nor simply necessary.*" "Tradition is the foundation of the Scriptures," says Baronius,² "and surpasses them in this, to wit, that the Scriptures cannot subsist unless fortified by tradition, whereas tradition has sufficient force without Scripture." "The excellence of the non-written word," says another,³ "far surpasses that of the Scriptures. . . . Tradition comprises in itself all truth. . . . We ought not to appeal from it to any other judge." And Lindanus:⁴ "Scripture is a nose of wax, a dead letter, and that kills, a very husk without a kernel, a leaden rule, a school for heretics, a forest that serves as a refuge for robbers." Chrysostom, Augustine, where are you? Can you believe that it is a Christian who thus speaks, and not rather a pagan, who of set purpose takes the direct opposite of what you used daily to inculcate on your flocks?

Thus had the council broken down the last remaining bridge that spanned the abyss between the Reformation and Rome. Tradition, "that impenetrable buckler of Ajax," as Lindanus also says, had been declared to be of the same tissue with the buckler of the enemies of Rome, and that "after the example of the orthodox fathers," said the decree. The passages, accordingly, which we have borrowed from them, figure among those which the Inquisition was afterwards audacious enough to order to be effaced from their works.⁵

Scripture had been named. The council was called upon to state precisely where it was to be found, and what the books are which compose it.

How happened it that such questions still remained to be decided? To be infallible, and to remain for fifteen centuries without saying precisely what went to make up the Bible, was,

¹ On the Word of God, b. iv. ch. iv.

² Annals, year 58, No. 11.

³ Coster, *Enchiridion*, ch. i.

⁴ *Panoplia*, books i. and vi.

⁵ See the *Indices Expurgatoriae*, published in Spain and in Italy in consequence of a decree of the eighteenth session. An edition of Augustine published at Venice in 1584, omits all the passages favourable to Protestants. "*Curavimus removeri*," say the editors, "*ea omnia quæ fidei mentes hæreticæ pravitate possent inficere.*"

on the Church's part, either a singular forgetfulness of her mission, or a singular avowal of her impotence. And one cannot say here, that if she had neglected to pronounce, it was because there was no doubt on the subject. The discussion shewed that there was more than one.

For the rest this is an objection which we might renew on many occasions. Does not the Church, in arrogating to herself this absolute right of teaching, and of being the only teacher, authorize us to demand of her a reckoning of what she has not done, as well as of what she has done? An infallible authority charged with the regulation of the faith, and a fundamental question that has remained for ages doubtful, will always, people may say what they will, present a contradiction. We shall return to it again. What is certain is, that on the 7th of April 1546, the day before that on which the council's decision came to be known, there was not a single Roman Catholic in the whole world that could tell, either of his own authority, for none had the right to do so, or on his Church's part, seeing she had never formally pronounced her opinion—the exact number of the canonical books. “Many,” says Pallavicini, “lived in the most distressing ignorance with regard to this; the same book being adored by some as the expression of the Holy Ghost, and execrated by others as the work of a sacrilegious impostor.” The divisions of Protestants on this subject have never gone nearly so far as this.

The discussion was warm, and even in some respects sufficiently learned, but not on the part of the bishops. Pallavicini, at this very place, would fain make them out to have been men of high theological capacity. He mentions as men of particular ability the three legates, two other cardinals, and the heads of religious orders;¹ for the rest, he is obliged to say, without mentioning names, that they were the *élite* of the bishops. Why the *élite*? There was no choice; most of them were, and still continue to be, unknown in the theological world. Their hesitations, their embarrassments in a multitude of cases, their perpetual recourse to divines by profession, all being things which Pallavicini does not attempt to deny, sufficiently refute his assertion.

Here, then, should be the place for noticing the intervention

¹ There were, then, eight at the council, and five of these were of mendicant orders. When we speak of the members under the general name of bishops, the chiefs of the orders are meant to be included.

of that other class of members, the divines, who had been called to the council for the purpose of elucidating the questions under discussion, but without voting, that privilege being exclusively confined to bishops, mitred abbots, and the heads of religious orders. From the first sessions there had been for some time thirty; their number was at all times much about the same as that of the voting members. Were we not too tired of the subject to return again to the question of infallibility, viewed in the relation to forms, we might be tempted to ask if their presence accorded with the spirit of the system in virtue of which the body of bishops is alone infallible; with the spirit we say, for, as respects the letter, the reply would be, that they did not vote. A great many questions were, in fact, handed over to them; the majority of votes was in many instances determined by the confidence reposed in their statements. The bishops were, doubtless, right in collecting all the elucidations possible; but one can hardly understand how a court should remain incapable of error, and yet pronounce its sentences according to the opinions of certain adepts who are not infallible.

Nevertheless, in the question of the canonical books, the contrary was about to take place, for in that case the decision came from the bishops. Let us see how far this was to the honour of the council.

The divines were unanimous in recognising the inferiority of the books which Protestants regarded then, and still regard, as apocryphal.¹ Could they hesitate? Josephus, Eusebius, Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Cyril, Gregory of Nazianzen, Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine,² Jerome above all, he who of all the Fathers had laboured most on the Bible, speak of it as a generally acknowledged fact; and if, after all that these have said, there is still some room for discussion as to the views they entertained of such or such a particular book of those in question, it is not the less beyond doubt that they all believed in the non-authenticity of some, and the inferiority of all.

Such, then, was the state of matters; but this unanimity on the part of the divines did not extend to their being agreed as to the rank to be assigned to those books in the Bible. Some wanted a simple statement of their inferiority without determin-

¹ Tobit, Judith, Esther, Maccabees, &c.

² It was he who, at the councils of Hippona and Carthage, caused these books to be received into the canon of the Bible, but with this clause that the advice of other Churches should first be taken. Further, they were not put on the same rank with the canonical books; it was only decided that they might be read and quoted.

ing the degree; others that they should be divided into two classes, one of which should serve as an intermediate between those universally admitted as canonical, and the apocryphal which had been generally reputed as doubtful. A third party merely required that there should simply be a list drawn up, without explanation, of all the books; and, last of all, a fourth, consisting of but a feeble minority among the divines, without denying that the apocryphals had held hitherto a more or less inferior rank, proposed to put an end to the matter by declaring them canonical.

Will it be believed? The last of these opinions carried the day. This was to trample under foot the testimony of twenty Fathers; it was to deny the superabundantly demonstrated fact that the ancient Jews did not believe in the canonicity of those books; it was to brave the general opinion of the Roman Catholics, as well as the recriminations of the Protestants; it was even to overlook the scruples of the very divines of the council. No matter! Was the assembly not omnipotent? And had the bishops been pleased to insert Plato's *Phædo*, or Aristotle's *Logic*, in the Bible, what could a Roman Catholic say against it? Ah, when we see how much sweating and sophistry it has cost during the last three centuries, in order to sustain this untenable decree, one may be allowed to think that the champions of Rome have more than once cursed, in their heart, the day on which so imprudent a denial was given to one of the most unquestionable facts in the whole history of the Church. But what is sadder still than the infatuation of the men who imagined that they could change the past as they fettered the future, is the impudent fury with which some would dare, down to this very day, to repeat that the Protestants mutilate the Bible; and why? Because, forsooth, they allow themselves to print it without those books which Rome herself, down to the Council of Trent, had never declared canonical.

It has happened, accordingly, with this decree as with that on tradition. Hardly was it made, when it was rested on as if it had existed for a thousand years; as if its roots had reached down to the very earliest days of the Church. "In like manner," St. Jerome¹ had said, "as the Church reads the books of Judith, of Tobit, and the *Maccabees*, *without receiving them, however, into the number of the canonical Scriptures*, those of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus may also be read for the edification of the people,

¹ Preface to the books of Solomon.

but not to prove or sanction any article of faith." Well, now, there are Latin Bibles in which the decree of 1546 is printed at the beginning of the book, and St. Jerome's dissertation a little farther on. At the distance of some pages you will learn from St. Jerome that there are apocryphal books, and if you turn to the council's verdict, you will be told that there are none. "I always thought that the heart had been on the left side," says one of the *dramatis personæ* in a play, astonished to hear it spoken of as on the right. "Yes, so it was once," replies the physician, "but we have changed all that." We are ashamed, we confess, to have a scene from Molière suggested to us in speaking about the Bible; but who is to be blamed for that? It would be quite as easy to change the position of the heart as to prevent St. Jerome, his contemporaries, his predecessors, his successors, the whole Church, in fine, during more than fifteen hundred years, from having regarded as inferior those books which were placed at Trent on the same rank with the others.

This decision, of which Romanists have sought to avail themselves with such hardihood since that time, has not even the merit of clearly belonging to the category of those which every Roman Catholic is bound to admit. It is generally acknowledged that the Church, that the pope, may be mistaken about facts, may admit, for example, a false miracle on false testimony. Now, the authenticity of a book is a question of fact, of history; it may be excellent in point of doctrine, without being any the more admissible in point of canonicity. Hence, though the Church has proclaimed it canonical, the only thing a Roman Catholic is bound to believe is, that it is good and orthodox; the historical question remains intact, and the Church's testimony on that part of the inquest remains purely human. Some authors have maintained, it is true, that certain questions of fact, and this one in particular, come within the domain of infallibility, but they do not agree upon the characteristic points by which questions of this class are to be recognised, and this distinction, besides, is too manifestly *ex post facto* for our observation to be at all weakened by it.

It remained to be decided in what language the books of the Bible—from henceforth all put on the same level in point of authority—should be reputed inspired and infallible. Here, again, a point occurred on which the council's decision was about to be opposed to the clearest data of learning, history, and common sense.

At bottom, it was not a matter about which there could reasonably be a question. Inspired or not, a man writes. Is it in Hebrew? Then it is in Hebrew and in Hebrew alone that you are sure of having his thoughts, all his thoughts, nothing but his thoughts. Is it in Greek? Then it is in Greek you will find what he meant. If you do not understand those tongues, nothing is more natural than that you should make use of a translation; but if you do understand them, why should you be prevented from going to the book as it came from the hands of the author? The only way would be to prove to you that the translation is of an absolutely perfect accuracy. But if you have to do with an inspired book, it is only by bringing the translator to an equality with the author, and making him inspired also, that we can make the translation equal to the original.

Now, St. Jerome, the chief author of the Vulgate,¹ has nowhere said a word from which it might be conjectured that he thought himself aided in his translation by any assistance from on high. Had he affirmed this, we should have appealed against it on the ground of the numerous faults which, as we shall see anon, have been corrected in that still very imperfect work. Was the work, at least, all done by him? No; several parts are taken from a more ancient version,² done by nobody knows whom, and which he thought far from good, seeing that it was in order to have it superseded by a better, that he undertook his own. Notwithstanding the superiority of the latter: "Those who speak Latin," says Augustine, "require, in order to the understanding of the Scriptures, to be acquainted with two other languages, Hebrew and Greek, so that they may have recourse to ancient copies when the disagreement of Latin interpreters suggests any doubt."³ Thus, notwithstanding his esteem for St. Jerome, he confounds him with the *Latin* interpreters, whose disagreement, he says, produces doubts which can be removed only by going to the originals. A century and a half after him, two versions only were in use, that of Jerome, which took the name of the *New*, and the *Italic* or *Old* one. Gregory the Great, in his commentary on Job, says that he prefers the *New* as being more conformed to the Hebrew, but that he quotes them both indifferently; this, he adds, is what is usually done by popes and their doctors. Gradually the two versions past into

¹ *Editio vulgata*, the edition in general circulation. Hence the name *Vulgate* given to the Latin Bible used in the Roman Church.

² *Italica vetus*.

³ Christian Doctrine, b. ii.

each other. Whatever could not be changed without inconvenience in the Old, was retained,—the Psalms, in particular, being what everybody knew by heart; the rest was taken from the New. One sole book was at length the result, namely, the Vulgate. But, for a series of centuries, the Church made use of it as one uses a book absolutely in his power, without disapproving of it, but yet no more approving of it otherwise than by the mere fact of its using it, in fine, without forbidding any one to have recourse to some other quarter.

No one, it is true, had any idea of doing so. Greek and Hebrew were not only dead tongues—they were annihilated. The Latin, by unanimous consent, had succeeded to their rights; and it had no more to reckon with those tongues than a son with a father many years dead. Accordingly, when the fifteenth century drew them from the dust with which they were covered, you would have said they were like dead men reappearing amid their confounded heirs. “A new language,” said a monk from the pulpit, has been discovered, “which is called the Greek. It must be carefully avoided. This language is the mother of all heresies. I see in the hands of many a book written in that tongue; it is called the New Testament. It is a book full of briars and vipers. As for Hebrew, those who learn it immediately become Jews.” Whether such was or was not the monk’s discourse—and a very grave historian¹ reports it as authentic—it admirably expresses the astonishment and the fears of the time. Those two tongues, *new* in virtue of being old, people were tempted to look upon as intruders, and to ask them what right they had to come and disturb the Latin in its occupation of the throne which it had now so long engrossed. They crowded around it; they confirmed it in the enjoyment of all the rights which it held from usage. Both Greek and Hebrew were to be allowed to subsist, but they were to be neither its superiors nor its equals; and, in 1502, in the famous Bible of Alcala, in putting the Vulgate between the Hebrew text and the Greek text, it was Cardinal Ximénès who said, in the preface, that it was Christ betwixt the two thieves.

Thus we see that the foundations of the strange decree that was about to be passed, had been laid at the commencement of that century. And yet, when the subject began to be more closely examined, the members were far from agreed about it.

At first, although the council was by no means rich in

¹ Sismondi, *Hist. of the French*, xvi.

Hellenists, and still less in Hebrew scholars, several of its divines were not without having made the discovery, either by their own labours or by those of others, of some, at least, of the imperfections of the Vulgate. These were interdicted at once by common sense and by conscience from putting their hands to a law, carried in the face of facts proved by evidence, patent, incontestable. The idea, therefore, was entertained for a moment, of taking up some certain copy of the original texts, and translating it into Latin, advantage being taken of all the lights that the age could supply; but people were alarmed at the immensity of the labour that this would entail, all the more, inasmuch as to proceed logically, all doctrinal decisions would have to be suspended until the entire completion of the new translation. For surely a judge is not competent to pronounce in a cause, as long as he admits his not being sure of having in his possession the exact text, or a faithful translation of the law.

Despatch, therefore, was required, and those who wanted a new translation were not listened to.

Even after admitting the Vulgate in principle, all was not over: it was necessary that the title on which it was received should be declared. Some wished that the approbation should be full, entire, without restriction of any kind. "Either God has failed in his promise of keeping his Church from error, or it is impossible," said they, "that he can have left her to make use of an erroneous translation. If Providence has given an authentic Scripture to the Jews, and an authentic Scripture to the Greeks, is it not insulting to that Providence to suppose God's well-beloved Roman Church should have been left without such an advantage?" Others, without going back so far, gave an artless picture of the embarrassment people would bring on themselves if they did not begin by shutting up the source of all embarrassment for ever. "It would be grammarians, then, that would become the arbiters of the faith! An inquisitor would have to listen to answers made in Greek and in Hebrew! Passages from Scripture that have been intercalated for ages in the Church's prayers, the decrees of popes, the canons of councils, might be attacked, refashioned, and dissected! This would be to yield the victory to Luther, Zwingli, and, in short, to all heretics past, present, and to come." All, in fine, with a little more or a little less bashfulness in the reasons they assigned, were agreed in practically assuming the

necessity of immediately establishing one fixed and immutable basis.

It is from this alleged necessity that the council's apologists still argue in their attempts to find an excuse for the strange decree which was adopted on the strength of it. "Had one of the doctors," says the Abbé Prompsault, "quoted the Hebrew text, another the Greek text, another the Syriac, another the version of Luther or of Servetus, the confusion would have been worse than at the tower of Babel." Possibly it might; but what has that to do with the proof of the authenticity and correctness of the Vulgate? How did the embarrassment resulting from the variety of the texts sanction the council's choosing one from the rest for the purpose of declaring it authentic? And, accordingly, great efforts have been made to prove that such was not the meaning of the decree. The council, it has been said, does not pronounce the Vulgate infallible. "Its decision is not a dogmatical decision; it is merely a disciplinary regulation, made in view of the circumstances and the wants of the moment."¹ Be it so; but where is this to be seen? Certainly not in the text of the decree. The council ordains and declares that in all public lessons, discussions, preachings, and expositions, this ancient version shall be held as authentic, and that no one shall dare, or shall presume, to reject it, *under any pretext whatever*.² Not even, consequently, under pretext that such or such a passage shall have been recognised as false, and the future, in this manner, is as much fettered as the past. But let us accept the explanation. We had only to do with the false; we have now to do with the absurd. The Vulgate is not infallible, and it is the Vulgate which alone, without control, without its being permissible to reject a single word of it, is to serve the purpose of infallibly fixing the faith. The doctor, in his professor's chair, is not authorized to quote it as rigorously correct, and he is authorized to declare the nullity of all the corrections you may presume to suggest. Each passage, then, is like a piece of money bearing the image of the Council of Trent. You are not held bound to believe it good, but you have no right to refuse it.³ "The council," says an author already

¹ Hug, *Introduction to the Books of the New Testament*.

² Statuit et declarat ut . . . pro authentica; ut eam nemo rejicere quovis prætextu audent vel præsumat.

³ This strange reasoning has been carried into a much more serious question, that of infallibility. "Infallibility in the spiritual order," says De Maistre, "and sovereignty in the temporal order, are two perfectly synonymous words. When we say that the Church is infallible, we do not ask any special privilege for it; we only ask that it should enjoy rights

quoted, "has not said that the Vulgate alone shall be authentic; it has *only* declared that it shall be held as authentic." This *only* is curious. The council has not denied that the original texts are authentic; it has *only* declared that the Vulgate is so also, although it departs from them at a thousand points. This is what the expression really implies.

Was there, at least, an edition universally admitted, correct, and unique? No; it had to be decided that one should be made. There was much wisdom in this; but it made the preceding decree only all the more strange. It would have been not more reasonable, but certainly more rational, to deny the faults of the Vulgate, and to proclaim it at once infallible and perfect, than to declare it inviolable, even while confessing it faulty, and that it was about to be corrected.

In consequence of this last decision, one naturally desires to know through what process it has passed.

A commission had been named which did nothing. Towards the close of the council Pius IV. appointed another, but at Rome. Pius V. renewed it, and accelerated its labours. Twelve years afterwards, at the accession of Sixtus-Quintus, the work had hardly commenced, and that impetuous pontiff began to lose patience. He made it his own affair, and, at the commencement of 1589, announced by a bull, that the work was drawing to a close. The new Vulgate was printed under his own eyes at the Vatican, and he himself revised the proofs. "We have corrected them with our own hand,"¹ he says in the preface. "The work appeared, and it was impossible," says Hug, "that it should not have given occasion for criticism and pleasantry. Many passages were found, particularly in the Old Testament, covered with slips of paper, on which new corrections had been printed; others were scratched out, or merely corrected with a pen. . . . In fine, the copies issued were far from all presenting the same corrections."

It had accordingly to be done over again. Gregory XIV., the successor of Sixtus-Quintus, set to work without delay, and after him Clement VIII. had the satisfaction of publishing, in 1592, the text which was to undergo no change. But what

common to all possible sovereignties, all of which should necessarily reign as infallible, for all government is absolute; and from the moment that it may be resisted under the pretext of error and injustice, it no longer exists." What flows most clearly from this passage is that, provided a man submit to the Church's decisions, he is not bound to think the Church in the right, any more than a citizen in obeying a law is bound to believe it good. To understand infallibility in this sense is to deny it.

¹ *Nostrâ nos ipsi manu correximus.*

was the public to think? How were corrections to be acknowledged, of which there were about six thousand on matters of detail, and a hundred that were important. Bellarmine undertook the preface. The honour of Sixtus V. was saved: all the imperfections of his Vulgate were—errors of the press.

Was this version, which, after forty-six years of corrections and recorrections, was to enter into full possession of the privileges announced in the decree, issued at least in the best state possible? No; Bellarmine admits in that same preface, that the revisers had allowed many things to pass that needed a stricter examination. But enough of this. Were it at this day the best of all the translations of the Bible, we have seen what it was when the council placed it on the altar, and how much audacity or ignorance it must have taken to declare it *authentic*, even in that indirect and weakened sense which people were afterwards compelled to attach to the word.

A fourth point, in fine, had been submitted to the assembly. To whom does the interpretation of Scripture belong?

Here, too, the divines shewed themselves men of larger and more reasonable minds than the bishops. However they might hate the reformers, they themselves being men of study, could not propose that the study of the Bible should be interdicted; the utmost they could venture, was to seek for some means of reconciling this exercise of liberty with the Church's authority, and the maintenance of her dogmas. This, it is true, was no easy task. Some said that new interpretations ought not to be rejected, *provided they were not contrary to the faith*; others would not have people frightened at diversity of interpretations, *provided that this did not go the length of contrariety*. As if it were possible, after having once permitted examination, to come under an engagement never to be in contradiction with received ideas! Let us thank the divines for these feeble yearnings after liberty; but they should have seen that this was a point in which no middle term is admissible. There is but one choice, subjection or liberty.

Such was the view taken of it by the bishops; and we need not add to which side of the alternative they leaned. They were told by Cardinal Pacheco, that "Scripture having been explained by so many persons eminent for piety and doctrinal learning, it could not be hoped that anything better could be added. Had not all new heresies arisen from the new meanings that had been given to Scripture?" The advances made by the

Reformation were little calculated, indeed, to recommend free inquiry to the eyes of any one that desired the maintenance of Rome; it would have required more than human largeness of mind and tolerance to accept a principle, the consequences of which it was impossible to avoid regarding as so fatal and so impious. Here, accordingly, the bishops of Trent lay under the pressure of a vital and absolute necessity.

More than this, once under that pressure, they were compelled to go on to the end. To forbid the *teaching* of any new opinion would have been but tacitly to permit the search for it, and the conception of it, provided it was not published. But there is but a short way from the heart to the lips. In interdicting the teaching, unless you take measures at the same time for restraining thought, you have done nothing. People were prohibited, therefore—such are the very terms of the decree—were prohibited from interpreting Scripture “in a sense contrary to that which the Church has held, and holds;” and that “*even although a man should have the intention of holding these interpretations secret.*”¹

This last clause evidently annihilated what little liberty one might suppose to have been accorded in other parts of the decree. If I cannot, without crime, I will not say teach, but even conceive, in the depths of my conscience, interpretations contrary to the laws of the Church, what means can I then take to keep myself without reproach? One only; that is, never to open the book where I might risk seeing, right or wrong, what the Church does not wish me to see. “Scripture must not be given,” says Fénelon,² to any but those who, receiving it only as from the hands of the Church, only desire to look for the Church’s meaning therein.” “To look for it”—that we can understand; “to find it”—who can be sure of that beforehand? And if the council forbids the *finding* of anything else, is not this, we repeat, to forbid *search*? “When Doctor Usingen,” says Luther,³ “saw me reading the Bible so much: Ah, brother Martin, he would say to me, what is the Bible! Read, read rather the old doctors, who have sucked the honey out of it.” Doctor Usingen ought to have lived until 1546, and to have gone to the council; he would have been sure to make the same reflection with ourselves on the inconsistency of the decree. Better had it been frankly to decide, as was desired by a certain Norman divine, called Richard, that Scripture

¹ Etiam si hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edende forent.

² Letter to the Bishop of Arras.

³ *Tischreden*, (Table-Talk.)

from henceforth is useless, since it is long since the Church has taken out of it all that it was proper to take. "It is true," he added, "that it was read in former days in the churches for the instruction of the people, and that it was studied also with that view; but now-a-days it is used only in the way of prayer. Let it still be employed for that purpose; but not as an object of study. Such is the mode in which we ought now to shew our respect for the Bible." Would not one say that it was the god of Epicurus momentarily proceeding from nothing to create the world, and returning to nothing immediately on his work being done? The Franciscan's opinion seemed strange and almost blasphemous; and yet, leaving out of view the bluntness of the terms, was it not the equivalent of the decree? Take the Roman system in its rigour; doctrines irrevocably fixed; an omnipotent authority charged with the maintenance of them, prohibition against change, or exposing one's self to the risk of changing anything, even in the secret of the conscience, and you must admit, that with all this, it is not easy to find for Scripture any place to occupy, or part to fulfil, even in reducing it to that of a mere book of edification.

And now, should we think of taking up the same question in the historical and critical point of view, we should have quite a book to make; a book, moreover, of which we should not have much to do in searching for the materials, so manifest are the objections, and so abundant are the testimonies.

First, then, in the Scripture itself, there is not a word, not a syllable, from which one might deduce an authority for not leaving it at the disposition of everybody.

The Old Testament,—we there read in a hundred passages that the reading of it was not only permitted, but formally commanded.

The New,—what do we find there? Historical books eminently popular, epistles addressed to numerous churches, not to pastors or to leading men, but to all the members without distinction. *Epistle to the Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Philippians*, say all the Bibles, the Vulgate as well as others. In the book of the Acts (xvii.), when St. Paul preached at Berea, what did the Bereans do?—*they searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so.* Did Paul blame them for this? By no means; St. Luke, who records the fact, mentions it on the contrary as a proof of their zeal. And could this same Paul, who saw nothing wrong in people going to the Scriptures, when

it was he, the Apostle, who taught,—blame us for going to them, and to his own writings among others, to see, like the faithful of Berea, *whether things are as we are told!*

Does this idea, receiving no support from the Bible, emanate at least from an ancient tradition? No. It receives no countenance from the writers of the first ages of the Church. Of recommendations touching the respect with which Scripture ought to be read, of advices on the methods of reading it to advantage, of reproaches addressed to those who read it ill, of regrets for those who have allowed themselves to be led astray in reading it,—you will find as many as you could wish; but what do all those regrets, counsels, and reproaches prove, if not this—that it was read? And yet never, never did the Fathers proceed from this, to restrain, or to deny the right to read it. The abuse does not destroy the right. After having enumerated all the variations, all the errors, all the extravagances even, which may have arisen from the free interpretation of the Bible, you will not have proved that any single individual, or body of individuals, any pope or Church, is authorized to forbid its use.

And, far from confining themselves to not interdicting, with what urgency do not the Fathers recommend it! Must we quote instances? Why, the difficulty is to choose; for were all the passages over which we have cast our eyes to be adduced, they would amount, without exaggeration, to several hundreds, besides entire discourses, quite as positive, and as strong as anything ever said by the Bible Societies.

“Search the Scriptures,” says Clement of Rome; and his famous epistle to the Corinthians, so much venerated, that it has been sometimes proposed to have it introduced into the New Testament, perpetually recalls or assumes this precept.

“I am confident,” says Polycarp,¹ “that you are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures, and that no part of them is unknown to you.”

“Each of you,” says another of the Fathers,² “in meditating on the word, will find there a treasure of succours for all spiritual evils.” *Each of you*,—and he that thus spoke, uttered these words from the pulpit, while a whole people heard them. Elsewhere, in a letter, “If thou knowest how to search in Scripture, for the succours that it offers, thou wilt not have need either of me or of any one.” And it is to a woman that he writes this.

¹ Epistle to the Philippians.

² Basil, Homily on the First Psalm.

Ambrose¹ says, "Holy Scripture edifies everybody. We speak to Christ when we pray; we listen to him when we read the Scriptures."

Origen,² "The true nourishment of our soul, is the reading of the Word of God. Let us nourish ourselves on the Gospels. Let us quench our thirst by the reading of the writings of the Apostles."

Isidorus of Pelusium,³ "The heavenly oracles have been written for the whole human race. Even husbandmen are in a condition to learn there what it is fitting for them to know. The learned and the ignorant, children and women, may equally instruct themselves there."

Jerome,⁴ "It is for the whole people that the Apostles wrote. The laity ought to abound in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." And at another place, writing to a woman too, "What I shall never cease to recommend to you, is to love the Scripture and to read it."

Augustine,⁵ "What happens to our flesh when it takes nourishment only once in the course of several days, happens to our soul when it does not nourish itself frequently on the Word of God. Continue, then, to listen at church to the reading of Holy Scripture, and read it over again in your houses."

But of all the Fathers, the most ardent on this point is Chrysostom. Besides a host of direct exhortations which it is needless to adduce after having given so many others, let us hear him refuting all the objections which this subject might suggest. "When we receive money," says he,⁶ "we like to count it over ourselves; and when divine things are what we have to do with, should we bend our necks and submit at once to the opinions of others? Consult, then, the Scriptures." But it may be alleged that they are not sufficiently clear. "The Holy Ghost intrusted the composition of them expressly to illiterate men, in order that every one, even the least educated, might understand the Word, and profit by it."⁷ But have we time to occupy ourselves with these things? "Let none," says he, "offer me these wretched excuses: I must earn my bread; I must find food for my children. It is not for me to read the Scriptures, but for those who have renounced the world. Poor man! Is it then because thou

¹ Ps. xlviii. *On the office of the ministry*, B. 1.

² Homily on Leviticus. *Philocalia*, 11.

³ Epistles 91 and 67.

⁴ On Ps. lxxxvi. *On the Epistle to the Colossians*. Epistle 97.

⁵ Homily lxvi. *On time*.

⁶ Homily xiii. *On the Epistle to the Corinthians*.

⁷ Homily iii. *On Lazarus*.

art too much distracted with a thousand cares, that it does not belong to thee to read the Scriptures? But thou hast still more need of this than those who have withdrawn from the world in order to devote all their time to God."¹

After the Fathers, let us turn to him who has been sometimes called the last of the Fathers. Later than they by several ages, his testimony is all the stronger. "Persevere," says St. Bernard,² "persevere in nourishing yourselves with the Word of God. Exercise yourselves in it continually, until your spirits fail, that is, until death."

Must you have the opinion of a pope? "Scripture," says Gregory the Great,³ "is an epistle addressed by God to his creature. Meditate, then, upon it every day, and through the Word of God, learn to know God."

"Must you, in fine, have the opinion of a council itself? We shall not go a hunting after those of the first ages, at times when the reading of the Sacred Books was so natural, and so universally recommended, that it was not even a question about which there was anything to decree; but mark what the council of Aix-la-Chapelle said in the year 816, "Let young women even love the Holy Scriptures. Let them draw wisdom from the books of Solomon; form themselves to patience by reading the book of Job; and then take up the Holy Gospels, *never to quit them again.*"

Yet there were at Trent, and there are still people who are ready to denounce as *new*, the idea that the Bible is for all! It was thought monstrous that Luther should have translated it into the vulgar tongue; what then did Jerome do when he translated it into Latin? What did Ulphilas, one of the Fathers of Nice do, when he translated it into the language of the Goths? Why did the venerable Bede say with joy, that in his time Scripture was read in England in five different languages? Why, according to Augustine,⁴ is it "*by the wisdom of God*" that Scripture, "from one sole language in which it was originally, has been multiplied into an infinity of languages and dialects, in order that it may be diffused everywhere?" Wherefore so many ages, so many councils, without the smallest word of blame directed against those daily exhortations, against that "infinity" of translations, against those efforts to prevent there being a country, a village, a house, without the Bible?

¹ Homily iii. *On Lazarus.*
² Sermon xxiv.

³ Book iv. Ep. 40.
⁴ Christian Doctrine, ii. 5.

But let us take care. "Not a word of blame," we have said; and yet a pope has not long since¹ affirmed the contrary. "Thus," says he, "*that which St. Jerome deplored so early as in his time, the interpretation of the Scriptures is left to the babbling of old women, to the dotage of decrepit old men, to the pert sophist, to all men, in short, of all conditions, provided they can but read.*" What answer shall we make?

Just none at all. The citation is false; and even had we had no means of verifying this, we should not have believed it. It cannot be true, we should have said; if any one ever wrote this, it must have been any one rather than St. Jerome.

And, in fact, this is what he wrote: "Labourers, masons, carpenters—those even who engage in the vilest employments, cannot become masters of their trades without having learnt them—there is nothing but the art of the Scriptures that every one claims for himself—the old woman, the old dotard, the pert sophist, pretend to know it, and mangle it and teach it—*before having learnt it.*"²

Thus, what the pope thought he might travesty into a reproach against the Scriptures, was a reproach—to whom? To those who did not read and study them enough.

The decree of Trent on this point is more discreet than people have been since. The Roman Church was not yet in a condition to say her last word; she behoved to confine herself to surround the printing, the sale, and the reading of the Holy Scriptures with restrictions, some of which are good. But by that very act she constituted herself supreme dispensatrix of those books, and of all that they contain. Though this decree does not forbid the reading of the Bible, not the less does it avoid recognising the reading of it as a right, still less as a duty; the interdiction appears in no part of it, and yet it may be deduced as a consequence from every part of it. If proofs are wanted, we have only to mark what were its results.

Three months after the close of the council, Pius IV., in publishing a catalogue of forbidden books, caused it to be prefaced with ten rules, the fourth of which is conceived thus,—
"Experience having proved that the reading of the Holy Scriptures, granted without distinction to everybody, does more harm than good, because of the rashness of men, it will thenceforth

¹ May 1844.

² Lacerant, docent, *antequam discant*. Second epistle to Paulinus, *On the Study of the Scriptures*.

depend on the judgment of the bishop, or of the inquisitor, to grant, according as he may be advised by the parish priest or confessor, leave to read those books, translated into the vulgar tongue by (Roman) Catholic authors, to those who they know can derive from them nothing prejudicial to faith and piety. That permission ought to be given in writing. Whoever shall not be furnished with it, and who, nevertheless, shall have the presumption to read or to possess the Scriptures, shall not have it in his power to obtain the absolution of his sins, if he shall not have previously handed them over to the bishop."

See now what begins to be clear: the bishop might refuse on the previous recommendation of a mere priest, that which thousands of bishops have, during many centuries, pressed, besought, conjured the souls committed to their charge, to have perpetually in their hands.

He might refuse, but he might also grant the leave in question. Even this is too much. Thirty years after the publication of this rule, it was confiscated by one pope for the exclusive advantage of all popes.—“It is to be observed,” says Clement VIII., “that this rule has not conferred on bishops and inquisitors any new powers of granting licenses to buy, read, or possess the Bible in the vulgar tongue, seeing that hitherto, by the order and usage of the holy and universal Roman Inquisition, that power had been withdrawn from them—which thing ought to be rigorously observed.” So well was it observed, that matters were often carried farther than the pope had prescribed. Alphonso de Castro, highly praises¹ Ferdinand and Isabella for having, at their own instance, interdicted all translation. In 1750, Perez del Prado, an inquisitor-general, exclaims with groans, that “Some men had pushed their audacity to the execrable extremity”—of reading the Bible in the vulgar tongue? No; of asking permission to read it.²

Thus, wherever the Church was mistress, we see the decree of Trent transforming itself rapidly into an absolute prohibition to read or to possess the Bible. The penalties are not always the same. In Spain it is death by fire; in other places only imprisonment; but everywhere it is made a crime, or, at the least, a serious misdemeanour. At this day, in Savoy, at two leagues from Geneva, you have but to have a Bible in your house, and you will be sent for ten years to the Castle of Pignerol, incontestably a more monstrous proceeding in the nineteenth century

¹ *On Heresies*, chap. xiii.

² *Llorente's History of the Inquisition*, chap. xiii.

than torture or the flames in the sixteenth. It often happens in France, that a Protestant *colporteur*, after having sold many copies of the Bible in a village, finds they have all disappeared on his paying it a second visit. The parish priest has burnt them all. "They are Protestant Bibles," he has said, and the terrified parishioner has hastened to rid himself of them. But, for the greater part of the time that this has been going on, the version has been that of Sacy, a Roman Catholic version, approved in former times by many bishops, and in which pains had been taken not to change a single word, albeit that, from having been made from the Vulgate, it is very often faulty. It was not, therefore, the *Protestant Bible* that the priest burnt; it was *the Bible*, and this he well knew. But what he knows still better, is the impossibility of refuting, on a multitude of points, those who shall accept of it as their battle-field. Emser, that wise man, was not quite sure, he would say, if it was well that the Bible had been translated into German. Perhaps he did not fully know how far it was well that it should have been written in Hebrew, in Greek, or in Latin. It and the Church are too much at variance.¹ It is against the versions of the Bible, accordingly, into the vernacular tongues that Rome has set herself to exhale the spite which she dared not express against the Bible itself. From the pope to the village priest, from the Vatican to the poor huts into which the Roman missionary carries his faith, that is to say, before all else, the pope and the virgin—we have now for thirty years been hearing a concert of maledictions raised against the translators, the *colporteurs*, the readers of that book which an Augustine blessed God for having "multiplied" in all the languages of the world. It was Pius VII. who, in 1816, gave the signal. What was it that men had done? Why, they had printed a new edition in Polish, first published, however, in 1599, by Wink, the Jesuit, with the approbation of Gregory XIII. and of Clement VIII. But, not content with reprinting it, they had sent it out in profusion. Hence the wrath of the pope; hence that torrent of epithets, very common in former times, in pamphlets, but which are no longer to be found in the style of the Roman Chancery. All this, accordingly, in the eye of Pius VII., was "the most malignant of inventions, a pestilence, the destruction of the faith, the conception of a new kind of tares, an impious machination, an irreparable ruin, the malice of a villanous society,"² &c., &c. But that society

¹ Luther in one of his prefaces.

² Brief to the Archbishop of Gueen.

had not been singular in dipping into this villany; a priest, a bishop had openly advised people to purchase those Bibles. Anon, a new brief; fresh lamentations. "We have been overwhelmed with much profound distress, on being made acquainted with the dismal project, such as was never conceived before, of disseminating everywhere the most holy books of the Bible in the new translations made contrary to the Church's salutary regulations. . . . But we have been seized with an infinitely greater affliction still, on perusing certain letters in which thou dost exhort the people to purchase these new versions, to accept them when offered gratuitously, for the purpose of attentively studying them. Nothing, assuredly, more distressing could happen to us,"¹ &c. What could be added to these lines? Had we given a rhetorician the task of drawing up a piece of writing diametrically opposite to all that we have quoted from earlier times, could he have performed it better? Other times, other laws, will it be said? Very true; and we do not allege that all that was good fifteen centuries ago is necessarily good now. But between the opinion of the Fathers and that of the pope in these two briefs, there lies a gulf which not fifteen hundred, no, not fifteen thousand years could have created, had men's principles on the subject remained in the least the same. And what mean these words—*such as was never conceived before?* Yes, doubtless, the Bible societies are later in date than the invention of printing; but when Chrysostom said,—“Read, read the Scriptures in your houses,” while others are delighted with the enumeration, such as the Bible societies are wont to make in our day, of the languages into which the Bible has been translated, who will ever be brought to believe that the Fathers would not have blessed God for an institution having for its object the depositing of the Scriptures, if possible, in all houses throughout the world?

In 1824, on the occasion of the jubilee for 1825 being proclaimed, a new assault was made on that book on which Luther had rested, just three hundred years before, as his authority for saying,—“We know, thank God, that those who believe in the Gospel have a jubilee every day.”² “Several of our predecessors,” says Leo XII., “have made laws for averting this scourge (the Bible societies). In our own time, Pius VII., of happy memory, issued two briefs.—In those briefs, we find testimonies drawn either from Holy Scripture or from tradition, to

¹ Brief to the Archbishop of Mohilow.

² On the Jubilee Bull of 1525.

shew how hurtful this invention is to faith and to morals." We have no need, after what we have laid before our readers, to say what sophistry, what an abuse of ideas and of words, have been required for the purpose of concocting "these testimonies *taken from tradition and from Scripture.*" The pope does not reproduce them. "And we, too," he proceeds to say, "that we may acquit ourselves of our apostolic duty, exhort you to withdraw your flocks from these deadly pastures." "*Deadly pastures!*" The Bible! And if he says this, it is in virtue "*of his apostolic duty!*" Oh, ye popes! if you cannot have any modesty in your ideas, you ought to preserve some at least in the use you make of words, and avoid courting, from sheer wilfulness, contrasts so scandalous, so crushing.

More recently,¹ Gregory XVI. also entered the arena. His bull, though more moderate in its terms, is still more unjust in its attacks, and still more severe in its injunctions. The Protestants are formally accused of adulterating the Bible; the pope positively refuses to believe that they can have any intention but that of subverting the Church and destroying souls; it is in this bull that the strange falsification of which we have spoken occurs. Next, "Be it yours, then," says he, addressing the bishops, "be it yours to remove from the hands of the faithful, the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue," that is, in plain terms, "to take the Bible from them;" for what difference can there be between a French Bible, for example, for the man who speaks French, and a Latin Bible for the man who knows Latin?

Will it be said, forsooth, that acquaintance with Latin presupposes a certain amount of instruction, a favourable condition to which the Bible is less dangerous? Let us listen to Alexander VII.² "Unless, in all their thoughts,—those who apply to letters, cleave immutably to all the decisions of the Holy See, —the more penetration and force a man's mind has, the more is he apt to be led away from the right path." But who risk most not adhering immutably to the decisions of the Holy See, if not those to whom, just because they are educated, that which is refused to the vulgar, must perforce be granted? To these, therefore, the law ought to be specially applied. If Rome dared to be consistent, they would be the first to be designated for refusal.

And let us not be told, in reply, of those whom the highest talents have not prevented from being, and from remaining,

¹ May 1844.

² Letter to the University of Louvain, 1665.

Roman Catholics, and that, too, while they read and studied the Bible. We have already seen what we must think of their alleged submission to the decrees of their Church; only let us note, to keep within the bounds of our subject, that while these great men were, or appeared to be, Roman Catholics on various points, there was certainly one point at least on which they were little so in reality, and troubled themselves little about appearing to be so; that point was the very reading of the book which they so much loved and admired. Was there much of the Roman Catholic in Pascal when he said, in contradiction to so many papal decisions,¹—"Mahomet established his authority in a prohibition to read, and Jesus Christ his, in commanding people to read?" The book so proscribed was spoken of by the Port-Royal men just as the ancient Fathers spoke of it, just as Luther spoke of it. They desired to see it in everybody's hands; in fact, towards this they did everything but found a Bible society. Hence De Sacy's version; hence those bold words which were condemned at Rome in 1713,²—"The reading of Sacred Scripture is useful at all times, in all places, and to all sorts of persons." How they contrived to reconcile this idea with the Tridentine decree, we shall not attempt to explain; in any case this were more easy than to comprehend how Clement XI. could dare to denounce as false, captious, scandalous, impious, and blasphemous,³ &c., assertions which might have been shewn to him, word for word, in the writings of twenty Fathers. But there is something consolatory in seeing that long chain of testimonies in favour of the Bible being left free to all, and being read by all, a hundred and fifty years after it had been broken by the council, taken up again and continued by such men. It is owing to this, that at the risk of being inconsistent, they gave truth the precedency of the Church; while our council, on the contrary, we shall find, always placed the Church before the truth. The Church, the maintenance of the Church, such was the settled idea, the *ultima ratio* of almost all the bishops, in all the discussions, and all the decrees. "Is there a God?" said a grand lady of last century to a young libertine abbé. "Certainly," he replied, "seeing that I am an abbé." This argument, which in that case was but an impious quibble, will be found at the base of all the Roman decisions. Shall tradition be put on a level with Scripture? Certainly, seeing that the

¹ Pascal's Thoughts, Art. 12.

² Bull Unigenitus.

³ *Ninet* in epithets in all.

Church equally rests upon it. Shall the apocryphal books be pronounced canonical? Certainly, seeing that the Church avails herself of them as such. Shall the Vulgate be made the sole official and unassailable text? Certainly, for new translations might shake the Church and disquiet her doctors. Shall the free interpretation of the Sacred Books be interdicted? Certainly, for the Reformation sprang from that. It is not fifteen years since a cardinal said, with an amusing candour, to Lamennais—"With your liberty, what will become of the Inquisition?" Ever the same system. This *is*, it therefore *ought* to be. "The Inquisition exists; that, therefore, which is contrary to it, ought not to exist." Ever the bed of Procrustes; excepting that he, while he was cutting people short, made no attempt to convince them that he did them no harm. The Roman Catholicism of the present day, wherever it has not the mastery, is the most noisy of all parties in proclaiming the rights of conscience and of reason. To hear it speak, one must needs believe that it is prepared to acknowledge and to sanction all the liberties acquired by mankind in the course of three centuries, in the freest states. But, though it might desire this—flatly contradicting its conduct wherever it reigns supreme—could it do so? Would it depend on itself to abjure laws in which it has preached the contrary, not temporarily, but in virtue of principles which it has declared to be immutable, eternal? In the matter of promises, which party are we to believe? The *Gazette de France*, or the Council of Trent? The Abbé de Genoude preaching a liberty without bounds, or Pope Gregory XVI. calling liberty of conscience "an absurd maxim, an idle dream,"¹ and the liberty of the press "a monstrous liberty which cannot be sufficiently detested, sufficiently execrated."² Shall we forget that in 1804, one of the first of the motives put forth by the pope for refusing to come and consecrate Napoleon, was that the consecration oath mentioned the liberty of worship? Shall we forget that, in 1832, the famous Cardinal Pacca, the pope's prime minister, wrote as follows:—"If, under certain circumstances, prudence demands their toleration (that is, toleration of liberty of worship and liberty of the press) as one tolerates a less evil to avoid a greater, such doctrines never can be presented by a Roman Catholic as a good or as a desirable thing." This, at least, is frank; and what is hardly so is that, in presence of such decla-

¹ Encyclical Letter of 1832.

² *Libertas illa terribilissima, ac nunquam satis execranda ac detestabilis.*

rations, there are still to be seen books, sermons, and journals, in which the name of Roman Catholicism is mixed up with the most enlarged ideas of toleration and emancipation. Let us beware of trusting to this pretended Romanism which is not that of councils, or that of popes, and which could not reign for two days without falling back perforce into what it has ever been, what it is wherever it has the power, what it declares, when it durst venture, that it ought always to be. But how should these men be so scrupulous in their promises, who are so little scrupulous in speaking of the past? At the moment we are writing, it is not a month since, at Paris, from the pulpit, in Notre Dame, before thousands of auditors, people were told that the Roman Church had never had recourse to violence whether for the purposes of extension or self-preservation. It is not two years since a Roman Catholic pamphlet, published at Geneva, contained these words,—“The Inquisition never forced any one to become a Roman Catholic. The Inquisition never punished any but revolutionists in arms. Never will it penetrate into the secret court of a man’s conscience to ask people, What do ye believe?”¹ Seriously to refute such assertions were almost as ridiculous as to have made them; but these travesties of the past are what may best supply the least distrustful, if they be ever so little not incurably blind, with the proper measure for estimating the worth of engagements taken for the future.

There is yet another thesis, moreover, which is neither the less false nor the less strange for being less indicative of bad faith. That for which Roman Catholicism has been most reproached, that for which all candid men, even the most Romanist in their religious tenets, have come at last to reproach it for, to wit, its intolerance, its despotism, its frightful persecutions at no very distant period, that has been pertinaciously attributed by some, not to Roman Catholicism, but, on the contrary, to its decline. This is the position now maintained by the self-called liberal Romanists; it was this, in particular, which Lamennais and his disciples were developing in their journal, the *Avenir*, when Rome shut their mouths. Three years later, Lamennais, in his *Affaires de Rome*, still recurred to it. Profoundly detached as the sequel has proved him to be, not only from the Roman discipline, but from all the Roman, and, alas! from more than one Christian doctrine, he could not make up his mind to abandon his old sophistry. If the pope, in his famous encyclical letter of

¹ *Défense de la religion Catholique, par un Curé.* Genève, 1844.

1832, condemned in the lump both political liberty and civil liberty, both the liberty of worships and the liberty of the press,—the author can see nothing in this but “a distressing decline of the Roman Catholic spirit.” Then, is it not so? If the *Catholic spirit* were in full vigour, were the pope and his court no longer under the yoke of Austria, he would have nothing more at heart than to give his people all the liberties which he execrated in 1832. You do not believe this at bottom more than we do, and under this form you would not dare to affirm it; but as you cannot dream of making us accept of the men of the present day, or of your popedom as it is at present, or of your catholicism such as it has ever been, some method must be taken for associating them, for good or evil, with the ideas and the instincts of the present age. Thus, men of sincerity may be found even among those whom our first impulse would urge us to accuse of dishonesty. Fondly clinging at once to the past and to the present, to their Church’s tenets and to the liberal ideas of their own times, they cannot resign themselves, in spite of the plainest acts and the most formal declarations, to the belief that between Rome and the present age there lies so wide a gulf. They see in futurity the popedom, better informed, extending its hand to all that is reasonable and good in the ideas which it has hitherto abhorred; but as they would not dare to exhibit it contradicting itself, this, according to them, would be but a return to the true and eternal principles of catholicism and the Church. Consolatory fiction—which has nowhere been worse received than at Rome, or more keenly repelled than by the very power which ought, we are told, to make it a reality.¹

Here, it would seem, we have got far from Trent; but really we have never left it. It would not be doing justice to the history of a law, were we not to follow it out, in the effects that it has produced.

After having voted the principles, the question then arose, under what form were they to be embodied in decrees?

Now, it was usual for the decrees of councils either to be, or not to be, accompanied with anathemas, according as the infraction of them should be deemed heresy or mere disobedience. The anathema is, as it were, the seal, on seeing which the faith-

¹ These reflections were written under Gregory XVI. Will they require modification under his successor? That he has the will, is possible; that he has the power, we do not believe. The liberties granted by a pope will always of necessity be of small consequence compared with what is elsewhere understood by that term.

ful recognise an article to be one touching the faith, and one which it would be a crime to deny or to doubt.

First of all, this method of sealing and sanctioning all that is alleged to be a matter of faith, calls for more than one observation.

What, then, is the meaning of a curse attached to the admission or the non-admission of a dogma? When we have to do with an overt act, all well. "*Cursed is he* who shall have struck his father." "*Cursed is he* who knowingly causes his brother to sin." Still it must not be abused; this would ere long be found far from Christian. But when we have to do with an idea, a dogma, as it is not directly in our power to be able to believe it, or not to believe it, in such matters there can be no farther blame than the negligence one may have shewn in procuring instruction. But, in the Roman Church, there is no room for negligence: all that you have to believe is presented to you and imposed on you. When, accordingly, you are anathematized for not believing, it is certainly on the non-acceptance of an idea; that is to say, it is on a fact independent of your will that the malediction falls. "Believe this," you are told. "In my soul and conscience," you reply, "I cannot." "Well, then, be accursed." Such is the exact translation of every decree on matters of faith accompanied with an anathema. It is either this, or it is nothing; nothing but a big word with which to frighten the simple.

That word Rome understood, and had always caused it to be understood in the most terrifying sense that it could bear. *Anathema*, among the Greeks, signified originally *deposited in a temple consecrated to a god*; afterwards it meant *consecrated to the infernal gods*, that is, *accursed*. In passing over to Christianity, this last meaning was farther aggravated by the idea of a far more terrible hell than that of the pagans. To be anathema, meant to be damned, and damned to all eternity.

Will it be said that St. Paul used this expression? In fact, "If any man preach any other Gospel, let him be anathema," Gal. i. 9. But besides that this formula, still quite pagan, could not have had any very precise meaning under his pen, it is one thing to curse, in general, whosoever announces *another Gospel*, and quite another thing to attach this awful sanction to each of the points of detail of which it is maintained that the Christian faith is composed. Then, again, has the Church necessarily the right to do what an Apostle did under the guidance of the Holy

Ghost? Every objection to its infallibility—and we have seen whether there be few of them—is an objection to the right of the anathema.

Just as it was about to exercise this formidable right the council hesitated. Not that it did not believe it was fully in possession of it; but the four decrees that had been made¹ were of a nature diverse enough to admit of the question being put, how far it was right that they should be placed in the same line, and be followed by the same sanction? The doctors who were consulted did not agree. They sent back the question to the bishops, and still less mutual agreement was there among them. Truly an odd spectacle, that of a council directed from on high for the regulation of the faith, and which, after having pronounced on four points, did not well know whether it had made decrees on articles of faith, or mere decrees on discipline!

Two parties were seen from the first to take shape; the one wanting four anathemas, the other desiring that there might be none. To the latter it was objected that the council would have the appearance of not having made articles of faith, or of having not believed that it had the power to make them; to the former, that it would be very hard to envelop in the same condemnation an infidel who should reject the Bible, and a learned man who should reject the Vulgate. After long parleyings a middle course was adopted, and the decision was as follows:—

On the first point, anathema. Anathema, accordingly, to whosoever should appeal from tradition to the Scriptures, from revelation falsified, or at least *falsifiable*, to revelation remaining intact.

On the second point, again an anathema. Anathema, accordingly, to whosoever shall deny the canonicity of any one of those books which had passed for two thousand years as apocryphal, and which no doctor until then, even of those who accepted them, had dared to place in the same rank with the rest of the Scriptures.

On the third and fourth point, (the Vulgate and the interpretation of the Scriptures,) a mere prohibition, but, as we have seen, a prohibition formal and absolute. Let none, on any pretext, reject the Vulgate; let none take it into his head to interpret Scripture against the sense which the Church has held and holds, *or against the unanimous consent of the fathers*;² that

¹ Tradition, the Apocryphal books, the Vulgate, the Interpretation of the Scriptures.

² Aut etiam contra unanimum consensum patrum.

unanimous consent which, be it said in passing, hardly goes beyond the existence of God.¹

These prohibitions entered, accordingly, into a decree said to be of *reformation*, and decrees of that kind were considered as not bearing anathema. This, doubtless, was the best thing that could be done; but it was complained of by many. They called to mind that, in speaking of reformation, and of the reforms that were to be effected by means of a council, everybody had in view the abuses that prevailed in the Church; why, then, they would say, attack first of all abuses that exist only among the Protestants? Is this the practical interpretation that is to be put on the decision that discipline and faith should be treated simultaneously? These reproaches were rather specious than just; the assembly thus far had been unable to pursue any other course. But when it was added that the legates were very well pleased at being able to delay as long as possible the examination of real abuses, nothing was said that the sequel did not justify.

Let us mention, to conclude this subject, the prohibition against employing words of Scripture in pleasantry, sorcery, flattery to the great, &c. A prohibition, also, against publishing aught on religion without the consent and approval of the bishops. This naturally followed all the rest, but with the addition of an encroachment on the civil authority, mention being made of fines to be inflicted on contraveners. This decree, accordingly, was never admitted beyond the states of the pope. Governments the farthest from wishing to establish freedom of the press among their subjects, have not recognised the Church's right to prevent it.

Everything, then, was now ready for the session; and yet the legates were not without apprehension. The greater number of the decisions that had been taken had not been unanimous. There had been disquieting minorities which, even after the vote, had nowise shewn by their looks and manner, that they believed the voice of the majority to have been the voice of God. Naclantus, bishop of Chioggia, went so far as to treat as impious the idea of putting tradition on an equality with Scripture.

At a final preparatory meeting, the Cardinal del Monte made a speech, in which, after much commendation of the wisdom and the learning of the fathers, he adroitly insisted on the necessity

¹ On this last subject we refer the reader to quite a late production by a priest who has broken with Rome, M. Trivier of Dijon. There is a curious chapter in it on the perplexities of the man who should seriously set himself to search in the *two hundred* 4to vols. of the *Collection of the Fathers*, what he has to believe on any point whatever.

of having at the public meeting but one heart, one soul, and, above all, but one voice. As some distrust was still felt on this head, the Cardinal Santa Croce called a special meeting of those who had shewn themselves the most intractable on the article of the Vulgate, and conjured them anew not to disturb, by an imprudent veto, the imposing harmony of the public voting.

The session was held, accordingly, on the 8th of April 1546. Five cardinals and forty-eight prelates were present. The exhortations of the legates had not been thrown away: there was no protest. Only instead of replying by the word *placet*, (*I approve*,) the Bishop of Chioggia said, *I will obey*. Another bishop repeated, but in writing, the petition that the title of *representing the universal Church* should be added to those of the council. Two others, in fine, declared that they did not demand the adoption, at that moment, of this title, but with the understanding that the council should assume it when it saw fit.

Notwithstanding the happy issue of the public sitting, and the incontestable legality of the decrees thus admitted, no little trepidation was felt at the council's having cut through, at the first stroke, so many questions, so much controverted and so grave; and it was not clear that, in particular, the pope would not be in some trepidation from the same cause. In sending him the decrees, his legates made no secret that they were far from having entire confidence in the solidity of the structure they had just erected; they almost prevailed on him to put off, from a dread of compromising himself, the confirmation and publication of these first acts. But the pope was not a man to disquiet himself about so little. The decrees suited his purposes: that was enough. Besides, was not any defect they might have in point of authority about to be supplied by his confirming them? Accordingly he did confirm them, and nothing more needed be said.

All was said, in fact, in the Roman point of view, seeing that it acknowledges nothing superior to a council-general approved by the pope. In reality, what had been gained?

For the present nothing. The spectacle had been presented to the Protestants of the numerous uncertainties amid which the very foundations of the faith that people pretended to impose on them shook and tottered; the council had thrust itself, at the very entrance, on questions which could not be treated without letting it be seen that tradition itself was on the Protestant side; it had pronounced itself, in fine, on two points, perhaps on three,

in a sense which had never yet been held by any one university, or any one doctor of any estimation.

For the future a great deal. "Fortune," said the ancients, "helps those who dare;" and this is not less true in the world of ideas than in that of politics or of arms. Every principle boldly laid down, every doctrine which takes a fixed position, by that very fact, acquires a solidity which is almost independent of the solidity or fragility of the foundations. When an army is routed, let but a single man stop in his flight, and it may happen that all will stop. In a brook that sweeps away a mass of incoherent bodies, let but one of these fix itself in the bed of the stream, and you have an island begun which will perhaps outlast even the banks at the side. Such has been the history, such is the present state, of the Roman faith. Until 1546, although a certain number of points appeared to be fixed, it was no more in reality than a huge river in which the elements of the future land lay tossing about. Let but one of these become fixed, and were it no more than a pile of grass, all would be done. But whence was this pile of grass to be taken? To what should be hooked on (let us be forgiven this word) the equality of tradition and the Scriptures? For it was necessarily with that they had to begin, and, as long as that point should remain afloat, the utmost result would have been but a floating island. To what? the council has not told us, and it would have found it not a little difficult to do so. It assumed the thing to be admitted, demonstrated, incontestable. The contemporary generation doubted and said nothing; the following generation believed. But the question, the eternal question, is to know whether a man of common sense can admit on the faith of the council, what the very presidents of that council admitted only while pale and trembling at the very thought of their audacity.

Meanwhile, in spite of their having been solemnly proclaimed at Trent, the pope ordained the publication of the decrees as if that had still remained to be done, and as if, without his concurrence, it were of no signification. We have said elsewhere how false this position of his was. We observed that, however people may try to elude the question, we have only to transport ourselves to the epoch of the holding of the council, in order to see that the difficulties it presents are incapable of any solution. What was most dreaded was being led off into an explanation. The pope would have shuddered to think of provoking such

manifestations as those of Basle and of Constance, where the councils declared that they could dispense with the pontifical sanction; the council, on its side, did not like either to break with the pope, for the Church had more need of a chief than ever, or to submit ostensibly to that chief, for that would have been to renounce all influence beyond Italy. Hence the tacit compromise that had united Rome and Trent. People who at bottom are least agreed, are often the very persons who apparently are most agreed. A friend with whom you are generally on good terms, you are not afraid to contend with on some points; but you studiously avoid touching on what may give offence to a person from whom you feel that you are separated by a profound difference of sentiments, and nothing, to all external appearance, prevents your being thought intimate friends. As a farther precaution, the pope ordered his legates to communicate to him, before the final voting, all the drafts of decrees, or, to speak more correctly, all the amendments discussed in the assembly, for the drafts themselves behoved to come from Rome. The legates, to the best of their powers, were not to allow the vote to be taken until after the pope should have replied; it would be for them to prevent anything from being voted in opposition to his views, and, in this manner, all confliction would be avoided. It was quite understood, moreover, that this arrangement was to remain secret, and that the decrees were to be understood as not transmitted to Rome, until after the session in which they were to be promulgated. Were there nothing to be saved but appearances, this was much—it was everything.

But there were things in which appearances could be saved no longer. The emperor kept himself aloof. The pope felt himself affronted both by his silence and by his words.

First, there was not a single German bishop at Trent, and none could doubt that their absence was owing to secret orders to that effect. The procurators of the Archbishop of Mayence had remained only a few weeks; the Bishop of Augsburg had sent one, but he was a native of Savoy. A most severe summons had been prepared for the session of 8th April, to be addressed to the absent bishops, particularly those who might be seen from the windows of Trent, says Pallavicini, that is to say, to the Germans, several of whom were, in point of fact, situate but a few leagues from the council; but the emperor took offence at this, and the decree, though voted, had to be left out. Thus he was evidently reserving for himself the possibility of

refusing to recognise the council, and his prelates were no more to be reckoned upon than himself.

It was much worse to see him continue to treat as an archbishop and a prince that same Elector of Cologne whom the pope had first summoned to appear before him, and next had excommunicated. And yet the sentence was anything but secret. It had been solemnly published at Rome, and that, too, in the strongest terms. The prince-archbishop's subjects had been loosed from their oath of allegiance; his rights and his title had been given to his coadjutor, Adolphus von Schauenburg. It pertained to the emperor to execute this decree; but Hermann, although a Lutheran, or almost a Lutheran, had remained faithful to him, and he had no wish to throw him into the ranks of the Protestant confederation. In vain did Paul III. entreat and urge; the emperor turned a deaf ear to all he said. It was Hermann who gave way, but without appearing to obey the pope; he quitted Cologne and resigned, as if of his own free will. For the rest we do not approve what the German Protestants said on this occasion, alleging that the pope, during the sitting of a council, could not condemn a person on points upon which that council had not yet come to any vote. The pope was incontestably in the right; and we have seen with pain, be it said in passing, that the greater number of priests converted in our days to Protestantism, have indulged in recriminations of this sort. They admit that they are no longer Roman Catholics, and they exclaim against despotism because they are turned out of their places. The bishops have only done their duty. Declare war against the Church, all well; but let it be in fair fight, not by chicane.¹

The fifth session had been fixed for the 17th of June. Preparations had now to be made for it.

Then were renewed the disputes about the selection of subjects. The legates had been ordered so to arrange matters that

¹ Here our national views, as well as individual convictions, compel us to dissent from the author. Were the Church autocratic in the person of the pope or of the bishops, difference from them might legitimate the deposition or dismissal of parish priests. But it is as ministers of Christ's Church that those priests *de jure* hold office, exercise their functions, and are paid. That Church is an absolute monarchy, and against the rights of Christ's crown no prescription runs. *De jure* therefore the priest's office, functions, and stipend commence, not with his allegiance to a usurper in the person of the pope, and with his profession of doctrines that are not those of Christ's Gospel, but with his abjuring that allegiance and those doctrines. To submit without protest to dismissal when converted to the Gospel, may be prudent, but cannot surely consist with the testimony required on such an occasion from the priest.—F. H.

original sin should occupy the council next; Charles the Fifth's ambassador,¹ supported by some bishops, called Germans although all of them were Spaniards or Italians,² insisted anew that the council should keep to subjects calling for reformation. As for the determination to which they had come to keep the two things abreast, these prelates observed, that in soliciting that course, their main object had been to prevent their being absorbed with questions of faith, to the exclusion of the others; there were to be no sessions, consequently, without disciplinary decrees, but nothing obliged them to mingle with these, decrees on matters of faith. This was, no doubt, a sophism, but the emperor was behind. After many twistings and windings, the legates were once more compelled to allow the tenor of their instructions to be seen; they declared that such was the will of the pope, but offered, at the same time, to write to him anew.

This proposal was accepted; and while waiting for the reply, the members occupied themselves with some internal regulations. It was ordered that there should be three sorts of congregations, first, those in which the divines should deliver their views on points of doctrine; next, those in which the doctors of the canon law should discuss questions of discipline; the third, in fine, where none but the bishops should be admitted, and in which the decrees should be drawn up.

This over, as the pope shewed no haste to reply, an important point was resumed, which had repeatedly been touched upon in the course of the labours of the fourth session, to wit, religious teaching, and in particular, preaching.

The question was a thorny one. Were they not all that? We shall hardly find one in which Rome had not to hold the balance between opposing ambitions and interests, yet, though opposite, equally necessary to the existence and consolidation of her empire.

In the case in hand, the bishops were ranged on the one side, and the monks on the other; the bishops, charged in point of right with all that bore on religious instruction, the monks charged in point of fact, and for more than three centuries, with the delivery of sermons, and now with catechising. The bishops made no demand to have the monks deprived of those functions; but they wished to regain the power of investing them with that trust. As the religious orders held only of the pope, the episcopal authority had been constantly exposed to encroach-

¹ Francis de Toledo, successor to Diego de Mendoza. ² Of the Emperor's states in Italy.

ments from men who could plant themselves, with the pope's sanction, in the midst of a diocese, preaching, hearing confessions, and drawing to themselves the minds and hearts of the people. It was like a second net thrown over that of the hierarchy, and enveloping the hierarchy itself. "The monks," said Luther, "are the best fowlers the pope has." And when Henry VIII., in the first commencements of his reformation, seemed disposed to preserve them, "It is as if he had done nothing," said the old monk; "he torments the body of the popedom, but he preserves its soul." And it was, in fact, for the bishops a perpetual subject of unpleasantness, contestation, and disgusts.

Great keenness was shewn, accordingly, in the council, in attacking the pretensions and intrigues of the monks; but the defence was no less keenly maintained than the attack. As there were, among the divines, representatives of all the orders, they spoke, they wrote, and the episcopate was forced to listen to some harsh truths. They proved that if they had taken possession of the pulpits, they had found them unoccupied, seeing that the bishops and parish priests had altogether abandoned preaching; they shewed that the papal bulls, in virtue of which they taught and preached, had been granted generally in view only of positive wants, incontestably proved to exist. The popes it is true, had often let it be seen that this neglect of preaching was anything but displeasing to them; and that the desire of instructing the populations of Christendom, was neither their only, nor their principal motive;¹ but the monks were at bottom in the right; and this discussion fully bore out the Protestants in one of their heaviest charges against the Church. They accused it of having suffered the habit of instructing and preaching to die out among the whole body of the clergy to whom was committed the care of souls; and it was easy for them to shew, both from Scripture and by history, how opposed this neglect was to the laws and to the practice of the first ages. Look to the epistles of St. Paul, and see if a pastor, a bishop, be not, before all else, a preacher. Rome had turned him into a priest, in the pagan sense of the word; at the very most, in the Hebrew sense of it; a sacrificer, a Levite, an arranger of ceremonies. There have been certain ameliorations in this respect, still these are not found in countries where Roman Catholicism prevails without control; but, in the

¹ See St. Bernard, *De consideratione*. Besides, he speaks with great force against the independence of the monks. "O liberty, worse than slavery! I would not have a liberty that imposes on me the debasing yoke of pride."

sixteenth century, this reproach attached to almost the entire body of the clergy.

Thus, the council had first to put the Church in a condition to dispense with the services of the preaching monks, before it proceeded to attack them. Besides, as they had got their privileges from the popes, it was felt that the pope alone could meddle with them; the smallest decision to the contrary, would have been an invasion of his rights, and would have led to the verification of those rights themselves—that is, to the most dangerous of all investigations. The more incontestable it was that a pope of the sixteenth century could not have entertained the idea of sending into a diocese men who should be independent of the bishop, the greater would have been the imprudence of declaring this by a vote; for a door would thus have been opened for the historical examination of all rights, and there were many which the most independent bishops were as little desirous as the pope was to submit to the ordeal of verification. Thus, some from devotion to the pope, others from necessity, or from reason, all were of one mind in thinking that on this point, without his sanction, nothing could be done.

He declared, in fact, that the council had no concern with the privileges of the monks; but, reserving his own rights in the matter, he authorized the legates to grant the bishops all the indemnifications that would not endanger that principle. Two were found; one, that no monk or friar should preach without the bishop's permission, beyond the monasteries and convents of his order; the other, that in every cathedral there should be a doctor of theology, nominated and directed by the bishop. It was also decreed that there should be one in each of the principal monasteries; but it was not well known what right the bishop could exercise over him, that would not infringe on the independence of the order. The idea was therefore entertained of putting him under the superintendence of the bishop, acting, not as bishop of the place, but as the pope's delegate; a distinction which, as we shall see, was very helpful in the sequel. This was the best measure that could be fallen upon for restoring to the bishops, without affecting the rights of the popes, part of those of which the Holy See had deprived them; but we shall also find that they did not always lend themselves with a good grace to the acceptance of that as a favour which they could claim as a right.

As for the rest, the abbots themselves, much embarrassment

as they caused to the bishops, were not altogether secure from the encroachments of Rome. In the face of his vow of obedience to his own superior, every monk could purchase the pope's intervention, and practically escape from the authority of his chiefs. In 1517, some abbots in Germany having forbidden their monks to accept Tetzels scandalous indulgences, the latter, in virtue of a papal commission, forced upon them confessors, with power to absolve all who had recourse to them, even against the rules of their order. Thus, provided all things should be found more and more directly linked to the papal throne, Rome troubled itself little about relaxing all the bonds of obedience and order in the inferior regions of the Church.

The replies given by the monks were not without effect. The decree on preaching commences with rules which Luther might have subscribed. "As it is no less necessary to preach the Gospel than to teach it in the schools, and as it is *even the principal function of bishops*,¹ the holy council ordains that all bishops, archbishops, primates, and others set over the conduct of the churches, shall be *held and obliged themselves* to preach the holy Gospel of Jesus Christ." Nothing could be better, but never was a decree worse observed. How many bishops are there that preach? The decree adds, it is true, "unless they shall be legitimately prevented." Judging by the actual state of matters, it would seem that it is the episcopate itself that is considered as the legitimate hindrance. But after this solemn declaration that *preaching is the principal function of bishops*, there ought at least to have been candour enough not to twit Protestantism with making preaching the main function of its ministers.

During these discussions, Paul III. had repeated his first orders. He no longer asked, he insisted that the council should proceed to doctrines, beginning with that of original sin. This had therefore to be done, but the prelates of the emperor's party did not even try to dissimulate any longer their desire to put off to the last possible moment, the decrees that were to mark out the Protestants, and to condemn them. The farther the council advanced, the more clearly might the political question be seen occupying the first rank. Had it ever ceased, could it ever cease to be there? All that can be said is, that it was more or less apparent there, more or less veiled, according to circumstances.

¹ Et hoc est præcipuum episcoporum munus.

The legates who, on the contrary, wanted nothing better than to have the party fully committed, in order that there might be no longer any possible agreement betwixt the emperor and the Protestants, had prepared a list of nine propositions for condemnation. They had taken care to include in this list those only in condemning which they could count on perfect unanimity; a few hours of deliberation, and all would be done. Upon this the imperialists changed their tactics. They craved that the Church's doctrine on the subject in question, should first be established; they were sensible that the discussion once begun, the council would not be long in a condition to draw up decrees. The legates felt this also, but how refuse?

Four questions, consequently, were set down for debate:—

I. What was the nature of Adam's sin?

II. In what sense are we to say that it passes to his posterity?

III. How is it transmitted?

IV. How is it effaced?

Before proceeding farther, we would remind the reader that our plan could not admit of the theological discussion of any of the questions mooted in the council. Wherever we shall have merely to allow Scripture, common sense, and history to speak, we will do so, as we have done already; wherever we should have to enter into the labyrinth of human opinions, and to choose between ideas equally probable, or equally improbable, we will be silent.

Now, nothing can be more natural than to try to ascertain, according to the Bible, if we must believe in original sin, that is to say, in a certain transmission of Adam's sin; but this fact once admitted, we apprehend there would be rashness, pride, folly, in setting ourselves to analyze and to explain it. The Christian who is most disposed to see in it a fundamental doctrine, is compelled to avow, if he reasons, that it is one of the points on which God has evidently not seen fit that our view should penetrate into the full depth of its bearings.

The divines, accordingly, were far from being agreed even on the first question. More clear, it would seem, than the other three, it is in reality perhaps the most obscure. What, in fact, was the sin of the first man? Had it been related to us as an ordinary sin, we could have figured to ourselves well enough its nature and its seriousness. It was, we should have said, curiosity, gluttony, pride; and as these vices are not rare, we should find no great difficulty in determining to what degree they were

to be blamed in the case. But when we behold them followed by terrible consequences, permanent in duration, and quite disproportioned, in the eye of mere man, to the gravity of the crime—here there was evidently a relation which escapes us, and which God only knows.

On the second and third questions, the divines did not even dispute, so sensible were they of the impossibility of coming to a common understanding. Unanimous in affirming that Adam's sin has had certain consequences for his posterity, how could they expect to be so when they came to state precisely in what these consequences consist? But they were not circumspect enough to decline any such precise statement. Each had his own system; one followed Augustine, another Thomas Aquinas, a third Duns Scotus; but they confined themselves each to saying what his own view was, leaving to the bishops the task of selection and arrangement.

None of the questions, even to the fourth, on being narrowly examined, failed to become a source of embarrassment. The members were agreed in saying, that original sin is effaced by baptism; but the door once opened to the questions *why* and *how*, a cloud of obscurities gathered round the subject. From the moment you give baptism any other bearing but that of an external sign, announcing the fact of entrance into the Church, and figuring by water the purification of the soul,—where would you stop? You are then caught, in particular, in the question as to infants dying without baptism, and, in spite of your reason and your sensibility, which revolt from the idea, it is impossible for you not to declare them shut out from salvation.

The council ventured, however, not to confine themselves altogether to St. Augustine's opinion, who, with his merciless logic, makes those infants to be so many lost souls; nay, Doctor Ambrose Catharini went so far as to beg that that opinion might be declared heretical. Condemn Augustine! They recoiled from that;¹ but these infants once out of hell, they knew not where to put them. Some Franciscan divines ventured to say that their dwelling was not under the earth, like that of the lost, but somewhere on the earth, in the air, or in the sun; some placed them in a sort of terrestrial paradise, where they employed themselves in reasoning on the marvels of nature, but

¹ The dogmatical authority of the fathers was, however, still far enough from what it has been since. Cardinal Cajetan had written at the commencement of the century, that a divine might sometimes interpret Scripture *without following the torrent of the Fathers contra torrentem Patrum*. What ultra-montanist would say as much at the present day?

without thinking, or having the power to think, of God. Catharini, who had constituted himself their patron, found even this last opinion too hard: the angels and saints, he affirmed, are constantly visiting them. The Jacobin divines chose a middle course, which, without having been decreed, has become the ordinary doctrine of the Church. According to them, infants dying without baptism have their abode between paradise and hell; they are neither happy nor miserable, neither joyous nor sad. In short, one would have said, that the council were called, not to say where these infants were, but to determine where they themselves should put them; and this was what was done. What folly! And but for the necessity of keeping one's gravity in all that is connected, even remotely and by ties that are absurd, with the grand ideas of religion, who could seriously relate such monstrous extravagances? All well to explain and develop doctrines, though one ought to know where to stop even there. But to wish to guess out, fix, and set up as doctrines, facts of which revelation does not inform us, and which are utterly beyond every kind of observation and verification—this is a freak which we should consider as incredible were it less established by evidence, and as what might be presented in a history of paganism, as an unheard-of instance of the temerity of the learned, the credulity of their disciples, and the senselessness of the people. If this reproach is not precisely applicable to the present decree, seeing that explanation on the state of infants dying without baptism was abandoned, how much was there not attempted afterwards on points of which we have nothing more taught us in the Bible, and which are equally incapable of being elucidated without it! Besides, on this very point, why, seeing the council decreed nothing, are details given in the catechisms, which it did not give?

For the rest, while withal it teaches, according to the council, that there is "no other means but baptism for procuring the salvation of infants," the famous *Catechismus Romanus*, commonly called the Catechism of the Council of Trent,¹ admits a fact which would suffice for the subversion of that doctrine, if for this common sense were not already all that is required. That fact is, that in the primitive Church, Easterday and Whit-

¹ We shall often have occasion to quote it. Published under the express order of the council, (session xxiv.,) based on the council's decrees, approved by Pius V. in 1570, and by Gregory XIII. in 1583, this book has been placed, in the Church of Rome, almost in the same line with the decrees of councils, and is, in fact, the basis of religious instruction throughout the whole Roman Catholic world.

sunday were the only ones on which baptism was administered.¹ Although the Catechism adds, "saving cases of necessity," how exceedingly improbable that infants, however thriving, would have been left for so many months without baptism, had it been thought that their salvation might thus have been compromised?

After long and fruitless conferences, the majority returned to its first opinion; there was to be nothing directly taught on original sin, but only the simple condemnation of a certain number of heretical ideas on that subject. It was in vain that several bishops, and still more the divines, remonstrated that a council is convened for the instruction of the faithful as well as for the condemnation of error; in vain did some, and Jerome Seripandi, the general of the Augustinians in particular, give it to be understood that here this would be a confession of the council's impotency. The bishops felt themselves decidedly incapable of drawing up articles in which they themselves should have sufficient confidence to authorize their imposing them upon the Church. They persisted accordingly. Shall we commend them for doing so? Their reserve ought to have been more steadily maintained; and as we shall see them often pronounce without hesitation, without their being, at bottom, either better informed, or more sure, we cannot give them much credit for a modesty so transient, when preceded, accompanied, and followed by so much pride and audacity. Then, in another view, how reconcile this silence with the council's authority and divine inspiration? If it has recoiled from original sin, what right will it have to impose what it shall decree on justification, on grace, on twenty other subjects, before which it must have had quite as many motives to fall back and be silent? The great inducement, we have said, was that the members felt that they were not of one mind; and on the questions of the same kind which they had to decide afterwards, they were a little better agreed. Such is the secret of the matter; but then there starts up a new objection. This agreement which, in other cases, has given you the courage to pronounce a decision, was, you say, a token of the divine assistance; God could not permit your being unanimous in decreeing an error. Be it so. But then, to what a strange part you condemn the Holy Spirit! Here we have two parallel questions, original sin, on which you have said nothing, and grace, on

¹ Quibus tantum diebus, nisi necessitas aliter facere coegisset, in veteris ecclesie more positum fuit ut baptismus administraretur.

which you are about to indite (for this was what was done) sixteen chapters. On the latter subject, accordingly, the aid of the Holy Spirit was full and entire; on the former, nothing or next to nothing. What caprice! And how strange should we deem the conduct of a protector to be, who should sometimes succour, sometimes abandon, sometimes maintain unanimity, sometimes leave to stray in all directions those who, he knows, cannot dispense with him, and are nothing without him! "To insist," says Father Biner, "that so numerous an assembly should present no example of dissidence, would be to go out of the world, and to have a mind to look on at a meeting of a council held by the angels." We, too, think it quite a thing to be expected that there should have been questions on which members were not agreed; but the farther we shall conceive the assembly to have been from resembling a council of angels, the more reason shall we have for thinking it rash to have pretended to pronounce infallibly on things of which the angels themselves, say the Scriptures, do not penetrate the depths.

The council, therefore, confined itself to the forming of five decrees with accompanying anathemas. The first was directed against those who deny that Adam lost original righteousness; the second, against those who deny the transmission of original sin; the third, against those who think that baptism does not entirely obliterate it; the fifth, in fine, against those who say that after baptism, concupiscence is still sin.¹

On the occasion of the second of these decrees, a quarrel, already of four centuries' standing, burst out afresh between the Cordeliers and the Jacobins, a quarrel which the council was not to compose, and which lasts to this day.

Was the Virgin Mary comprehended in the decree which declares all the children of Adam subject to original sin? Such was the question.

An idle question, if ever there was one. Idle in itself: as long as the Bible says nothing about it, what means shall we find for resolving it? Idle in its results: of what moment to us whether the Virgin Mary was conceived under the empire of original sin or not? Wherein can this circumstance influence in

¹ In theology the collective desires of revolt existing in man (the revolt of the flesh against the spirit, of the spirit against God, &c.) are called *concupiscence*. Those desires, viewed as the consequences of original sin, cease through baptism to be sins: they become criminal only when we yield to them; whilst in the man who is not baptized, they are culpable by the simple fact of their existence.—Such is the Roman doctrine, and it is in that sense that the council condemns those who shall attack the efficacy of baptism, while they maintain that it does not prevent concupiscence from being sin.

the least our faith or our works? And although the immaculate conception of the Virgin were a fact capable of being established, shall we hold that Christianity was incomplete until people began to speak about it?

Until the twelfth century, in fact, we find nothing formal on this strange problem. Of this we have a proof in the quotations accumulated by Pallavicini, at this part of his work, for the purpose of demonstrating the antiquity of the acts of homage rendered to the sanctity of the Virgin. The stronger these declarations, the more inconceivable would it be that the exemption from the stain of original sin should not be mentioned in them, if it were believed ever so little or even so much as dreamt of. It was towards 1130, at the very height of the kind of fever that led to a continual addition of new honours to the worship of Mary, and of new marvels to her history, that the canons of Lyons set themselves all at once to preach this new doctrine; they spoke even of instituting a festival in honour of it. St. Bernard opposed this. He wrote them a severe letter, which it has been attempted, but in vain,¹ to transform into a simple reprimand, for their not having begun by referring the matter to the pope. The man who called that idea *a presumptuous novelty, mother of temerity, sister of superstition, daughter of fickleness*, could not have intended to attack it merely in point of form. It did not arise, however, from his being habitually chary of his expressions of homage to the Virgin, for he calls her elsewhere, in language more picturesque than noble, "the neck of the Church, the channel through which all good influences and divine graces pass from the head to the members;" but as he, after all, was a superior man, he resisted a little better than the rest of his age, the passion for ransacking the worlds of fancy for the purpose of finding there what was futile or absurd. Eighty years after we see John Scot taking up the question, and on reading him, find it had made some progress. The idea of the immaculate conception had charms for him that led him to maintain it, but only as a possibility. Direct proofs of it he neither gives nor seeks, and seems to think that they are never to be had. In his latest writings he decidedly leans to its being admitted, but always as a matter of sentiment. He feels repugnant at the thought that the Virgin ever could have been for a single moment under condemnation. Christ redeemed all mankind; nevertheless he could not have been a perfect redeemer had there not been one

¹ Pallavicini, l. vii — Cardinal de Bonald, *mandement* of 21st November 1843.

being, at least, whom he should save, not only from the consequences of original sin, but from original sin itself. And who could this being have been but his own mother? Admirable reasonings these, on which a man of science could not admit the existence of a single plant, of an insect, of an atom,—yet with which people have so often been content in establishing the sublimest mysteries! As the disciples of John Scot, the Cordeliers went much farther than he did, and thus the immaculate conception was openly maintained as a dogma, but was keenly attacked, at the same time, by their enemies, the Jacobins. As the Church did not pronounce a decision, the field remained open, and hence arose wranglings, writings *pro* and *con*, and deadly animosities without end. Another subject began likewise to be discussed with an ever increasing vivacity, that of the virginity of Mary, held to have been perpetual, according to some, ending, according to others, with the birth of Jesus Christ, or with that of other children born after him. The former of these opinions gained ground every day. There were purposes to be served by it, and this was enough to secure its being believed to rest on a sound foundation. In vain do the gospels shew us the Virgin married to Joseph, living long years with him, altogether a stranger to the mystical notions imputed to her, and which, besides, would have been in positive contradiction to Jewish ideas, seeing that with them virginity in marriage was a kind of opprobrium; in vain do these same books present her to us as several times accompanied by those whom they call the brethren of Jesus: all these difficulties have been overleapt. Mary is not only a “Virgin,” as saith the Scripture in its charming introduction to the wonders of Bethlehem, she is “the Virgin,” the type of virginity, and of all the perfections of which that state, according to Rome, is the source. The council has not said this, but the Church of Rome teaches it; the Roman catechism enlarges upon it with explanations which we would not dare to quote, even in Latin. Nevertheless, were the reasons adduced in support of it as strong as they are feeble, not to say ridiculous; were the “*brethren*” of Jesus not his brethren, as has been alleged, but his cousins; it must ever be admitted, that the evangelists attached very little importance to the doctrine, seeing that they have given, without a single hint to the contrary, so many details which could not but render it improbable, and dispel the very idea of it.

Meanwhile, on the question of the Immaculate Conception the

popes have fluctuated like the doctors. Some would declare themselves for, and others against it, but always as divines, not as popes; in short, opinions have been too much divided for any of them to venture upon an official decision. From time to time some steps have been made in favour of or against it. John XXII., from hatred of the Cordeliers,¹ seemed for a moment prepared to condemn their doctrine; Sixtus IV., a Cordelier himself, openly favoured them. In 1476 he forbade their being accused of heresy, and sanctioned the festival first conceived at Lyons. The fact, however, still remained undecided, Sixtus IV. not affirming, but only forbidding the condemnation of those who did affirm it.

Such then, in 1546, was the state of the question. If not yet sufficiently advanced for the one party to venture on deciding it in the way prepared by Sixtus IV., it was too much so for the Jacobins to attempt having it decided in the other. They confined themselves, therefore, to insisting that no exception to the law of original sin should be mentioned. More bold, because they felt themselves more popular, the Cordeliers called for the express exception of the Virgin. The legates, although divided on the question at bottom,² were agreed as to the necessity of saying nothing about it; nevertheless, anxious to screen themselves from responsibility, they referred the matter to the pope, and, at his suggestion, a middle course was again adopted. The decree was left as it stood, only it was added, that the question remained intact; that the Virgin was neither comprised nor excepted, that the bull of Sixtus IV., in fine, should rule the case.

Has that rule been kept? The Immaculate Conception had been voted at Basle,³ and that, no doubt, was one of the reasons that prevented its being voted at Trent. Here, then, there was a step backwards. But time has advanced. The idea has made progress; it only had to be left to itself in order to its regaining, and more than regaining, all that it had lost. At the present day matters stand thus. There are no positive decrees; but every bishop that asks leave to establish the worship of the Immaculate Conception in his diocese, has this granted to him by the pope, and hence it has now become almost universal. Let but some years more elapse and nothing will prevent the fact from taking its place definitively among the articles of faith.

¹ They had supported the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, whom he had excommunicated. On such threads hung the fate of the Immaculate Conception!

² Del Monte was for, Cervini against, and Pole wavered.

³ Session xxxiv.

Some years hence, then, we may expect it to be pronounced heresy to deny what as yet one may safely deny or believe. The history of this point, were it to remain for ever undecided, is that of many others. Is this not, in fact, the course that all the Roman dogmas have run? An idea starts up. Some defend, others attack it. It fluctuates for two or three centuries, sometimes for five or six, sometimes for more, in the midst of desires, of fears, of interests, which invite or repel it; next, some day, when the Church seems to be sufficiently impregnated with it to secure the step from being assailed with too much violence of protest, behold, it is made an article of faith. And then at least people know how they stand; but until then what an indescribable medley of certainty and uncertainty, of bondage and of freedom! Was the Virgin exempt from original sin? You are invited to believe that she was, but without your being assured that it is true. Perhaps it will be affirmed to-morrow, and then anathema to him who shall deny it; possibly it will never be affirmed; perhaps, for this is no more impossible than the rest, the contrary will one day be affirmed. Here then we have an infallible Church which shall have remained for a thousand years, perhaps two thousand, before regulating—what? why a pure matter of fact; a question, consequently, on which time brings no new light. If one can decide it to-morrow, there should be the power of deciding it to-day, there should have been power to do so in the sixteenth century; and if there was no power of deciding it in the sixteenth century, there ought to be none to-day or to-morrow. The present pope goes farther than had ever been done before; why this advance? have any new proofs been discovered? No. There are not even any old ones, for had there been any the question would have been decided long ago. Has the pope received any revelation more than his predecessors? On a matter of positive fact there can be no half-revelation; it must be ay or no. Wherefore, then, we repeat, wherefore this half-affirmation? Wherefore these exhortations to believe what neither the Church nor the pope can yet affirm to be true?

The fifth session accordingly took place on the 17th of June. Pallavicini, as usual, after having peevishly noticed some of Father Paul's mistakes, says more even than he does on the divisions in the assembly. The following passage is extracted from him word for word, it is only abridged in some places:—

“The decree on original sin was approved, notwithstanding

the opposition of Cardinal Pacheco and those who in the congregation had desired that the exception with respect to the Virgin, should be expressed in more favourable terms. Some of these craved that at least silence should be imposed on the partisans of the contrary opinion, either generally or only in public preaching. There were some who advised that of the two opinions, that in favour of the Virgin's exception was simply pious; others required that it should be declared the more pious of the two. The Archbishop of Sassari alleged that—"this decree did not please the Bishop of Cava! Not the less did protests continue to be made against the title of the council, &c."¹

And when we reflect that all this transpired in full session, in an assembly of at most sixty persons, in view of a numerous public, or, more properly, before the eyes of all Europe, after so many private sittings, where the members might have come to a common understanding, after so many exhortations on the necessity of being united, and on the immense inconvenience of their not being so,—one may judge as to what that general agreement was at bottom, in virtue of which they proceeded to fix the faith of the Church, and to anathematize all that was not the faith so constituted.

The ambassadors of Francis I. arrived a few days after. These were Claude d'Urfé, Jacques de Ligneris, and Pierre Danès, afterwards Bishop of Lavaur. What did they come to do? The part properly belonging to the ambassadors who attended the council was never well defined. We behold them there doing a little of everything, from *la haute politique*, which never ought to have found access there, to the most insignificant doctrinal squabbles, in which they protested they had no call to intervene. We see them, according as their masters were on good or bad terms with the Court of Rome, repressing or encouraging the opposition made by their bishops. That same ambassador from Spain who, a month before, had asked leave to be present at the congregations, that he might, as he said, restrain the bishops of that country, was the first, afterwards, to excite them against the pope. We cannot blame, absolutely, the presence of a diplomatic body at Trent. It was one of the necessities of the moment. We will not accuse, either the pope for having asked ambassadors, or the secular sovereigns for having sent them, but if they enhanced the external lustre of the council, still more did they contribute to deprive it of the very

¹ Pallavicini, book vii. ch. xiii.

appearance of what it behoved to have been, in order to its commanding respect and confidence.

The French ambassadors were admitted to the general congregation on the 8th of July, and there expressed themselves, by the mouth of Danès, with a boldness and independence that were but thinly veiled by courtesy in point of forms. In reminding his audience that his royal master had resisted the example and solicitations of Henry VIII., he almost hinted that for this the council and the pope ought to be extremely grateful; then, going back to the early times of the French monarchy, he drew a pompous picture of the services it had rendered to the Church, and particularly to the popes. He quoted the humble thanks with which a pope had repaid the succour and the hospitality of the Kings of France; he even advanced a fact, which has not been proved, namely, that Adrian I. had recognised in Charlemagne the right not only of confirming, but of naming the pope; a right which would never have been lost but for the renunciation of Louis le Débonnaire. He was allowed to speak on, but the pope's friends were excruciated. If some of the facts which this speech comprised were inexact, there were others to which there could be no reply; and all these recollections, which Rome might have despised when she was at the pinnacle of her glory, formed a melancholy addition to the checks which this century had seen her receive.

Meanwhile the Bishop of Trent had brought to a successful termination the negotiations begun with Cardinal Farnese. Charles V. had accepted the offered twelve thousand men, and was about to open the campaign. By a secret convention the pope engaged to excommunicate the King of France should he, directly or indirectly, furnish any aid to the Protestants of Germany. But while nothing was neglected on the part of Paul III. to give the opening hostilities the character of a *holy* war, and while, with this in view, he went so far as to permit the emperor to appropriate the half of the ecclesiastical revenues of Spain, the emperor persisted, at least in Germany, in denying that religion had anything to do with it, as respected him. Solely intent on retaining on his own side those Lutheran princes who had not yet deserted him, he would say that he attacked the others only as faithless and revolted vassals. Their rebellion against the Church and the pope was no affair of his, and still less were the council's anathemas.

Paul III. thought to shew the hand of a master in publishing

a jubilee "*for the success of the Church and the emperor.*" He thought he should thus compel the latter to avow the alliance, and to advertise himself as the champion of the Church. This too was in vain. Charles was not the man to put himself in an inferior position. Like the pope, and in general like all the popes, all obstacles which he could not throw down, or which, for the moment, it was not convenient for him to throw down, he would pass, affecting not to notice them. Eight days after the celebration of the jubilee, he quietly put the Elector of Saxony, and the Landgrave of Hesse to the ban of the empire, without altering a word of the formularies usually employed in those cases. He reproached them, it is true, among other misdeeds, with laying violent hands on Church property, but without seeming to be aware whether this had been done systematically and heretically.

The pope's situation became daily more and more painful. Not only did the undertaking not assume the character he had desired, at all costs, to give to it, but his efforts caused uneasiness and discontent in most of the Italian princes. Good Roman Catholics, but extremely tired of the imperial tutelage, they felt an interest, in spite of themselves, in the German princes who dared to think of casting it off; they could perceive that Charles V. could not again become absolute in Germany without his yoke becoming more hard to bear in Italy, and beheld with grief the pope supplying him with the means for being so.

Is it true, as Sarpi will have it, that the ruin of the Protestants was not the sole object of the wily pontiff, and that he still hoped to find, amid the engrossing contingencies of war, a pretext for ridding himself, in an honest way, of the council? Although nothing had as yet been done for which he had any positive ground of complaint, and although, besides, all due measures had been taken to enable him to manage the threads of secret influence to the last, it was with an ever increasing anguish that he felt himself watched by the eye of that hitherto benevolent rival, whose sopited rights might reawake some day, under the slightest breath of wind wafted from Ratisbon or Spire. Then, too, although the ability of the legates, and still more, the feeling of a common interest, had succeeded hitherto in keeping off storms, more than one black cloud had appeared on the horizon. "The council is not free!" one bishop had exclaimed. "The council," cried another, pointing to the legates, "is composed of only three members!" These legates had been openly assailed

a hundred times; and as the system of the responsibility of ministers was not yet admitted, either in the laws or the manners of society, their master felt himself really and truly reached by all the strokes directed apparently only against them. "It must not be imagined," they wrote to him in confidence at the time of the first session, "that the bishops here are such as we are accustomed to see at Rome. They feel their importance; and they desire that it should be felt." And, in fact, although the great mass of the Italians were devoted to a degree that nothing could shake, it was amongst them that some of the most disquieting members were to be found. To such as were so from the spirit of opposition, or from asperity of character, were joined those who were so from conscience and from piety. The most dangerous to Rome were those who honestly believed in the divine authority of the council; these it was found impossible to convince, that while voting against reason and conscience alike, still they were the oracles of the Holy Ghost. Add to this the prospect of so many difficult, obscure, and insoluble questions, of which they already had many a specimen, of so many reforms that were called for, and promised, yet which there was no disposition to grant; and one can very easily comprehend that Paul III. was burning with eagerness to have done with it.

This, at least, was the opinion so generally entertained, that nobody felt a moment's scruple in giving a corresponding interpretation to all that he did, and said, and thought. The legates had done nothing hitherto that had not been done in concert with him; when they were heard alleging the near approach of the armies as a reason for proposing what was known to be one of his most cherished wishes—the translation of the council into his own states,—who could doubt that they did so by orders from him? Pallavicini positively says no, and his reasons, we must admit, are good. But though he may prove tolerably well that the legates acted at their own instance, he proves also, unintentionally, that nothing but dread of the emperor had prevented Paul III. from announcing this to be his wish. Besides, to translate the council, would, at such a crisis, have been tantamount to dissolving it; without the council, the pope could no longer expect that the war which was about to commence would assume the aspect of a war of religion. The legates, consequently, were disavowed and censured; but, says the historian, to mitigate the bitterness of this censure, word was sent them that the pope would fain believe that they had not so much

yielded to a shameful panic, as to their excessive eagerness for the translation; that meanwhile, *the more honourable it was to desire it*, the more unseasonable was it to speak of it at that moment. In fact, it was positively said that the emperor had spoken of nothing short of tossing into the Adige whoever should dare to propose such a thing. They had no choice, then, but to prorogue, for six months, the session appointed for the 29th July.

The two armies remained long enough in presence of each other. If the Protestants had not had two chiefs, an untoward circumstance at all times, but especially in war, they might have acted on the offensive; their united forces were for a short time decidedly superior to those of the emperor. Once, indeed, they made an advance to within some leagues of Trent. The emperor had engaged to see to the safety of the council; had they pursued their advantage, could he have done that? The council might have been dispersed or captured, before he could come up to its defence. They went off; having no desire, it was said, to do the pope so signal a service as to rid him of it.

Notwithstanding the disagreement of the elector and the landgrave, their affairs were at first tolerably successful. Until the end of October success was about equally divided. But, then, the imperialists having invaded Saxony and Hesse, those two leaders had to fly to the defence of their estates, and the emperor, almost without any fighting, found himself master of all Upper Germany. Meanwhile, more eager to beat those who still held out against him, than to crush those whom he had beaten, he merely levied contributions in money and men from the latter. Religion was left free, or almost free; he openly promised the electorate of Saxony to Duke Maurice, who was devoted to Austria, but quite as much a Lutheran withal as the prince who had been deprived of it.

Then it was that the pope opened his eyes, or, to speak more correctly—for he was not the man to have had them shut—he ventured at last to let the world know that they were open. He recalled his troops. The emperor had the bad faith to complain of this, and Paul, the weakness to excuse himself on the score of its being impossible for him to support any longer so heavy an expenditure.

We shall ere long resume the march of events. Meanwhile, let us return to what was passing at Trent.

The very next day after that of the session held in June, witnessed the revival of keen disputes and busy intrigues, about the

selection of the subjects to be treated in the session that was to follow. The pope's divines said that after having spoken of the evil, it behoved them to speak next of the remedy; first, original sin, then grace. This was sound logic; but logic, it was too well known, was no more their real motive in proposing this course, than the good of the Church was that of the others when they persisted in rejecting everything but decrees of internal reformation.

In order to propitiate these opponents, the legates gave out that the subject of grace, committed to the divines, would not be long of being in a fit state to be resumed in a general congregation. While waiting for that, then, they might take up some subjects of a different nature. The legates suggested that of residence, and after some difficulties it was accepted.

This question is in theory one of the simplest that can be imagined. Ought a bishop to reside within the bounds of his church? Does he do wrong when he does not reside there? Nobody ever replied in the negative; and the Christians of the first ages of the Church would have been scandalized at the mere utterance of a doubt on the subject.

In point of fact, it is otherwise. For a course of at least eight centuries—for it is not threescore years since the reform in this respect has been actually in operation—the history of the Church has been saddened by the complaints of the faithful on account of the non-residence of their first pastors.

It were impossible, therefore, for us to attack this abuse more warmly than has been done, amid the applauding shouts of the people everywhere, by the most eminent men of the Roman Church. Much more than this, to all that we might say, it may be objected that not only mere authors, but councils, and even popes themselves, have been of one mind in holding residence to be the law, and in censuring non-residents. What then have we to do here? And how can we reproach Roman Catholicism for what it has never ordained, never approved?

If these decrees absolve it, its own acts condemn it. How could you prove that an abuse which you find prevalent, for whole centuries, everywhere, always, universally;¹ an abuse which has stood out not only against the unanimous reprobation of the faithful, against apparently the most stringent decrees,

¹ "What a sight for a Christian who traverses the Christian world! All the pastors have abandoned their flocks; all the flocks are in the hands of mercenaries."—Memorial to Paul III. on the amelioration of the Church, 1538.

those of the Council of Trent, as well as the constitutions of Innocent III.,—how could you prove that it was not profoundly inherent in the Church's tendencies, and that it may at this day wash its hands of it, by merely pointing to certain laws, more or less severe, intended for its repression.

And can it be said that the regularity observed at present has been the effect of those decrees and those laws? No. This abuse, like so many others, has disappeared only in consequence of the timely aid of the Church's enemies. But for the Revolution, we see no reason to suppose that the bishops of France would not have been at this day what they were in Louis the Fourteenth and Louis the Fifteenth's times, when to send a bishop to his diocese was, according to the approved phraseology, to *banish* him. Without the diminution of the revenues of the clergy, without the active superintendence of the civil authority and of the press, why should we suppose that Roman Catholicism would all at once have found in itself that power of self-reform which it did not possess when it reigned without control?

As for the effects of non-residence, as little could we speak of them more severely than the Roman Catholic historians have done, or than the Cardinal del Monte did, when he opened the discussion. He went, however, a little too far. The Reformation itself, according to him, was but one of the results of that same abuse. Had all the bishops, said he, been at their posts, heresy would not have found its way among their flocks. This might have been true in some places; but we see that the bishops were not generally wanting, either in zeal or in courage, from the moment they had to struggle against the Reformation. It was because it is not enough that a general be at his post; he must also have troops to fight with. What could scholasticism and authority do against those soldiers of the Bible who went right to the heart of the citadel? The cardinal did as many do still. Compelled to own that the Church had given occasion for attacks under which it risked being destroyed, he purposely exaggerated its errors and vices in discipline, with the view of making people think that these formed the source of all that was wrong. Then, this was a subject on which Rome could be severe without condemning herself, and there were so few such, that we cannot wonder at her anxiety to profit by them.

The president, therefore, had sought to acquire popularity at the expense of the bishops: he forgot that the bishops had

ample materials for doing the same thing at the expense of the Court of Rome and of the pope. Residence, said James Cortesi, bishop of Fiesoli, I admit to have been at one time absolutely necessary; but at the present day, what use can it serve? To preserve purity of doctrine? Why, the first monk that comes may preach what doctrines he thinks fit, without the bishop having any power to silence him. To check the corruption of the clergy? The most corrupt portion of them—the monks—are out of their jurisdiction, and there is not a paltry priest who cannot purchase, or procure the purchase, at Rome, of exemptions, with which to screen himself from episcopal authority. To exercise a stricter oversight in admitting men to the priesthood? There are itinerant bishops sent out from Rome, who, for ready cash, make priests of those whom the bishop has rejected. If the bishops don't reside, it is because they have nothing to do. Give them a true authority, or, rather, restore that of which they ought never to have been deprived, and then they will reside.

These remarks, though bitterly severe, were not the less generally just. The greater number of the bishops would not venture to express themselves thus; all they durst do, and it was a great deal, was to decide, that in treating of the residence of the bishops, the re-establishment of their authority should also be seen to. We shall have frequent occasion to revert to the difficulties with which the question, thus stated, was encompassed, and which kept it for sixteen years before the council before it could be brought to a conclusion.

Five-and-twenty propositions on grace, extracted from the books written by Luther and other divines, were to serve the purpose of fixing the limits of the field for debate. We do not reproduce the discussions that followed. Without explanation they would be little understood by the common reader; to explain them we must defend some, and attack others, all which would take us far too much out of our regular course.

In the face of a religion in which works were tending more and more to be everything, Luther may possibly have failed to explain, with sufficient clearness, from the very first, in what sense he considered works to be nothing. "If at the commencement," he afterwards said,¹ "I spoke and wrote with such asperity against works, it was because Christ had been

¹ Table-Talk.

hidden and obscured in the Church, and buried under a load of superstitions. My desire was to liberate from this tyranny pious and God-fearing souls. But never, never have I rejected works." Thus, in his alarm at the consequences of a system in which people seemed hardly to have any more need of a Saviour to merit, to *effect* their salvation, he had not sufficiently kept in mind that one extreme never can justify another. But if guilty of exaggeration it was more in words than in ideas, and the twenty-five propositions submitted to the council did not reproduce his ideas so much as his words.

Bossuet would fain prove that the reformer's exaggerations had not even a pretext to excuse them. "The Roman Church," says he,¹ "fully admits salvation by grace; never has she taught that it may be bought, paid for, by the efforts and the works of man." He demonstrates this by some expressions in the decree itself, which was to be promulgated in the sixth session.

But when Luther spoke, where was that decree? Shall we be told that there were others. In fact, we know that several councils, several popes even, Innocent III. in particular, had written some fine things on the subject of justification by faith. In theory, and with the pen in their hand, how could they speak otherwise? Unless they would maintain that man could save himself, and that Jesus Christ might have dispensed with coming, there must always have been the necessity of abiding more or less in the ideas preached by Luther. But did those ideas pass into practice? Were they to be found, we will not say among the common people, with the strong tendency they have, whatever doctrines they hear preached, to believe in justification by works, but in the ordinary instructions, in the usages, in the laws, in the manners, in the ceremonies of the Church? What can be adduced from these sources that did not, in spite of those few words hidden in books, lead at that time directly, inevitably, to that *tyranny* of works from which Luther desired to deliver Christendom? But, after the council, was there any change? And supposing that the council had frankly decreed that it is by works that we are to be saved, what would there have been to change in the actual religion that was then to be found in those countries where Roman Catholicism was all powerful, in Italy, at Rome, under the eyes of the pope?

Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, published

¹ Variations, book iii.

at Rome under the assumed name of Fregoso, had met with great success there.¹ It had been found necessary to know who the author was, in order to discover the poison which the council was about to analyze. But on the question of original sin, it was much more easy to condemn than to say why they condemned, and still more, to come to agree as to what should be put in the place of the propositions that were condemned. We should find twenty pages too little for the shortest possible abridgment of the opinions that were expressed in the course of the discussion. Not an idea, true or false, that was not presented with an interminable train of scholastical divisions and subdivisions; not a single point on which there were not at least two quite different opinions, and as for different shades of sentiment, there were almost as many as there were divines. Hence endless contentions; hence scenes in which the disputants went so far as to seize each other by the beard,² and in which the dignity of the assembly was miserably frittered away and disappeared.

Faithful to their old promise of delaying to the utmost the condemnation of the Lutherans, the legates felt no uneasiness at the length of the disputes; people did not seem to be sensible of the damage thus done beforehand to the authority of the decrees that were to issue from so troubled a source. However, when it was seen that they could not last longer without the council's being transformed into a school of angry theologues, the drawing up of the decrees began to be seriously considered. Here, then, it was for the bishops to set themselves to work; but their previous embarrassments had been mere child's play compared with those into which they were now about to plunge. In the question of original sin, two or three points had at least remained free from all attempts at unsettlement; here there was nothing that was not contested, or, at least, explained so variously, that the variety of forms was equivalent to a complete disagreement in the essence. Grace presents one of those problems which the heart can alone resolve; the moment you would reduce it into articles it eludes your grasp. You believe, of course, in heat, in light. Try to seize, to imprison it.—This you think

¹ See in Ranke how nearly, at the time of Luther's first publications, his doctrine of justification was about to become that of all the learned and pious Italians. Thou hast brought to the light that precious stone *which the Church kept half concealed*, wrote Pole himself to Contarini, afterwards cardinal, but at that time the most Lutheran of the Roman Catholics. The dread of consequences alone had led to the abandonment of the principle.

² San Felix, bishop of Cava, and Zannetino, bishop of Chiron.—Pallavicini, b. viii. ch. vi.

would be insanity. Do you therefore deny its existence? No; that would be still greater insanity. Well, then, believe in grace as you believe in light, in heat, in life, in love. Love! whatever be the kind of love in question, if you set yourself to study it as a schoolman would do, you will not find four men in a thousand who agree on the definition that should be given to it, or on the divisions and subdivisions to be introduced into it. Leave to it its own undefined and noble amplitude, and there will nowhere be found a man who, however he may deny it in theory, is not compelled to open to it, under one form or another, some one of the thousand entrances into his heart.

To the difficulty of drawing up any decree on a subject of this nature there was added that of veiling the infinite diversity of views that had come to light. It was not, however, proposed, not at least openly, to get rid of the matter by paying no attention to these. Many indeed would have been delighted at this being done. After what has been seen in the preceding session we seem fully warranted to believe this; but the general feeling was that it was too soon to return to that course. Besides, the observations of parties beyond the council had not been wanting; the epithet *most prudent* had been ironically added in many a pamphlet to the titles assumed by the council. In fine, as it was in the course of discussions on grace that the Reformation had made such an explosion, the council felt itself not in a position to condemn it without having fixed this first ground of doctrine.

It was Cervini, cardinal of Santa Croce, the second legate, who undertook this thorny and bold piece of business. A commission, however few the members, would never have brought it to a close; it was necessary that there should be one man to do it, and that a person who was not to be lightly trifled with. Yet the cardinal shewed himself beyond measure kindly and complaisant. So accessible was he to the smallest observations, so ready was he to modify and change words and ideas, that you would have said that he was not the president but the humble clerk, writing out everything, preserving everything, elaborating everything. His sole object, his sole thought, was to bring the matter to a close to everybody's content, or at least so to contrive that there should be no one discontented enough to protest.

And he succeeded, but not until the close of three fatiguing months and fifty sittings, particular or general. Sarpi asserts that he had seen the minutes of countless changes made by the cardinal on the first draft; he shews that the greater number of

those modifications tended to substitute vagueness for what was positive, obscurity for clearness, and for contested points ambiguous expressions, in which the most diverse, nay, the most contradictory opinions, as we shall yet see, might equally claim the credit of having made the law. We know nothing more deplorably astute than the sixteen chapters of that decree. It presents one of those Herculean labours which we admire in spite of ourselves, not for their intrinsic worth, but in consideration of the pains, the time, the imperturbable patience of which they are the fruit. But here, together with perseverance and art, what incredible audacity! What, pretend that this decree, which has cost you three months' hard labour, and in the arrangement of which you have so often felt your absolute inability to decide with precision any of the points to be found in it; this decree, in which you have openly made concessions to the most opposite opinions, and which, only yesterday, you held yourself quite prepared to modify, here and there erasing or putting in, just as you would do with any other piece of writing—this decree, on the arrival of the session, has been read with the usual ceremony, and, lo! it is forthwith inviolable and sacred! It will traverse ages without man, angel, prophet, no, not the Son of God himself, were he to return to this world, having the power to alter a word of it, seeing that would infer a disavowal of the Church, to which, according to you, he himself dictated it. Nothing is more curious than the sincerity with which, by way of compliment to the council, this tedious operation has been acknowledged, although its very length and laboriousness form, self-evidently, so strong an argument against that very council's authority. "It is not to be believed," says Pallavicini,¹ "with what care, with what subtlety, with what perseverance, every syllable of it was weighed and discussed, first in the congregations of the divines, who only advised in the matter, and afterwards in that of the fathers who had the definitive voice." "In vain," says Father Biner, "would any one charge the council with having treated subjects superficially. . . . Long deliberations were often thought necessary before a single word could be added, taken away, or altered." This does not prove, be it remarked in passing, that there may not also have been subjects that were treated with far too much haste, and we shall see that there was more than one such; but to keep to the point of view

¹ B. viii. ch. xi.

thus indicated, what an imprudent apology! When called upon to speak, said Jesus Christ to his apostles, "take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak." This is inspiration: this is infallibility. Without this we cannot have any conception of it. If you required whole hours, whole days to decide upon a word, who shall guarantee that by prolonging your deliberations a little more you would not at last have decided in favour of some other? You prove to us the matureness of the decrees; but matureness, quite a human thing, necessarily supposes the possibility of a still higher degree of matureness; the moment you make it of any avail in favour of a decree, you acknowledge the introduction of an element that is human, variable, fallible. If not, then would you have it that God, by the medium of your hand, has made those innumerable erasures. These gropings in all directions—shall we say of them that it was the Holy Ghost, who, before dictating his last word to you, led you dancing about from error to error? Go, after this, go and declaim against the vagaries of Paganism! Never did Greece, never did Italy, or India, adopt any such monstrous improbability. When the Brahmin ordains anything to be believed, it is at least in the name of decrees which he himself has not made, and whose origin is lost in the night of time; but to command faith, to shut and to open heaven, on the strength of a law which may be found in its rough draft with blots and erasures, why, this is an audacity which has never been approached by the very falsest religions.

The fruits of all this were not long in making their appearance. The council had sown the wind and could expect only to reap the whirlwind. "Some men speak in order to be understood," wrote afterwards Gui de Pibrach to the Chancellor de l'Hôpital; "these men speak that they may not be understood."¹ This was soon to be proved by a strange occurrence.

Shortly after the publication of the decree upon grace a book appeared with the title, "*De Natura et Gratia*." Dominick Soto, the author, was one of the council's leading divines. To the council itself he dedicated his work. Before the authority of that venerable body he humbly prostrates himself in his preface; he speaks of the decree with profound admiration, a feeling to which he was no doubt all the more alive, inasmuch as that decree was partly his own work. "The book," he says, "will be

¹ "Cum ceteri homines loquuntur ut intelligi possint, isti nihil magis volunt quam ne intelligantur."

no more than a feeble commentary upon it." And, in fact, there is not a page of it in which he has not the air of a man who rests implicitly on the ideas and the expressions of that decree. Never were the Scriptures themselves more respectfully turned to account.

The book was read, and it suggested reflections ; it was viewed with a certain feeling of anxiety. Some readers, at a great loss to recognise in the commentary what they had put, or thought they had put, into the text, were ready to exclaim with Socrates in reference to Plato,—“ What things he makes us say !” Others, although they leant to Soto’s views, hesitated to accept from his hand a victory which the council had left undecided. Not a word was said on either side ; it was felt that a single word was all that was required to re-open an abyss.

That word was launched by Catharini. Passing by all the points on which there was scope for shifts and evasions, he went straight to the one that was most susceptible of being decided by a *yes* or a *no*. Can the just man be sure of his having grace ? *No* had been Soto’s answer, and according to him it was the opinion also of the council. *Yes*, replied Catharini, and so, according to him, had the council decreed. Which was in the wrong ? Why, neither the one nor the other, for the council had said neither *yes* nor *no* ; but both were wrong in wishing to extract from the decree what both well knew not to be there. Soto resumed his thesis ; Catharini returned to the charge. And it was always to the council that they addressed themselves, always to the council that they complained, with equal bitterness, that its decisions were perverted from their proper sense ; always to the council, in fine, each of them presented himself as the true and sole defender of its infallible authority. And the council held its peace, and was to do so to the last. Neither the urgent appeals of the two champions, nor the solicitations of some of the members, neither the visible uneasiness of all good Roman Catholics, nor the jests which were current all over Europe,¹ nothing, in short, could prevail with it to put an end to the contest by saying, once for all, what the meaning was which it wished to be attached to its decree.

But why press this ? It is a case in which, if ever, the facts speak for themselves. Any ordinary assembly which should see

¹ The council prophesied, it was said, like Caiaphas, who prophesied without knowing what he said. And the sting of the jest lay in this, that it was but the reproduction of one of the figures employed by the Bishop of Bitonto in that famous sermon in which he had tried to prove, that whether it meant it or not, the council would be the organ of God.

serious controversies occasioned by the vagueness of one of its decisions, and should refuse to give a precise statement of its bearing, would be of itself a singularity perhaps unique in history; but should that assembly, at the very time that it maintained this silence, persist in holding itself out to the Christian world as the regulator of its faith, it would present an instance of contempt for common sense which it would be difficult to find terms to describe.

Let us now resume the thread of our history. The picture of dissension would be incomplete without adding that of the debates of another kind, which had never ceased to obstruct the tedious elaboration of the decree. We have seen the emperor, up to the commencement of hostilities, do his best to retard the condemnation of the Lutherans, with whom he did not despair of coming to a settlement of differences. At the moment of his marching against them he had seemed to desire that Trent should have its thunders in readiness; after vanquishing them he thought his own were enough, and had begun to slacken fire. As for the translation of the council, he persisted in refusing his consent, and the pope, consequently, ceased to have the appearance of desiring it. We have seen that the legates wished it; with the conviction that the pontiff would like it as soon as it was possible, all their efforts were directed to procuring the consent of the emperor. Meanwhile, at Trent, they loudly opposed the idea of it; they even menaced with the pope's indignation those who spoke of going away; but their sentiments were so well known, that this was a task they had to begin afresh every day. Those who returned to the charge well knew whose favour they were courting.

From all this there arose a medley of the most heterogeneous discussions. One day there would be a meeting to discuss one of the most abstruse articles of the decree on grace, but hardly would the members be assembled when they would begin to debate about the chances of war, the urgent reasons for quitting the city, the best means of diminishing the dearth of provisions, &c. Another day, with their minds absorbed with such subjects of anxiety and alarm, they would bravely set themselves to the task of weighing the syllables of that *chef-d'œuvre* of obscurity which they must needs terminate at some time.

Finally, and at the same time too, the decree on the residence of bishops had to be elaborated. We have spoken of the diffi-

culties that beset the subject, and will now present some farther explanations.

From the fourth or the fifth centuries, perhaps even earlier, the practice had been introduced of ordaining priests without attaching them to any church. Those priests received no pay; those even who belonged nominally to a church, but without permanent residence or the discharge of ministerial functions there, had no share in the revenues of their working colleagues. So strictly were those revenues regarded as solely destined to the men who had earned them as their wages, that the very savings of a priest did not belong to him, but reverted at his death to the general fund. A testament to the contrary would have been null and void, and it was even looked upon as a fraud to attempt the evasion of this law by disposing of them in the way of a donation *inter vivos*.¹ By little and little, in proportion as the Church grew in wealth, and as its charges became *dignities* in the worldly sense of that word, secular princes arrogated to themselves the right of bestowing them as a recompense for services rendered to the state or to them. Hence the name of *benefices*, (*beneficia*, favours,) under which people came at last to designate all those of which the revenues exceeded a mere stipend, barely proportioned to the work performed; hence, also, the custom of leaving that work to be done by an inferior minister, paying him shabbily for his trouble, and leaving the spot to reside elsewhere. From the sixth to the thirteenth century, ecclesiastical charges were multiplied beyond measure. Gifts bestowed on the Church were generally converted into foundations of places to be endowed; this, in most instances, was the express desire of the donors. People wished to carry to the grave with them the assurance that a priest would be maintained, in all time, on their donations to the Church. In founding chapels—and who, that had the ability, did not then found them?—the founders would have thought their purpose but half accomplished if they did not bequeath enough of property for the maintenance of one or more priests, to perform divine service in them. In the greater number of cathedrals, the number of canons far exceeded, we do not say the actual needs, for they could have been dispensed with altogether, but what might have been reasonably allotted for the external necessities of worship. At Rouen, at Clermont, at Saintes, and in many other cities,

¹ See Hurter's *Institutions of the Church*, b. iv.

there were as many as forty ; at Autun, fifty ; at Toul, sixty ; at Blois, eighty. The number of vicars attached to those churches was generally greater still : Toul cathedral had nearly a hundred. Some mere parish churches were in the same case. That of St. Alban, at Namur, had twenty canons and twenty vicars. Campelt, a village three leagues from Paris, had also twenty canons. At the commencement of the last century there were about an hundred and sixty thousand priests in France, four times the number at present, although the population was less by a third. No law, in fine, regulated their distribution over the country. At the side of a village having a complement of twenty canons, you would find another where a single priest had hardly wherewithal to live.¹ The donors scattered their gifts where they pleased ; there was nothing to compel them to take the real wants of the people into consideration. Often a mere casual circumstance would enrich a church and multiply its priests. A nobleman, setting off for war, might have a sudden access of piety. Stopping at the first village that offered itself, he would enter the church, make a vow, and, if he returned safe and sound, the humble parish living would become perhaps a wealthy benefice. A petty Savoyard herdsman takes a fancy for entering into orders, and with this in view leaves his home for Avignon. At Geneva he covets a pair of shoes. But how is he to pay for them, for he has nothing ? “ Take them,” says the shoemaker, “ and pay me when you are a cardinal.” Forty years afterwards, on the spot where once stood that humble shop, a sumptuous chapel arose,² served by *thirteen* priests. This was the Cardinal de Brogny’s payment of his debt.

Far be it from us, then, to pretend to censure, in themselves, such exhibitions of a piety, sometimes very unenlightened, but certainly lively and sincere. The history of pious foundations teems with affecting facts, and with admirable legends ; but the more these facts, each viewed apart, interest and disarm you, the more occasion will you find for being surprised, if not scandalized, at the abuses of all sorts which could not fail to spring out of them. The greater number of the beneficiaries having literally nothing to do, nothing, at least, which they could not do equally

¹ It oddly happens that one of the countries in which these whimsical inequalities are most preserved is a Protestant country. But what is more curious still, is the declamation of Roman Catholicism against Anglican opulence and the vices of that organization. What then has England done but made no change on this point from what existed previous to Henry VIII. ?

² Called the Chapel of the Maccabees, at the side of the Cathedral.

well elsewhere,¹ it would have been absurd to force them to reside on their benefices. Hence, for all others as well as them, a perpetual encouragement to negligence, to sloth, and to the disorders that arise from sloth. Had they all been either absolutely bound to residence or absolutely released from it, the evil might possibly have been less; but from the beneficiary without functions, to the parish priest burdened with ministerial duties, there was a multitude of degrees, none of which was far enough removed from its neighbour for non-residence, when once established with respect to the one, not to establish itself in the other also. In fine, notwithstanding the severity of general rules, made or renewed from time to time by councils and popes, there ceased to be any benefices in which exemption from obligation to residence, might not be either taken at once, or procured. The bishops, in particular, arrogated for themselves full liberty in this respect, and their indulgence for themselves forced them to wink at all disorders of the same sort.

Of one mind in acknowledging that here there was an evil, and a great evil too, the members of the council ere long fell out among themselves when a remedy had to be sought for, and the nature of that remedy determined.

Is residence a matter of *divine* or only of *ecclesiastical obligation*? In other terms, when a bishop dispenses with residence in his own case, does he disobey God or the pope? And if it be with the papal sanction, can he be considered as guilty towards God?

Here we have another of those questions the very statement of which is of itself an indictment against the Church in which they could have possibly occurred. That a pastor called to preside over a flock might forsake it without sinning against God, or that, after having obtained authorization to do so from a man, he should be, before God, free from blame, is an opinion which the primitive Christians would not even have condemned as an error. He who could have entertained it, would have seemed rather to be pitied as having lost his senses, than held guilty of a heresy.

At Trent, not only was this opinion announced but it found warm defenders.

Their adversaries, to say the truth, did not well know what to adduce in reply. Often the plainer a truth is, the more difficult it is to demonstrate it in set phrases. Were we to be asked

¹ Many were bound to nothing but reading the Breviary, and dispensations might be obtained even from that.

why we think that a priest offends God, directly God, and not the pope or God in the pope, when he abandons his Church and keeps his revenues, in truth we should not know what to reply. We should say that there can be no doubt about it; that the plainest common sense sufficiently demonstrates it; but as for arguments and proofs, to what quarter could we go for them? At the most we might quote St. Paul, "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers;"¹ or St. Peter, "Feed the flock of God which is among you;"² still we might possibly meet with the reply, on the latter text, that, seeing it is from St. Peter, it ought rather to prove the papal right. Such, in fact, was the drift of the reasoning adopted at Trent by the partisans of the opinion that was cherished by the popes. One might have been able, without going beyond that same chapter, to defy them to shew a single word in it where Peter speaks with the air of a chief speaking of his own authority. "The elders," says he, "which are among you I exhort, who *also* am an elder. Feed the flock of God, and when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." But how shall we think to convince by proofs from Scripture men who have so far rid themselves of respect for its authority as to build up the system on which they are fool-hardy enough to lean? "The episcopate," said some, "is of divine institution, only in the person of the pope; among all other bishops, consequently, it is of papal institution. Since it pertains to the pope to assign to them the number of sheep they have to feed, it is for him also to prescribe the manner; and seeing that he may, if he shall think fit, deprive them of the power, may he not also permit them to abstain from exercising it?" Then, is not this the case?—should a pope think fit to consider himself, as, literally, the sole necessary bishop, to dismiss all others, and to extinguish with them the whole inferior clergy, so as to remain sole and only pastor of all the Roman Catholic parishes in the world, would he not have the right to do so? It is absurd, but it is logical; and we have already seen whether these words are not often synonymous when people would press the consequences of the Roman system.

Now, this absolute concentration in the hands of the pope of all the powers of the Church is, although many Roman Catholics are ignorant of it or conceal it,—the Roman system, is the pure and invariable ultramontane doctrine, that of the court of Rome,

¹ Acts xx.

² 1 Pet. v.

that of the popes. This we shall ere long prove, and to do so we shall only have to leave those divines and bishops to speak who were regarded, at Trent, as the pope's procurators—the avowed representatives of the papal doctrines.

Meanwhile the dispute became envenomed. The legates saw that the moment had arrived when the authority itself of the Holy See, in so far as it is the source of the episcopal power, was about to be questioned; and of all the posts they had to defend there was none worse than this. "We shall return to that," they said; "let us proceed to what is more urgent." They did return to it, in fact, but at the end of fifteen years, quite at the close of the council, and the storm was only all the more violent.

The pope being thus put out of the discussion, the sound part of the council could hardly have any farther confidence in the efficacy of what was about to be laid down as the law in these matters. Of what use was it to prescribe residence, as long as the Court of Rome should be free to exempt whomsoever it pleased from the operation of the law, or to shut its eyes on all contraventions? The course taken was that of laying down the rules, without disquieting themselves, and, above all, without appearing to disquiet themselves about future consequences. Those rules, besides, were by no means hard. The prelate who without sufficient reason should remain six months continuously absent from his diocese, was to lose the fourth part of his revenues; an absence of a year was to infer deprivation of the half. Nothing more easy, therefore, than to keep within the rule, and yet be absent nearly all the year; the bishop had only to reside one month in six, or even one month in twelve, provided that month was laid out in two fortnights properly placed. Then, who was to deprive a delinquent of the quarter or half revenue he might forfeit? The metropolitan? It is doubtful whether he would be disposed to do so, and, were he disposed, whether he would have the power. The pope? But, according to the terms of the decree, the affair ought not to reach the pope until it had passed the hands of the metropolitan. And if it be the latter who offends, where then will the sanction be? This is all evident; it would have availed as much to have said nothing, and to have done nothing. Had all the members of the council been profoundly desirous of remedying the evil, what could they have done? They had their hands tied and their tongues also; for if individually free, up to a certain point, to

say all that they thought, as a body they were not so. They were bid to look at abysses on all sides; "take care," they were told, "if the pope should tumble into one of these, you will tumble in along with him!" And it was all true. In order to correct the abuses of which we have spoken, they could only betake themselves, in the last resort, to the very power which had been their first and permanent cause; and as for those grand ideas of order, piety, morality, duty, which alone could have formed an adequate barrier against like disorders, it would not have been possible seriously to appeal to these without engaging in a contest with him whose will, it was thought desirable, should hold the place of all laws, and exclusively determine all duties.

Non-residence accordingly was, on the whole, rather facilitated than interdicted, inasmuch as the law furnished bishops with the means of reducing it to rules. Henceforward, how could they be reckoned on in compelling the holders of inferior benefices to reside? It was decided, however, that they should, not as bishops, but as the delegates of the pope, have a certain authority over those even who had or might have pontifical dispensations. Those dispensations they behoved to verify, to see also that the absentee had provided a suitable substitute, that this substitute had a suitable salary, &c. Excellent measures these in detail, but which ended only, in point of legal principle (*droit*), in the confirmation of the papal omnipotence, since bishops could only give a regular execution to the dispensations, but could neither reject nor annul them. It was also decided that no bishop could ordain priests in another's diocese without that other bishop's sanction; finally, that every bishop should, for the future, notwithstanding any contrary usage or even any exemption that might have been granted, have the inspection and the direction of the chapter of his cathedral church. This last article presented, of itself, the measure of excess into which the abuse of dispensations had fallen. What could we suppose the position of a bishop to be in the face of a body created of old to serve as his council, and transformed, by the will of the pope, into an independent and rival power? It was enough to drive out of his diocese any bishop that hated bickerings and intrigues.

Such, nevertheless, was the point now reached, even in spite of the episcopal body, by the Roman system when left to itself and to its own encroaching tendencies. There had not been in the Roman Church a single struggle, a single innovation, a single

decree, which had not ended at last, directly or indirectly, in the extension of the pope's authority. As for the public advantage and the salvation of souls, these were as little thought of as if the whole concern had been some vast industrial enterprise; there was not even the affectation of these objects being cared for. See with what keenness, in this very session, the Italians made residence an affair of papal right. This was very impolitic, it seems, and very imprudent; it involved the transference to the pope's shoulders of all the disorders and all the evils arising from non-residence, and of which the legates themselves had, at the opening of the council, drawn so frightful a picture. Well, strange to say, this danger did not disquiet them in the least. Provided the question of right was settled, they did not mind what reproaches might arise from matters of fact. Little cared they though the court of Rome were accused of having ruined the Church, by pushing the abuse of dispensations to its very utmost verge, provided it should become the standing law that of these dispensations she was to be sole arbitress, and that it should depend only on herself, should she see fit, to do as much in time to come as had been done in time past. Then, even had they desired it, how could they break with that past accumulation of abuses and disorders? Often had the council allowed an intention of doing so to escape; but we should greatly err were we to suppose that the members were diverted from that intention only by the resistance made by the pope and by the skilful management of his agents. Not a step could be taken in that direction without making the council press against one of the supporting pillars of the edifice, and all men have not the courage of Samson.

After so many months spent in trying to come to a common understanding, the contending parties were still so far from this, that the public sitting (13th January 1547) witnessed the recommencement of the debate on residence; the decree, a circumstance which had not occurred before, could not be admitted. "The voting slips," says Pallavicini,¹ "were covered with so many conflicting remarks, that it was found impossible then to decide anything; the legates reserved to themselves the power of examining these, and of determining the result according to the views of the majority in a general congregation." This congregation did not meet until the 25th of February, and as the decree had in the interval undergone several modifications, we do not

¹ Book viii ch. xviii.

see how it could have been legally maintained at the 13th of January, which is the date it bears in all the collections.¹

As for the decree on grace, it had passed without opposition. "Truly it was on that day," says Pallavicini, "that the council might glorify itself on the most sublime of its works, for that was the first day on which the Church, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, taught fully to man the sequel of his origin and the true property of his nature." Between what the historian tells us of the interminable labours attending the birth of this decree, and all that he is afterwards compelled to say about the obscurities that were allowed to remain in it, what are we to think of these words? Is this sarcasm, or is it falsehood? It is neither. Pallavicini does not lie; still less does he sneer. The decree is passed. He submits to it. The statue, after six months' efforts, has reached the altar: what did it signify to him in what manner, or of what metal, it had been made? It is there, and so he falls down and worships.

The seventh session was fixed for the 3d of March; the council then had two months before it. It had been previously resolved that the order to be followed should be as much as possible that which appears in the Confession of Augsburg; but as this course would have led them to treat next of the Church and its authority, points which many were fain to treat, but more were afraid to touch, the legates contrived to have it decided that they should be passed over.

This then brought them to the grand question of the sacraments. Cardinal Santa Croce undertook the charge of the congregations in which the subject was to be discussed in its doctrinal aspect, and Cardinal del Monte those which were to take up the disciplinary questions attached to it. But notwithstanding the novelty and the interest of the subject, the legates found it beyond their power to divert a great many bishops from proposing that the question of residence should be discussed concurrently. "Declare it to be of divine right," said the Spaniards, "and there will no longer be any need for entering into so many details, and removing so many obstacles. It will speak sufficiently for itself." They were not mistaken, but this was pre-

¹ Had we any wish to engage in disputes about forms, we should find plenty of them on this occasion. Thus, for example, in the decree of the first session, no mention is made of the legates; and in that of the second, it is said,—“Under the presidency of the *same* three legates.” This could not have been a slip of the memory; it is evident that there had been a wish to evade, at the commencement, the serious question of the presidency, and to resolve it afterwards by assuming it as a past fact. The same irregularity reappears in the 12th session, at the resumption of the council in 1551. In strict justice, the act should be null.

cisely what their opponents were resolved not to have at any price. To declare openly that it was not a matter of papal right, all well; but that it was of divine right, never. Cardinal del Monte began by representing that they should at least leave time for the passions to cool; next, as they still pressed the matter, he had recourse to what cut all knots: he told them that the pope did not wish them to take that side of the question. It was decided, nevertheless, that the examination of the causes of non-residence should be continued, and that the plurality of benefices in particular should be discussed.

How many sacraments are there? This is what had, first of all, to be determined.

When the Roman Catholics of our day tell us that there are seven, they do so with so much confidence that one could hardly think it possible that this was still an open question three centuries ago. They themselves, for the most part, suspect this less than any one. They have not the most distant idea that it has not been recognised and taught in their Church since its foundation, and it is with the most perfect good faith that they ask how any man can be bold enough to attack that venerated number.

True it is, that the number seven had then for a long time been generally acknowledged. But although admitted at the council of Florence, this was still an opinion only, not a dogma; and when it was seriously proposed to make it a dogma, the subject was beset with uncertainties.

First of all, it was found impossible to justify by Scripture, not only the number seven, but the existence even of such or such an one of the seven. This we shall have occasion to demonstrate ere long.

In the second place,—a still more serious matter for the Roman divines,—it was found impossible to discover anything at all settled among the Fathers on this point. In Augustine, for example, the word *sacrament* is sometimes used in the sense of *sacred thing*, and applied to all the Church's ceremonies; sometimes it is restricted,¹ as among Protestants, to baptism and the Lord's supper. St. Ambrose, under the general title, *De Sacramentis*, speaks also of those two only. This number, two, occurs, once and again, even in the writings of St. Thomas (Aquinas).² "As Eve," he says, "was taken from Adam's side, so from the pierced side of Jesus Christ have proceeded the

¹ Christian Doctrine, iii. 9.

² Questions 62, 5; 66, 3.

two sacraments that form the Church ;” that is to say, according to the explanation which he adds, Baptism represented by the water, and the Supper represented by the blood. In St. Bernard also, the meaning of the word is so far from fixed, that we see it applied to the act known in the Roman Church under the term *foot-washing*. After this we should like to know how the Roman Catechism could venture to say that the number seven has come “*from the tradition of the Fathers.*”¹

That same catechism might, on this subject, furnish us with a curious specimen of exegesis. “The Latin Fathers,” it tells us, “have employed this word in the same meaning with that of *mystery*, as employed by the Greeks. It is thus that St. Paul employs it in those words (Eph. i.) :—“*Having made known unto us the sacrament of his will;*” and in these (1 Tim. iii.), “*Great is the sacrament of godliness.*” And the explanation continues. Now, in the Greek text the word is *mystery*. Thus, the catechism begins by putting *sacrament* for *mystery*, and reasons, then, as if St. Paul had written *sacrament*. It is true that it is the Vulgate that has made the change, and, of course, after that, all error is impossible.

The best proof of the vagueness and uncertainty that still prevailed on the subject, is to be seen in the discussions that took place. Several divines proposed that the simple enumeration of the sacraments should be thought enough, without saying whether they were seven, or more, or fewer. They remarked, that by following any other course, the council could hardly dispense with defining what was meant by the general term sacrament, and this would be found a very knotty undertaking as soon as two or at the most three were admitted. In fact, if the definition be made wide enough to comprise things so different as marriage and holy orders, it is impossible that it should not comprise also things which the Church does not call sacraments, as, for example, monastic vows. The schoolmen had tried to provide for this. The sacraments, they said, confer grace *ex opere operato* ; the vows confer it *ex opere operantis*.² A poor subtlety, manifestly contrived to meet the emergency, by justifying the exclusion of the vows and the number seven, but which could not stand for a moment before evident reason and common sense.

Here, then, lay the difficulty which frightened many of the

¹ Patrum traditione ad nos pervenit.

² By the work done.—By the work of him who does it.

divines. But among these, as well as among the bishops, there were many who longed to see the matter set at rest. They held the dignity of the Church and of the council to be interested in it; nor were they mistaken. If there were really seven sacraments, it was very strange that the Church should have allowed fifteen centuries to pass without teaching this to the faithful. They behoved, therefore, to bring the matter to a conclusion. Next, had they not already the seven cardinal virtues, the seven capital sins, the seven days of the week, the seven planets, the seven candlesticks of the Apocalypse, which had been so felicitously taken advantage of in the golden bull, for fixing at seven the number of the electors in the empire,—without reckoning the mysterious anciently acknowledged excellence of that number in itself? “Being certain,” says Pallavicini,¹ “that God is an infinite wisdom, that no reason, no fitness, however subtle, can present itself to us before having first presented itself to him, we need be under no apprehension, that in the interpretation of his works and of his words, it may be with us, as it was with Plutarch, when he found in Homer’s verses so many mysterious meanings of which that author had never dreamt.” It is evident, then, according to this grave historian, that in conceiving the most uncouth idea, a man may always say to himself, “God has had it before it suggested itself to me.” This is truly a novel way of understanding the *infinite* wisdom of God. Temerity with unaffected simplicity, “We doctors say such subtle things, that God himself is astonished at them!”

It was not thought fit, however, to insert any of these fine reasons in the decree; and as there were no others for holding to the number seven, none were inserted at all. “If any one shall maintain that there are more or fewer than seven sacraments, let him be anathema.”² The Roman Catechism is less laconic. “Seven things,” it says, “are necessary to man in order to his living and preserving life. He must be born, he must grow, he must take food, he must use remedies for the recovery of his health when he has lost it, he must regain his strength when his energies are weakened, he must have magistrates to govern him, he must by means of lawful children perpetuate the human race. All these having corresponding points in the life by which the soul lives to God, one may easily deduce from them what ought

¹ Book ix. ch. iv.

² Si quis dixerit sacramenta esse plura vel pauciora quam septem . . . anathema sit.

to be the number of the sacraments. By baptism, we are born anew in Jesus Christ; by confirmation, divine grace makes us grow and strengthens us; by the Eucharist, our soul is fed and sustained; by penance, we are cured of the plagues caused by sin in our souls," &c. Mark that this odd catalogue has not even the merit of being complete, and it is the only merit that anything so extremely silly can have. Sleep is far more universally necessary to life than the use of cordials or of remedies. What sacrament shall be made to correspond with sleep? And yet it is not as a figure of rhetoric that the catechism employs, and counsels the employment of such reasoning. It gives it as *a good reason*;¹ and the French translation of 1844 is still more explicit, "In order to shew the faithful that there are seven sacraments, neither more nor less, pastors may employ this reasoning, *which is very fit for convincing them of it.*" We may be allowed to suppose, that before reasonable people, they, on the contrary, take good care not to employ it.

Here, then, we have seven sacraments, and now who has instituted them?

To say that such or such an one was instituted by Jesus Christ, would be to admit that others were not instituted by him, and by doing so, to assign to them an inferior rank. What was to be done? Nothing more simple: they must all be attributed to Jesus Christ.

This was to trifle with tradition quite as much as with Scripture. Hitherto, in fact, nothing but baptism and the supper had been regarded universally as instituted by the Saviour. For all the rest, people had seldom gone farther than the Apostles. Many Roman Catholics, and those among the best, did not even go so far, at least for one or two of them; many left marriage expressly out, not that they denied it a place among the sacraments, but because it seemed by no means natural to attribute to Jesus Christ, what he spoke of so often without anywise attributing it to himself. All this was said; but it was one of those moments with the council when the wind of omnipotence seemed to have turned the heads of all the members. They would have been terrified at the least exception, as it might appear to be a triumph conceded to the Lutherans. They gave no reasons, and entered into no details: anathema to whosoever should deny that all the sacraments were instituted by Jesus Christ; and it was even with this that the decree was to open,

¹ Probabilis ratio.

“Si quis dixerit sacramenta non fuisse *omnia* a Christo instituta —anathema sit.”

In spite of the anathema, it was found necessary to find some means of mitigating a little the palpable falseness of the decree. Even as early as in the oath of the bishops, drawn up by Pius IV. immediately after the close of the council, the word *all* is left out. “I acknowledge that there are seven sacraments, instituted by Jesus Christ.” The sense is the same, but already the assertion is a little less formal. From this time forth it has been interpreted generally by saying, that the sacraments were all, indeed, instituted by Jesus Christ, but some immediately, that is to say, from his own mouth, the rest mediately, that is to say, by the Apostles or by the Church, under an inspiration derived from him. If this is not more true, it is assuredly more reasonable; what is certain is, that it is not in the decree, and that if the council, foreseeing this interpretation, had wished, on the contrary, to proscribe it, it could not have expressed itself more clearly than it has done. Yet listen to what Bossuet says, “The divine institution of the sacraments appears in the Scripture, either by the express words of Jesus Christ who established them, or by the grace which, according to the same Scripture, is attached to them, and which necessarily marks an order from God.”¹ After this, if Claude and Jurieu were wrong in accusing Bossuet of having made the decrees of Trent suit his own purposes, we must give up insisting that black and white are not the same colour. To bring this subject to a close, we have still one word, one only word to say, but we defy any man to gainsay it; it is this, that a reader altogether ignorant as yet of Christian doctrines, and who should look for them in the decrees of the council, never could avoid the conclusion, and would believe without any kind of hesitation, that *all* the sacraments were positively instituted by Jesus Christ,—being what Bossuet and what all the Roman Catholic doctors of the present day admit to be false.

As it was thought a matter of principal importance to give expression to nothing but absolute decisions, where the authority of the form might supplement whatever was wanting in the principle, the council were sufficiently embarrassed at first on the great question of the use of the sacraments, and, in particular, of their necessity. Not that too many bishops were not quite ready to say, without disquieting themselves about reasons or

¹ Exposition de la foi catholique, ch. ix.

consequences, that the sacraments are necessary; but it was replied that there is none of them that is so in the same manner with the rest. Baptism had been declared indispensable to salvation; and whatever opinion might be formed of the excellence of the others, it was evidently the only one of which this could be thought. An infant dying immediately after baptism, a Christian living far from any church, in a desert island, or among heathens, never had been regarded as lost, even although they had never participated in six out of the seven sacraments. On the other hand, the Protestants had never maintained that the sacraments which they admitted, were not necessary in the sense of there being no impropriety in abolishing them; they only maintained that they were not the *necessary* and indispensable channels of saving grace. But Luther had said, "The sacraments *are not necessary*;" and this was enough for the council to think itself obliged to say that they are necessary. Notwithstanding the remonstrances of the most sensible of the divines, the article passed. "Anathema to whosoever shall maintain that the sacraments are not necessary, *but superfluous*."¹ A mere play upon words. Betwixt indispensable and superfluous there is a middle point, which the Protestants have constantly maintained. On whom and on what, then, did this anathema fall? Besides, can it be logically correct to range under the same epithet, things that receive it in a different sense? The sacraments are *necessary*, says the decree. But *necessary* applied to baptism, and *necessary* applied to the supper, and to marriage, are, in reality, two different words. The decree adds, that "*all are not necessary to all men*;"² an elucidation which is only an additional obscurity. If *necessary*, in that part of the phrase, means *indispensable*, it ought not to have been said that "all are not necessary to all," but that one alone, baptism, is universally necessary. If it be something else than indispensable, still baptism ought to have been mentioned apart, and the assertion, that "all are not necessary to all," could apply only to the other six. To get rid of these uncertainties, it has been suggested that the decree should be understood as merely teaching, "that it is necessary there should be sacraments." Strictly speaking, this is not in opposition with the text; but the simpler this last proposition, the more must it be admitted that the text is confused. But is even this proposition clear? It is susceptible of two

¹ Siquis dixerit sacramenta non esse ad salutem necessaria sed superflua . . . anathema sit.

² Licet omnia singulis necessaria non sint.

meanings. Do you mean to say that it is good, useful, excellent, that there should be sacraments? The Protestants have never said the contrary. Mean you to say that we must absolutely have them? Then, what know you of that? Who has told you that God may not save by quite other means? And what do you make of so many passages of Scripture, in which salvation is promised either to faith or to works emanating from faith, without any mention of the sacraments? In the hypothesis of their absolute necessity, the omission is inexplicable.

Still further to augment this indistinctness, there has been added an old scholastical distinction between necessity of fact and necessity of intention.¹ Thus, for example, extreme unction is to be held as necessary, not in this sense, that it must absolutely have been received in order to a man's dying in a state of grace, but in this sense, that he must have desired it. And if some have died in a state of grace without having desired it, without even having thought of it, without having so much as ever heard it mentioned, it was because they were in such a state of mind that they would have desired it had they known of it, or had they thought of it. Reduced to such proportions, the necessity of the sacraments ends at last in becoming something altogether reasonable; but then all the more unreasonable is it, to have called that necessary which turns out to be so far from necessary. It is, besides, inconsistent with the absolute necessity of baptism. Those infants who have not the happiness to receive it would most certainly desire it, if they knew of it. If, then, this last proposition is well founded, why exclude them from heaven only because of their not having received it? And if that sacrament be an exception, why does the council continue to speak of all of them at once?

These are criticisms that may be made by anybody. Although we were to receive this decree as true, it strikes us that still we should find it singularly ill drawn up; the more we cleaved to its doctrines, the more annoyed should we be at so faulty an exposition of them. Many other decrees are in this case. We shall give here and there some specimens of such.

It had yet to be decided, in fine, how the sacraments take effect. Are they the *occasions* of grace or the *causes* of grace? Or, have they any virtue independent of the sentiments of the recipient?

Common sense says, no; so also does the Scripture. This we shall ere long demonstrate with respect to each of them. Un-

¹ Si quis dixerit sine eis aut eorum voto.

fortunately, after what had been already voted on the influence of baptism, it was hardly any longer possible to abide by either common sense or Scripture. If baptism works such a marvellous result upon a babe, who can have no idea of what it is, nor can in any way accept it, it is, in fact, not easy to admit that the other sacraments have not, of themselves, by the fact of their having been received, *opere operato*, any influence whatever. If the babe has been saved by a ceremony in which it has not taken, and could not take, any part whatever, wherefore should the dying and unconscious invalid not be saved by a ceremony to which he remains a stranger? It is thus that one error leads on to another. What had been pronounced to hold true with respect to an infant, had to be repeated with respect to the sacraments in general. They were proclaimed, therefore, to be *causes of grace*.

And now, how were they to be said to be so? This was another question which could not be forgotten. Upon this there flared up among the divines one of the fiercest disputes that the council had yet witnessed. Some maintained that the sacraments are only physical and instrumental causes of grace, which amounted to this, for example, that the good effects of communion in a soul are essentially connected with the act itself of receiving and swallowing a wafer. The rest, more reasonable, said, that a spiritual effect cannot depend on a physical cause; that hence the efficacy of the sacraments arises from this, that God has engaged to operate on the soul within, every time that such or such a material act shall have taken place without. The latter, not without reason, were charged with being Lutherans; the former were charged by the Lutherans with teaching an absurdity;—and as for us, we are compelled to add, that this absurdity is the thing that best agrees with the totality of Roman doctrines and usages. With Roman doctrines, as a whole, we say, for one does not see to what, if not to this, we are led by the eighth canon, which runs thus:—“If any one says that the sacraments do not confer grace of themselves *ex opere operato*,—let him be anathema.”¹ With the Roman usages, as a whole, we further say—for the adoration of the wafer, the character so profoundly sacred attributed to the chrism, endless minute ceremonies employed in the administration of the sacraments, everything in fine sanctions the belief,

¹ Si quis dixerit per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferre gratiam . . . anathema sit.

whatever attempts there may have been at times to deny it—that the Roman Church ascribes, or allows its members to ascribe, a certain direct action on the human soul to things that are altogether and purely material.

Be this as it may, so keen was the contention, that the legates complained to the chiefs of the monastic orders, of the want of moderation exhibited by their members; they even wrote to the pope that something must be done in order to keep them down. But how? They could not be dispensed with; and it cannot be wondered at that, on the strength of their seeing this, they permitted themselves, from time to time, to fancy that they were not only the assessors of a council, but a council itself.

After divers discussions more or less futile, the council proceeded to ask, up to what point is the intention of the priest necessary to the validity of the sacrament which he has administered? “The smallest mistake, even though made involuntarily,” a pope had said,¹ “nullifies the whole act.” The council of Florence had pronounced the same opinion, and it was a link which people durst not break; but they took fright at the consequences. They were, indeed, frightful. Let an infidel, or a dreamy priest, baptize a child without having seriously the idea of baptizing it, that child, if it die, is lost; let a bishop ordain a priest, without having actually and formally, from absence of mind or any other cause, the idea of conferring the priesthood, and behold we have a priest who is not a priest, and those whom he shall baptize, marry, or absolve, will not be baptized, married, or absolved. The pope himself, without suspecting it, might have been ordained in this manner; and as it is from him that everything flows, all the bishops of the Church might some day find themselves to be false bishops, and all the priests false priests, without there being any possibility of restoring the broken link.

Pallavicini begins with treating all these suppositions, which Catharini had enlarged upon with great warmth, as “marvellous tragedies;” and when reproduced by Sarpi, they become no better, always according to the cardinal historian, than “specious tricks.” “There is nothing new,” says he, “in these arguments.” Have they not been refuted a hundred times after the decree of Florence? He makes a jest of Catharini “painting in affecting terms the anxiety of a father who having a child in the agonies of death, should say that the poor child has not been

¹ Innocent III., Ep. ix.

baptized, perhaps, and is about to be excluded from heaven." And yet the historian comes at last to admit that that anxiety is perfectly justifiable. "As for the rest," says he, "there is nothing repugnant in the idea that no person in particular, after all possible researches, can come to be perfectly sure of his baptism. Nobody can complain that he suffers this evil without having deserved it. God, by a goodness purely arbitrary, delivers the one without delivering the other." Admirable reasoning; but behold, we are brought at once by it to the very predestination which has been made such a matter of reproach against Calvin; and while Calvin makes it at least depend solely on the will of God, here we have it made to depend on the inattention of a priest.

This was remarked by Catharini. No reply was made. The votes were taken. The decree of Florence was maintained; there was only a slight softening of the terms, but, after all, without any change in the substance. "If any one say that the intention, *that, at least, of doing what the Church does*, is not required in the priest—let him be anathema." This is not clear; but we should in vain take it in the widest possible meaning, and say, for example, that baptism is valid, provided that the priest, in administering it, has not the formal intention of making it null,—not the less will there remain with the priest the infernal power of excluding from heaven an infant whom he makes a show of baptizing. From the moment you shall admit the very smallest possibility that God may save that child—and Pallavicini himself is compelled to say that the thing is not impossible—you would upset the decree. With or without reservations, it is of little consequence: you admit that the intention is not indispensable.

But, it will be said, what then ought the council to have done? Ought it to have said, that the intention is useless? That certain movements of the hands and lips suffice for the baptism of a child, for the ordination of a priest, for bringing Jesus Christ from heaven and incarnating him in a wafer? It is then, indeed, that the cry of formalism might be raised! No doubt, but why pronounce at all? Say that the intention is necessary, and you open an abyss of improbabilities; say that it is not necessary, and you land yourself in gross formalism. There might readily have been found a rational solution, and it was that which Luther had had in view when he denied the necessity of intention on the part of the priest; but this the council did not wish, and could not wish to adopt. It would

have been, as we have already remarked, to connect the effect of the sacrament, not with the intention of him who administers it, but with the disposition of mind in the person receiving it. Then, of what consequence is it how, or by whom, you have been baptized? To you, and to you alone, it pertains to ratify your baptism by accepting the engagements taken for you; for, as St. Paul says, the baptism that saves "is the engagement of a good conscience before God." From the hands of a worthless priest there is nothing to prevent your having been legitimately sealed with the seal of divine grace; from the hands of an unbeliever who, in giving you the bread of angels, shall have made a jest both of God and of you, you may have communicated, and that in all holiness. Of course the priest would be a miserable wretch, were he to think himself authorized on that account to administer the sacraments without intention and without piety; but not the less is it the only idea which does no offence to reason, to justice, and to the general character of a worship "in spirit and in truth."

But why should we seek to justify our criticisms? The Roman Church herself has sufficiently justified them by the changes she has made, or permitted to be made, in this decree. Hardly a year after its publication, Catharini wrote a book, in which he ventured to affirm that the council had voted according to his view. He was exclaimed against, but was not condemned. "I think," says Pallavicini, "that his view is a false one, *but has not been expressly condemned by the decree*; and therefore he could legitimately maintain that it was not opposed to the council." Since that, what do we find has been done? In the article of the sacraments in general, the Roman Catechism admits fully, as the council had done, the necessity of the intention, but in the details it abandons it. Thus, in speaking of the Eucharist, "It will be recollected," it says, "as we have said above, that the sacraments may be legitimately administered by wicked priests, provided the things necessary to the consummation of the act be exactly observed;" and the word which we translate by *exactly, ritè*, is hardly ever used in speaking of anything but exactness in forms. In fact, saving the circumlocutions necessary for saving the council's honour, the non-necessity of the intention ended at last with being universally taught. The Tridentine anathema has been transformed by little and little into mere exhortations on the seriousness which ought to be felt in the administration of the sacraments. This

is most reasonable, it is most Christian—but it is no longer the decree.

Let us notice, on this subject, a striking difference between the modifications that time has introduced into the council's decisions. Modifications of dogma—these have, for the most part, been made in a reasonable and Christian sense; but in matters of practice, it is the council, on the contrary, as we shall see, that was more reasonable and more Christian than the Church. In both cases we might ask, what becomes of the authority of the supreme code written at Trent?

After having thus regulated what bore upon the seven sacraments in general, the council applied itself to its next duty—that of examining them apart, beginning with baptism. Who could have imagined that it would be fifteen years before they reached the last of them?

Several of the points relating to baptism had been previously decided in the question of original sin; a few only remained, and on these there was little difficulty in coming to an agreement. One alone occupied the council some little time. Is the baptism of heretics a true baptism? May their re-baptism be dispensed with when they become Catholics?

For a considerable time Romanists had been agreed in considering their baptism as valid, and in making no difference amongst them in this respect; but it could not be forgotten that the time had been when the Church shewed herself much less liberal. At several epochs there had seemed to be a disposition rather to re-baptize all heretics, without exception. The Councils of Nice and Constantinople having thought that they ought to specify those who should be re-baptized, and those who might not be so, some bishops made propositions to that effect, but the majority saw that they could never bring the matter to a bearing. So it was decided that a sanction should be given to the opinion generally received; only to avoid the appearance of contravening former decisions and former usages, they confined themselves to declaring the validity of every baptism administered "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, *with the intention of doing what the Church does.*"¹ But in what did this intention consist? The decree does not say. Had it told us, it would still have had to say, up to what point there must be this intention, for it is clear that all men cannot have it in the same degree, or in the same way. The Roman Catechism

¹ Cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia.

is still more liberal. "Every body may baptize, men or women, whatever be their sect or profession, Jews, pagans, or heretics."¹ How Jews and pagans can have, in any degree whatever, the intention of doing, when baptizing, what the Church does, it is not easy to comprehend; and one may very well be excused for seeing here the abandonment of the necessity of intention. Next, how admirable this gradation!—Jews, pagans, *heretics*. Protestant minister, know that you are less fit to baptize than a rabbin or a brahmin.

This decree ends at last in committing the matter to the caprice of bishops, and often of mere priests. When the case is that of a Protestant who, on being perverted into Roman Catholicism, is not disposed to make a public spectacle of himself, any such proposal as that he should be baptized again would be studiously avoided; but when notoriety is thought desirable, and the pervert lends himself to that object, it is thought impossible to refuse, it is then made the first step in the proceedings. But as baptism, according to another article of the decree, stamps an indelible impression on the soul, and cannot without sacrilege be received twice, "If thou art baptized," says the priest in these cases, "I baptize thee not; if thou art not baptized, I baptize thee."

What finally remained to be done, was so to contrive, that in acknowledging the validity of the baptism of heretics, there should be no appearance of admitting the uselessness of the accessory ceremonies,² of which they had disencumbered the administration of that sacrament. It was therefore declared, that saving the greater impossibility, the priest could not omit in any sacrament any of the rites approved by the Church. The council was prudent enough to avoid saying a word about their antiquity and their apostolicity; but doctors of divinity are left free to carry these as far back as they may think proper; and the Church has never, in so far as we know, condemned those who have boldly attributed them to the Apostles. "Although natural water suffices," says the Roman Catechism, "the practice has been always observed in the Church, in conformity with the tradition of the Apostles, when baptism is solemnly adminis-

¹ The manifest object of this extraordinary liberality in making all men capable of celebrating the sacrament of initiation into the Church, is the multiplication of her subjects, of those to whom she may afterwards apply the laws against apostates.—Tr.

² Exorcism for chasing away the devil, salt placed in the mouth, making the sign of the cross on the forehead, the eyes, and the shoulders, putting spittle on the nostrils and the ears, chrism on the top of the head, &c.

tered, of accompanying it with the holy chrism." Here we have the chrism carried up to the time of the Apostles. But let us not be too loud in our reclamation; we shall find it traced back anon to Jesus Christ.

On the whole, then, in the decree on baptism, certain concessions were made; on confirmation, with which the council was next to be occupied, there could be none. The Roman Church's teachings, where she has departed most from apostolic Christianity, are, in general, those with respect to which she is least disposed to make concessions, and those, too, where she can least afford to make them; for, as soon as she shall have yielded on one detail, there would be no reason for her not yielding on others. Here it was not on details that she had been attacked; it was the sacrament itself that was denied, and there was no middle course betwixt abandoning it and maintaining it.

If confirmation, in itself, has nothing bad or absurd in it, it is nevertheless one of the points on which it will be found most difficult to be consistent with the Bible, and even with tradition; with the Bible, for it says nothing about it; with tradition, for it had long spoken of something quite different. The early fathers speak of a ceremony, in which young Christians, at their admission to the supper, came previously to declare themselves members of the Church, and to *confirm*, in public, the engagements they had made, or that had been made for them; this is what takes place, in most Protestant churches, under the name of *reception of catechumens*. The priest's part was confined to the interrogation of the neophytes, the receiving of their oath, making them an exhortation, and, finally, offering up a solemn prayer for them. As it was natural, considering the occasion, that that prayer should have for its special object their obtaining grace to be steadfast in their faith, there came to be gradually attached to it a certain sacramental importance. Next, there followed, it is not known at what period, the use of a certain anointing; it was, as it were, a second baptism, or, if you will, the complement of the first. In proportion as baptism assumed a more formal and complete signification, confirmation could not but become more and more dissociated from it; from being the portion of a sacrament it became a distinct sacrament itself. Upon that, both word and thing underwent a change. The word, for instead of indicating a ceremony in which certain vows *were confirmed*, it designated that only in which young Christians were *confirmed* in their resolution to be Christians; the thing also, for the accessory be-

came the principal, the custom of pronouncing certain vows, certain declarations of faith, fell into disuse, and the anointing only remained.¹

It is the anointing, then, accompanied by a certain formula, that now constitutes confirmation in the Roman Church. Under that form it is clear that it could not be maintained either that the first Christians made a sacrament of it, or that they had any idea of it at all. Accordingly, more than one scruple arose in the very midst of the council. Some members went so far as timidly to recall the old ceremony of the confirmation of vows. "In opposition to this," says Sarpi, "it was urged that since that was no longer practised, it must be believed that it had never been practised, *seeing that the Church never would have abolished so useful a ceremony.*" An argument this, it will be seen, quite irrefutable. Next, if it was thought useful, why not re-establish it without abandoning confirmation by anointing? Far from that, precisely the contrary had been already voted. "If any one," it is said in one of the canons on baptism, "maintains that children, come to the age of reason, ought to be called upon to confirm the vows taken in their name by their godfathers and godmothers, let him be anathema." Anathema, also, to whosoever shall maintain that the privation of the sacraments ought to be the only penalty inflicted on those who should refuse to sanction that which their godfathers and godmothers have promised for them." What, then, shall their punishment be? Of this the decree says nothing. The sentence is left blank, to be afterwards filled up by the Inquisition.

A point remained which had never yet been definitively settled. Is the bishop alone competent to administer confirmation?

To this idea church usage had long been favourable; but one would fain have said why, and this was not easy. In fact, it is impossible to give any other reason than custom. The Catechism, which never recoils from a difficulty, thinks it has found one. "*Holy Scripture,*" it says, "informs us that the bishop alone can confirm. We read in the Acts that *those of Samaria having received the Gospel, Peter and John prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost,—they having only as yet been bap-*

¹ The Roman Catechism does not even attempt to establish confirmation by Scripture: it contents itself with quoting two passages which two of the Fathers, it says, applied to this sacrament. One, quoted by St. Ambrose, is the following, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit, by whom ye have been sealed as with a seal." The other, quoted by St. Augustine, is this, "The love of God has been shed abroad in your hearts, by the Holy Spirit whom he hath given to us." To cite this is tantamount to a confession that there is nothing to cite.

tized." Where do we find the bishop here? it will be asked, and it might quite as well be asked, Where is there any anointing? Where is there confirmation? For what is here related singularly resembles all those cases in which the Holy Ghost is spoken of as conferred by the Apostles. But wait,—“ Philip, who had baptized the Christians of Samaria, was only a deacon. It is seen, then, according to what is here stated, that he had not had the power to confirm them.” What is seen here is that the Apostles alone conferred the Holy Ghost; but that that means confirmation is what nobody would ever have the idea of seeing if not suggested to him beforehand. Next, what are people thinking of? If this incident prove anything it would prove, in fact, that a deacon cannot confirm; could it prove that a priest can no more do so than a deacon?

As for logical motives, they were completely wanting. Confirmation is neither as important as baptism, seeing that it is not held to be indispensable to salvation, nor so solemn as the supper, seeing that nothing can be imagined more awful than the act of in some sort creating the divine body of the Saviour. If, therefore, a mere priest is competent to administer these two sacraments, why not the other also? By the light of the historic details given above this may be well enough understood. When confirmation was what we have said it was, it was natural for the bishop, the first pastor of the place, to preside at the ceremony; when anointing was made an additional part of it, it was further natural that the honour of performing it should be left to him; but there is nothing to prove that it was an exclusive right, or, still less, that the hand of a bishop was considered as necessary to the spiritual validity of the sacrament. In the Greek Church mere priests have always had the right to confirm. We might refer, moreover, to what we shall afterwards have occasion to say on the impossibility of finding, in the early times of the Church, any appreciable difference betwixt bishops and simple pastors.

The majority of the council shewed itself, nevertheless, inclined to decide the question definitively in favour of the bishops; but as some instances were adduced of priests who had confirmed in virtue of a papal commission, it was found necessary to say no more than that “ the bishop is the *ordinary* minister of confirmation.”

As for the act in itself, neither its nature nor its object was explained. The first canon bore anathema against whosoever

should refuse to call it a sacrament, and the second against whosoever should maintain that there is no virtue in the sacred oil with which it is administered. It is upon this that the Roman Catechism displays a *naïveté*, we had almost said an impudence, at which many Roman Catholics might well feel as much confounded as ourselves. "In order that the faithful," it says, "may be more penetrated with the sacredness of this sacrament, they ought to be shewn, not only that Jesus Christ is its author, but that it is he who, as Pope Saint Fabian attests, prescribed the use of the chrism. As for the consecration of the chrism, it is the bishop that performs it with particular ceremonies, and those ceremonies, as Pope Fabian attests, were prescribed to the Apostles by Jesus Christ at the last supper, *where he shewed them the way in which the chrism was to be made.*" Had we not the text before our eyes in Latin, in French, in two different editions, we should feel apprehensive lest, in quoting the above lines, we might be only repeating a malicious bit of fun taken from some anti-Romanist pamphlet.¹

The other congregation, that of the Cardinal Del Monte, had taken up the same questions under their disciplinary point of view.² They had succeeded tolerably well in putting together, without serious disputes, the old regulations made by councils and by popes. Only after having placed at the head of the draft of the decree, that the administration of the sacraments should be *gratuitous*, there was much difference of opinion as to what that should mean. Some desired that not only should the priest ask nothing, but that he should accept of nothing. "Freely ye have received," says the Gospel, "freely give." It was replied, also out of Scripture, "That he that serves the altar should live by the altar," and that the prohibition to accept any pay, however good in the case of churches rich enough to support their priests, evidently could not be applied to those which had no revenues. In support of this a canon of the fourth Council of Carthage was adduced, which canon permits the receiving of what may be offered by the parents of a child who has been baptized; the Council of Lateran also, under Innocent III., was adduced, which authorizes and even approves the custom of making offerings on sacramental occasions. Notwithstanding this, it

¹ Where? In one of his decretals, "*quas dubias esse non dubium est,*" says Baronius. "The Church," adds the latter, "has no need of these intruded documents." We know that such is not the opinion of the Catechism. It is right. The day that the Roman Church should proscribe all such documents it would sign its own abdication.

² It is not certain that this examination took place at this time; but the precise date is of little consequence in relation to what we have to say about it.

was found impossible to come to a common understanding on the point. The drafts that were proposed always said either too much or too little, opened the door for making a traffic of sacred things, or shut it on lawful resources. The matter was resumed in a general congregation, but there the members were as little of one mind upon it, and the idea of pronouncing any decision was abandoned. The great majority of priests, it is known, have not thought themselves interdicted from interpreting this silence in the sense of a sanction.

At all events, taking the thing in its general aspect, and apart from the abuses that have mingled with it, we could not have reproached the council with not having forbidden the acceptance of any offering. At an epoch in which the clergy nowhere had any fixed stipend, there were many churches which, without *the casual* (fees), could not have had ministers at all. There, all that could reasonably be required of the priests was, that they should not refuse the sacraments to those who might wish to have them gratis. Even in wealthy churches the acceptance of voluntary offerings had not, in itself, anything contrary to good order, to the spirit of Christianity, to the dignity of religion and its ministers.

The evil, an inevitable evil, is that offerings of this kind soon end in being neither voluntary nor free. Have you a child to present to baptism? You will not, it is true, be made to pay in advance, and, if known to be not in a condition to pay, your child will nevertheless be baptized; but however near you may be to a state of entire and absolute incapability of paying, you will pay; you will, though it should be while murmuring, nay, perhaps, while cursing the priest, and possibly religion too, submit to the miserable tariff, in which all that is most holy in this world is charged for in shillings and pence. Your father, your son, may have died. A good Catholic, you would fain that a mass were said for his soul's repose; but the tariff is there, and money you have none. Well, then, it is very possible that the priest to whom you shall apply, may consent to say for nothing a mass for which you have not wherewithal to pay; but it is very possible also that he may refuse; most of all, it is very possible that you will not venture to ask it of him. Let him refuse it, or let him grant it, it will not the less be received, acknowledged, and universally admitted that in the Roman Church if one wants a mass, he must pay; and the more convinced you shall be of the efficaciousness of masses for the de-

liverance from the flames of purgatory of some soul who is dear to you, the more monstrous will it appear in your eyes that that inequality between poor and rich which already seems so sad and deplorable in this world, should perpetuate itself beyond the tomb.

Such are the natural inconveniences attending this dangerous state of things. But we have thus far supposed the priests to be as accommodating and as charitable as possible, as desirous as all ought to be to lessen by kindly concession the suffering which the natural inequality of conditions may produce. Is it generally so? This is what the most devoted champion of Roman Catholic honour would not dare to affirm. Wherever Roman Catholicism has not been obliged to moderate, under the eye of the Reformation, or of the vigilant superintendence of the press, the shameless dealings with which it has been reproached, how many priests do we see that seem to have the slightest suspicion that there can be the smallest harm, the very least impropriety, in openly making money of everything? In such places, it is true, the people are no more scandalized than the priests are ashamed; but this accordance between the brutishness of the one party, and the greed of the other, this silence on the part of the populace with such abuses before their eyes, this absence of any suspicion that all this is not the due course of things, forms only an additional and a permanent plea against the religion which has so far deprived people and priests alike of the capacity for perceiving the commonest proprieties. In other countries, for the rest, with a little more modesty in respect of forms, the system is ever the same. In France, for example, little as the public are allowed to peep behind the curtain, not a day passes without the discovery of things alike incredible and scandalous. When a French Roman Catholic, on his return from Italy, takes occasion to praise the Catholicism of his own country, as infinitely purer and nobler than that which he has left, you will only have to shew him in France, in the towns as well as in the villages, at Paris as well as in the heart of Brittany and of Provence, the greater number of the things he had been most scandalized with at Rome, at Naples, at Palermo. Yet well does the Roman Church know, and a hundred times has she proved it to her cost, that it is by questions bearing on money that her opponents succeed best in decrying her among the masses. She cannot have forgotten that the sale of indulgences was, not indeed the cause, but certainly the occasion, of

the most terrible blow she has ever received. And yet nothing is changed. Indulgences, masses, dispensations, all continue to be sold, to be negotiated we ought to say, for the spirit of the age has passed over this quarter, and it presents one of the rare instances in which Roman Catholicism keeps pace with the modern march of ideas. Of all the details recently given by the journals on the trade in masses, not one has been contradicted. More than that, the result of these has been to prove that it was not an abuse but a necessity. A priest can say only one mass in the day. As soon as a church has more demands upon it than it can meet, it must, unless it would embezzle the money it has received, contrive that the masses with which it is charged shall be said somewhere. It will content itself, therefore, with deducting a certain per centage, and a mass ordered at Paris shall be said at a hundred, at two hundred leagues' distance, perhaps beyond France altogether. This is one way among others of honestly doing business; but while these details supply excuses for individuals, they not the less cast a bitter reflection on the system. And what shall we say of that *Agency of the Catholic Apostolate*, established at Rome as the commercial go-between for the clergy of all countries in transacting with the Roman chancery? All may have read that famous circular in which commercial forms, oddly accoutred in pious phraseology, reappeared with a curious mysticism.¹ Shall we be told that the pope neither created nor sanctioned that agency? It may be so, but where then did the agency find the tariff annexed to the circular? If it has somewhat enhanced the sums charged, since it must be allowed to reimburse itself for its outlay, it has not changed the nature of the articles.² And if such be the state of matters at the centre, why should it be otherwise at the extremities? Each parish, accordingly, has its chancery, its articles, its tariff; and although it might be shewn that, after

¹ "I have the honour to transmit to you the table of the principal petitions which the Agency undertakes to obtain at Rome. Your zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls inspire me with the confident assurance that you will select such articles as are best fitted for obtaining that end in your parish."

² Plenary indulgence,	10 fr. 80 c. equal to £0 9 0
Right of giving it,	12 ,, 80 ,, ,, 0 10 8
Right to <i>indulgence</i> -chaplets, crosses, &c.,	12 ,, 80 ,, ,, 0 10 8
Right to obtain from an ordinary confessor absolution in cases reserved to the pope,	25 ,, ,, 1 0 0
Dispensation from the celebration of masses with which one has been charged,	27 ,, ,, 1 1 8

Dispensations from the recitation of the breviary, dispensations of all sorts, in marriage affairs, dispensations from vows of virginity, power to read forbidden books, to give dying persons the papal benediction, &c. &c.

all, the average income of Roman Catholic priests is not more than that of Protestant ecclesiastics, we might repeat, that here we have not to do with persons but with principles. The question is not how little or how much this way of making money may at the present day produce. We make bold to assert, in accordance with thousands of Roman Catholics, as well as with a notable part of the council itself, that fiscality played, and has not ceased to play in their Church, a part which is incompatible alike with the true interests of religion and the true dignity of the priesthood.

In congregation general, the sacraments had the same fate with original sin; the members shirked the difficulty of exhibiting what had been so often called, in the course of discussion, *the doctrine of the Church*. They voted the twenty-seven anathemas, (fourteen on the sacraments in general, ten on baptism, and three on confirmation,) and to this they confined themselves. Many bishops began to be seriously uneasy about the reception which this silence on the part of the council, with respect to so many important questions, might provoke in other quarters. Protestants have been much censured for exhibiting their own creed only in attacking that of Roman Catholics. To this reproach, often just, often exaggerated, and which, moreover, applies only to individuals, who shall forbid our opposing the course which, on so many occasions, the council itself pursued? On the sacraments in general, on baptism, on confirmation, we are told what must not be believed; but where are we to find what is to be believed? In the Roman Catechism, no doubt? It is very true, we find no lack of assertions there. We have quoted it for light on certain details; taken as a whole it would not be less curious. "It is certain," it says, "that Jesus Christ instituted baptism." All well! you think, here is what is reasonable and not to be doubted. But wait! something more must be said; that alone would be far too scriptural and too simple. Jesus Christ instituted baptism; but when? You believe that it was when he said to the Apostles,—"*Go, baptize all nations?*" Quite a mistake; it was when, after being himself baptized by St. John, he communicated to the water, by contact with his divine body, the power to sanctify men. "All the world is satisfied of this," adds the French translation. It is unfortunately true that some of the Fathers have taught, or have appeared to teach, this miraculous consecration of water by the baptism of Christ; but if this was anything more than a

figure, if a certain character was really communicated to water in general—who shall explain to us how there should be no profanation or sacrilege in employing it daily for the vilest purposes? What becomes of *this so great and divine virtue*¹ in the water of a brook or a sewer,—that virtue which, as you would have it, has passed from Jordan into all the waters of the universe? One feels ashamed at having anything to do with such miserable questions; but to whom belongs the shame, if not to those who provoke them?

And on what has been said of all Jews, pagans, heretics even, being competent to baptize, “who would not,” says the catechism, “admire the goodness and the wisdom of our God!” Certainly, once make baptism indispensable to salvation, and it would have been a piece of frightful barbarity not to have facilitated the administration of it; but where do we discover that God has granted to baptism greater facilities than to the other sacraments? Shall we say, in the institution of it? No; when the Saviour said, “Go, baptize,” it was to the Apostles that he addressed himself, quite as much as when he instituted the supper. Shall we say, in the writings of the Apostles? But there is not a trace of it there. In the usages of the primitive Church? No more shall we find it there. If, at that epoch, there were facilities, it was much rather for the supper, which we see generally celebrated under the form of a repast, while baptism remained a ceremony, and a ceremony, we have said, occurring but twice a year. Thus, in all this, there is no divine order but the ingenuity of the Church, no concessions but those which were indispensable to the Church’s being able to teach, since she had made it a tenet, the absolute necessity of baptism.

And now, leaving doctrines, let us proceed to decrees of reformation.

The question of the plurality of benefices was of immense extent; immense from the number of cases which it embraced, and still more from the number of difficulties which it started. To elude it was impossible. If a man have two bishoprics, it is evident that, with the best intentions, he must always be out of one of them. As for the inferior benefices, the same man had often four or five, sometimes ten or twelve, sometimes twenty. There had been cases of cardinals having thirty. Leo X., on

¹ Tanta et tam divina virtus a Domino aquis tributa.

his coming to the popedom, had *twenty-eight*, and those of the richest.

Sad as this state of things must have been, the abuse had not been carried so far in all cases as one might think. Many benefices being too poor for a priest to live by them, the holding of more than one became, in many instances, positively necessitated by the inadequacy of the revenues; but this inadequacy of revenue, people soon became habituated to estimate much less by the legitimate wants of the titular than by the exigencies of his rank in the world or in the Church. The son of a nobleman would have thought it beneath his dignity not to have more than one. In default of nobility, the very possession of one important benefice gave a man a pretext for possessing others, in order that he might with the better grace support the first. Almost all the bishops held abbacies, let us add, and we shall then have noted beforehand the feeble efficacy of the regulations which were to be made, let us add, we say, that they continued to have as many and more of them than ever. One day, a century and a half after the time of the council, a French bishop, in the course of conversation, happened to inveigh against pluralities. This caused no small astonishment, and naturally enough. The man who spoke was abbot of St. Lucien, prior of Gassicourt and of Plessis-Grimaux. He then began to explain how, looking at the expenses he had to meet, he thought himself authorized to infringe the rules he preached. And yet that bishop was Bossuet. The liberty he allowed himself from motives which we may believe to have been justifiable, might be taken by others quite as well, although with less to justify them. When Fénélon, on his being appointed Archbishop of Cambrai, resigned the only abbacy he had, that of St. Valery, "You are ruining us," said the Archbishop of Rheims, who had a dozen at least. "Let each do as his conscience bids him," said Fénélon in reply. "Well, then," rejoined Le Tellier, "my conscience ordains me to keep what I have." Hear, too, John Carrero, relating to the Senate of Venice in 1569, five years after the close of the council, what he had seen in France, whence he had just returned: "Things," said he, "are come to that pass, that people trade openly in bishoprics and abbacies, as they would do in pepper and cinnamon. It is seldom that the collation of a benefice does not bring much money to the man who gives notice of it, to the man who obtains it, and to the broker who takes it up as a job. In most instances they are given away before they are vacant. Thus,

in my time, some one found it difficult to convince people that he was not dead.”¹ And a Roman Catholic writer,² after having adduced this passage, adds, “There was a little more modesty at Rome, but, at bottom, things went on in no other way.”

Originally, care was taken to unite in the same hands what were called *compatible* benefices only, that is to say, without the cure of souls and without any obligation to residence. But for a long time all distinction had been effaced. The plurality of *incompatibles* had only to be paid for at a somewhat higher rate.

Often, by a curious subterfuge, people contrived to have the union of two benefices pronounced at Rome, and the beneficiary was then considered to have only one. The pope ordinarily required that these benefices should be adjacent to each other, but distance was not an absolute hinderance. Such or such a benefice lay half in France, half in Italy, or in Germany. On the death of the beneficiary the union ceased, but might be renewed by a fresh act of the will of the pope.

Let us recall, finally, the commendams, the most fertile of all those sources of abuse. Amid the disorders of the middle ages, it often happened that a benefice, in danger of perishing by usurpation or pillage, was remitted, recommended (*commendatum*) either to a lord or to some other person in a condition to protect it. This kind of tutelage was given at first only for a time, and until the election of a titular; but as the commendatory, meanwhile, drew the revenues, a taste was acquired for the office. The popes, on their side, had discovered it to be an excellent means of adding to the number of their creatures; the commendatory, besides, was always willing to purchase the indefinite prolongation of his right with a portion of the revenues. Commendams, accordingly, came to be granted for life; new ones were erected every day, and it was long since any anxiety had been felt about justifying them on the plea of their being necessary for the protection of the benefice. “Were an Indian to come among us,” says Montesquieu,³ “it would take six months before he could be made to comprehend what a commendatory abbé is, as he paces the pavements of Paris.” Those abbés, in fact, were not priests; they were only what was called *in orders*; they could go out of these and marry, on condition of relinquishing their commendams;

¹ Thus Leo X., when at the age of seven, was nominated by the King of France to the archbishopric of Aix, and while the papal confirmation was in course of being got, word came that the titular was still alive.

² The Abbé Prompsault.

³ See his *Pensées diverses*.

still there were ways and means of escaping from this condition. It was thus that, under Lewis XIII., the Count de Soissons had accumulated several abbacies on the head of a poor abbé from Poitou, his preceptor, to whom he gave a thousand crowns a year, while he took from him a hundred thousand. Even bishoprics had been sometimes put in commendam, in the hands of laymen, by means of their having a coadjutor *ad sacra*, that is to say, charged with the ecclesiastical functions of the bishopric. In short, the most fertile imagination could not invent anything, in point of abuses of this sort, which had not existed somewhere, and often everywhere. Sovereigns, we are aware, had much to do with these disorders. Shall we hold this to be an excuse? We have seen that "There was a little more modesty at Rome, but, at bottom, things went on in the same way." The most respectful objection had always met with a worse reception than the most exorbitant demands, always flattering as these were, in one sense, to him in whom the right of granting them was acknowledged to reside. In fine, if the abuse of the commendams was a little less excessive in Italy than in other countries, that of pensions secured on benefices was pushed farther there than anywhere else. A century after the council, in 1663, we find De Angelis, bishop of Urbino, complaining that his rich see, after deducting the pensions charged upon it, only brought him sixty crowns. About the same period we see the bishoprics of Ancona and Pesaro vacant for several years, none being found willing to occupy them under the burdensome conditions that were required. In 1667, there were at Naples twenty bishops or archbishops who had preferred quitting their sees to ruining themselves by paying the pensions with which they were burdened. It was the same thing with parish livings. The owner of the richest of them had sometimes hardly wherewithal to live. Down to the country livings there was hardly one the petty casual income of which was not burdened with obligations of this sort. Such was the state of the clergy in Italy under the eyes of the pope.

Never had the plurality of benefices, under all its forms, been more severely stigmatized than it was now in full council; and all that was said on the subject was so true, so incontestable, that there was nothing to say in reply. The legates allowed the torrent to pass; aware that every objection would only serve to provoke details that would become always more and more precise. Already, not a word could be said that was not an allusion

to facts generally known, and which did not call up proper names on all lips.

But there was one name which none durst pronounce, and which yet was only all the more clearly to be read alike in the quailing looks of some, and in the delight shewn by others—it was that of the pope. Of three cases marked out for the animadversion of the assembly, there were always at least two in which he was an interested party, and really the only interested party. From whom had those countless dispensations been bought which subverted everything? From the pope. Who had erected those scandalous commendams? The pope. Who had granted those benefices without end, enjoyed by Cardinal Ridolfi, who was unceasingly adduced as the very type of prelates born to snatch up everything and do nothing? The pope. One could not thump the shoulders of such delinquents without the pope's shoulders feeling the whole weight of the blow.

But as there had been an affectation of criticising particularly the abuses that prevailed among the cardinals and his holiness's officers, the legates cleverly availed themselves of this fact, to obtain from the assembly an order to write to him about these. He alone, said the Italians, is fit to reform his own court. This was true; men of the best intentions felt only too sensibly that nothing could be done without him. After having discoursed at great length on the evil, a round of consultation had been made as to the remedies that should be determined upon, and the severest canonists had been unable to suggest anything that had not been oft-times decreed by other councils, nay, by popes themselves, without its having ever resulted in any true and lasting amelioration. What made the question still more complicated was, that there were several points which none could dream of regulating by precise laws, many outlets which it was impossible to close effectually. However scandalous the abuses of dispensations might have been, it would have been unreasonable to deprive the pope absolutely of the right of granting them, after assuming that he had the power; whatever evil might arise from the plurality of benefices, still there were cases in which it was natural and necessary; so that it could not but remain permitted. But on what conditions? There was nothing to forbid the fixing of a certain number. But who should be the person to judge of these? The pope, ever the pope. If, then, they were to accept the proposal of remitting the affair to him, it was quite as much from their own embarrassment as from deference to him. Next,

to put a stop to murmuring, the legates affirmed that Paul would confine himself to the reformation of his own court, and would leave the rest to the deliberations of the assembly.

There is no need to shew that this distinction was illusory. "Could we make a single regulation," said those who ventured to speak freely, "in which some of the officers of the pope would not be found interested? There is nothing for it, then, but either to be for ever falling back and keeping quiet, or asking the pope's permission to go on." This became still more evident on the arrival of the brief by which he authorized the assembly to regulate certain points relative to benefices, and, in particular, to restrain unions. The legates durst not even give official information of it. The authorization assumed far too plainly inferiority, dependence, and the boldest felt, nevertheless, that in things of this kind the council could not regulate matters alone. This twitching sense of the indignity done to the council may be perceived in all those articles of the decree that emanated from those deliberations.

But it had first to pass through many modifications. Discussion tending only at first to augment uncertainty and embarrassment, some bishops asked whether it would not be better for each to produce his own plan. They should thus have at least some clear ideas before them, and would know what they had to discuss. "As for themselves," they said, "they were about to set about doing this." Now, there were twenty of them, and those of the least timid, some devoted to the emperor, others, and this was still more disquieting, determined to quail before no difficulty in having done with a state of things which they looked upon as deadly to religion and the Church. Great, therefore, was the anxiety of the legates.

Those bishops kept their word. After several meetings had been held, Cardinal Pacheco, their president, presented a memorial, in which they craved:—

Before all, and as the first foundation of all true reformation in these matters, that residence be declared of divine right;

That those cardinals who had several bishoprics should immediately be compelled to make their option, and to keep only one;

That all the dispensations should be revoked where the necessity for them should not be sufficiently demonstrated;

That the union of offices should be abolished;

That pluralities should be confined to cases of evident necessity;

And other analogous measures. In all, there were eleven

articles, forming the ground-work of a complete code on the subject.

It was an admirably well concocted plan; but it was clear that unless the council meant to declare itself above the pope, it could not pretend to decree all this. And yet the legates were so much afraid of any direct discussion on the respective authority of the two powers, that they dared not attack, nor prompt others to attack the document as tending to weaken that of the pope. What especially alarmed them was, not so much the boldness of the articles, as the fact itself of meetings held without their cognizance, and beyond the reach of their influence. Twenty bishops! Ten or twelve more and they would be the majority.

The legates hastened, therefore, to send off the memorial to Rome. The pope would no more venture than they to reject it as invasive of his rights. Most of its authors were Spaniards; there was an impression that Charles V. was at their back. The pope appointed a commission, and, contrary to the advice previously given by Del Monte, that commission recommended concessions on some points; it being clearly understood that there should be nothing yielded on principles, and that means should be reserved for retaining with one hand what might be yielded by the other. Each of the eleven demands was the object, therefore, of a reply more or less favourable, more or less evasive; still the pope did not deem it fit to cause the work of the commission to be communicated to the assembly. He sent it to the legates, instructing them to use their discretion in yielding nothing if they could possibly avoid it, or in conceding, within those limits, what it might seem to them impossible to refuse. It is but doing justice to Paul III. to admit, that amid all his efforts for the maintenance of his privileges, he viewed them, in theory, with far more reason and coolness than other popes have done. He defended them as acquired rights, rather than as rights inherent in the popedom. A man of a practical mind, he had little taste for the doating sophisms with which others had attempted to stay up papal omnipotence. If he committed faults, he did not at least insist on people giving them the stamp of divinity; if he made little use of the lessons of reason, at least he made no shew of setting it at defiance and believing himself above it. It was to him that Contarini ventured to say in an epistle, "Christ's law is a law of liberty. It forbids that gross servitude which the Lutherans have justly compared to the Babylonish captivity."

He had given permission, accordingly, for some concessions being made. Cervini, the second legate, wished to avail himself of that permission; Del Monte, more candid, or more able, opposed this. Provided that the votings were, in the end, such as he should desire, he treated it as of little consequence that an imposing minority should acquire shape and consistence in the debates. Was he already thinking of the tiara? We know not; but he said to himself, no doubt, that the council would come to an end while the popedom would not come to an end; that the rubs and annoyances therefore would be of short duration, while the advantages would be permanent. At all events the sequel shewed that he had struck on the right path. Such as we see him when cardinal at Trent, the same we shall find him when pope at Rome.

The Spaniards had already protested against the transmission of their memorial to the pope. In fact, to put the question to himself on what matters he would permit them to vote, was to enter into the spirit of his last bull, and to condemn themselves never to pronounce on a single point beyond what it might be his good pleasure to leave to the decision of the assembly. Fresh protests met with no better success, and when the decree came to be drawn up, the Spaniards were beaten at all points. The legates had brought a plan conceived after their own fashion, and with which at first it seemed impossible that all should not be satisfied. A host of abuses were noticed in it, and among these, several that the Spaniards themselves had not specifically mentioned. But, at bottom, there were hardly any that were seriously proscribed; and, indeed, strictly speaking, none were proscribed. The preamble of the decree bore these words, "saving always in all things the authority of the apostolic see;"¹ and as it was not declared that the holy see had ever exceeded its rights, this was as much as to say, that its power, for the future, would be absolutely the same as during the past. There was some courage in having thus plainly avowed that the pope meant to remain master; it was really throwing down the gauntlet to the council and to the Church. A Spanish doctor went so far as to apply the epithet diabolical to the opinion that residence was a matter of papal right. Several begged that the clause *salvâ semper* might be removed; many also complained that the canons drawn up by the legates, frequently referred to the pontifical

¹ *Salvâ semper in omnibus sedis apostolicæ auctoritate.*

decrees, which were placed, by this fact, on the same footing with those of the council, and even above them; for they seemed less to confirm them than to seek to be confirmed by them. Care had been taken, in truth, to put this honour only on popes that were even then of ancient date; but, in point of legal principle, of what consequence was antiquity? They were popes; it was the pope. And, moreover, among the decrees quoted in those of the council, there was not one in which the superiority of the pope, if not taught, was not at least constantly assumed. Thus, in the question of benefices, reference was made to a constitution of Innocent III., where the plurality of benefices is forbidden, it is true, but always saving those cases in which it shall have been permitted by the pope. To condemn the abuse they did only what confirmed the right. As for the *salvâ semper* of the preamble, not only was it allowed to remain, but it re-occurs, under all forms, in the greater number of the articles.

This decree has fifteen. Had we to prove in detail the correctness of the preceding observations, we should take the sixth, being that which treats of the unions of benefices. It has been seen that of all the abuses that were attacked, this, if not the most deplorable, was often the most strange. The pope had noted it in his bull as one of those which he allowed the council to discuss. Hence, it appeared at once that it was less as members of a council, than as councillors of the pope, that the prelates had to pronounce on this point. Did they proceed at least to make a liberal use of the permission? But they could decide nothing for the future which would not go to bind the hands of the pope, and it is clear that this was not what he meant to permit them to do. They proceeded, then, to the more limited task of repairing the past; but here, again, they behaved, in applying a remedy to an evil, not to appear as if the pope were its author. The bishop, accordingly, not as bishop, but as the pope's delegate, might demand an inspection of the titles of all the unions dating within the last bygone forty years. Those which should have been fraudulently obtained, he should declare to be null and void; those which did not appear to be justified by sufficient reasons, he should declare to have been fraudulently obtained, and nullity was to follow. Thus the bishop has no part in the proceedings at all; it is a delegate of the pope, who in the name of the pope, verifies an act that emanates from the pope. Is that act of the nature of an abuse; is it bad? The pope then is not supposed to have anything to do with it; but this does not pre-

vent its being competent for him, in spite of the judgment pronounced by the bishop, and without his ceasing to pass for nothing in all that is bad and improper in the act, to renew and to uphold it. "The union shall be null," says the decree, "*unless the pope shall judge otherwise.*"¹ Thus he remained in everything, and everywhere supreme. And not only could he reverse all that might be done by the bishops, but one might foresee that the bishops would care little to commence the struggle and set themselves up as judges of the sovereign judge.

Accordingly, although the prospect of this verification by the bishops may from time to time have inspired more or less shyness and caution, there is hardly one of those abuses which, as we have already said, may not be found re-occurring long after the council had had its day; that is to say, if they have disappeared at last, we can hardly give the credit of this either to the assembly that condemned them, or to the bishops who were charged with the duty of prosecuting them, or to the supreme authority which remained the principal source of them. We have already seen what residence practically was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. All those abbés who were so famed under Lewis XV. for their wit, their gallantry, and often, too, for their infidel opinions, held abbacies *in commendam*. Cardinal Mazarin held forty abbacies. The infamous Cardinal Dubois had, in addition to the archbishopric of Cambrai, within which he never set a foot, above a million and a half (of francs) in revenues drawn from various benefices. The last abbé of St. Denis was a bastard of Louis XIV.; he was three years old when his father conferred that dignity on him. Down to the close of the last century, we everywhere see prelates devouring what might have sufficed for the support of two or three hundred priests; everywhere we see, at the same time, priests, parish priests, living in the deepest distress; almost everywhere also, in contempt of another canon, we see sacred buildings, monuments of the piety of the fathers, falling into ruins in the hands of their children. Many cathedrals suffered less from jacobin vandalism than from the long continued neglect of their bishops. "This is mine, or it is the Church's," Henri IV. would say when he saw a building in a dilapidated state. Bishops, abbés, beneficiaries of all kinds, thought of nothing but making money. Exceptions there were, no doubt, but how many? The general mass were all infected with this vice; all seemed to say with Louis XV.,

¹ Nisi aliter a sede apostolica declaratum fuerit.

“This will last out my time at least.” The Revolution came. It rendered the same service to the Church that it did to the states which it entered. It made a clean sweep of abuses; it took from Roman Catholicism the possessions that impaired her respectability, and were destroying her. It compelled her to reconstitute herself, at least partially, on bases more in harmony with the new ideas and the ancient wishes of the populations around her. There is but one country in which as yet nothing is changed, and that country is Rome. “Mastai, what doest thou?” was lately inscribed on one of the walls of the palace of Pius IX., “Wait, and you shall see,” was the reply. We are now waiting, and all the good that Pius IX. shall do we shall applaud; but our remarks will not the less for that hold good. Although we should cease to see, side by side with the abuses which he can destroy, other abuses to destroy which would be for the popedom an act of suicide; although the Roman government should become, in a few years, the best government in Europe,—what is certain is, that it is not six months since it was the very worst. The plans of the new pope having loosed many tongues, hitherto condemned either to praise or to be silent, there is no lack of revelations; the abyss is shewn to be deeper than the greatest enemies of the popes even thought it had been, or said that it had been. People praise the present; magnificent pictures are presented of the future; it seems not to be perceived that this is to condemn the past. Are not the eulogies now heaped on Pius IX. a satire on all that has been done hitherto by others down to his time? What is, after all, the love with which the Romans surround him, if not the hatred with which his predecessor had inspired them? Where, consequently, could you find, six months ago, those replies which will not fail to be made, from henceforth, when we shall say that Roman Catholicism has lagged behind all the ideas, all the improvements of the age? No, no! Resistance to all reforms has been too long, too obstinate, to permit the popedom, whatever should happen, to have one day the right to vaunt of the small measure of reform that it has done or suffered. If Pius IX. shall keep his promises, we shall give the credit of it to Pius IX. the man, but never to the popedom.

The seventh session (3d March, 1547) went off better than had been expected. The doctrinal canons had passed unanimously; the others had been contested by only thirteen bishops,

several of the opposing members having accepted the assurance that there would be a return to those subjects, and that the making of more efficacious regulations would be seen to.

Meanwhile, Paul III. began to be tired of the sleepless nights that the council cost him. It was long since he had been wearying to get rid of a tribunal where such bold truths might be uttered with impunity. The very decrees, although the work of his ministers, nevertheless, were always saying what was still too much. Thus, in the last, notwithstanding the precautions that had been taken to avoid censure, and to prescribe nothing, the decree as a whole was not the less a censure on the past and a formal vow for the future. Those unions which, in respect of the scandalous nullity of the motives alleged in their favour, were about to pass for having been obtained by fraud, the pope well knew he himself had oft-times granted, knowingly, wilfully, without having been in the least taken at unawares or deceived. The more, therefore, there was the affectation of his being supposed incapable of doing such things, the more plainly were they declared to be heinous offences, and he himself interdicted from relapsing into them. And what was to be made of that canon, the first of the decree, where it was said that no man should be a bishop who was not born in lawful wedlock? More fortunate than his predecessor, Paul III. could name his father; but he who ought not to have been a father, had children; and those children he had created cardinals!

In fine, notwithstanding the devotedness and the ability of his legates, he could see that the assembly might, in a moment, escape their grasp, and that the least step taken out of the course traced out for it, would infallibly be followed by many more. Any moment, too, the emperor might end in placing himself at the head of the pope's opponents. Was it not to him that even already the kind of insurrection on the part of the Spanish prelates was attributed? Had he not himself said to the nuncio, at the time of the departure of the pontifical troops, that he had no greater enemy than the pope? Had he not openly imputed to the pope's son, the Duke of Parma, the sedition that had nearly cost him Genoa? And one may be allowed to suppose that Paul III., pre-occupied as he might be with the political side of all the questions then agitated, had not remained insensible to the untowardness of theological quarrels, and to the danger of exposing to the public gaze so many divisions that had hitherto remained hid within the bowels of the Roman unity.

The memorial of the Spanish bishops had filled up the measure. There was now an absolute necessity to have done with such risks, but neither the pope nor his councillors knew how to set about it. They durst not dream either of closing the council, seeing so much still remained for it to do, or of suspending it, since it would have been impossible to say why, and ere long there would be a cry for the suspension being taken off. There remained a third course to follow, and that was to transfer the assembly to some locality where the pope would be its master; yet it did not well appear how, unless he were to employ actual force, he could be more its master, wherever else it might meet, than at Trent. In any event a pretext was necessary; and seeing they had remained at Trent, at the very height of the agitation caused by the war, how could they excuse their quitting it, when the emperor was quite in a condition to provide for the security of the city? Thus the pope could do no more than simply recommend his legates to hold themselves ready to seize the slightest occasion that might occur. They behoved, for the rest, to beware of alleging that they had the pope's orders, but were to act, as if at their own instance, in virtue of the bull which they had received two years before. The sequel shewed that it was not without having an object that he had ordered them to act in virtue of general powers, now somewhat old in date. Thus he reserved to himself the means not only of appearing a stranger to the translation, but of disavowing it, in case the scheme should not have the majority in its favour, or should raise too many storms in other quarters after being voted by the assembly. He was sure, besides, that the legates would not hesitate either to take upon themselves the whole responsibility, or to submit, if necessary, to a public disavowal. Was not his cause that of all the cardinals? And of what consequence was it that a legate should compromise himself in the eyes of all Europe, provided he thereby saved or strengthened that ancient throne on which he might hope to sit one day himself? But here devotedness was not enough. All the questions that people had put to themselves at Rome, without seeing what answer could be given, were found again, at Trent, as insoluble as ever. To gain all the voices underhand, supposing even that that had been possible, would have availed nothing; there behoved to be some reason, good or bad, put forward in the decree of translation.

The session, accordingly, was held on the 3d of March. One

day, two days passed. The members began to talk over the matters to be treated of at the next, fixed for the 21st of April. Should it not be the Eucharist? The legates hesitated; the little ardour they shewed in organizing the debates contrasted strangely with the importance of the subject. They seemed to be absorbed with some grand problem; and so, in fact, they were. They consulted their confidential friends. Still nothing, absolutely nothing, turned up. At last a bishop happened to die. Magnificent obsequies were ordered on the occasion. The legates were present, and all the council along with them; it was at least another day gained. All at once it was recollected that two or three other persons had died that same week, and that several were seriously ill. A light seemed to flash upon their minds. The problem was resolved; the pretext was found at last. The Plague was at Trent; there was nothing for it but to leave as speedily as possible.

“Was it not,” says Father Paul, “merely an artifice of the legates?” This question has given rise to keen controversy. One party, perhaps, has yielded too much to the pleasure derived from relating a scene worthy of a comedy; the other, perhaps, ought to have abandoned the idea of representing the legates as having followed, instead of having given the impulsion. That a disease prevailed is incontestable. But whether the legates seriously believed that it was pestilential, and that, as such, it was dangerous, is what we shall never know. At all events, if we have no proof that they were not sincere, we consider that neither have we enough of proof on the other side justly to banish all suspicion of insincerity. After all, of what consequence is it? It was at the worst no great crime to take advantage of a risk which came so miraculously to their aid; the essential and the truly characteristic fact is the order that they had received to do all that was in their power to get the council transferred to another place. Now, this fact is admitted by Pallavicini. “It appeared to them,”¹ he says, “that they would never have a better opportunity of transferring the council, a measure which they thought of great consequence to the security of the Church. They resolved to avail themselves of previous orders, *orders quite recent and reiterated*. These orders prescribed to them to proceed to the translation, if the majority should consent to it, and should they themselves reckon that the Holy See was threatened with some serious mischief.”

¹ Book ix. chap. xiii.

They made great haste, therefore, too much haste, perhaps, not to make their eagerness, if not suspected, at least suspicious; but however small the delay, was there not a risk of all being lost? The sick might recover, as, in fact, they almost all did; the public panic, after having been increasing for about a week, might subside. It did not seem good, therefore, to go after the 9th of March, six days after the session. It was when uneasy feelings were at their greatest height, several prelates, wrongfully accused, perhaps, of collusion with them, but who, nevertheless, were afterwards among their friends, had set off in all haste. The legates had caused an inquest to be held on the sanitary condition of the city. The result was the certification of a dangerous disease being present; but the report had been drawn up by two physicians, both of whom were devoted to the pope,¹ and those belonging to the city had refused to sign it. They pursued their purpose. Just as they had decided, in theological questions, so many points that were manifestly uncertain, they now pronounced, and that too in the strongest terms,² that it was dangerous to remain any longer in Trent. Then it was that the legates made known the bull, kept two years secret, authorizing them to transfer the council to another place, and the assembly adjourned to the following day, when they were to fix what that place should be.

It was not without difficulty that that vote had been obtained. The imperialists had said that they were not to be duped; and though there might have been some of them, as is likely, who did not at bottom feel very comfortable, the dread of the emperor prevailed far more with them than that of the plague. "Let us wait at least a few days longer, they had said. Let us allow the most timid, if necessary, to go to Verona or to Venice. If the disease disappears, they will return; if it shall continue, we can act accordingly; but let it not be said that we fled at the first shadow of danger." Why did they speak of a shadow? Nothing was more real, in the eyes of the legates and of the pope, than the danger with which they had menaced themselves with their terrible articles.

Meanwhile the panic was increasing. Word came that the towns in the neighbourhood, in serious alarm, already talked of shutting their gates on everything coming from Trent, and the decision that they had taken, by accrediting the rumours that

¹ Jerome Frascator, physician to the council, and Balduino Balduini, physician to the premier legate.

² De hujusmodi morbo ita manifeste et notarie constat, ut prelati in hac civitate sine vitæ discrimine commorari, et in ea idcirco minime retineri possint et debeant.

were afloat, risked the immediate declaration of such a measure. On the day following, the imperialists were no less opposed, the others no less docile. The legates remarked that they could not pass into the territories of any prince without having first asked and obtained his permission; that thus, looking to the urgency of the case, the place for resuming their sittings must be selected from the Papal States. That place had been already chosen. It was Bologna. All the prelates that had voted for the translation voted for that city. Finally, on the 11th of March, a public session was held. The decree of translation was read. Thirty-eight prelates approved, and fourteen protested.

The legates left Trent on the 12th, and were followed by all that remained of the papal party. The rest refused to leave. And yet it was said in the bull of 1545 that on the translation being once decided on by the legates all the prelates should be bound to follow them, and that "even under ecclesiastical censures and penalties," even "under the pains of perjury," even, in fine, "under pain of incurring God's indignation, and that of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul."¹ What then was thought of these menaces by those who persisted in remaining? The majority had pronounced the decision; the legates acted in virtue of powers regularly exercised. The decision may have been a bad one, but it was perfectly legal. What right then had fourteen bishops to pretend to exemption from it? Did they not, by acting thus with respect to one of the decisions of the assembly, virtually give their sanction to others doing the like by whatever did not meet their views? And yet it is not unlikely that, once returned to their dioceses, those same bishops made no more scruple than others in commanding obedience in the name of that very pope whom they had braved, and of that very council which they had mocked. Thus it is, thus has it ever been with the Church of Rome. The most refractory doctor as respects the Church, the most refractory bishop as respects the pope, the most refractory parish priest as respects his bishop, all of them, no sooner than the power of reigning is in question, contrive to speak of their superiors as they would speak, and, perhaps, as they would not speak of God himself.

¹ Sub censuris et pœnis ecclesiasticis. Sub perjurii pœnis. Indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus.

BOOK THIRD.

Two councils instead of one—The pope says nothing—All is brought to a halt—Victories of Charles V.—Paul III. allies himself with France—*Old dotard*—Protestation—What Rome has read at all times in the hearts of her friends—Fresh protests—New mask—Mutual affronts—Thunder and finesse—Fourteen months already lost—The pope's death universally expected and desired—The *Interim*—Criticisms—Resistances—Conferences resumed—Nuncios sent into Germany—Their powers—Checks and affronts.

Death of Paul III.—Glance at his life—The conclaves—Historical Review—Tedious delays—Sad heroism—Factions—Combinations—Julius III.—All difficulties return—They seem to grow easy—Fresh ones appear—The pope eludes them—Second convocation of the council—The bull is keenly criticised—How interpreted by Charles V.—The council opened anew with fifteen bishops—Was it still-born—Political occurrences—Rupture with France—Gallican inconsistencies—How redeemed by Henry II.—New causes of distrust—Will the Protestants come—John Huss—Adjournments—Amyot—Parliamentary audacities.

The communion under both kinds—State of the question in the sixteenth century—Discussion—Authorities—Trent and Constance—*Drink ye all of it*—Sophisms—True motives—A safe conduct granted.

Transubstantiation—Production and adduction—Reciprocal objections—Did Luther believe in transubstantiation—Physical objections—Miracle upon miracle—Are all things possible with God—Axioms—Is transubstantiation a miracle like any other—*This is my body*—Scriptural objections—Analysis of the narrative—Historical objections—The Apostles and the New Testament—The Fathers—The idea advances but slowly—Admissions—The Mass—The priest—Indiscreet questions—Theory and practice—Adoration of the host—Jesus Christ *whole and entire*—What purpose does transubstantiation really serve—Ignoble questions—Dilemma—Superstitions—Idolatry.

Episcopal jurisdiction—Origin—Objections—Historical review—How the pope became its centre—The council avoids going back to principles—Concessions.

Thirteenth session—Complaints against the divines—Regulations on that head—The sacrament of penance—The confession—Scriptural objections—Falsifications and sophisms—Let every man *examine himself*—*To loose* is the most miraculous and the most divine of powers—The more it is alleged to be necessary, the more is it objectionable—Have the Protestants renounced what is reasonable and good in confession—What the Church ordains at present is not what was recommended in primitive times—The council shuts its eyes and pursues its own course—Other difficulties—In what manner is penance a sacrament—What proves too much proves nothing—Was the right to bind and loose given to the priests alone—Reserved cases—A conclusion drawn in passing—What there is most false and most dangerous in confession—Good results, the value of which, however, must not be exaggerated—Peoples—Kings—Phrases and facts—Absolution—Absolute or conditional—Logically it can only be absolute—Questions addressed to a good woman—Deplorable results, to which everything concurs—Inconveniences in detail—The *Compendium*—Admissions—Conclusion.

Extreme unction—One Apostle only speaks of it—Scriptural discussion—Contradiction—Difficulties arising out of the only passage that can be adduced in favour of this sacrament—*Ullers and priests*—Formula in common use—Reiteration—Extreme unction of little use, and often dangerous.

Fresh discussions on episcopal jurisdiction—Numerous abuses—Insufficient corrections—Dispensations more rare but more dear—Fourteenth Session—The affair of the safe conduct taken up again—Reception of the Protestant ambassadors—Fifteenth Session—Prorogation

—The situation again becomes menacing—Fears and precautions of the pope—Arrival of some Protestant doctors—All ceases and dies—War bursts out in Germany—The emperor takes to flight—Suspension for two years—Involuntary Gallicanism—Peace of Passau and abolition of the Interim—The council no more talked of—Rome thinks she has got rid of it.

AND NOW, behold, we have two councils instead of one. The bishops that remained at Trent did not go so far as to say that they were authorized to continue the deliberations by themselves alone; but not the less did they persist in considering themselves as the true council, momentarily suspended for want of a sufficient number of members present. Those at Bologna, with better reason, considered themselves as the lawful council; but no more durst they on that account do anything, well knowing that there could be no means of publishing their decisions as the decrees of a general council. A curious correspondence commenced between the rival assemblies. The Bologna fathers intituled themselves plainly, *the Holy Council of Bologna*, (*Sancta Synodus Bononiensis*;) the Tridentine fathers durst not call themselves Council of Trent: they were *the Holy Council*, *in whatever place it may be, (in quocunque sit loco.)*

Strange to say, and it clearly shews how false the position of both parties was, they did not anathematize one another. The divines of both wrote letters upon letters, issued memorials and counter-memorials, absolutely as if it were some philosophical or theological dispute that had to be brought to an issue between two universities. Neither party seemed to have the least idea that there existed a judge.

It was because the judge was still more embarrassed than the parties were, and that all were interested in not pressing him to decide, the one that they might not force him to compromise himself, the other, that they might not force him to condemn them, in which case, unless they were prepared to make a schism, they would certainly have had rather to obey him than the emperor. In point of law, however, he had no need to sanction the translation in order to its being and remaining legal; it was enough that he did not condemn it. But he was well aware that Europe expected more than this: from the moment that there is an appeal from the decision of ministers, the sovereign is morally bound to pronounce. The pope was so much the more under this obligation, as his bull of 1545 made no mention of any consent to be obtained from the assembly; had the majority voted against the translation, the legates, in virtue of that bull, might still have commanded it. "Of our own move-

ment," the pope had said, "of our certain knowledge, and in virtue of the plenitude of the apostolical authority, we give you a full and free power and faculty to transfer the council."¹ Thus the translation had been, in itself, an act of the papal authority; how then could they shelter themselves logically behind the vote of the assembly, seeing that, according to the bull, that had been no more than a mere formality which might have been dispensed with? On the other hand, the bishops who remained at Trent kept their health desperately well; all dread of the plague had disappeared; and as that had been the sole reason alleged for quitting that city, there was no longer any for not returning to it.

The eighth session (which had become the ninth, on account of the *pro re natâ* session of the 11th of March) took place on the day that had been fixed, (21st April,) in one of the churches of Bologna, but with only thirty-four bishops. No decree had been prepared. They confined themselves to confirming that of 11th March, by declaring that the translation had been voted for reasons "*then* instant, urgent, and legitimate,"² and to fixing the following session for the 2d of June.

On the 2d of June another session met, but only to be adjourned to the 15th of September. It was wished, said the decree, "to shew farther indulgence to those who had not come."³ Moreover, nothing was ready. There had been held, indeed, in the interval, some congregations as sequels to those that had been held at Trent, but without any voting. The Eucharist was the subject that had been treated of in these. What a medley! How oddly does the Eucharist figure in this labyrinth of intrigues and deceptions!

The 15th of September, in fine, was doomed to be no more auspicious than the 2d of June. News arrived of the tragical death of the Duke of Placentia, son of the pope. Universally despised for his debaucheries, and hated for his cruelty, he had been murdered in his own palace; his body, dragged through the streets, had been subjected to the most disgraceful outrages. Nor was this all. A few hours after the murder, the governor of Milan had entered the city with troops, and had taken possession of it in the name of the emperor. In such circumstances,

¹ "Motu proprio et ex certa scientia ac de apostolice potestatis plenitudine, transferendi concilii plenam et liberam concedimus potestatem et facultatem."

² Ex causis *tunc* instantibus, urgentibus, et legitimis.

³ Volens tamen cum iis qui non venerunt etiam adhuc benigne agere.

how could a session be held? Besides, as on the 2d of June, nothing was ready, a fact that manifestly contradicts Pallavicini's assertion, that the meetings had been frequent and active, it was more and more evident that the members did not yet feel themselves to be in a condition to vote anything. It was not even thought seasonable to have a public meeting of the members, or to fix a new period. The legates caused an indefinite adjournment to be pronounced.

The occupation of Placentia by the imperial troops was connected with occurrences, for a short summary of which this is the proper place.

The army of the emperor and that of the elector of Saxony had met on the 24th of April. The elector had been defeated and taken prisoner; Charles V. had sentenced him to death as a rebel, but afterwards spared his life. The electorate had passed to his cousin Maurice, a Lutheran, as we have already said; which did not prevent the assembly at Bologna from paying its court to the emperor, and trying to mollify him on the subject of the translation, by chanting a *Te Deum* in honour of his victory. The landgrave of Hesse had submitted. He had been left under the impression that he had only to humble himself in order to obtain forgiveness, and had been retained as a prisoner. Charles V. now became absolute master of Germany.

Paul III., therefore, had more reason than ever to fear him, and to fortify himself against him;¹ all the more as Francis I., the only man in a condition to counterbalance his influence in Europe, had died. But his successor, Henry II., shewed a disposition to follow in his father's footsteps. He gave a favourable reception to all the overtures sent to him by the pope; he promised to give his natural daughter, Diana, then nine years old, in marriage to the pope's grandson Horace Farnese; in fine, he recognised the council of Bologna, and promised to send bishops there. The pope on his side was never more accommodating. On various points bearing upon the collation of benefices, he granted the king several things contrary to the regulations of the last session. An early public specimen this of the manner in which he meant to be executor of the assembly's decisions.

Meanwhile, the emperor, after having openly approved and

¹ "Mendoza's correspondence with his court, during these contests, is something unheard of. Nothing at all equals the tenor of those letters. They shew a profound hatred, an unutterable contempt, a bitterness which reflection strives to soften, and only makes more bitter: a distrust, in fine, which one would hardly expect to see the like of between the worst criminals."—*Ranker, History of the Popedom.*

encouraged the bishops that had staid at Trent, had thought himself obliged to seek a reconciliation, if not with the pope, whom he treated as an *old dotard*, at least with the Church. He could think of nothing better for this end, than to establish the Inquisition at Naples. A sedition arose; the Spaniards narrowly escaped been chased out of the kingdom, and the emperor had to yield. Of what consequence was the Inquisition to him? He had merely wanted to perform an act of Roman Catholicism. The act was done; Paul had to pay the cost.

The diet (1st September) had been opened at Augsburg. There the emperor bitterly represented the uselessness of his efforts for the pacification of Europe by means of a council; then, after having wrested from the Protestants a promise to submit to it as soon as it resumed the course of its deliberations, he caused a letter to be addressed to the pope by the prelates in the diet, "commencing," says Pallavicini, "with a honied prayer, and ending with the sting of a menacing protest." It was with profound surprise, said the prelates, that they had heard of the translation; and they represented it in plain terms as annihilating the authority of the assembly. In fact, they were right, and the inaction of the Bologna Fathers proved it better than anything else could have done; but it was nevertheless a curious spectacle—that of a council becoming a nullity in the eyes of the prelates of a great nation, by the mere fact of its having passed into a city that belonged to the head of the Church.

It would, then, be a curious subject also for the historian to trace the distrust which the most Roman Catholic sovereigns have at all times shewed they have felt towards the court of Rome. Charles V. and his people, in this instance, merely expressed, only a little more frankly than others, because they felt themselves stronger, what the popes have read, or to speak more correctly, what they continue to read in the hearts of all their crowned friends, nothing in this respect having changed. You will hear every day complaints, and cries of indignation, and of scandal, against the few trammels to which the French law subjects the relations of the Roman Church with its head; as if France, forsooth, were the only country where the pope is not trusted. Distrust is more candidly expressed there, that is all. Elsewhere, it is a very different thing. Governments that are most Roman Catholic, are most severe as respects their bishops, and the most suspicious on the side of Rome. In France, a bishop may publish all that he thinks fit; he is afterwards sub-

ject, and then only for his official acts, to the harmless jurisdiction of the council of state. In Austria, in Piedmont, in Tuscany, in several other states of Germany and Italy, he could not publish a line, either as bishop, or simply as author, without having submitted it beforehand to the government's censors. In France, the official communications of the clergy with the pope, must pass through the minister of religious worship, but there is nothing to prevent the bishops from having unofficially as many relations with Rome as they think proper; in the states we have just named all correspondence, even private, if not interdicted, is at least sedulously watched. As for the receiving of briefs from the popes, these governments hold themselves no less entitled than others, to give or refuse leave to publish them. There was a great outcry quite lately against the King of Prussia for having interdicted his Roman Catholic subjects from studying theology at Rome; yet he did nothing more than several Roman Catholic princes, even Italians, had done before. What would the ultramontanists of Paris say, were the government to think of taking a saint out of the breviary? The Austrian government removed from it Gregory VII. Of course we do not equally approve all the measures mentioned above. We do not like to see a bishop subjected, in his most insignificant acts, to the humiliating yoke of the police; we merely quote facts, and say, See what—under these fair shows of union and filial submission—are the real relations of Roman Catholicity with its chief; see what is the confidence that the pope inspires in the governments which make most use of his name, on the other hand, in all that ministers to their projects or their ambition.

Paul III. had, however, neglected nothing in his preparations to meet the menacing attitude assumed by the emperor's prelates. He had gone so far as to offer to proclaim him king of England, and even to furnish him with troops for the conquest of that kingdom, held as it was, to have been vacant since the excommunication of Henry VIII.; but it was too palpably evident that the wily old man thought mainly of keeping him at a distance, and distracting his attention. Accordingly, the emperor replied only by sending Cardinal Madrucci, the bishop of Trent, to Rome, anew to solicit the return of the council to that city. The cardinal, on his arrival, obtained an excellent reception from the pope, but was left without any explanation. He was only permitted to state to the consistory the object of his mission. On the 9th of December, in presence of the cardinals, Madrucci

solemnly restated his request. It was in the name of God, he said, in the name of the emperor, in the name of the empire, in the name of all the friends of religion, that he besought the pope to send back the bishops from Bologna to Trent; he craved, also, that it might be decided whether it was to the cardinals, or to the council, that the election of the new pope should belong, in the event of the see becoming vacant.¹ This was plainly enough to recall to the pope's recollection—what? The eighty years of his by-past life, and the account that he would soon have to give to God? Alas! religious ideas had not habitually much to do in all this. All that was intended, was to attack Paul III. on his weak side, by giving him to understand that ere long he would not be in a condition to guard his children from the wrath of the emperor. But there was something which Paul III. loved more than his children, more even than himself; it was the omnipotence of the Holy See. The question had grown more and more into importance, in his eyes, in proportion as the emperor pressed his suit, and had affronted him by what he had caused his prelates to do. Placentia, even Placentia, which he had kept, “as a loadstone held in his hand for the purpose of attracting the iron soul of the pope,”² no longer influenced him. On no account would he consent to the return to Trent; but as his courage could not embolden him to avow what would have immediately caused a schism, it was impossible to wrest an answer from him by prayers, threats, anything. The cardinal set off on his return to Germany, leaving the matter in the hands of Diego de Mendoza, formerly ambassador to the council, and now charged with the same functions at the court of the pope. A few days after, Mendoza again set forth all the emperor's grievances, and all his demands. Without protesting as yet, he stated that he had orders to protest, however little the pope might delay granting satisfaction.

Then it was that Paul III., raising the mask, or, if you will, changing the mask, thought fit to act a part which we have seen him long preparing for; and this was to treat the affair as that of a controversy between the two assemblies. He thus withdrew, as it were, from being a party in the quarrel, and assumed the air of one who was influenced only by respect for the inde-

¹ Several of these details, denied by Pallavicini, have seemed to us sufficiently proved by the testimonies of other authors, and particularly Raynaldus, Sleidan, and De Thou, in accordance with Paul Sarpi.

² Pallavicini, Book x. ch. vii

pendence of the council and the wish of the majority; in fine, he gained time.

His first step in this new path was to say that he could give no decision without having first advised with the bishops at Bologna. The question was about to stand more and more on false ground, as both parties were now to quit their original position. Charles V. reclaimed on the ground of what was fitting and necessary, and the assembly was to reply on the ground of right.

It did reply, in fact, as might have been expected, that it considered itself, and could not but consider itself, the only legitimate assembly. Without absolutely rejecting the idea of a return to Trent, it declared that the only way to obtain a reversal of the decision it had taken was for the bishops at Trent, in the first place, to submit to that decision, and to come to Bologna, or, at least, to declare their readiness to come. Then, but only then, it might be considered what was best to be done.

This answer in itself had nothing in it unreasonable; but to be satisfied with it one would have required to forget that it was dictated by the pope, that the prelates of Bologna had no desire to return to Trent, and that, in fine, there was hardly any hope of the council ever being seen there again. Charles V., however, seemed ready to accept the question in its new terms, but only, as was his custom, in order that he might decide it according to his own views. Taking, therefore, the Bologna assembly directly in hand as the party in fault, he ordained the two agents who acted for him there, Francis Vargas and Martin Velasco, to use, without delay, the powers with which they had been invested, but the nature of which was still unknown. Consequently, on the 26th of January 1548, they craved an audience. The case was taken into consideration, and was referred by the assembly to Cardinal del Monte, the only legate present, for his colleague was at Rome. Del Monte caused them to be introduced, and they presented their mandate. "Constrained to protest, for the good of religion and of the Church, against certain men calling themselves apostolic legates, and against a certain assembly intituling itself Council, the emperor has named, and names, for the purpose of acting on his behalf, the two personages here present."¹ And not content with this insulting introduction, the envoys demanded that admission should be granted to five witnesses and two notaries, whom they had brought with

¹ All these last details are taken from Pallavicini.

them in order that their protest might be minuted in due form. The assembly again deliberated; it was voted that they should be put off till next day. But they insisted, and after some parleying the assembly yielded the point. Only, before giving them an audience, a minute was intimated to them, bearing that they should not be held bound to listen to them, inasmuch as it was not as the council that the emperor addressed them, but as a certain unlawful assembly which surely was not that of Bologna. Then Vargas, before coming to the protest, warmly exhorted the assembly, as he uniformly called it, to ponder well what it was about to say or do. And on his calling out, "Here we are, we, the lawful procurators of the emperor!" "I too," said the cardinal, "I am here, the true legate of a true and indubitable pontiff, and here is a lawful council, lawfully transferred, for the glory of God and the good of the Church!" *The glory of God and the good of the Church*, grand words these, which, however, for the preceding thirty years, people had known how to estimate at their proper value; but, for all that, Del Monte had incontestably the finest part to play. Those legates, rendered illegitimate for having made use of powers manifestly legitimate, that council, ceasing to be a council because it had pronounced against the opinion of fourteen of its own members,—all this reminded one rather of the rude unmannerliness of a soldier than of the dignity of a prince.

With a greater show of reason and more calm, the written protest, which Velasco then read, was hardly more logical. After a long picture of all that Charles V. had done in order to prepare for and facilitate the council, the translation was declared unreasonable, precipitate, null; the recommendation of the assembly in virtue of which it had taken place, was called deceptive, vain, captious, infinitely worthy of being rejected by the pope. How, then, did the pope dare, it went on to say, to give to that culpable division the name of translation, to that illegitimate assembly the name of council-general? The emperor declared, in fine, to the bishops, that he would thenceforth hold them responsible for all the evils that might occur, and from which he was about to look for the means of guaranteeing his states.

The oral reply was full of spirit; the written one extremely mild. It was published four days afterwards. It contained but one sentence:—"The things alleged are manifestly in disaccordance with the pious and Catholic intention of the most invincible emperor, the holy council is convinced that they have been spoken

either without any mandate on his part, or upon a false exposition of the case to him."

Yet never did the emperor seem less in a way to amend his doings. A week after the delivery of the Bologna protest, Mendoza reproduced it at Rome, in full consistory, before the pope. The same ideas, the same forms, except that the ambassador threw himself upon his knees, an action that threw into still stronger relief the incredible audaciousness of what he said. "Let any one figure to himself," says Pallavicini, "the terror of such auditors, met in so large a number, in the most august court in the universe, at the noise of this thunder-clap, launched by a Jupiter who had the lightning in his hand."

The only refuge of Paul III. now lay in the last part of the course which we have said he had resolved to pursue. Some days after Mendoza's protest he sent for him to come to the consistory. The ambassador found him apparently more calm, and his manner more natural than ever. The reply, written, it is said, by Cardinal Pole, was read by the pope's secretary, the bishop of Foligno. It was not less than five-and-twenty pages long, but, from the first, it was clear what the pope wished to come to. According to him, then, the whole affair had been a mistake. The emperor's protest was not meant to be read except in the case of his, the pope's, refusing to take cognizance of the *difference that had arisen betwixt his majesty and the council of Bologna*. But he had not refused; he was ready to do this, and had even appointed four cardinals to present to him a report on that subject. Accordingly, he had not to reply to the protest. He only regretted that the terms of it should have been so severe, but he was not the less sensible of the zeal of the emperor. He was happy, in particular, to see so great a prince openly recognise in him the quality of sovereign judge in this affair. He ended by saying that he was about to interdict both assemblies from proceeding to any synodical acts, and that they should have a month for submitting their reasons to him.

Upon this, although Mendoza went away declaring that he had been made to say what was quite different from what he had really said, and quite different from what the emperor had expressly charged him to say,—Paul wrote to the bishops at Trent that he was ready to hear what they had to say for themselves. Hitherto, he said, he had regarded the translation as good, judging the matter according to the public rumour; but since that point had been called in question, he was now prepared to act

only as an impartial judge, listening to the statements of all parties, and carefully weighing the reasons *pro* and *con*. This impartiality at the end of a whole year, this profound disinterestedness in an affair in which he was known to be so much interested, this curious allegation that hitherto he had not looked narrowly into it, all this, in a less serious document, would almost have tempted one to ask if he was not indulging a little jocularity. Accordingly, he received in return only an ambiguous reply, in which, without contesting the character he assumed of judge, any appearance of pleading before him was studiously avoided. The letter of the bishops was, in short, only an urgent request that he would disapprove of the translation.

Those at Bologna, also invited to plead their cause, were more clear, but quite as disquieting. They had come at last to take up the matter seriously. Strong in their legal position, they pleaded with precision and directness. They pressed, they almost summoned the pope to justify them; but, as there was no pleading on the other side, the case was no longer a process before a judge, and Paul no longer felt himself to be a judge in the sense in which he thought it of so much consequence to be one. The month had for some time been run out; less than ever had he any wish to pronounce a decision.

Meanwhile, another year (1548) had come round, and it was now about the close of April. The council had been interrupted for fourteen months.

Germany was now connected by a mere thread with Rome, and the pope still found means to negotiate with the emperor for the restitution of Placentia. Charles first eluded, and then refused. Fresh solicitations were followed by fresh refusals. Paul at last spoke of excommunicating, not the emperor, he durst not do that, but *those who occupied the city*, as if those who occupied the city were not there for the emperor. At the same time he was secretly laying the foundations of a league against him. But the Venetians, on whom he had counted much, gave it to be understood that they did not care to ally themselves with so old a pope. His successor might have other views, and leave the empire on their hands. The king of France, says Pallavicini, was as little desirous "to embark on so worn out a vessel." Thus there was neither excommunication nor war.

Charles, on his side, began to see that he could obtain nothing. He contented himself, therefore, with waiting for the death of the pope, an event that had long been spoken of as the only thing

likely to unravel so many entanglements. But as Paul III. was still almost as vigorous in body as he was in mind, it was of importance to the pacification of Germany that so many questions should not remain in suspense. Charles had not relinquished the chimera of bringing back unity by means of a council. He did not seem to be sensible of the absurdity involved in the promise wrested anew from the Protestants, to receive the decrees that were to come, after they had repelled those that were already published; and though, as is most probable, he might not think that that promise was ever to be realized as respected doctrines, he attached to it, politically, immense importance. As long as it subsisted, as long as the possibility of a reconciliation was admitted, or seemed to be admitted, the rending was not complete, the empire might still be one whole. But that promise, it was clear, once that the council was broken up, and the idea of a council definitively abandoned, would be considered no more binding on those who had made it. A German council would not have served any good purpose. The emperor had often threatened the pope with it; but betwixt the Protestants and him, it was a council-general that had been ever talked of. He took it into his head, therefore, to publish a decree in which all the points in litigation should be regulated provisionally; Roman Catholics and Protestants should remain subject to it until the resumption of the council. Hence the name of *Interim* by which that act is known in history.

There was something singular in the idea of regulating provisionally what of all things seems to have the least of a provisional character in it—articles of faith. But if the Interim comprised important concessions, such as the marriage of priests and the communion under both kinds, there were many points, also, on which Charles V. could make no concession without lending a hand to the subversion of Romanism. With regard to these last, then, there was concession only in the fact of their being represented as only provisional; but that of itself was still an insult to the Church, an insult to the pope, for there were few of them that were not of long standing as articles of faith, or that a Roman Catholic was free to regard as not definitively regulated.

The result, accordingly, was what any one might expect: nobody was satisfied. Those bishops even that were most devoted to the emperor could not dissemble to themselves that he had far overstept the reasonable limits of the civil power. As a

prince, he had the power of allowing the Protestants to remain free: to make a selection of what they were to believe and not to believe, to concede some points to them while he withheld others, was tantamount to setting up as pope, and without ceasing to profess being a Roman Catholic, to do just what Henry VIII. had done in ceasing to be one. Moreover, those who drew up the decree had not even restrained themselves so far as exactly to follow the canons passed at Trent; the chapter on Justification, in particular, seemed as if it had been written by Luther. What signified those appeals to a future council, seeing the decrees of a quite recent council were treated as null and void? Did the emperor intend, then, that those very decrees should be revised? This was impossible, it was said,—it was absurd, for he himself had owned the legality, and consequently the infallibility of the assembly, as long as it had not quitted Trent. And if Roman Catholics spoke thus in Germany, under the very hand of Charles V., what was to be expected in Italy?

While he alienated the Roman Catholics, what had he gained among the Protestants? Nothing, or almost nothing. Though the Interim might gratify them as paving the way for a rupture with the pope, they saw nothing in it, at bottom, to satisfy them. What were those few concessions which the emperor had made them, in comparison with what he had lacked either the will or the power to concede? The marriage of the priests did not reconcile them to the supremacy of the pope: leave to communicate under both kinds, did not make it more easy for them to believe in the mass, the seven sacraments, the invocation of saints, and many other things necessarily preserved in the Interim. In fine, they knew that the Church would never recognise in the emperor the right which he had arrogated to himself, and they could not feel much obliged to him for giving them that which it did not belong to him to give at all.

All eyes were now turned to Rome. A terrible explosion was expected, and the emperor probably was not one of those who were least disquieted. He had interfered in matters of faith; he had not even respected the lawful decisions of the council; he might be excommunicated without a single sincere and consistent Roman Catholic having the means of declaring for him, and excommunication would have pushed him straight to either a humiliating retractation or to a schism. But side by side with these audacities in doctrine, the Interim contained all the elements of

a violent rupture. The eleven articles of the Spaniards at Trent had been incorporated into it, almost word for word. Episcopal authority was declared in it to be of divine right; the pope was recognised in it as head of the Church, only in the character of its chief magistrate, necessary for its unity, as the king is in a kingdom, but not absolutely necessary and such as the Church cannot exist without him—whereas, in the papal or ultramontane system, the pope is the base, the corner-stone, the source of all power.

It was the pope, nevertheless, who, notwithstanding so many subjects of complaint, kept his temper best, and best understood how matters were situated. Were it for us to judge him from the Roman Catholic point of view, we should say that it was his duty to excommunicate the emperor; we might find ground to charge him with treason towards the Holy See, in maintaining an obstinate silence after so many aggressions. But, politically, the future was to justify him. He could see that the Interim must eventually destroy itself. The best punishment he could inflict on the emperor was to leave him to look on, as his own work went to ruin, and to let him enjoy the renown of having laboured in behalf of heretics, without having obtained anything from them in return.

It was from them, in fact, that the resistance especially came. The emperor having declared, in the preamble of the decree, that he did not intend either to adopt himself, or to compel any one to adopt the doctrines that had been modified from deference to the Protestants, the Interim obliged the Roman Catholics to nothing; it was only in theory that they could be dissatisfied with it; but as for the reformed, they either openly repulsed it, or obeyed it only in matters of form and with a repugnance which they did not even seek to dissemble. Frederick of Saxony, although a prisoner, obstinately refused to submit to it; many towns submitted to it only under threats of war and ruin. It is true that Charles V. did not insist on people declaring that they were convinced of the truth of all that was taught in his decree. Provided they re-established the Roman forms, the mass, images, &c., he carried his inquiries no farther; but those forms which some viewed, or affected to view as indifferent, were not the less for many others an idolatry in which their conscience forbade them to take any part.

Add to this the embarrassments created in the midst of Roman Catholic populations, by the reformatory decree published along

with the Interim.¹ As long as nothing more was attempted than the putting upon paper, out of spite for the pope, a host of reforms hitherto refused by the court of Rome, the emperor had only to congratulate himself on the zeal and docility of his bishops; but speaking and doing are different things, especially when one has to give an example at his own cost of the thing he has been lauding. Moreover, not a single step could be taken without obstacles occurring which the pope alone could remove, and which could not have been overthrown, without by the same blow snapping the last tie of connexion with Rome. There was a prevailing conviction that all that people might attempt to build must be founded on sand, unless the pope were to concur in laying the foundations; all that they sought to destroy was found to rest on papal regulations, or on papal dispensations, and without a rupture with the pope how could either be annulled? After many tentative efforts the emperor saw that without his aid nothing could be done. That aid he caused him to be asked to grant. Of the Interim, as may be believed, not a word was said; the pope was presumed to know nothing about it. It was only in the carrying out of some disciplinary reforms that he was besought to lend his assistance.

Happy at this return, and very sure of gaining something by it, the pope was in no haste to accede to the emperor's desire. This was not only, it is true, in order to enhance the value of the service to be rendered; among the reforms in which his concurrence was wanted, there was more than one which he was by no means anxious to see accomplished. Hence there arose a negotiation between the emperor and Peter Bertano, bishop of Fano, and nuncio at the imperial court. In fine, Paul consented; but it soon came to be seen in what sense he had put himself at the service of the imperial will.

In the first place, instead of the two legates whom the emperor had asked for, he contented himself with sending two nuncios. This was no more, in reality, than a difference of names, but sometimes there is a great deal in a name. A legate is the representative of the pope; he is as it were pope himself. A nuncio is no more than an envoy, an agent, an ordinary ambassador; in most instances he is but a simple bishop, whereas the legate is always a cardinal. They were two bishops, therefore, Lippomani, coadjutor of Verona, and Pighini, bishop of Ferentino, who were added to Bertano.

¹ 2d July 1548.

They arrived in Germany with a bull in which there was scarcely a word said about the reforms decreed by the emperor, and the co-operation for which he had applied. The pope pretended that he had understood nothing more to have been asked of him than the means only of re-opening the Church to those who should present themselves with a view to re-admission. He had confined himself therefore to investing the three nuncios with power to take off every kind of excommunication and censures, even for the offence of *bigamy*, said the bull; an ingenious method of accrediting the old falsehood that bigamy was one of the things sanctioned by the Reformation. For the rest the pope had not confined himself to perfidious insinuations; the bull exhibited, on some other points, an alarming frankness. The nuncios might grant dispensations from all obligations, taken even upon oath, with heretical princes and peoples; they could absolve from all perjury committed at their expense. This, it will be seen, was a wretched commencement of the work of bringing back the Protestants to a spirit of respect and obedience to the Church; it was also destructive of the entire policy of the emperor, by annihilating any little confidence that they still might have in his promises.

Accordingly, he was more discontented than ever; all the more as the pope, in this same bull, took all the compensation in his power, for the encroachments made on him by the Interim. It bore among other things, that the princes whose forfeiture had been pronounced, on their return to the communion of the Church, should be immediately restored to the possession of their states. This was assuming, in the first place, that the emperor had deprived them of their states, as heretics, whereas he had always maintained that he attacked them only as rebels; it was assuming, in the second place, that his consent would not be required in order to their being restored to their rights.

The nuncios were generally ill received. "As Pighini," says Pallavicini,¹ "was pursuing his journey through Germany, he could see some feeble outward manifestations of religion,² which the emperor's victories and edicts had with much difficulty introduced; but the minds of the people he found more heretical than ever, so much so that the masses were celebrated without anybody being present. Hardly was there found any one that thought of applying to the nuncios for the exercise of their powers, or that received them even with ordinary politeness;"

¹ Book xi. ch. ii.

² Of Roman Catholicism.

to which the historian artlessly adds, "It was evident that all their efforts would be useless *unless they were supported with arms.*" Thus the Protestants hardly gave the nuncios any occasion to open the fold again for the return of the stray sheep. And yet the opening had been made wide enough. The monks that had renounced their orders, had only, in order to their return to favour, to wear their old monkish dress *under* their secular clothes; and as for those that had married, the pope, without absolving them by any general measure, offered to make a special enactment for each, conceived in the most indulgent spirit possible.

Ill received by the Protestants, the nuncios met with a yet worse reception from the Roman Catholics. The ambiguousness of their mission, the palpable uselessness of its results, the animosity kept up by the maintenance of the translation to Bologna, all contributed to their being looked upon with an evil eye, and the emperor, without breaking with them, no longer cared about giving them anything to do. After a stay of six months spent in different cities of Germany, they spoke of going away. Charles V. then asked them to delegate part of their powers to the bishops. After lengthened conferences a kind of decree was drawn up, half imperial, half papal, in which the bull was inserted without modification, but accompanied with regulations to which it was considered to give the sanction of the court of Rome.

The year 1549 was now drawing to a close, so that the council had been asleep for nearly three years. Some Spanish bishops still remained at Trent; some Italians at Bologna. These were permanent protests against and for the translation.

That death which had so long been the subject of conversation, and the object of men's desires in Europe, now happened at last. After a pontificate of fifteen years Paul expired, on the 10th November, regretted by the Romans whom he had contrived to attach to himself, admired by statesmen who had acknowledged in him a master, but charged with a very heavy load of deeds to be answered for in the eyes of religion and of history. God struck him in the quarter where his offences had been greatest. After having trampled under foot all laws, and all the proprieties of life, in his eagerness to load with wealth and honours the children whom he should have blushed to own, it was on hearing of the treason of his grandson Octavius,

secretly in league with the emperor, that he felt his end approach. In less than three days he died. Had he in his last moments any re-awakenings of conscience and serious piety? Did the first gleams of eternity, as he approached it, make him see at last in its true light his long course of trickery with the strong, of violence with the weak, of lies to men and to God? Possibly so; possibly likewise, and this is but too likely, possibly he persisted to the last in taking no blame to himself. And of what, after all, shall we accuse him? A soldier, he had held his post; a general, he had made stratagem supply the want of force; "Prince of glorious memory," says the historian of the council, "he shewed himself man only in the excess of his affection for his own; in all other respects he merited, in the eyes of the Church, the name of hero."¹ For him, the Church was himself; and who knows that he was not prepared to make a ground of merit before God, of all the guiltiest deeds that his devotedness to his own glory had led him to perpetrate?

After all, we venture to say, a life like his is perhaps more shameful in reality for the Church and the popedom than that of such or such a pope, whose very name excites our horror. Great crimes are in some sort more personal. Those of Alexander VI., for example, pertain rather to the man than to the pope; a Roman Catholic may execrate them as well as we, except, indeed, that he must afterwards explain how infallibility could have resided in such a man. In Paul III. we have not to do with striking and isolated crimes; his life exhibits a long tissue of immoralities, that are neither murders nor incests, but for which Roman Catholicism and the popedom remain and will eternally remain in part responsible. With history in our hand we might prove that Paul III. was the representative, and, as it were, the personification of Roman Catholicism such as it was, such as it must necessarily be, in the face of the Reformation and of the tendencies developed by it. Repugnance to convoke a council, precautions taken to retain the command of it, artifices of all sorts for the purpose of dictating its decrees or giving them a false meaning; all that he felt, all that he did or that he wished to do, another pope in his place would, like him, have felt, and done, and wished to do. God has judged him; let us say nothing. When we look at the anguish he must often have suffered during the last years of his life, it requires no great effort of charity to feel more compassion than hatred for an old man sinking under such a load; but the

¹ Pallavicini, book xi. ch. vi.

more indulgent we shall be towards those who bore that load of errors and abuses, the more, as we have already said elsewhere, we shall feel ourselves entitled to be severe towards the Church that placed it on their shoulders.

To whom was this load now to pass? Seldom has Europe ever put this question to herself with more interest and disquietude.

All that could be said has been said already on the conclaves. The most Roman Catholic historians have been forced to groan over all that is vexatious, according to them, and profoundly scandalous, according to others, in the manner in which these meetings are held, in the intrigues by which their sittings are prolonged, in that preponderance which is openly given to political interests over those of religion and the faith. What is, still more, what was the election of a pope but a debate among the powers called to concur in it by their cardinals? The few religious formalities thrown over that heap of earthly affairs, seem to have been imagined for the purpose of inviting hypocrisy to that congress of all the passions. What an insult to the Holy Ghost and to God, to commence by solemnly invoking the presence of the Holy Ghost each of those days which are forthwith to be so filled up with faction and cabal! What an insult to religion, to conscience, to common sense, to proclaim the result of all these long machinations as the work of God! But no: these men are so familiarized with all that is most strange, that neither their reason nor their conscience is any longer revolted by it. Listen again to him whom we ever find at the breach whenever there is a paradox or an abuse to be defended. "God himself," says he, "in not producing, till after the creation of all other things, the greatest and most perfect being that he has placed upon the earth, has desired to teach us that slowness, in important works, is no proof that they are less the result of his will, but, on the contrary, the most expressive seal of that very will." Of what then do we complain? The longer a conclave has lasted, the more intrigues it has had, the more the chances that the person elected is the elected of God.

The internal history of conclaves, accordingly, would make one of the most interesting, but also, alas! one of the most melancholy books that could be composed. This very word *conclave*, which should signify *shut, shut with a key*, and which is sought to be justified by an unheard of superfluity of gates and sentinels,—is at once a lie. In spite of the oath of secrecy and

that triple guard, it is a matter of public notoriety that letters and emissaries pass and repass almost without any difficulty. That loaf, that piece of meat, brought for such or such a cardinal, may be found, if you open it up, to contain the note in writing which is perhaps to decide the election. All this is known and seen. Nobody is deceived, but everybody is willing to be so, because everybody has need of this, in order to deceive in his turn. Here, moreover, as everywhere else, we must distinguish between persons and things. The pope being a personal sovereign, and still more, a sovereign called to meddle more or less in the affairs of all the others, it is natural and inevitable that politics should share in his election. Although the cardinals were to try to banish them, they would find they could not. As long as the popedom shall be what it is—and how shall it ever be anything else?—a conclave must be an afflicting spectacle to all the friends of religion, to whatever communion they may belong. Perhaps there never was one in which the cardinals did not groan over such a state of things, but no more has there hardly ever been one in which the great majority have not accepted, without scruple, the consequences of the part that each has had to act, and have not appeared more happy than pained at having to move about for days, and weeks, and months, in that atmosphere of intrigues. Weeks, months! Were it a matter of ancient history, should we believe it? Can we figure what forty or fifty men, condemned to remain shut up together until they shall have made choice of one of them, may have to say to each other, to calculate, to combine, during fifty, sixty, or seventy days? It bewilders one. It is almost heroism.

It was during no less than seventy-one days, (from 28th November 1549, to 7th February 1550,) that the cardinals remained in conclave, employed in giving a successor to Paul III. And yet, to all ordinary motives for hastening the election, there was added this time, one altogether new, and withal very pressing. The year 1550 had commenced. A solemn jubilee had been published; it was proposed to have it opened on the 24th of December, with certain ceremonies which the pope alone could perform. The city was chokefull of pilgrims. Every evening an immense crowd assembled round the conclave to learn the result of the voting of that day; every night they returned discontented, angry, cursing the cardinals and the conclave, as if there was not among them the man whose feet they were ready to kiss the moment that he should be pope.

The cause lay in the fact, that few conclaves had ever been so strongly divided. Three factions, as usual—the Imperial, the French, and the Italian, divided the assembly. The Italian wished to have one of the creatures of Paul III. elected. Cardinal Farnese, the head of that faction, was too young as yet seriously to think of the tiara; but it was of consequence to him to be able to reckon on the protection of a future pope for his family and for himself. This faction, however, did not include all the Italian cardinals. The aggrandizement of the Farneses had procured them enemies; a pope who, owing his greatness to them, should be expected to place it at their service, was not thought to be desirable. The French favoured Cardinal Salviati, the imperialists Cardinal Pole. A candidate had therefore to be looked for who should unite the suffrages of two out of the three factions, and such was to be found in the late president of the council, Cardinal Del Monte. The Farneses had seen him entirely devoted to Paul III.; the French had seen him engaged in conflict with the emperor. The majority had been led to vote for him—still that was not enough. Former custom had not permitted the elevation to the papal throne of a cardinal whom the emperor had formally declared beforehand that he did not desire to have as pope. Thus the previous consent of Charles V. was requisite, and Del Monte, the principal author of the translation of the council, seemed less likely than any of them ever to obtain it. Cosmo, Duke of Florence, negotiated for him, and on the 7th of February he was pope.

Now, among the engagements discussed in the conclave, and to which each of the cardinals, according to usage, had promised to submit in the event of his election, the imperial party had caused the insertion of one bearing that the council was to be continued. In consequence of this, Julius III. was hardly installed, when an ambassador extraordinary, Louis d'Avila, arrived in Rome, bringing along with the emperor's official compliments, the pressing request that he would take into consideration the performance of his promise. Julius III. replied that he was ready; he had but one condition to interpose,—it was that the council, said he, should serve for the ruin of heresy, not for the demolition of the authority of the Holy See. This was at once almost tantamount to a refusal. On such a condition as that no pope would ever have felt repugnant at the holding of a council. Besides, who could guarantee it to him? Could the emperor himself prevent the most delicate points being at

any moment touched upon? What was in any case clear, was that Julius reserved to himself the power of regulating, as his predecessor had done, the rights and the competence of the council. To the old motives that actuated Paul III., and which still subsisted, were added those of the new pope. He who had pertinaciously remained at Bologna until the death of Paul III. could not well yield, as a sovereign, without condemning his own conduct as a minister.

He yielded, nevertheless. The solicitations addressed to him were too warm, and the expectation too general; necessity proved an overmatch for wounded vanity. Perhaps it cost him less than one might be disposed to think. Since his elevation to the popedom he was no longer the same man. Although he had always loved the pleasures of life, he had contrived, till then, to give the precedence to business; but now that he was pope, he devoted himself to them so entirely, that his councillors found it difficult to wrest a few hours from him for the most pressing interests. As little disposed as any one could be to surrender any of the prerogatives of the popedom, he considered them only as, in some sort, a deposit to be transmitted intact to his successors; they were not to him the object of that deep felt worship to which so many other popes had been, soul and body, devoted, and of which he himself had till now been the inflexible minister. What still farther contributed to smooth away difficulties, was that he had only to apply to his own case the old policy of Paul III. We have seen, in fact, that the business remained under the form of a suit at law between the emperor and the Bologna assembly, a suit that was to be brought to an issue before the pope. The representative of the assembly having become pope himself, he could not be both judge and party. The matter dropt accordingly; all that he had to do was to call the council without saying a word about what had passed.

All this, it may well be thought, took infinitely more time than from our rapid narrative one might suppose. It was not until after the lapse of six months that the parties began to understand each other.

The consent of the king of France, however, had yet to be obtained. The French had never liked the selection of Trent for the council; we have seen that they thought it at once too Italian and too German, albeit that it was impossible, as we have also seen, to find a city not more German, or more Italian.

It was from antipathy to the emperor that Henry II. had appeared to approve the translation to Bologna; thither he had sent an ambassador, but very few of his bishops. The view now pressed on him was, that by refusing to send them to Trent, he would thenceforward be the sole author of the impossibility of the council. He was flattered with the idea of being arbiter, in case of need, between the emperor and the pope; and he was gained over at last by being reminded of the character of "protector of the Holy See," in which so many of his predecessors had gloried. The promise had also to be made to him, in order that he might promise it in his turn to his parliament and bishops, that no encroachment should be made on the liberties of the Gallican Church. A very wise promise, but a very odd one also. How could the pope logically say what the assembly would or would not do? Was not this tantamount to the avowal, that he was preparing to allow it to do nothing without his leave?

This point gained, there was much else to regulate. First, there was the eternal question of the submission of the Protestants to the decrees of the council, a question now more complicated than ever, since the council had decided things to which they neither would nor could submit. Accordingly, at the diet, when the emperor announced to them the resumption of the council, they with one voice said that, first of all, there ought to be a declaration that all that had been done at Trent was null. To the pope's great displeasure Charles did not receive this proposal with the indignation to be expected from a true Catholic. He replied to the Protestants that it would be for the council to examine the question; the pope could not obtain from him an explicit engagement for the maintenance of what had been done. And as there was no doubt that the assembly, were it to deliberate under the same conditions as before, would not hasten to ratify the whole, the Protestants craved, as before, that their divines should be admitted, that the pope should not preside either directly or indirectly; that he should begin, in fine, by absolving all the bishops from their oath of fidelity to him; conditions always renewed, always unacceptable, but which the emperor did not reject with so much warmth as the pope might desire.

Julius took the course which we have ever seen taken by the popes on such an occasion; he went straight on. In the bull of convocation, (November 1550,) he assumed as admitted and incontestable, that the new council was to be a continuation of the

old;¹ at the same time he started from the fact, that a council-general held without an acknowledgment of his authority, would not be a council.² The emperor had begged that this piece might be communicated to him before being published. The pope sent it to him, but dated and sealed, not wishing to appear as consulting him about its composition. Charles made a vain attempt to prevail on him to alter it. He replied, with much reason, that a bull with nothing in it to startle the Protestants, would necessarily be a lie. The ambassador requested that one expression might at least be altered—that in which it was said that the pope sought not only to preside in the council, but to *direct it*, an assertion which Roman Catholics even might consider as exaggerated. Julius replied, in plain words, that if certain Catholics had forgot that truth, he did no more than his duty in reminding them of it; and to cut short all such demands, he ordered the publication of the bull.

It was read accordingly in the diet, and immediately produced the effect that had been dreaded. Consistent and sincere Roman Catholics were very well pleased with the frankness shewn by the pope; but all the emperor's party thought it imprudent and ill-timed. The Protestants, on their side, repeated for the hundredth time, that this was not the council to which they had promised to submit. The emperor once more intervened; he promised solemnly, to both parties, that all should pass to the satisfaction of Germany. But something more than words was wanted. He had to give a precise expression to his promises, and to allow them to be minuted; accordingly, the decree of the diet (13th February 1551) was almost point for point, the counterpart of the bull that it was expected to homologate. The pope had spoken of the *continuation* of the council; the emperor declared, by the medium of the diet, that everybody should be free to propose, according to the dictates of his own conscience, what he should believe likely to promote the good of the Church. It might be proposed, therefore, that all should be recommenced. The pope had spoken of directing the council; the emperor affirmed that he would take care that all things should be done according to law and order. Now, many people thought, that *according to law and order* implied either the cessation, or at least a great diminution of the pope's influence. The pope had

¹ Decernimus et declaramus—ipsius concilii continuationi et prosecutioni—incurrere velint.

² Nos ad quos spectat generalia consilia indicare et dirigere.

spoken of setting forth *the doctrine of the Church*; the emperor announced a pious and free council, at which all the questions should be decided in a Christian manner, *according to Scripture and the Fathers*. In a word, the edict professed to be no more than a commentary on the bull, but the commentary carried away the text.

Julius dissembled, officially at least, for in conversation he always expressed himself with a frankness that quite bewildered the politicians. He was a wit. He never met with a check for which he did not console himself with some sufficiently biting sarcasm, and he was no more put out of sorts by the emperor than by any one else.

The re-opening was fixed for the 1st of May. One sole legate, Marcellus Crescentio, cardinal of St. Marcellus, was charged to preside; two prelates, Sebastian Pighini, archbishop of Manfredonia, and Lippomani, bishop of Verona, were given him as co-adjutors. Crescentio, if we are to believe the bull of legation, was a zealous, prudent, and pious man; but if we are to believe the ambassador Vargas,¹ he was a man full of pride and effrontery, who treated the bishops as if they were his footmen, and flew into a passion the moment he met with any contradiction. We shall see which of these two portraits most agreed with facts.

The council opened on the day fixed, but with only fifteen bishops. Notwithstanding this small number, from the very first meeting held the evening before, "God permitted that there should reign in that new assembly more liberty than concord."² The discussion bore principally on the time to be fixed for the next session. The president wanted a delay of four months. The majority were opposed to this,—and yielded. A first success this to the pope. In this, at least, it is impossible to deny that the new council was the continuation of the old.

In this session, (the eleventh dating from the commencement,) all that was done was to declare the council open, and to adjourn to the 1st of September.

New complications had now arisen, so that on the very day of the opening it was doubtful that the council could live.

The sole result of the reconciliation of Octavius Farnese with the emperor was its having hastened the death of Paul III. Threatened with seeing his city of Parma occupied as Placentia had been with the imperial troops, the duke put himself under the protection of France, and received a French garrison. He had previously asked the pope to continue to assist him against the

¹ Letter of 26th November 1551.

² Pallavicini, book xi. ch. xiv.

emperor; but whether from a dread of irritating the latter, or from antipathy to the Farneses, of whom he was beginning to be tired, Julius had replied that he must himself provide for the safety of his city. It did not appear, however, that the pope meant by this to sanction his putting himself under the protection of another prince; perhaps, too, as some believed, he was not really angry at it, but only durst not venture to share the responsibility of a proceeding so likely to irritate the emperor. The latter flattered him, besides, by representing that the conduct of the young duke was an outrage on the Holy See, from which he held his city and his title. Strange assertion in the mouth of the man who had dared to seize Placentia as belonging to the empire, and said not a word about restoring it! None ventured to expose this contradiction. Julius launched a manifesto against Octavius, summoned him personally to Rome, and declared that he would hand over to the emperor the task of punishing him if he did not submit.

It was now the king's part to be angry. Is it the case, as some will have it, that the pope's true object must have been to set him at enmity with Charles V. in order to find a pretext for breaking up the council? We cannot think that the Roman court would have voluntarily purchased this result at the cost of a war in Italy, especially at a moment when the goodwill of the emperor permitted the hope that the assembly would not be disposed to attempt too much. Be that as it may, war ere long seemed inevitable. Julius remonstrated with Henry II. that it was not allowable for him to undertake the defence of a vassal without the sanction of his suzerain; Henry II. dropt the question of right, and asked him if the emperor, then, had laid him under so many obligations that he could not tolerate any barrier in the way of the encroachments of the empire in Italy. The quarrel waxed fierce. Henry threatened to keep Parma; the pope to excommunicate Henry. "If he takes Parma from me," he would say, "I, yes I, will take France from him." And the emperor forbore to interfere, so that a quarrel between the king and him rapidly took the form of a quarrel betwixt France and the pope.

Ere long Henry kept no measures. The prelates of the kingdom had orders to prepare for a national council; those even who were at Trent or at Rome were to return immediately to France. Upon this the pope became a little more tractable. Yet he had right on his side; but what is right in politics? And what was

all this but politics under a slight varnish of religion? Ascanius della Cornia, his nephew, was despatched to the king. Henry gave him a tolerably good reception, and matters were discussed at first without excessive bitterness, but without coming to an understanding. Anon the bitterness reappeared; and the king ended at last by causing a protest on his part against the council itself to be intimated to the pope. "This could not," he said, "be a council-general, seeing the ill-will of the pope towards France was about to prevent that country's taking a part in it." In this, with all respect for the chivalrous Henry II., there was neither loyalty nor logic. Was the pope then bound to permit, without even reclaiming, a foreign prince to occupy one of the cities in his domain? Next, in so far as a nation is Roman Catholic, and calls itself so, how admit that its refusal to take part in a council-general can suffice to make it a particular council? The parliament, on being consulted by the king, went, however, so far as to declare that a nation is always free to accept or to reject the canons of a council, and even to make a selection from them, accepting some and rejecting others. It is easy to prove, as was excellently done in the parliament, that this liberty existed in the first ages; but it is clear, also, that this was before the constitution of the Roman Catholic unity. What would the parliament even have said had some small nation, some Swiss canton, that of Zug, for example, with the eight or ten thousand inhabitants which it then had, declared itself entitled to reject a council that had been admitted by the rest of Europe? Now, the canton of Zug was a sovereign state. What France wanted to do Zug had the right to do also; but, like France, it could do so only on the condition of breaking, in fact, that unity which people knew so well how to employ as a weapon in combating those who dared frankly to deny it.

As with Charles V., in fact, it was at the expense of the Protestants that Henry II. redeemed his irreverent conduct towards the Holy See. We have seen how the emperor, when his contentions with Paul III. were at the very worst, wished to establish the Inquisition at Naples; two years afterwards, when the debates on the translation of the council ran highest, he actually established it in the Netherlands. In France, it was by the light of the fires at which the reformed were burnt, that Henry II. may be said to have written his anti-papal protests; it was while providing those fires with victims that the parliament exculpated itself from having violated the Church's unity, and by

its bold procedure furnished weapons for the Church's enemies. A century and a half later we shall find that it was still by punishments that Lewis XIV. desired to purchase forgiveness for his Gallican temerities. Alas, how does the history of humanity seem to be made up of blood and inconsistencies!

Null and baseless in point of reason as it was, still the protest of the king of France, together with the absence of his bishops, struck a rude blow at the future authority of the council. That blow Charles V. did his best to parry. He sent off to Trent all the German and Spanish bishops he could muster; he even saw to the electors of Cologne, of Mayence, and of Treves, proceeding thither, conceiving that their high rank and princely magnificence would powerfully contribute to secure the credit of the assembly. At the same time he had himself represented in it by three ambassadors, one for the empire, another for Spain, and one for Austria and his hereditary estates. But in proportion as his ardour augmented that of the papal party was perceived to decline. His history, already a long one, sufficiently warrants the suspicion that he had some secret objects in view. Why so many Germans in 1551 when there had been none in 1545? Distrust was daily on the increase.

He had, also, put himself to a great deal of trouble in order to oblige the Protestants to take part in the council by sending their deputies to it. Julius III. had made no positive promise that they would be received; he had even said, in language more picturesque than dignified, that he had no wish to fight with a cat in a cage. There was nothing very attractive, it must be allowed, in the prospective arrival in full council, with the Bible under their arms, of men, everything said by whom must inevitably tend, with whatever mildness they might temper their expressions, to deny all the rights, and to demolish all the pretensions, of the assembly and the pope. The political protests had been disposed of; the religious protests it was of importance that they should hear at a distance only, in order that they might at least have the appearance of persons that heard them not, and therefore might be excused for not replying to them. The Protestants, on their side, made very little account of the pretended favour intended to be done to them. They saw plainly enough that there was no intention of giving them any substantial influence in the votings of the assembly; they asked themselves if their presence, after having served no purpose, perhaps, but that of irritating their judges, and preventing all concession, would

not be interpreted as implying acquiescence. Finally, they behoved certainly not altogether to leave out of reckoning that John Huss had been burnt at the council of Constance, notwithstanding the safe-conduct of the Emperor Sigismond. The Fathers of Trent were asked to begin by giving such a safe-conduct themselves, in the name of the council and of the pope, to the Protestant doctors who should be chosen for the purpose of attending.

At Trent, meanwhile, nothing had been done; hardly had it been proposed to do anything. The four months had been spent in waiting for, receiving, and talking over news; in the few congregations that had met, the documents bequeathed by the Council of Bologna had been put into order. The session took place on the 1st of September. All that was done was to adjourn to the 11th of October, intimating at the same time that the chief subject to be treated was the eucharist.

It was on the 1st of September, also, that the ambassadors had their first official audience. The Count de Montfort, who appeared for the empire, spoke of the council and the pope in the most flattering terms; none could have imagined, to hear him, that there could ever have been the slightest misunderstanding between the emperor and the Court of Rome. The French Ambassador, Amyot, the translator of Plutarch, proceeded in quite another tone. The letters accrediting him were addressed, "To the most holy Fathers in Christ of the *assembly* of Trent." *Assembly* not *council*; this was a revival of the late quarrel about Bologna, now about to recommence with the king instead of continuing with the emperor. Before opening the letter it was asked whether, with that address upon it, it could fitly be opened? After some deliberation it was opened, but with the declaration that this was done from respect for the king of France, and without anywise admitting the insulting title he had given to the council; a title, it was added, which his majesty had surely not adopted in an ill sense. It was also from respect, as the letter ran, but only from respect, and without holding himself anywise bound to do so, that the king wished to explain to the assembly why he had not sent his bishops. He then related, but in moderate terms, his quarrel with the pope, a quarrel which at that moment took the shape of skirmishes between the garrison of Parma and the pontifical army. He ended by asking the bishops to receive his letter, as that not of an enemy, but of the eldest son of the Church, full of respect

for the Holy See, although unfortunately at war with him who occupied it, as ready, in fine, to submit to all the assembly's decrees, provided they were made legitimately and legally.

Great was the buzz of voices on hearing this, but it rose to a tumult when Amyot declared that he was commissioned to repeat, as a complement to the letter, the protest already made at Rome in the name of Henry II. That protest said nothing at bottom that was not already in the writing, and that had not been seen by everybody; but with the letter, which, from beginning to end, was calm and polite, none could seem to be offended; whereas how could any one dissemble with respect to the protest, which was equally clear and animated, and was made still more so by the incisive tone of the ambassador? The example set by Paul III. with respect to the ambassador Mendoza was followed, and a declaration made to the effect, that as nothing guaranteed the authenticity of the insulting commentary added by Amyot, no regard should be paid to it; that they should keep to the letter as the only authentic document.

Amyot's words, notwithstanding, were not long of receiving a most striking confirmation in France, and one that at all times most sensibly affected the popes. A royal edict prohibited the remittance to Rome of any money, on any account whatsoever. The verification of this measure in the parliament gave occasion for the boldest speeches, so that a meeting of Protestants could not have expressed themselves with more severity on the extortions of the Court of Rome. "Who shall prevent us," said the procurator-general, "from dispensing with sending sums of money to the pope? Could these do anything towards assuring men's consciences? Not only did they not justify matters before God, but it is long since they have ceased even to colour matters in the eyes of men." The people whom they were burning said nothing worse of them.

It was in the midst of this fierce agitation, then, that the council proceeded to dogmatize on the eucharist.

Immediately after the twelfth session, the members were employed in collecting the articles which the divines would have to examine. Transubstantiation naturally found a place in the first line, as the foundation of Roman doctrine in these matters. There were nine other articles, of which one only was of importance, that of communion under both kinds.

First of all, let us say a word on this last.

There was some exaggeration in the importance attached to it by the Protestants. The more you spiritualize the holy supper, the easier, it would seem, you ought to find it to be accommodating as to the manner of receiving it. The contrary proved to be the case. Wherever the Reformation had appeared there was not a more exciting question than that about restoring the cup to the people.

It was because neither was there any question in which more audacious violence had been done to the plain letter of Scripture by the Church of Rome. In spite of the few passages in which *bread* is spoken of without *wine*¹ being mentioned, it is clear that after having read in the Gospels, and in St. Paul, the detailed narrative of the institution of the supper,² nobody would suppose that any one could have dreamt of suppressing one of the two elements. Protestants, it is true, do not regard wine as indispensable to the validity of the act. Nowhere have they refused the supper to persons who absolutely cannot drink wine; their synod at Poitiers, in 1560, has declared this.³ Nowhere, any more, have they affirmed that a country without wine and without the possibility of having it, ought to be deprived of the supper. But as for taking the cup from all, always and everywhere, if that is not the most untoward of the alterations to which Apostolical Christianity has been subjected, it is at least the most palpable, and that which we need feel least surprised to see most warmly resented by all who were beginning to open their eyes to the errors of the Church. Then, if the Protestants did exaggerate the importance of the cup, they had been justified in this by two popes, centuries before. Leo the Great, in one of his discourses, accuses the Manichæans of sacrilege, because they would communicate without wine. Gelasius I., in one of his decrees, expresses himself still more forcibly. "The division of one sole and the same mystery," says he in speaking of the supper, "cannot take place without great sacrilege."⁴ Bellarmine maintains, it is true, that Gelasius addressed himself to priests only; but, as Baronius admits, there is not in the whole piece a single word that permits that supposition.

As for demonstrating historically that the communion under both kinds long prevailed, that would be useless; it has never

¹ In Acts ii. and xx. The supper in these two passages is called *the breaking of bread*; but it is spoken of there only incidentally, without any detail, and wherever there are details, there the wine occurs

² Matthew xxvi.; Mark xiv.; Luke xxii.; 1 Cor. xi. ³ Discipline, ch. xii. art. 7.

⁴ *Divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sub grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.*

been denied. Only people are mistaken in limiting this *long time* to three or four centuries. "Until the commencement of the twelfth," says Mabillon in his treatise *In ordinem Romanum*, "the communion under both kinds was invariably maintained by the Church."¹ It is curious to contrast this positive declaration of a Roman Catholic as candid as he was learned, with the manner in which two councils have admitted the fact. At Constance, in voting the communion under one kind: "It is true," it is added, "that *in the primitive Church*, the sacrament was received under both kinds."² Then comes another council, and this admission, incomplete as it is, still appears too candid: "*At the commencement of the Christian religion*," the Tridentine Fathers proceed to say, "the practice of the communion under both kinds *was not rare*."³ See how the truth, even when purely historical, makes progress in the successive decisions of the Church. Why should not a third council declare that it was *very rare*? A fourth, that it was quite unknown? There would be less distance between these last assertions and that of Trent, than between that of Trent and the actual fact, clearer than day, that the Church existed for ages without such a thing as communicating without wine being dreamt of, and, above all, without people having the idea that the Church could have made it a law.⁴

This last, in fact, is the most serious point in the question. The Christian who may be most disposed to allow the Church all the rights she arrogates to herself, might still on reflection doubt that she could have this. When Jesus Christ had said, "Drink ye all of it," when twenty or thirty generations of Christians, when the fathers, when the councils have been unanimous for ages, in translating this word *all* by everybody, was it still a matter that could reasonably be changed? The Church, according to this, might have taken away, had she so desired, not the wine only, but the bread also. She might have still more plausibly done so, seeing that Jesus Christ simply

¹ Ante annum 1120, communicio sub utraque specie ab ecclesia immutabiliter retinebatur—Sess. xiii.

² Licet in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie.

³ Licet ab initio Christianæ religionis non infrequens utriusque speciei usus fuisset.—Sess. xxi.

⁴ Angelo Manrique, in his *Annales des Citeaux*, speaks of several ancient public chalices preserved down to his time in various churches. On that of the Cathedral of Rheims, the gift, according to tradition, of St. Remi, the following line was engraved:—

"Hauriat hinc *populus* vitam de sanguine sacro."

"Hence let the *people* drink life from the sacred blood."

said, "Take, eat;" it might at least have been alleged that the word *all* does not occur in the phrase. Might it not be said that the Saviour wished to prevent the very thing which has happened? With the bread he says "Eat," with the wine, "Drink ye *all*!" This word accordingly has ever given peculiar annoyance to the defenders of the Roman practice. Mark how Bossuet gets rid of it. Nothing, says he, more clear than this passage; but no more is there anything more clear than the order given to the Jews to eat the passover in a standing position. Did they observe that command? No. Jesus Christ himself violated it. If then the Jewish Church could change something in its passover, why should not we also have modified something in ours?¹ A sophism this, a pure sophism; and bad must the cause indeed be when we find Bossuet reduced to this. The Jews did not eat standing, agreed; but when they read in their law the positive command to do so, where do we see that they were allowed themselves to give the force of a law to the practice of remaining seated? It is one thing to neglect a precept, because thought to be of small importance, and another thing to decree the contrary. Had Christians begun of themselves, from negligence, to communicate only with bread, the Church would have been none the better authorized to refuse the wine to those who might ask for it. In fine, what proportion could there be between an act so purely accessory as that of eating in a standing or sitting position, and an act positively pointed out, in the institution, as a half of the sacrament?

Wherefore, then, has the Roman Church shewn so much perseverance in extending, and so much obstinacy in maintaining, a practice apparently so indifferent as that of withholding the cup? Controversialists have seen nothing in this but infatuation, a false sense of shame at the idea of retracting the ostentation of omnipotence. This last motive has not, doubtless, been without its influence. To say *no* precisely where Jesus Christ has said *yes*, might be at certain epochs a powerful means of making an impression on men's minds, by exhibiting the authority of the Church as equal if not superior to that of its founder. But there has been another reason besides these. A matter of indifference as it is in a dogmatical point of view, the taking away of the cup is of immense importance in a sacerdotal point of view. It forms the most continuous and the most sacred of the barriers that have been raised by the Roman Church betwixt

¹ Variations, book viii.

the flock and the pastors; it has given occasion for a privilege which has the double advantage of not being burdensome to the people, and yet of being exercised daily before the eyes of all, and in the midst of the performance of one of the most solemn of all acts. Add to this, that nothing had been neglected that could enhance its value. After the wine had been taken from the people, it was still conceded for two centuries as a very great favour, to those who received the communion from the hands of the pope. Towards the close of the fourteenth century,¹ this last vestige disappeared; we see no longer any one but the king of France, who in his quality of Most Christian King, and of eldest son of the Church, still communicated under both kinds, but only on the day of his consecration and in the article of death. Thus an honour which the most powerful of the monarchs of Europe obtained only as a favour twice in his life, the most petty village priest enjoys every day, as a right inherent in the priesthood. How can we be surprised after this to find so much repugnance to concession on this article, even although dogmatic infallibility had no direct interest in it.

The Protestants, on their side, had not ceased to make it one of the primary conditions of their return to the Roman Church. The emperor felt that were this point once to be decided in the Roman sense, all hope must be abandoned either of gaining the Lutherans, or of preventing their protesting formally against the council. His ambassadors, accordingly, insisted that there should be no discussion of its merits. The presidents wrote about it to the pope. He replied that the omission of a point of such importance was not to be thought of; all he permitted was that it should be put off for three months. To what purpose? After the manner in which it had been already treated in the preparatory meetings, the Protestants could not imagine that there ever would be a vote in their favour upon it. There had been a talk of conceding the cup to them, but on condition that they should declare that they did not regard it as necessary, the body of Christ being entire under each species. An illusory concession which came, in fact, too late, as we shall see, and which no Protestant ever accepted with that qualification.

On this occasion was resumed the delicate question of their coming to the council. Neither pope, nor assembly, neither the Protestants themselves nor any one in Europe, looked for any good from their coming. The emperor always pressed it. He

¹ See Mabillon, same treatise.

had directed that a safe-conduct should be asked for them, to which he was to add one from himself, so as to remove any apprehension that their deputies might feel with respect to their personal safety. The assembly hesitated. Besides the repugnance felt by its members to facilitate the access of heretics to Trent, they doubted how far they were competent to give a safe-conduct; apprehending, not without reason, that such an act of sovereignty might be regarded as an invasion of the papal authority. At last the idea was entertained, at the suggestion of the pope himself, of drawing up one in which the Protestants should not be named. They were comprised under the title of "Ecclesiastics and seculars from all Germany," to whom the council guaranteed, "as far as it was in its power," liberty and security. With this *as far as it was in their power*,¹ the pope's authority remained intact, but the safe-conduct was no longer a safe-conduct. The pope was left free to cause the deputies to be seized; and who could feel sure that the emperor would feel disposed to defend them?

Transubstantiation had been voted without a debate. No voice had been raised against it. It is easier sometimes for people to agree in what is altogether false or absurd, than in what is only partially so.

The agreement among the divines did not, however, go beyond what was required in order to the anathematizing, in the gross, of the adversaries of transubstantiation. After having called it a mystery, it was found impossible to resist the fancy to have it explained. Some prelates, more ignorant or more wise, had begged that the council would keep to the anathemas; but the majority thought themselves able enough to draw up, in the sixth session, a doctrinal decree. Hardly had it commenced when a keen dispute arose between the Dominicans and the Franciscans. According to the one, the Saviour's body is made present in the eucharist in the way of *production*, that is to say, without quitting heaven, it is reproduced in the wafer; according to the others, it is produced by *adduction*, that is to say, it really arrives from heaven to take the place of the substance of the bread. In the former case, consequently, the bread subsists, but is changed; in the latter it is annihilated, and replaced by another substance.

Both might well have been asked what they knew of the mat-

¹ Quantum ad ipsam sanctum synodum spectat.

ter, what they could ever hope to know of it, and, above all, what possible interest either faith or piety could have in such details. Believers, forsooth, were greatly distressed to know whether it was by production or by adduction that they had Christ's body administered to them! It is true, that if the miracle be once admitted, it is by production that one may best try to explain it; but in that case you challenge against the miracle in itself, one of the strongest objections that it can encounter. What becomes of the identity and the unity of the body produced in several different places simultaneously? This was asked by the Franciscans; but revenge was taken on their adduction. Nothing in nature, said the Dominicans, is annihilated. If the eucharistic bread is not changed, but only replaced, what, then, becomes of it? And so both were right and both wrong, the inevitable result when people are such fools as to contend in the dark, without anything really to contend about.

Some things are prevented by their very strangeness from being attacked so vigorously as they seem to require. Transubstantiation is one of these. In the eyes of all who do not believe it, no greater or more inconceivable error ever entered the mind of man. But having once resolved to keep our temper, and to respect honest convictions, we naturally recoil from a contest in which the insulting words, dishonesty, silliness, and so forth, are so apt to drop from our pen. Shall this be a reason for our saying nothing? No; while we abstain from insult, we shall speak out everything.

First of all, be it well understood that we speak of transubstantiation Roman, material, absolute, such, in fine, as was decreed by the council. Many believe to this day that Luther admitted it; and these, if there be any among our readers, have perhaps asked themselves, why, from respect for Luther, we do not leave this point in the shade? Our respect for Luther and for his disciples never shall make us shut our mouth where we think he has erred; but here, the more narrowly we have looked into the matter, the more have we become convinced that in attacking the gross materialism of the Roman supper, we should be rather for Luther than against him. He has admitted the word, and this is vexatious. As for the thing, he so spiritualized it that the word in his mouth, especially towards the close of his life, became a complete contradiction. Accordingly, after the sixteenth century, and when the first heat of the controversy had passed, Lutheranism and Calvinism have generally considered

themselves as agreed on this point, and very few Lutherans in our times would refuse to subscribe to all that we are about to say.

We shall not insist on physical objections. That body enclosed entire within a space some thousand times less than its natural size, and *produced* or *adduced*, as you will, in a hundred thousand places at once without ceasing to be the same; that wafer which becomes flesh, true flesh, without any change whatever being wrought in its colour, in its form, and in its taste; that wine which becomes blood, true blood, while it preserves all the qualities of wine,—in all this there is abundant scope for sneers at improbabilities, if we chose to indulge them. And as if this were not enough of a miracle, so utterly unheard of, the Roman Catechism tells us of a second, not so ordinarily spoken of, but which must certainly be admitted if we admit the first. “The bread becoming flesh,” it says, “and the wine becoming blood, by a farther miracle they preserve their appearance and their taste.” Thus, the thing is still more mysterious and wonderful than if the wafer had visibly become flesh, and the wine visibly become blood. You would in that case have had but one miracle, but now you have two. Great and glorious act, assuredly, of the power and the wisdom of God! He performs a miracle, and immediately behold a second miracle for the purpose of concealing the first.¹

We are not in the least surprised, says Bossuet,² at the difficulties that arise from the senses. “The other mysteries of religion have accustomed us to subject our understandings to the obedience of the faith.” It is no more difficult for the Son of God, he elsewhere says, to make his body be present in the eucharist by saying, *This is my body*, than to make a sick man whole by saying, *Be thou whole*. In fine, according to the Catechism, “If the bread and the wine which we take at our meals, change, by the sole force of nature, into flesh and blood, why should the bread and the wine of the supper not become changed by the force of the sacrament, into the body and the blood of Jesus Christ?”³ Answers which all amount to this: “Speak not of improbabilities, all things are possible to God.”

No, all things are not possible to God. There are things

¹ We may add that all other miracles as *sensible* proofs of divine power tend to weaken temptations to unbelief, whereas this, by deceiving the senses, presents a perpetual temptation to unbelief. Now, “God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man.”

—Tr.

² Treatise on the Eucharist.

³ Exposition of the Catholic Faith, ch. x.

which he cannot do; there are things, if you prefer the expression, which he could not desire to do without ceasing to be reasonable and wise, without ceasing to be God. Can he make a thing to be and not to be? That an event that is past should not have been? Can he create a square which is round, or a circle of which the radii are not all equal? "You are obliged to suppose," replies Bossuet, "that it is impossible to God to make one body to be at the same time in different places; but this is what you have not even attempted to prove by any passage of Scripture." The Scriptures have never said, in so far as we are aware, that a part is less than its whole, or that a straight line is the shortest that can be drawn from one point to another; but are we any the less sure of the thing on that account, less ready to repel, as insulting to God, the idea that he could ever have commanded us to believe the contrary?

Well, then, we defy any one to shew us that these impossibilities differ from that of transubstantiation. Reason can no better accommodate itself to the presence of one body in two different places, than to a square being not a square, to a circle which shall not be round, to an event which is past and which nevertheless is yet to come.

Shall we be told that reason has nothing to do here? Take care. That which is only above reason may, in fact, give reason nothing to exercise itself upon; but never can you deprive reason of the right to reject what is contrary to it. The making whole of a sick person, the resurrection of a dead person, are no doubt miracles that astonish us; but when attacked by the infidel, it is on the ground of improbability,¹ not of impossibility; he is compelled to acknowledge that if God willed them, they might have happened, and must have happened. Transubstantiation is a different thing. You cannot attack it without your arguments falling full on its very possibility; you cannot charge it with improbability without at the same time charging it with absurdity. This important distinction betwixt what is above reason and what is contrary to reason, Bossuet admits; he contests only the right of applying it. "Thus," says he, "every time that a man shall object that a point of faith is not only above reason, but directly contrary to reason, must we enter with him into this inquiry?" Refuse, if you will; but in that case, abandon the discussion. All your arguments are null before hand. A thing that is contrary to reason cannot be proved;

¹ *Unlikelihood* would perhaps be a better word here than *improbability*.—T.E.

how, then, could you prove it as long as you shall not have shewn that it is not so? Roman controversialists are the first to follow this course, when it does not run against them. When, for example, they would prove the credibility of miracles, they set about it just as if they were Protestants; they prove, first of all, that reason can admit them. Why refuse to do as much when they have to do with transubstantiation? Is this not an admission that they would not succeed? In fact, you have only to ask those who believe in it. Force them to analyze what they experience in thinking of it, and they will tell you that they do not believe in it in the same manner that they believe in the miracles of Scripture. The latter, as soon as you are convinced of the authenticity of the book that records them, you believe without effort; they are only acts, exceptional, no doubt, but quite natural and simple, of God's power. But the former you come to believe, or to persuade yourself that you believe, only by putting a force upon yourself, by trampling upon your reason, in fine, by infatuating yourself. The mind acquiesces in the miracles of Scripture; but here, it can only withdraw from exercising itself and be silent. The moment we have to do, not with a momentary suspension of the law of nature, but with the reversal of an axiom, all acquiescence is impossible. We shall have occasion to return to these considerations in Book IV. in speaking of the Mass.

Even were it but a simple miracle, it would always remain to be proved that this miracle really happened.

This is my body, said Jesus Christ; and this, according to the Roman Church, is the foundation of its doctrine. On which we might first of all object,—

That Jesus Christ was there, in flesh, in bones, still a complete man; and that the idea of a man holding his own body in his hands is a monstrous oddity;

That in saying, “*This is my body which is broken for you*,” he would have expressed, had it been really his body, a fact that was not correct; since it was on the evening before his death, and his body as yet was nowise broken;¹

That after having called the wine his *blood*, he called it *this fruit of the vine*;

That if the words of St. Luke, “*this cup is the New Testament in my blood*,” evidently make the cup, not a testament,

¹ The Vulgate accordingly makes it *shall be broken* (frangetur), while the Greek verb is in the present tense.

but the symbol of a testament, there is no reason for the preceding phrase not being figurative also, and for the wine not being the symbol of the blood, the bread that of the body ;

That Jesus Christ often used expressions not less figurative, I am *the door*, I am *the vine*, I am *the way* ;

In fine, that if he said (John vi.), "The bread that I will give is my flesh," and "he that eateth me, even he shall live by me," in the same chapter we read also, "the flesh profiteth nothing ; the words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life." Suppose that a man holding bread, and employed further in breaking it into twelve parts, were to say, "This is my body which is broken for you," to what would you apply the word *this* ? Evidently to the whole bread, for it is the whole bread that is broken, not the separate pieces. Thus, in order to our being able to understand the first four words, *this is my body*, in their literal meaning, we must leave out of view those that follow, at least they must be taken in a figurative sense, for there is evidently a figure in calling that broken which is not so. After this, what ground can we have for denying that the whole phrase is figurative ?

Without going beyond the narrative of the institution, we should still find there more than one detail positively contrary to the literal sense of the four words on which Romanists would fain concentrate the debate. And what, would the reader know, has the Catechism, which had seen them before we did, done with these details ? The pains it takes to attenuate them, is the best proof of the annoyance they must have given. "Jesus," says St. Matthew, "having taken the bread and given thanks." This *to give thanks*, (*to bless God*, for that is the Greek,) is first changed into *blessing, consecrating* the bread, a change previously made, but with more reserve, in the decree of the council, where it is merely said, "After the benediction of the bread and the wine."¹ Here then is the consecration, but as the words reputed to be consecratory, *this is my body*, do not, nevertheless, occur in the narrative, until a line or two lower down, the Catechism takes care to bring the two ideas into closer connexion. This, it says, is as if the Evangelist had made it run thus :— "Having taken the bread, Jesus blessed it, *saying*, This is my body." So here we have the mass discovered.² Notwithstand-

¹ Post panis viniq̄ue benedictionem.

² Yet the Roman Catholic doctors did not light upon it so cleverly as one might suppose. Transubstantiation was taught long before it was thought possible to indicate the precise

ing this, however, the canon of the mass has taken a farther precaution. "Take and eat," says the priest, "*for* this is my body."¹ "This *for*, however," adds the Catechism, "is not necessary to the validity of the sacrament." Why, then, put it there, when none of the Evangelists has done so? Had the sacred authors attached the smallest importance to the order and the regularity of these details, if, in particular, they had seen in the words, *This is my body*, the consecration of the bread, the signal of its being changed into flesh,—how can we conceive that they should all have fallen into the incredible inadvertence of not introducing them until *after* the fact of the distribution of the bread? "He brake it, and divided it among them, and said, Take, eat." Then follows, as a mere explanation, "This is my body." With an historian believing in transubstantiation, and believing it to be effected by those four last words, it would not be an inadvertence, but folly, to introduce them only at the end. Where should we find a Roman Catholic, who being asked to say over the mass, would put the consecration after the distribution? And if it be at all admitted that some ignorant clown, knowing nothing of the matter, might make such a blunder, who will admit that four or five doctors, writing coolly and calmly, could all have fallen into the same error, or rather into the same absurdity?

And now, let us leave the details. It is a history we are writing; let us see what history says on the subject.

To begin with that of the Apostles, taken from the Acts and the Epistles, we might ask any man of good faith, if he could come away from the perusal of it with the idea that the communion was at that time what Rome has made it since. Some expressions might be cited, more or less copied from those used by Jesus Christ; but others would have to be adduced also, which, as they can only be taken literally, must necessarily outweigh the others. We may say and demonstrate, that all that can be found in favour of transubstantiation are figurative; but

moment when the miracle took place. Innocent III. (De sacrificio Missæ) admits, that in order to be able to say with truth, "*This is my body*," Jesus must have effected the change which they announce some time before. But if they were no more in his mouth than the announcement of something already done, how could they have in the mouth of the priest the power of operating that very thing? Innocent, accordingly, attributed the sacramental consecration, not to these words, but to the prayer made by the priest before pronouncing them. This was more reasonable, but it was vague. More precision was wanted, and people kept to the words, *This is my body*. Innocent's opinion, however, was not abandoned; shortly before the council, it re-occurs in Biel and Catharini. Thus it is hardly three centuries since the consecrating virtue was definitely attributed to those four words. This is one more of those things which the greater number of Roman Catholics, and even of their priests, are far from suspecting.

¹ Hoc enim est corpus meum.

with respect to all that are opposed to it, it is impossible to depart from their plain and obvious meaning. In short, all that Rome adduces might have been perfectly well spoken by men who did not believe in transubstantiation; what is opposed to it could not have been said by men who believed in it. What shall we make, for example, of those passages in which the supper is called simply "The breaking of bread?" What, in particular, of that famous chapter, in which St. Paul repeats, not as an historian, but with a positively practical purpose in view, the detailed narrative of the evangelists? Is not the eucharist formally represented there as a repast taken in common? The Apostle complains of certain abuses that had crept into meetings of that kind. He recalls, on this occasion, the institution of the supper; he desires that the repast should be more fraternal, more serious, more Christian; he threatens and condemns those who should take part in it *unworthily*; but as respects the repast itself, he says not a word from which one might conjecture that he thought the custom extraordinary or bad. With transubstantiation is this admissible? Much more, in deducing consequences from the fact of the supper's having been instituted by Jesus Christ, and from his having called the bread his body, what does he say? Now was the time, if ever, for him to state positively, "Christ is there; it is his body; it is he himself;" and this would have been at once the strongest and the simplest of motives to urge in recommending respect. Instead of this, what says the Apostle? "*But let a man examine himself*, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own condemnation, *not discerning the Lord's body*." The Roman Catechism hastens to translate these words thus, "Not discerning, under the bread and wine, the Lord's body which is concealed in them."¹ And the reason for this is, "That if, as the heretics say, there be nothing to be venerated in this sacrament but the memorial and the sign of Christ's passion, what need for so warmly exhorting believers to examine themselves?" What! because of Christ's not being corporeally present, there would be less need for being well prepared for the communion? These words of St. Paul, viewed more closely, are quite as contrary as the rest to the idea of the real presence. In fact, the communicant either believes in it, or he does not believe in it. If he believes in it, whether he examine himself or not, he discerns the body concealed under

¹ Corpus Domini, quod in Eucharistia occulte latet, ab alio ciborum genere non distinguit.

the bread; if he does not believe in it, it is not by examining himself that he will come to believe in it. In both cases there is no connexion between the counsel given, and the consequence indicated. This *discernment of the Lord's body*, then, can only be what arises from self-examination; that is to say, from the right dispositions taken altogether, which ought to be brought to the act, and from a profound sense of its sacredness.

After this, although transubstantiation were proved to us to have been established from the close of the first century, or from the commencement of the second, still we should be entitled at once to deny that it can be traced to the Apostles.

But there is nothing of the kind to be found in history. Only let us acknowledge that the Church's ideas on the subject of the supper, speedily began to be modified. As the increase in the number of Christians no longer admitted of their partaking of a repast in common, it had become necessary to conduct it with more solemn forms; and with these new forms there crept in a tendency to regard the substance also under an aspect more or less new. Jewish or pagan reminiscences, the mystery with which the early Christians were often compelled to surround themselves, the excitement caused by a sense of danger, the need of a protection from on high ever more present and more sensibly felt, everything, in fine, had concurred to enhance the eucharist in proportion to the miracles of grace that were expected from it every day. That bread, that wine, people could no longer make up their minds, in some sort, to look upon as no more than bread and wine; they attached themselves more and more closely to those passages of Scripture which seemed to make them something else; they advanced by long strides towards transubstantiation; and yet ages were destined to elapse before they durst venture to make it an article of faith.

Why so long of coming to the birth? Because even amid the general tendencies, people were often thrown back against their will upon the precise statements of the Bible and the plain conclusions of reason. What we said above of Scripture, we may now say of the Fathers: to whatever they have written that seems to favour the doctrine of the real presence, we may oppose things which they manifestly would not have said, had they believed in it.

See Justin, first, in his famous apology: "On the day of the sun we meet. The Scriptures are read, and then an elder exhorts the people to follow such beautiful examples. We rise,

we pray anew ; water, bread, and wine are set down. The priest (presbyter) gives thanks, and those present reply, Amen. A part of the consecrated things are distributed, and the deacons take the rest to the absent." Were the real presence, were transubstantiation here, it might be said that the Protestants believe in it, for it is precisely, with hardly any exception, a representation of their meetings.

Read Tertullian:¹ "Jesus Christ having taken bread, and having distributed it among his disciples, made it his body, saying, This is my body, that is to say, the figure of my body." Besides these last words, note, that as in the narratives of the Evangelists, the consecration *follows* the distribution.

Read Origen:² "If Christ, as the Marcionites maintain, had neither flesh nor blood, of what body and of what blood were that bread and that wine *the signs and images?*" Elsewhere³ he calls the bread of the eucharist *a figurative body*. At this passage and at two or three others of this kind, "Origen was a heretic," replies Cardinal Duperron. Heretic if you will; but all his heresies have been adopted by Epiphanius, by Augustine, by Jerome, and never, in so far as we know, have these words been made a charge against him.

Read Ephrem:⁴ "Taking bread in his hands he gives thanks, and breaks it *in figure of his immaculate body*."

Read Macarius:⁵ "Bread and wine are offered, being the figure of the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ. They who participate in this visible bread, eat spiritually the flesh of the Lord."

Read Theodoret:⁶ "The Lord has honoured these visible signs with the name of his body and his blood, not in changing their nature, but in adding grace to nature."

Read Vigilius:⁷ "When Christ's flesh was on the earth, it was not in heaven; and now that it is in heaven, it is not on the earth."

Read Chrysostom,⁸ and this passage is all the more remarkable against the real presence, as the first words seem to lead to it:

¹ Against Marcion, book iii.—Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum fecit, dicendo hoc est corpus meum, id est figura corporis mei. Duperron, in quoting this passage, changes *id est* into *scilicet*, and makes Tertullian say: "This, to wit, the figure of my body, is my body." Bellarmine (Eucharist xx.) is not content with twisting the meaning, but mutilates the phrase. He suppresses altogether *id est figura*. These falsifications shew plainly enough how clear this passage has appeared, and how embarrassing.

² Against the Marcionites.

³ Commentary on St. Matthew.

⁴ Against the curious inquirers into the body of Christ.

⁵ Homily xxvii.

⁶ First Dialogue against the Eutychians.

⁷ Against Eutychius, book v.

⁸ Letter to Cæsarius.

“Before the bread is consecrated it is called bread; but when divine grace has sanctified it through the intervention of the priest, then it no longer bears the name of bread; it becomes *worthy of being called* the Lord’s body, *although the nature of bread remains in it.*”

Finally, read St. Augustine. That one among the Fathers who has furnished the most arms to the partisans of the real presence, is the one also who, when he reasons and speaks without figures, furnishes us with the most against that same opinion. Listen to him in one of his treatises:¹ “The Lord had no difficulty in saying, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body.” Listen to him in an epistle:² “This sacrifice (of the eucharist) is a thanksgiving and a *commemoration* of the blood of Christ which he offered for us.” Listen to him in another epistle:³ “Had the sacraments no resemblance to the things whereof they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments. But, in consequence of that resemblance, *they take most frequently the name of the things themselves.*” And what, then, does he give as an example? Why, the bread and the wine of the eucharist. Hear him, finally, in one of his works, in which we may feel most assured of having his veritable sentiments, his *Christian Doctrine*: “If a commandment forbids anything that is shameful or criminal, or recommends what is useful and good, that command is not figurative; but if he commands a bad thing or forbids a good thing, it must not be taken literally.” And what does he give as an instance? Why, still the eucharist. “If ye eat not,” saith the Saviour, “the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink not his blood, ye have no life in you.” It looks as if in these words he commanded a crime; it is a figure, then, by which we are recommended to communicate in our Saviour’s passion, by engraving in our memory, in a manner at once affecting and useful, the killing and crucifying of his body for us.⁴ What,

¹ Against Adimant, ch. xii.

² To the Deacon Peter, on the Faith. (This book has been attributed also to Fulgentius, the disciple of St. Augustine.) In i-to sacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulit.

³ To Boniface. Si sacramenta quaedam similitudinem harum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non habent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum nomina accipiunt. Mark the expression: *Quarum sacramenta sunt*, of which they are the sacraments; as if he had said, Of which they are the sacred emblems.

⁴ Si præceptiva locutio est aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem, aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. “Nisi manducaveritis,” inquit, “carnem filii hominis,” &c. Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere; figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recordandum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit. (De Doctr. Chr. iii. 16.)

after this, and we have far from quoted all that has been collected of an analogous kind, from the writings of that Father,—what, we say, become of those passages in which Augustine, reproducing, without comment, the figure employed by Jesus Christ, appears to teach the real presence.¹ And what a lamentable courage must the Fathers of Trent have had when they ventured to say, “All our ancestors . . . have taught thus in the most open manner. . . . And since these words of the Saviour present this proper and most evident meaning, according to which they were understood by the Fathers, it is assuredly a most heinous crime, that these words, against the universal sentiment of the Church, should be twisted by certain quibbling and depraved persons, into certain fictitious and imaginary figures; the Church, accordingly, has always detested as satanical these explanations imagined by impious men.”²

Among these impious men, as the crowning of the work, there ought to have been ranged all the Roman Catholic historians who have been candid enough to relate the origin and progress of this idea, which one would believe, looking to the decree, could have had no other commencement but that of Christianity itself. Through whom do we know, if not through them, and in particular through one of the most devoted champions of Rome, Bellarmine, that it was Paschasius Rathbert, abbot of Corbie, in the ninth century, who first positively taught the real presence? Through whom do we know, if not through them, that though his opinion may already have been that, as is possible, of the majority of doctors, still it met with quite a sufficient amount of opposition to prove that it was not an admitted doctrine? Rathbert himself, in a letter to Frudegard, admits that many accused him of having exaggerated the meaning of the words of Jesus Christ. Does he say that they were,

¹ At Geneva, too, in this manner, and in the Reformed Church of France, it would appear to be taught, for one of the liturgical hymns contains these verses:—

Sa chair sacrée est le seul aliment	His sacred flesh supplies the only food
Qui donne à l'ame un vrai contentement.	That fills the hungry soul with real good.
Son divin sang, qu'il offre pour breuvage,	His blood, whence he our beverage supplies,
Nous a des cieux mérité l'héritage . . .	Has merited our kingdom in the skies. . . .
Mais qui pourrait ainsi manger et boire	But who the body and the blood could think
Le corps sacré, le sang du roi de gloire ?	Of glory's king to feed upon and drink ?
C'est le Chrétien qui, &c.	It is the Christian who, &c.

² Ita enim majores nostri omnes . . . apertissime professi sunt. Quæ verba . . . quum propriam illam et apertissimam significationem præ se ferant, secundum quam a Patribus intellecta sunt, indignissimum sane flagitium est ea a quibusdam contentiosis et pravis hominibus ad fictitious et imaginarios tropos converti, contra universum Ecclesiæ sensum: quæ hæc ab impiis hominibus excogitata commenta, velut satanica detestata est, semper agnoscens, &c.

therefore, heretics? Does he attack them in the name of the Church? Not at all. Had he done so we should only have had to adduce the names of those who, either during his lifetime or afterwards, impugned his doctrine,¹ and to ask if so many eminent personages, abbots, bishops, archbishops, could have dreamt of impugning what they regarded as sanctioned by the Church. Thus, whatever date may be assigned to the first commencement of transubstantiation, it remains demonstrated that in the ninth or tenth centuries people wrote freely for and against it. It was an opinion, not an article of faith.

Finally, in 1059, under Nicolas II., it was adopted at Rome, but at a private council, and not very clearly. In 1215, under Innocent, it was definitively voted at the council of Lateran, and took the name which has since been given to it.

All opposition was now, no doubt, to be at an end. But no. Between the council of Lateran and that of Trent we find doctors who, even while declaring their belief in it, admit that they do not see it in the Scriptures. First there is Duns Scotus; he knows not, he says,² any Scriptural declaration which, by itself, and without the determination of the Church, can oblige one to admit it. Then we have Cardinal D'Ailly,³ "This opinion," says he, "that the substance of the bread always remains, is not repugnant either to reason or to Scripture. It is even easier of comprehension, and more rational, if it could accord with the determination of the Church." Then Gabriel Biel, in his lessons on the mass:—"We do not find in the Bible⁴ in what manner Christ's body is there. That is proved by the authority of the Church and of the saints, for by reasons it cannot be proved. But why should the Church and the saints have determined so difficult a meaning, seeing the Scriptures might be expounded on this article in a manner much more easy to be understood? The Church has so determined." See again, shortly before the council of Trent, two great doctors that entertained the same view. The one is Cardinal Cajetan:⁵—"That which the Gospel has not explained expressly, to wit, the manner in which the bread is changed into the body of Christ, we have received from the Church." The other is Bishop Fischer:⁶—"Here (in the narrative of the institution of the supper) there is not a word by which one might

¹ Amalaire, Archbishop of Treves; Heribald, Bishop of Auxerre; Raban, Archbishop of Mayence; Waldfred, Abbot of Saint Gall; Loup, Abbot of Ferrières; Bertram, Monk of Corbie, &c.

² Commentary on Book IV. of Sentences.

⁴ Non invenitur in canonè Bibliæ.

⁶ Against the Captivity of Babylon, ch. x

³ Ibid.

⁵ Question lxxv.

prove the true presence of the body and the blood of Jesus Christ. One cannot prove that, then, by any Scripture." And although the council affected to rest on Scripture alone, although it has declared the meaning to be clear, evident, incontestable, which it has given to the words *this is my body*, lo, here we find Cardinal Bellarmine returning, forty years afterwards, almost to the same thesis:—For him, says he,¹ he believes, like the council, that transubstantiation may be proved by Scripture, but it may, nevertheless, be doubted whether it be so, since very learned and very ingenious men have been of a contrary opinion.

What more could we ask than these admissions? What could we find more positively corroborative of what we have said, under the scriptural point of view, against transubstantiation? Say, if you will, that these authors were wrong in not clearly seeing it in Scripture; the mere fact that they, good Roman Catholics, have admitted that they had not seen it there, will ever prove that it is not clearly there; and we should then ask if it be admissible that a dogma which was to be in relation to worship that which the existence of God is to faith, that is to say, the centre and foundation of all the rest, should not have been distinctly announced, distinctly alluded to, in a single passage of the holy books.

Now, then, all that we have said of it we might repeat, did we so choose, in speaking of all the dogmas and all the practices of which it is the source.

We should ask first, not if the mass is in Scripture—for that would be almost a jest—but whether the supper holds a place there which can in any way be compared with that now held by the mass at the present day in the Roman Church? We may be allowed, on this matter, to make an observation which Protestants themselves may deem too bold, but to which a man of calm and sound mind will not, we think, be able to refuse his assent.

This observation is that the supper—by which we mean, of course, the *matériel* of the supper—has not in Scripture the importance that Christians have generally given to it. We would not, assuredly, be understood to mean by that, that it can ever be surrounded with too much respect, or that one can prepare himself for it too carefully; it is the holiest of the accessories, but still an accessory, since it may be dispensed with. Observe, that St. John, the most spiritual of the four evangelists,

¹ On the Eucharist, book iii. ch. 25.

has omitted recording it. The greater number of the Epistles do not mention it. The fact that the first Christians communicated at all their meetings, far from contradicting us, favours our view, if it proves, which we admit without difficulty, that the first Christians always and everywhere obeyed the command,—“Do this in remembrance of me.” It proves also, looking to the simple manner in which they observed it, and the daily participation in it by one and all, that they were very far from seeing in the supper the foundation and the essential part of worship. The augmentation of its solemn accompaniments is what we quite approve; but if one cannot say that this is contrary to the ideas of the primitive Church, no more can one say that it was in conformity with its usages.

What, consequently, shall we say of the transformation that has taken place in the supper becoming the mass? The mass is the abstract, the centre, and, for many, the whole of religion and of worship. In like manner as Christ is thought to be incarnated in the wafer, Christianity is viewed as, in some sort, incarnated in the mass. The mass, always and everywhere the mass. The mass on all occasions; the mass for all objects. From Rome down to the merest hamlet, not a temple where the general plan, or the details of the edifice, where all, in fine, does not announce the mass, is not made for the mass, and does not exclude, at the first glance, every other idea but that of the mass. The mass, accordingly, is the first thing that a Roman Catholic, if he begins to open his eyes, is astonished at not finding in the Bible. Judging of it by the importance that he has been taught to attach to it, he might expect to meet with it at every page. In vain will it be attempted, after that, to shew it to him in its germ in the narrative of the supper, in some isolated passages. If still too little versed in theology and history to reply from the grounds of either, it will always be enough for him to say that what occupies so large a space in his creed, in his worship, behoves to occupy, in the picture left us of the early years of the Church, sufficient space at least not to escape his notice on a first reading.

Assuredly a priest who believes in the real presence may boast of possessing the greatest and most miraculous of the powers with which a creature, man or angel, was ever invested. “We confess that the priest is greater than Mary herself, the mother of God. She gave birth to Christ but once; but the priest creates him when he pleases, and as often as he pleases.” Such

is the tenor of a form of abjuration imposed at the commencement of the last century on the peasants of Hungary. Although the authenticity of this has been disputed, these lines, extraordinary as they are to reasonable Roman Catholics, are not the less, if we admit the real presence, rigorously true. What Mary, blessed among all women, viewed as the most glorious and sacred of favours, there are three or four hundred thousand priests throughout the world to whom it is a thing of daily and very simple occurrence. And when one thinks that the most impure and criminal of men may, in a few seconds, with a few hastily uttered words, perform, when he pleases, this prodigy of prodigies,¹ your head swims, in truth, in the view of such an abyss of inconsistencies and pride. All that Egypt or India ever imagined in the way of fabulous monstrosity for the elevation of their priests above the ordinary level of humanity, has been outdone by Rome in teaching transubstantiation. Did not the number of the priests and the frequency of the masses attenuate the importance attached to it,—were, for example, one sole priest in the world thought to perform it, he would be almost a god.

A priest, *who believes in the real presence*, we have said. Do we mean to hint that all do not believe in it? When Luther, at that time a fervent Roman Catholic, went on his journey into Italy, nothing more profoundly shocked him than to see priests laughing in secret at their public performances. "Bread thou art, and bread thou shalt remain,"² they would say in the mass, instead of the sacramental words. Are there still any such priests? We know not, and it is not for us to inquire. We could not even approve of people saying, as is sometimes done, that a priest cannot believe in the mass; all we say is, and this at least is true, that it must be more difficult for him to believe it than any one else. That wafer which the people contemplate at a distance, and always under the influence of a certain charm, he sees close at hand, he touches it, he breaks it, he eats it every day; every day he must admit, while apart, that such as it was

¹ Let us not forget that this power, if it exists at all, is necessarily unlimited. All the wine that may be contained in a cellar, all the bread that may be found in a baker's shop, the priest may by a few words transubstantiate into the body and the blood of Christ. *Consecrare potest multos cophinos panis et vini dolium, si presentia ista haberet*, says Cardinal Tolet, (*De Instructione Sacerdotum*, lib. ii.) Llorente relates that a priest amused himself one day by consecrating in passing all the bread exposed for sale in a market. He was punished, and passed for a person who had lost his mind; but not the less was the bread regarded as transubstantiated. Nobody dared to touch it. Priests came to take it away, and nobody knowing what to do with it, it was burnt. When a doctrine can lead to such enormous absurdities, is it not doing it too much honour to combat it with reasons?

² *Panis es, et panis manebis.*

before consecration the same it has every appearance of being after. That wine which he alone has the right to drink he finds possessing at the altar the same taste and the same properties as at his ordinary meals. Those words which are thought to work the miracle—where shall we find the priest, however pious, who cannot recollect many occasions on which he has pronounced them without seriously pondering them, perhaps without thinking of them at all, perhaps with his mind full of bad thoughts? And shall we be told that such a man never can doubt the virtue of such an operation! Never feel the slightest difficulty at the thought of a result so enormously out of proportion to the means! Charity commands us to believe this; but the more we think of it the more does reason refuse.

At Trent, too, before proceeding to decree transubstantiation, the council had been led to examine whether practice corresponded with theory on this point, and the existence of strange disorders had to be admitted. Besides the small degree of seriousness with which many priests set themselves to perform this dread act, there were few churches in which custom did not give its sanction to superstitions or abuses more or less contrary to the awfulness of the sacrament. These abuses, condemned afterwards by the council, have generally disappeared; but even at this day the forms are far indeed from being always worthy of the essence. Nothing more pompous, no doubt, than a grand mass at Rome, at Milan, at Vienna, at Paris; did God descend in visible form on this earth, hardly could he be received with greater splendour. But for one of these grand spectacle masses, how many thousands are said in which the greatness of the mystery vanishes under the paltriness of the forms! Shall we be told that the cup used by the Saviour was very probably neither of gold nor silver? True, and it were misapplied railery, indeed, were we to attack the tin vessels of the poor village priest; but it is not of anything paltry in that way that we mean to speak. No. Look to that cathedral in which so many marvels have been displayed at Christmas or Easter; look to that St. Peter's at Rome where you seem to have witnessed the poms of heaven, then return on the following morning. The tapers have been put out, the hangings have been removed. No one is at the high altar. In passing before a small chapel you hear a few words murmured. You see there, in the corner, an altar for a priest, and a boy who at certain moments repeats with the utmost rapidity of which his lips are capable some

Latin words which he blunders. The priest takes no notice of this. He also has his lesson to recite, and that lesson he finds rather long; he may have recited it these twenty, these thirty years, perhaps for half a century. At last he says his last Amen. He walks off to other business, and the boy to school. And this that you have been witnessing is the mass! It was, if we are to believe the Roman Church, the most awful, the most profoundly sacred act that could take place in the world! Ah! Protestants can well afford to profess their disbelief in the real presence, and to avoid celebrating the communion with pomp and shew; the bread and the wine of the supper, without ceasing to be bread and wine in their eyes, meet with a very different respect in their Churches from that which the wafer—the body of the Saviour—daily meets with in those of the Roman Catholics.

Do men hope to compensate by the adoration of the wafer for the irreverence with which it is so often treated in so many masses said with precipitation or mechanically? Adoration being regarded as one of the consequences of the real presence, it too was one of the points admitted without difficulty by the council. And yet there was no such close connexion between the two dogmas as seemed to be thought. Even were the wafer incontestably the body of Jesus Christ, it may still be doubted whether it be agreeable to the spirit of Christianity to adore a body, be it what it may, however divine the soul to which it serves or may have served as an envelope. Will it be said, that since we honour the mortal remains of great men, the stronger reason have we to honour those of the Son of God? Honour them! Who denies that? See whether, among Protestants, that bread which to them is only the representation of Christ's body, be not the object of the most profound respect. But between the highest honours and adoration the distance is great, it is immense. Honours prejudge nothing as to the nature of the object to which they are paid; adoration makes that object a God. Can a body, then, be a God? No. The Church itself has felt this. In order to get at the deification of the wafer, it was necessary that the body of Jesus Christ should have a certain divinity of its own, subsisting even after the departure of the divine soul with which that body had been animated. "Divinity," says the Roman Catechism; "never deserted it even in the sepulchre." Does this mean, peradventure, that after having been subject to all the necessities and to all the sufferings of the flesh, that body, nevertheless, would not have corrupted in the

tomb had it remained there? In that case it must be confessed that the wafer hardly resembles it, seeing that like every other kind of bread it can dry up and moulder away. Be that as it may, the Catechism insists much on this idea, it being the necessary complement of the more vague decree by which the council ordained the adoration of the wafer. "Not only," does it say, "is the true body of Jesus Christ, to wit, all that is proper to the human body, the bones, the nerves, contained in this sacrament, but, farther, Jesus Christ *whole and entire*." Thus it is not only a body that is there under this morsel of paste, there is himself, the Saviour, living, thinking, acting, such, in a word, as he was on the day of the supper. It must be admitted that the pagans shewed more respect for their gods. The man who would have ventured to say that Jupiter was *whole and entire* in one of his statues, would have risked passing for a madman or an impious wretch.

The Church acknowledged, however, that one might in all places address the Saviour in prayer. Will he hear you when on your knees before the wafer better than elsewhere? No; for he is everywhere. One does not see what the material presence can add to that of a being already present everywhere. When we speak of the Deity as inhabiting a temple, we know well that it is a figure; what is the wafer in this sense but a temple, and how could a divine being be any more enclosed in it than in any temple whatever? This would lead us to a final objection. What purpose is really served by transubstantiation and its consequences? Does it augment the priest's respect for the supper? No: we defy any man to find in any Protestant Church anything comparable to the perfunctory character of common masses. Does it augment the awe felt by simple believers? No: the piety of the two parties being equal, the Protestant communicant is no less deeply affected than the Roman communicant. Does it enhance the dignity of the priesthood in the eyes of the people? No: we have already remarked, that the frequency of the miracle, and the numerousness of the priests, have made it quite a common affair. Is the real presence necessary for the interior effect of the sacrament? The Church, to preserve her consistency, has been obliged to maintain this. "The host," says the Catechism, "does not change into our substance, like bread and wine." What then becomes of it? This question naturally suggests itself; and hence angry disputes, of which we could not give even an idea without soiling this page with the most

ignoble details. Innocent III., in his *Treatise on the Mass*,¹ passes them complacently under review. He inquires what would become of the wafer if eaten by an animal, a mouse, for example, &c. &c. After having sunk as low as would appear to be possible, "there are other questions, to be sure," he says, "but in these matters it is better not to be too much inquisitive than to be inquisitive about too much." And, to say the truth, he rightly considered himself as very reserved in comparison with many others, for there is no extravagance that has not been said or written on this subject. Returning simply then to our first question, "Is the real presence necessary for the interior effect of the sacrament?" the following is the answer we would give to those who should affirm it:—Several persons equally pious, equally well prepared, communicate together. Among the wafers which the priest is about to give them there is one which, from some oversight, has not been consecrated. Christ is not there; it is mere bread. Will he who shall receive it have communicated? If you say no, you insult common sense. If you say yes, what purpose is served by transubstantiation?

Although it tended, which we have denied, to augment men's respect for the supper, for the priesthood, and for religion in general, still it must be seen whether this advantage be not more than counterbalanced by the superstitions that flow from it. The mere adoration of the wafer, disengaged though it were from all idolatrous accompaniments, is at once an immense step in that pious materialism over which enlightened Romanists are the first to groan. The worshipped wafer, we have said, becomes thereby a god; a god less gross, if you will, than a statue of wood or stone would be, but nevertheless a material and visible god. Now, though there may be some apparent advantage in fixing the eyes and the mind of rude populations on a visible god, not the less is it a breach of the spirituality of the Christian religion. Instead of making efforts to raise mankind to the lofty standard of Christian ideas, the Roman Church has found it more easy, and, above all, more advantageous to bring Christianity down to their level. The adoration of the wafer ere long ceased to be limited to the time of mass. The deified bread remains exposed upon the altar. Ceremonies, festivals, processions are got up in its honour. It is at the sound of cannon that it leaves the temples, and at the sound of cannon that it enters them. An eminently spiritual religion has fixed itself and

¹ Book iv.

been incarnated in the most material part of an act instituted as a simple memorial.

Whilst one party among the divines and bishops thus fixed for ever, reserving the correction of some abuses in detail, the greatest and the most intolerable of the Roman abuses,—others had resumed the questions of discipline, and specially, that of episcopal jurisdiction. Their object was to settle its limits, and still more, although the bishops took care not to announce this, to put an end to encroachments on the part of the jurisdiction of the pope.

“Dare any of you, having a matter against another,” says St. Paul,¹ “go to law before the unjust and not before the saints, (the members of the Church?) . . . If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the Church.” Such was the first foundation of episcopal jurisdiction. It is hardly necessary to remark:—

1st, That St. Paul speaks here of arbiters, and not at all of judges or of regular courts.

2d, That the only reason he gives is, that civil judges are pagans. Then, Christianity once established, and the courts of justice having become Christian, the recommendation fell to the ground.

3d, That he speaks of the Church, of the members of the Church, even “the least esteemed,” says he, and nowise of pastors in particular.

The faithful, nevertheless, were led, particularly during the persecutions, to give a regular shape to this part of the Church’s internal administration; the bishop naturally found himself at the head of it. When Christianity became the religion of the empire, the ecclesiastical courts had acquired too much consistency for their sudden abolition not to risk being an outrage to religion and the clergy. They found a place accordingly in the general administration of justice; episcopal sentences became obligatory like those of other judges. Anon privileges were bestowed on these courts. Even so early as under Constantine, if one of the parties chose, a suit might be transferred from the civil judge before whom it had commenced, to the bishop’s court. Notwithstanding the less favourable arrangements of other emperors, these privileges always went on increasing. The bishops drew at last into their courts everything that touched,

¹ 1 Cor. vi.

more or less remotely, on religion and the Church; testaments, because the Church was deemed to be the guardian of orphans and widows; contracts of marriage, because marriage was a religious act; engagements of all sorts, under the pretext that the oath, a religious act, formed a part of them. Finally, all the power which princes and peoples had originally conceded to the episcopate only from respect for religion, and without the episcopate arrogating to itself any part of it as a right, was by a gradual advance in boldness declared to be independent of the civil authority. It was from God, from God alone, and directly from God, that the bishops maintained they held it.

At the same time, as isolated bishops had had no great success in imposing this doctrine on princes, they had been compelled, in this as in everything else, to close their ranks around the pope; they had been forced to recognise in him the chief of this vast judiciary body, pretending to have been instituted by Him of whom the pope claimed to be the representative on earth. But Rome gives nothing, even to her own servants, without making them pay for it. Availing herself, therefore, of the need which the bishops had of her, in resisting the civil authority, ere long she considered them in their character of judges, only as instituted by her. It was to the pope, to the pope alone, that God had given jurisdiction; the bishops were only his mandatories, as the civil judges are those of their prince. But while, in a well regulated state, the prince never intervenes in the administration of justice, the practice of carrying causes by appeal to Rome, adroitly encouraged by the popes, had become universal. The bishop saw all important causes taken away from him. When he began to attend to a process before him, he was never sure of its being left in his hands. His very priests might slip from his grasp, not only for breaches of discipline, but even for misdemeanours and crimes. Papal jurisdiction, it will be seen, had poached largely on the domains of episcopal usurpation.

No man in the council had shewn any wish to trace things to their source, and to ask himself, putting abuses out of the question, what was the foundation of the assumed right from which they flowed. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction might have had, amid the disorders of the Middle Ages, more than one happy effect; but services rendered, however disinterested they may have been deemed, which assuredly they were not, never could create a positive right. Accordingly, long before the Reformation, and without at all trenching on the domain of doctrine,

more than one author, to the great satisfaction of the civil princes, had set himself to weigh the titles of the episcopate, and had found them very much wanting. On going back, what was there found? Either the concessions made by princes, or nothing; nothing but the Scripture, that is, four lines of St. Paul, which, as we have seen, said rather quite the contrary of what the Church had found in them.¹ In 1551, after so many works on public law, in the face of Charles V. and the Parliament of Paris, the question could no longer be one of law; it was necessary for the Church to keep to the utmost to fact, and to preserve as much of that as possible, considering it still fortunate that the princes did not speak of resuming everything. At the head of the decree, accordingly, there was no declaration of principles. Such being the case, what are we to regard as the Church's doctrine on this point? Is ecclesiastical jurisdiction of divine right? On the side of the council, the faithful have been left free to believe it to be so, or not; on the side of Rome, it is long now since no such liberty has been allowed. From the time of Gregory VII., the popes have plainly set themselves up as judges of the Christian world. Boniface VIII., in particular, had so formally decreed this, that one does not see how it can fail to be a point of faith with all who admit the pope's infallibility.

Thus constantly in danger of coming into collision with either the rights of the pope or those of the princes, the council could decide nothing of importance. Besides, view in what manner you please, in theory, the jurisdiction of bishops, it would have been unreasonable not to admit the superiority of that of the pope. And so the main source of the abuses complained of, the appellate jurisdiction of Rome, behoved still to exist. That being assumed, what restrictions were there to be imposed upon it? The independent bishops demanded that before appealing, the parties should be compelled to wait until sentence should be pronounced; they desired, also, that appeals should be taken from the bishop to the pope, only by passing through the intermediate jurisdiction of the metropolitan. These reclamations, however moderately made, found little echo in the majority of the assembly. The Italian bishops were the first to suffer from the papal power; but they were the first also to profit by it, and the most interested in maintaining it. The permission, accord-

¹ We have seen already (in Book First) what is to be thought of the famous passage, "If any one hear not the Church."

ingly, of appealing from the bishop to the pope was suffered to subsist, without passing through the metropolitan's court; the council contented itself with pointing out certain classes of causes in which the appeal should not suspend procedure, and could not be admitted until after the bishop had pronounced sentence.

Some small concession had also to be made on the article of ecclesiastical degradations. A priest, as a general principle, could be tried only by the Church; but as it was an established rule that the Church could not condemn to death, a priest accused of a capital crime had to be handed over to the civil jurisdiction. Now, in order to that, he had to be degraded; and the endless formalities with which the Church had encumbered that act, had but the effect at last of allowing many crimes to go unpunished. For the degradation of a bishop, thirteen were required; for that of a priest, six; for a mere deacon, three. Everywhere, and under all the formalities, might be traced the grand outlines of that immense scheme, put together with so much ability, for placing the State at the mercy of the Church, even in the very things in which she affected to declare her incompetency. It was decided that a priest might be degraded by a single bishop, assisted by a certain number of abbots, or failing these, a certain number of priests.

These decrees, as well as that of the eucharist, were published on the 11th of October (thirteenth session). The ambiguous safe-conduct which was to be transmitted to the emperor for the Protestant divines, was also read. They had asked, so it was said, in an appendix to the decrees, to be heard on divers points, and particularly upon the communion under both kinds. On that account, it was added, the council had suspended deciding on those points, and sent them the safe-conduct. This was far from correct. The Protestants had not asked to be heard on those more than on any other points, and to say the truth, they had asked for nothing; but there must needs have been some form for granting them the safe-conduct, since the emperor insisted upon it, and this was the form that best saved the council's dignity.

At this same sitting there appeared the ambassadors of the Elector of Brandenburg. Much anxious expectation had been felt about what might be said to the council by the envoys of a Lutheran. Protestants looked for a bold speech; Roman Catholics durst not hope for more than cold respect and unmeaning compliments.

Christopher Strassen, the spokesman, displeased everybody; Protestants by his submissiveness, Romanists by the very excess of a submissiveness which was infinitely greater than what on the Elector's part could be sincere, or could even appear to be so.

As for the ambassador from Henry II., he had set off immediately after the delivery of his protest. Yet the council's reply to the king's letter was read as if he had been present. That reply was generally calm and dignified. The king was besought, at the close, to send his prelates to Trent, and to remember his title of most Christian king. If he thought offence had been done to him, let him sacrifice his offended feelings to the good of the Church and the peace of Europe.

The day following, on meeting again in congregation, great complaints were made against the divines. In the course of the last discussions, twenty times over had they thrown all into disorder by their subtleties and contentions. It had been thought necessary, therefore, to fix the order in which they should speak. Those from the pope were to be allowed to speak first, next those from the emperor, then those from kings, electors, simple princes, &c. The number of times that each should be allowed to speak, and the time he was not to exceed, were also fixed. Finally, there was a renewal of the order, that they should always commence with proofs taken from Scripture. An illusory concession this, as we have already said, seeing that there was always an understanding, that in default of scriptural proofs, they might be taken from the Fathers, and, failing the Fathers, from the very accommodating arsenal of tradition.

The sacrament of Penance, with which the council was about to occupy itself, is not, at the first view of it, a point on which Roman Catholicism is reduced to this. "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven." "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Such are the words which it will be enough, it would appear, to inscribe on all the confessionals, in order to shut the mouths of all the adversaries of the Roman confession. We can, therefore, reply to them only by inquiring whether, in the view of those to whom they were addressed by Jesus Christ, these words bore the meaning attributed to them since?

But, of a thousand persons to whom the collection of the Epistles, including the Acts, should be given to peruse for the

first time, we ask if there would be one who, on being asked to trace the primitive history of the Church, as represented in these writings, would give Confession, in the Roman sense, a place in it? We ask whether those often quoted words, "Confess your faults *one to another*,"¹ far from giving any support to the Roman Confession, be not rather positively contrary to it? We ask whether those other words, as often quoted, "And many that believed came and confessed,"² do not clearly indicate a mere act of humility, without reference to any obligation, any general law? We ask if St. Paul, in his directions on the supper, could possibly have confined himself to concluding with these words, "But let a man *examine himself*?"³ We ask, in fine, if it be credible that among so many counsels and commands addressed to so many Churches, there should not be found a single direct mention of a thing of such daily and universal occurrence, if it existed then at all?

This absence of all direct and available mention we could not better prove, than by shewing what the Church has been obliged to cite, in order to give a faint colour of an evangelical and scriptural kind to Confession.

In the first place, wherever it could be done without too much violence to the context, *to repent* has been translated *to do penance*,⁴ an expression which, in common parlance, implies the idea of the sacrament. Thus, in the decree that the council proceeded to make, this abuse of words re-occurs thrice. "Repent and *do penance*," says Ezekiel. "Unless *ye do penance* ye shall perish," says Jesus Christ, in St. Luke. "*Do penance* and be baptized every one of you," says St. Peter in the Acts. In this last passage, besides the play upon words, let us note a singular inadvertence. The council declares that penance is a sacrament for those only who have received baptism. Seeing, then, that St. Peter here puts baptism after repentance or penance, he cannot, according to the decree itself, refer to the sacrament of penance.

But it is mainly in the Roman Catechism that we must look for the efforts that have been made to keep the words of Jesus Christ—"Whatsoever ye have bound," &c., from the isolation in which they are left in the midst of the New Testament, by the sacramental interpretation of them. First, before instituting the sacrament, Jesus Christ is said to have *insinuated* it, when, on raising Lazarus from the dead, he caused him to be *unbound*

¹ James v. 16.² Acts xix. 18.³ 1 Cor. xi.⁴ *Pœnitentiam* agere.

by his disciples. "It was," says St. Augustine, quoted by the Catechism, "to shew that priests have the power of *unbinding*." Note that the passage runs thus in St. John, "Jesus saith *unto them*, loose him and let him go;" and as the evangelist had spoken of a crowd of bystanders, it cannot be affirmed that this *them* applies exclusively to the disciples, who, moreover, were nowise priests, seeing that, according to a decision of the council, it was not until he was just about to leave them, that Jesus Christ stamped them with that character. Priests or not priests, in what science, in what branch of human study, would such an abuse of words, of ideas, of deductions, be tolerated? "At whatever hour," the Catechism goes on to say,¹ "a sinner desires to repent, our Lord has taught us not to reject him." Quite right; but where did he particularly teach this? "When St. Peter asked² him how many times we must forgive *sinners*, and if seven times were enough?" *Sinners*, you see how it is. St. Peter received power to forgive sins. He asks for directions as to the manner of doing so. What more clear? There is but one difficulty; it is that the Apostle said quite another thing. "How oft shall *my brother sin against me* and I forgive *him*?" Of sins and sinners, not a word. Elsewhere the Catechism quotes these words faithfully, but always with an effort to enlist them into its system. "Penance," it says, "is not, like baptism, a sacrament that cannot be repeated;" and the proof is that Jesus Christ sets no limits to the pardon of offences: it is natural, then, that he sets none, he who is so infinitely good, to the remission of sins by the sacrament of penance. In this manner, it will be seen, there is no reason why penance, instead of being nowhere, should not be everywhere. To the very words, "let a man *examine himself*," all is converted by the Catechism into something favourable to confession. "Let a man examine himself," and if he find himself in a state of sin, let him beware of communicating without having gone to confession. "Give me four lines of a man's writing," said Richeliéu, "and I will undertake to find enough in them to have him hanged." "Give me four lines of Scripture," the Roman Church seems to say, "and I undertake to find in them all that I have taught."

Such, then, is our first objection: sacramental penance, confession, are not in Scripture. Had we to write a theological treatise, we should now set ourselves to investigate what we are to understand by this power of binding and loosing, of remitting

¹ Part i. Art. 10.

² Matt. xviii.

and retaining, with which the Saviour invested his Apostles. We should see whether their altogether exceptional position, the perpetual aid of the Holy Ghost, the possession of other miraculous gifts, not transmissible, would permit us to believe in the transmission of this. And yet it was in reality the most miraculous of them all. "Thy sins be forgiven thee," said the Saviour to a paralytic, and anon the Jews were more surprised at those words than at the most amazing miracles. "Who," they exclaimed, "can forgive sins but God only?" They were right. If priests have not inherited the power of performing other miracles, whence should they have retained the gift of performing this? In writing to Timothy two epistles on the rights, the duties, the prerogatives, the functions of the minister of the Gospel, what says St. Paul about this divine function? Nothing; nothing even which any one has been bold enough to attempt to twist into such a meaning.

Accordingly, either the Apostles did not believe themselves entitled to communicate this power, or, which is still more likely, they were far from interpreting it in the Roman sense. When St. Paul, on being assailed as a minister, sets himself to enumerate his privileges as such,¹ he says nothing, absolutely nothing of this.

Premising these remarks, what most fortifies the objection drawn from the silence of the Apostles, is the very importance that has been given to this sacrament. The more you shall say that it is necessary, the more reasonable will you make it for others to think it impossible that the Apostles should never have spoken of it. But, with the exception of baptism, the necessity for which is deemed to be absolute, no sacrament, according to the council, is so necessary as this; and even, interpreting the decree literally, it, too, is absolutely necessary. "God being rich in mercy, he has granted a second remedy of life to those who, after baptism, shall have delivered themselves to sin, and this remedy is the sacrament of penance, whereby the benefit of Christ's death is applied to those who have fallen after baptism." Such is the opening of the decree. Without saying in so many terms that this is the only remedy, the council speaks of it as the only one, nor does it mention any other. For original sin, baptism; for all subsequent sins, the sacrament of penance; no other means, no other door. Would you have the proof? Go to the Roman Catechism, the avowed interpreter of the decrees of

¹ In various parts of his epistles, and particularly 2 Cor. x. and xi.

Trent,—“It is not enough,” it says, “to believe that Jesus Christ has instituted Confession; we must farther be persuaded that he has commanded the practice as necessary,” (as *absolutely* necessary, says the French translation.) “In like manner,” it says a little farther on, “as one cannot enter into a place that is shut, unless by means of him who has the keys, no more can one enter into heaven, when he has shut the door against himself by a mortal sin, unless the priest, to whom Jesus Christ has committed the keys, shall open the gate to him. Otherwise, in fact, the use of the keys would be entirely null; and could the door be opened by any other means, in vain should he to whom the power of the keys has been given, interdict entrance to any one.” Here, then, we have the power not only of loosing, but of binding. Impossible to enter unless the priest shall open; impossible to enter if he shall shut. Ah, what infamous treason must have been that of the Apostles, if, although quite aware of such a secret, they have not written it on every page of their book, and have allowed so many wretched creatures to perish under the delusion that heaven stands open to whosoever believes, repents, and loves!

We shall not stop to shew how far down we must come from those early times, to find some citations, some facts, that begin really to signify something in favour of the Roman penance. *Really*, we say, for it is clear that we cannot accept in support of Confession properly so called—obligatory, necessary, sacramental Confession—what the early Fathers have written about a free and irregular confession, a simple avowal made to a priest with the view of easing the conscience, obtaining of advice, and receiving from the mouth of his minister the assurances of God’s love and mercy. Such confession the Protestants have never rejected. It is expressly recommended by Luther, in his Catechism, published in 1530. Calvin, in a letter to Farel,¹ congratulates himself on the faithful being in the habit of coming and opening their minds to him before communicating. At the present day, if that practice is not so general as one could wish, it is, nevertheless, much more so than Roman Catholics believe, and would be much more general still, were it not that people dread the abuses that result from the Roman confession. “The pastor,” says a Roman Catholic writer,² “is not authorized to enter the house of his parishioner, and to ask him to account for the tears he sees him shed. He cannot, without dread of indis-

¹ May 1540.

² Audin, *Vie de Calvin* (Life of Calvin.)

cretion, interrogate the man who suffers, groans, murmurs, or blasphemes." It would be difficult to write anything in more direct contradiction to facts. In Protestant states, it is a thing unheard of, and a public scandal for a door to be shut upon the pastor; is this the case in Roman Catholic states (those of course in which the clergy do not reign absolutely)? How much distrust! What affronts, often unjust, no doubt, yet almost unknown among the Protestant clergy! This is easily accounted for. The one presents himself as a friend, the other as a master. The one says that he can shut heaven; the other does not say that he can open it, but he sends you to him who alone, let people say what they will, has veritably the keys thereof.

Will it be said that the Church could, for the good of souls, render obligatory that which at first she was content to recommend? This opinion would be at once in disaccordance with that which traces up to Jesus Christ the institution and the necessity of the sacrament of penance, an opinion, nevertheless, held by the council. But the question does not lie there. It must be proved, before all, that what the Church commanded in the sixteenth century is really what she recommended in the first or the second. And here, as we have already said, we have what is altogether impossible, what many divines, at the council, begged in vain that the members would examine. How could they consent to such a request? From the very first step taken in this course, the council would have found itself encompassed with more elucidations on the subject than the majority could desire, ay, more than even those who proposed this inquiry would have liked, for hardly could they have anyhow contrived after that to maintain that penance was necessary, or obligatory, or even so much as a sacrament. They thought it better to shut their eyes and say, with an assurance proportioned to the little truth there was in the assertion, that such had been *always* the *unanimous* opinion of *all* the Fathers.¹

All these difficulties, however, were not got rid of. At the seventh session penance had been declared a sacrament. There was no need, therefore, of going back to that; but it had still to be explained how and in what sense it is a sacrament.

Now, whole ages had witnessed keen disputes in the schools on the question, where exactly lay that which caused this designation to be given to it. The *sacrament of penance* evidently does not lie in penance, or repentance, itself. A man who should

¹ *Universorum Patrum consensus semper.*

repent of his sins, but without having had recourse to Confession, would not pass for having received it. Is it in the confession of sins? No; for absolution must follow. It is in absolution then? No more in that than the other; confession must have preceded it. The only conclusion, you think, must be that it lies in the union of these two things. You will be told that a sacrament is a sign, and that there must be something material and actual in it in order to its being so. In baptism we have water; in the supper bread and wine; in penance what shall it be? And so you are forced to make it reside in the very words of absolution pronounced by the priest. This was what the council did.¹ We shall see ere long to what it leads.

But there was another difficulty. The third canon anathematizes whosoever shall deny that Jesus Christ established the sacrament of penance by these words:—"Whosoever sins ye remit, whosoever sins ye retain," &c. Now, it was observed that they had often been understood as applying not to this sacrament in particular, not even to repentance in general, but to all the means by which the remission of sins may be obtained, and in which the priest may be called to intervene. Those words, in fact, however little they may bear the meaning that has been given to them, have necessarily a far wider signification, which they knew not how to suppress. Confession is not mentioned in them. Not a word is said as to any previous formality, or any condition whatever to be fulfilled by the person whose sins are to be forgiven. Therefore, if the right exist at all it is absolute. Wherever the priest shall see sentiments, circumstances, what you will, in fine, seeming to him to call for absolution, on him alone will depend the granting of it; he could, in a word, condemn or absolve, without being subject to any rule but his own good pleasure, whomsoever he happens to meet. The Roman Church has thought to be prudent in not recognising in him the unlimited possession of this power, but in this has only brought upon herself a serious objection. What proves too much proves nothing. Let us repeat, if the priest have the power to bind and loose, and if that power be founded on the words quoted, it is not limited to Confession; it is indefinite. This objection, it may well be thought, was not listened to.

Yet another difficulty meets us, still under the Roman point of view. The tenth canon anathematizes those who shall say

¹ Docet sancta synodus sacramenti penitentiae formam, in qua præcipui ipsius vis sita est, in illis ministri verbis positam esse: Ego te absolvo.

that the right of binding and loosing has not been given to the priests alone. Now, some of the divines remonstrated that this was a matter of discipline, not of faith. "In the primitive times," they said, "we see the sacerdotal functions discharged, in more than one rising church, by men who evidently were not priests in the modern sense of the word." If they baptized, if they administered the supper, there is nothing to prove that they did not confess, and it is to this that we may reasonably refer the exhortation given by St. James,—“Confess your sins one to another.” The objectors, accordingly, drew this conclusion, not that the Church had done wrong in depriving the laity of Confession, but that, since this was a matter of discipline, and not of faith, it ought not to be made the subject of an anathema. Thus the divines, as well as others, went wrong in tracing Confession to the earliest times of the Church; but they were right in saying that it had not always been exclusively in the hands of the priests, and that an act that was tolerated by the Apostles could not be condemned as contrary to the faith. But they were not listened to.

Others remonstrated also, in the same point of view, against the dogmatical condemnation of the idea that a mere priest can absolve from every kind of sins. They did not deny the propriety of reserving certain cases to the bishops and the pope; but still they thought that this distinction, omitted by Jesus Christ in the institution of the sacrament, could not thenceforth be more than an affair of discipline, not of divine right or of faith. No attention was paid to them.

Setting aside the value of these details as precious examples of the diversities of opinion then to be found in the Church, on so many things that are taught in our day as matters that have been settled from the earliest antiquity, they would still be valuable as corroborative of what we have said elsewhere on the medley the council had made of discipline and faith. Among the fifteen anathemas of the decree on penance we have seen three at least that bear on objects manifestly disciplinary. From these, consequently, a Roman Catholic is entitled to withhold the respect due to what is infallible; but it is evident, on the other hand, that the council did not so understand it, and that its infallibility, in its own eyes, was quite as much engaged on these as on other points. If they are incorrect, what becomes of the authority of all the rest?

It is not what is most false and dangerous in the Romanist doc-

trine of Confession that has subjected it to most assaults. It has become too much a habit, especially among those Roman Catholics who reject it, to consider it as only a yoke imposed by the clergy on the people. It is a yoke, no doubt, and we deem those to be fully in the right who throw it off; but if you attack it only as a yoke, you are greatly in risk of finding yourself on bad ground. To all you may have to say on the inconveniences of a spiritual superintendence, which so easily degenerates into *espionage* and tyranny, numerous instances will be adduced in reply, in which its influence has been beneficial, nay, it will even be said, necessary. Crimes abandoned or expiated, restitutions, reconciliations, divers returns to religion and virtue,—such are happily not unfrequent facts in the history of Confession.

Now, the more unjust it would be to deny these facts, the more should we err in accepting them as arguments.

First of all, let us beware of allowing their value to be exaggerated. Are the Roman Catholic, on the whole, more moral than the Protestant populations of Christendom? Nobody, to our knowledge, has yet maintained this; nobody, at least, who has seen with his own eyes and judged fairly. Much more, the most Roman Catholic countries are those which can least bear the comparison. What do we find contributed most to shake Luther's faith as a Romanist? His journey to Italy; still more his residence at Rome. And yet he did not come from a country of saints and angels. Germany, too, had its vices; the German clergy had their turpitudes; but all that was little, it was almost nothing compared with what Luther had to witness in the ancient seat of the popes. Thirty years afterwards, he could never say enough of the painful surprise with which it had overwhelmed him. "For a hundred thousand florins," he would say to his friends, "I would not have missed the sight of Rome. I might dread being too severe; but you see I am cool. Never could I say too much about it." "The nearer people live to the capital of Christendom," writes Macchiavel,¹ "the less will you find in them of a Christian spirit. We Italians have chiefly the Church—the priests, to thank for having become profligate and ungodly wretches." Macchiavel did not go there from the sanctity of a monastery. But let us dismiss words—they may be somewhat too strong—and keep to the fact, universally admitted at that epoch, that nowhere was there less morality than in Italy.² Has that

¹ Dissertation on Livy.

² We know what was the ordinary theme of Savonarola's preachings and predictions.

fact undergone a change? The inquiry is too delicate for us to pursue it. But to those who may reproach us for having merely pointed to it, we would say, were you to draw up a general table of Christian nations, placing them in the order of their morals, would the Roman Catholic be at the beginning or at the end? Had you to put down in such a table the Roman Catholic people alone, where would you place those who attended Confession most? Hear what Lamennais said, at an epoch when he thought himself more Roman Catholic than any one else. He speaks of Spain; and mark well whether it be of Spain only that he could speak thus:—"People indulge in all violations of the (moral) precepts, taking refuge under the shelter of religious worship. The compensation which some consciences dream of establishing between such or such a crime and such or such an act of devotion, their unreasoning (*naïve*) security in habits of vice, the strange motives of that security, those souls, full of hell, and at ease before the altar, all this produces amazement and consternation." "Behold," says the author, "the great misfortune of *Catholicism* in Spain!" Misfortune of Christianity, we admit; but why say misfortune of Catholicism? Do we see it complained of, or groaned over? Do the clergy in those lands seem in the least to conceive that there can be any other Catholicism than their own? Has Rome ceased to regard their inhabitants as her most devoted children? We do not say that she approves of such a state of degradation; but this state of things is profoundly associated with all the methods she employs for being and remaining mistress of men's souls.

What we have said of nations we might say of kings. Look at your sovereigns who have confessors, have they been, are they now, generally more moral, more honourable, than Protestants? No one, we think, can any more maintain this. A few princes will be cited, whom Confession may probably have made better than they would otherwise have been; many might be cited for whom it was nothing but a pillow for lulling the conscience asleep amid immoralities, and sometimes amid crimes. More than one has been seen to become an object of pity from excess of docility; very few, who with ardent passions, found in Confession a veritable restraint on their indulgence.

"Were Confession abolished," says the Roman Catechism, "not only would the world overflow with an infinity of secret crimes, but men would cease to feel ashamed to commit them openly, or to indulge in the most shameful disorders." Before

the Reformation, this might have been dreaded; since the Reformation, the statement is false. Everywhere, from its earliest progress, we see it harbinger a moral regeneration, which its greatest enemies owned and admired. In France, the preachers of the sixteenth century never ceased to put Romanists to the blush, by displaying the austere virtue of the Huguenots. Under Calvin, Geneva became a new Sparta.¹ Beza, the Roman Catholic, was a debauchee; Beza, the Protestant, a Cato. Henry IV. of France, as a Protestant, was a debauchee; as a Roman Catholic, he remained a debauchee still. Pass the sea; go into England, into Scotland. Do you laugh at the Puritans? They have at times been ridiculous, but it is easier to laugh at them than to shew wherein they were not, in point of morals, the gravest and most irreproachable of men. Pass the ocean. The Old world has begun to people the New. From Spain, with her colonists, there went out troops of confessors; from England, the Bible. And now what find you in those regions? The Spanish colonies became sinks of vice; the English were the reproduction of Scotland in the seventeenth century; you behold purity of morals, seriousness of manners, civilisation resulting from piety; you have Penn, you have Washington. Such has been the sequel, instead of the frightful dissolution predicted of the fall of Confession.

Quite assured, therefore, as to its pretended moral necessity, we need not refute at any great length what has been said of its religious necessity. "Without this salutary institution," says Chateaubriand,² "the guilty would sink into despair. Into what breast shall he discharge the burthen that oppresses his heart? Shall it be into that of a friend? Ah, who can reckon safely on the friendship of men? Shall he fly to the desert for a confidant? The deserts ever resound, to the criminal's ears, with the noise of those trumpets which the parricide Nero thought he heard around his mother's tomb." Fine phrases, but mere phrases. We detect a sophism at once in his speaking of great crimes, when we have to do only with sins of daily occurrence. Even on that ground, is the author not mistaken? Men without re-

¹ Unable to deny this, some writers have shifted their ground, and set themselves to declaim against Calvin's despotism. His last biographer, Audin, adduces as an act of tyranny the ordinance of 1561, that "No one shall remain confined to bed for three days, without letting the pastor know, in order that he may receive admonitions and consolations from him;" which the pope prescribed in 1845 to the physicians throughout his states, that they should cease to attend every sick person who, on their third visit, shall be found not to have made confession to a priest.

² *Génie du Christianisme*, 1ère partie.

ligion hardly know anything of such despair : and did they experience it, it is not to the confessional they would go in search of consolation. Religious men might go perhaps ; but who will say that they might not lay hold, of themselves, without a confessor, without formal confession, still more without absolution, of those promises of grace with which the Gospel abounds ? Would such an advocate of Confession be so good as adduce, we shall not even say a single Protestant, but a single enlightened Roman Catholic, a Christian, though not availing himself of the confessional, who ever fell into this alleged despair ? At the very most, we shall be told of some who, from indolence, from weakness of the moral sense, may have sighed for the peace that absolution gives ; a mendacious peace which nothing but a deplorable forgetfulness of the first notions of the Gospel, could lead any one to view as an argument in favour of Confession.

All that we have been considering, in fact, however eagerly it has been sought, especially in our own days, to make it the principal, is not, and cannot be more than an accessory. No happy results that the Romish Confession might have, can bar our right to say, Let us go to the bottom of the matter, and see what it is. This we proceed to do.

I have committed a fault. I am about to confess. The priest asks me some questions, gives me some advices, imposes on me a certain penance, and absolves me. I ask myself how both he and I stand with regard to all this ?

*I absolve thee,*¹ he has said. Is this declaration absolute, or is it conditional ?

If absolute, if at the instant those words passed from his mouth, they were necessarily ratified in heaven,—I say to myself, I may have deceived him with false semblances of repentance, yet those words have been not the less pronounced, and God must have ratified a pardon which has been stolen.

If conditional, if God confirms the absolution only in the case of his seeing in me sentiments worthy of grace,—this is reasonable ; but what then becomes of the authority of the priest ? He has not really absolved me ; he has neither loosed nor bound. All is but a mere promise, that if I fulfil the necessary conditions, God will absolve me. May not the first that comes tell me as

¹ Here, perhaps, may be the proper place to remind the reader, that until the definitive erection of penance into a sacrament, that is, until about the twelfth century, the priest did not say, *I absolve thee*, but *God absolves thee*. It was no less rash, but more humble.

much? May not I myself say as much to any sinner who may consult me on the state of his soul?

In this last case, consequently, the priest is only an adviser. He helps you in self-examination; he gives you directions, which may be excellent, on the means of being absolved; but he does not absolve you. You are thus compelled, if you hold to leaving him anything to do at all, to return to the other alternative, that is to say, to leave him too much, far too much, enormously too much; you are compelled to admit that once absolved at the confessional, the greatest villain stands also absolved before God.

And this incredible system, which nobody on earth, it seems, would dare to maintain in its naked reality, is the only one, nevertheless, to which the usage of Confession can lead, in practice, unless you make a halt on the way. Read the decree of the council; is there any indication there that the absolution pronounced by the priest, may possibly not be ratified in heaven? No. To say that, in any way, would be to overturn the whole structure. The penitent is, no doubt, told beforehand that he ought not to be silent on any sin, and that he is held bound to perform the penance imposed; but here we find precisely what authorizes him to believe that after a sincere confession, and the exact performance of the penance imposed, the absolution is necessarily valid. Take hold now of that idea, analyze it, and see to what you are led. A pious woman was asked one day, what penalty the priest had imposed at the confessional whence she had just returned. Five *Paters* and five *Ave Marias*, she replied. And if you should not say them? My sins will not be forgiven. And if you say them ill, without attention, with weariness and disgust? No more will they be forgiven in that case. Therefore you have not received absolution? Certainly: but I must work for it. The priest has not then given you anything? He gave me absolution. Nay, for you still have your sins; and you will continue to have them until your penance be performed, and you will keep them too unless you perform it in a proper way. Again we ask, what has the priest given you? Either a definitive absolution which you are conscious that you have not received, or a mere promise of absolution, which any other man might have given you. And the poor woman was confounded at seeing no middle point betwixt this reducing of the priest to the level of mere believers, and that exorbitant power with which her conscience forbade her to believe him to be invested. Hitherto, however, it was betwixt these two ex-

tremes that she had found, or thought to find repose ; it is also in this cloudy middle that most Romanists find, or think to find, theirs. Absolution is not, in their eyes, either a sovereign pardon, or a mere promise ; but let us add, those who have been led to comprehend that it must necessarily be either the one or the other, cannot but reject Confession.

But unhappily there are many who do not look narrowly enough into the matter to stop in their course, so as to rest on this false middle ground, where there is room at least for a little conscience and piety. They will not go so far as to tell you directly, that once absolved by the priest, it matters not how, they believe themselves pure from all sin ; but though they say it not, though, strictly speaking, they may not positively think it, that fatal error is not the less the natural, the direct, and, it must be said, the perfectly logical consequence of the system that has been imposed on them. What is Confession in those countries into which a little true Christianity, and a little good sense, have not by some means or other penetrated? Did paganism, with its impure priests and cheap expiations, ever present anything so unheard of as the brigand who goes from the confessional to his place of ambuscade, tasting all the tranquillity of virtue between the crime he has committed, and that which he meditates committing? And why should he not be tranquil? Of his past crimes he is absolved ; only let him take care not to be killed before he has murmured a few prayers imposed on him as penance. Of his future crimes he knows he can be acquitted at the same cost. He never dreams of repentance ; still less of amendment of life. Shall we be challenged to cite a book, or a priest, that has taught this? True, these are not things that are written or said. But we, in our turn, defy any one to produce a book, or a priest, able enough to refute that brigand so as to deprive him of his frightful security, without a deep breach on the very doctrine of Confession, the right of absolution, and all their consequences. Everything, to the very title of sacrament, bestowed on penance, concurs to produce these deplorable results. When the priest has said, "I baptize thee," the infant is baptized. When he has said in the mass, "This is my body," the wafer is changed, infallibly changed into flesh. When he has said, "I absolve thee," how can it be, if penance be a sacrament, if these words be pronounced with the same authority as the others, how can it be that there should not be absolution? To refute the brigand who deems himself absolved, well and duly

absolved, you must begin by telling him that absolution, in itself, signifies nothing.

And what might not one have to say on a thousand inconveniences in detail, on a thousand errors more or less serious, all of which, it is true, Rome does not preach, and several of which she disowns, but in which one might prove to her that, alike in fact and theory, there is nothing but the consequences of her doctrine; on the mischief done to piety in favouring, by the imposition of penalties, the idea that man can pay his debts to divine justice, while the very contrary idea lies at the foundation of all the teachings of Christianity; on the ridiculous lightness of those penalties, seeing that in most cases they are nothing more than the repeating of a few prayers; on the risk of transforming prayer into a task, whereas it is uniformly represented to us in Scripture as a privilege and a happiness; on the inconvenience, in fine, of concentrating within this narrow and puerile circle all the good feelings wherewith the sinner may or might be animated! "I often confessed myself to Dr. Staupitz," says Luther, "not on carnal matters, but on what makes the essence of the question. Like all other confessors he replied, I don't understand you." Read the *Compendium*, that gospel of the confessors, and say whether it is not always the same. Speak to them of all sorts of abominations, they will confound you by the knowledge they shew in these foul matters; speak to them, like Luther to Staupitz, who nevertheless was a fine character, of your soul, of its wants, of its thirst for life and grace, "I don't understand you," they will say. If they did understand you, would they be Romanists? And if there be some who could understand you—for, thank God, there are such—ask these last if they seriously believe in the power of opening and shutting heaven.

And if to corroborate all this, we now require some admissions of the same kind with those we should expect from such priests, know you where we should look for them?

First of all, in Bossuet: ¹ "It is Jesus Christ," says he, "it is that invisible pontiff who absolves the penitent inwardly, whilst the priest exercises the outward ministry." And should this *invisible pontiff*, who reads what is passing in the penitent's heart, see something quite different there from what the priest thinks that he sees, will he equally absolve him? You would not dare to affirm it. This comes then to saying that the penitent is never

¹ Exposition of the Catholic Faith.

sure of the absolution received, and to believe in that pardon he must feel the dispositions required for obtaining it. Thus he will either believe in it blindly, or he will not really believe in it at all.

To whom shall we go next? To a pope; to Innocent III.¹ "As the Church," he says, "may sometimes err with respect to persons, it may happen that such an one who shall have been loosed in the eyes of the Church, may be bound before God, and that he whom the Church shall have bound, may be loosed when he shall appear before him who knoweth all things." Do we say more than this? And if this be so, what signifies absolution?

Finally, on one of the very banners of Rome—the banner that Luther first seized and tore to shreds, we read further the tacit condemnation of this system. The formula of the Indulgences of 1517 ran thus:—"May our Lord Jesus Christ *have pity upon thee and absolve thee* by the merits of his most holy passion! and I, in virtue of the Apostolic power that has been confided to me, *absolve thee* from, &c." If the first phrase signify anything, what means the second? If you must begin by sending me to Christ, what need have I of you? Who shall hinder my going to him myself? What is it that you can secure for me?

On the whole some happy results may, in human affairs, make us pass over many inconveniences; but when the things of religion are at stake, and where the inconveniences go at once to sap fundamental principles, to approve, to tolerate—whatever honesty of intention there may be, involves the application of that odious tenet, that the end justifies the means.

Extreme unction, which was next considered, does not present the same dangers. It has, we must own, all the outward guise of a sacrament, and, which is of moment, an Apostle speaks of it. What then are we to think of it?

First, if one Apostle speaks, the rest do not; and this silence, which might astonish us even had it been no more than a ceremony in general use, is incomprehensible on the supposition of its having been a Christian sacrament.

In the second place, does St. James speak of it as if it were a sacrament? Put the theological question out of view; let us look to common sense, and that the plainest. It is incidentally, in three lines, in the midst of a series of counsels,² that the

¹ Epistle ii.

² James v. 14, 15.

Apostle speaks of anointing the sick. But for the teaching of the Church, who could suppose that this practice had, in the mind of St. James, the importance of a sacrament, the rank of baptism and the supper?

Only one Apostle mentions it. Two words in St. Mark, however, have been laid hold of, "They anointed with oil many that were sick."¹ Here, according to the council, the sacrament was insinuated. We have already seen this forcing of a text at another place. Without dwelling on the strange idea of a legislator *insinuating*, let us remark, that the words refer to sick persons and cures, not at all to spiritual aids procured or figured by anointing. "They anointed with oil many that were sick, *and healed them*."² The healing of the sick is in St. James likewise the first of the indicated results. After the anointing he says, "the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." Although the Apostle did not certainly mean to say that the cure was certain provided the prayer was fervent, the idea of healing, thus put in the first line, is a circumstance not to be neglected. The extreme unction of the Roman Church, a sacrament, a ceremony altogether spiritual in its meaning and effects, hence cannot be that anointing, partly curative, partly miraculous, mentioned by St. Mark and St. James. This is the opinion of Cardinal Cajetan. "Neither the words," says he, "nor the results announced here, indicate the sacramental unction of extreme unction."³ So true is it that the Roman Catechism has been obliged to explain why, being the same, it has not, nevertheless, the cure of the sick for its result. "If all sick persons do not experience its virtue in this respect, we must think that this arises, not from the sacrament having lost its vigour, but from a want of faith in those who receive or those who administer it." Is it meant by this that if it were always received and administered with sufficient faith, nobody would any longer die? That would be rather too strong an explanation. It may be remarked, too, that it would be in contradiction to what the Church teaches on the power of the priest being independent of his private dispositions. Here we have a sacrament which fails in one of its effects, it is said, because of the want of faith in those who administer it. Who, after this, will warrant us that the priest's want of faith may not make baptism

¹ Mark vi. 13.

² See Marginal addition.

³ Nec ex verbis nec ex effectis, verba hæc loquantur de sacramentali unctione extreme unctionis.—He is in the right. But if extreme unction does not come from this, where then does he make it come from?

fail, transubstantiation fail, absolution fail, all the sacraments, in fine, prove abortive?

Nor is this the only difficulty; and what is remarkable, they all spring from the same text in St. James, the only positive passage that can be adduced in favour of extreme unction.

First, "If any one is sick," says the Apostle, "let him call for the *elders* of the Church." Are those elders the pastors? There is nothing to prove this. Were the pastors in St. James's time priests in the Roman sense of the term? Consequently, is it to the priests alone that this sacrament of divine right belongs? The council says yes; but beyond its own affirmation it neither gives nor can give any proof of this. The *Presbyteri* of St. James are, according to the decree, priests duly ordained by the bishop,—and anathema to all who believe it not.

The Apostle having said, "Let them pray," it has been thought necessary to give the form of a prayer to the sacramental words that accompany the anointing, and hence a fresh difficulty. In all the other sacraments, in virtue of the power supposed to reside in him, the priest affirms and gives; in this he affirms nothing, he gives nothing. "By this holy anointing may God forgive thee all that thou hast done, be it . . . or be it . . . &c." The priest therefore exercises in reality no power. He prays for the sick man, and does not warrant the success of his prayer. This is more wise; but if in the sacrament of penance also he were to confine himself to saying, "May God forgive thee," would it still be a sacrament? In what sense, then, can extreme unction be one? This certainly required explanation. It is an *optative* sacrament, shall it be said, and the others are *collative*. This carries you far indeed! Nor is this all. Before receiving it you must have confessed. That same priest who has said to you *I absolve thee*, behold him now praying to God to absolve you. Of what avail was his first pardon? In fine, as this sacrament is administered in several anointings, at each of which the formula is repeated, it was only by subtleties that it could be explained how the sacrament remains one, how it is not complete from the first utterance of the formula, how, in the view of an object so purely spiritual, two anointings should be of more avail than one, and three more than two. The same difficulty re-appears, but much more seriously, in the sacrament of Orders, *one* also according to the council, although administered in seven successive acts. All this in itself is of no great importance; but it is well to shew

how the Roman theory of the sacraments, so plain and so *one* at a first look, should involve, even for a Romanist, so many difficulties and embarrassments.

On the whole, then, although we cannot charge it as a crime against the Roman Church that it has maintained extreme unction, viewed merely as a ceremony known to the primitive Church, we are of opinion that that ceremony was not originally either recommended or interpreted in such a manner as that Protestants behoved to retain it, if they saw inconveniences arising from it.

Now, of these there are two. It is of little use—it is often dangerous.

It is of little use, for one cannot attribute to it any effect which shall not have been already more or less produced or figured by another sacrament. What will it add to the graces which the sick person has already been enabled to receive by means of penance or the communion? “A sacrament,” says Chateaubriand, “opened to this righteous person the gates of this world; a sacrament is about to close them. The liberating sacrament breaks by degrees the ties of the believer. Already he seems to hear the concerts sung by the seraphim. Already he is prepared to fly towards those regions whither he is invited by that divine hope which is the daughter of virtue and of death. He dies at last, and no one has heard his last sigh—so sweetly has this Christian passed away.” But how would this Christian, “this righteous person,” so full of resignation and hope, have “passed away” with less tranquillity had he failed to receive the unction, had you repeated to him, not the formula five times over, but one only of those admirable exhortations with which the Gospel is full? Go, poet, go! the most affecting pictures in the world can never supply the place of the smallest amount of conclusive reasoning.

Extreme unction is often dangerous, is our second objection. This, first, because people easily glide into attributing to it virtues which it has not and never can have. At so solemn a moment as a man's last dying struggle, the mind is hardly in a state to calculate the true bearing of an act, the meaning of which is so far from clear even in the decrees and the treatises in which it has been attempted to elucidate it. Instead of going to the sense, people cleave to the sign. It has been made a sort of charm; the commonalty, if they want to know whether a man has died a Christian, ask no more than whether he has

received extreme unction.¹ And what still further tends to foster such erroneous ideas is, that it is administered every day to sick persons who are incapable of thinking, seeing, or even of feeling. In all cases of that sort, if we do not consider it as useless, we are compelled to recognise in it an action entirely independent of the sentiments of the person who receives it. The body is all but a corpse, and lo, a few drops of oil poured on members already devoted to the worms, are nevertheless to influence the soul's eternal destiny!

In the first century, among men whose lives were but a long and laborious preparation for death, we can conceive that this error was less to be dreaded; but since extreme unction was neither instituted by Jesus Christ, nor recommended after his departure as a sacrament behoved to have been,—it might and ought to have disappeared among those who have seen more dangers than good results attending it.

While one of the congregations was employed in elaborating the dogmatical decrees, the other had resumed in detail some points relative to episcopal jurisdiction.

Each new point gave rise to new complaints, most of which were so evidently legitimate, that there was no means of escape from making some concessions. Thus some bishops having complained that a priest suspended or interdicted, even for immoral conduct or notorious scandal, could procure his rehabilitation by the pope, the legate allowed it to be decided that such rehabilitations should not take place; exacting only that the pope should not be named in the decree. Sarpi will have it that this was only that he might remain free from its obligation; but as that kind of dispensations emanated entirely from him, this omission of his name could not have that effect. All that was wished, then, was to avoid addressing him too directly, on what was felt to be a serious reproach. The same precaution was taken in another decree, relative to what were called *conservatory* expenses. A man accused before the bishop might purchase at Rome permission to choose a judge, and that judge in most cases never acted, but confined himself to sheltering the accused from the episcopal jurisdiction. The thing was prohibited; but universities, colleges, hospitals, and convents were excepted from

¹ It is with the view of avoiding this evil (écueil) that some Protestant Churches interdict themselves from giving the supper itself to the dying. The precaution is perhaps exaggerated, but it springs from a principle which cannot be too much borne in mind.

the prohibition, and this considerably reduced the application of it. It is true that the council had hardly the power of touching the ancient privileges of those corporations,—the popes themselves durst not, and those privileges, besides, were often the safeguards of necessary liberties. Everywhere the evil was found bound up with what had in the first instance been a good, and the council was incessantly in the position of an operator who is stopped at every incision he makes, by the cries of the patient or the dread of wounding a healthy part.

They had the courage, nevertheless, to take up anew two decrees of the sixth and the seventh sessions, for the purpose of giving precision to their meaning, and making their regulations more severe. In this last we have seen what the council had done in the way of restraining, as much as in it lay,—unions of benefices; it was added that the union could not take place, in any instance, where the benefices lay in different dioceses. In the sixth, bishops had been prohibited from ordaining priests in any diocese but their own; but ambulatory¹ bishops were free to establish themselves in monasteries, and there, in spite of the diocesan, they ordained whom they choose, that is to say, in most cases, all that were least worthy of the priesthood.² The pope levied a tribute on these ordinations. They were forbidden, but the facility with which Rome had tolerated, while regulating for her own advantage, such a violation of quite a recent decree, sufficiently shewed how little good faith was to be expected from her in the execution of all that did not suit her views. “As for the disciplinary decrees published in this session,” wrote the bishop of Astorga to Cardinal Granville, the emperor’s minister, “they are not of a nature to cause scandals to cease. What we do here is not what we wish to do, but what we are allowed to do.” “A pretty reformation, forsooth,” exclaimed the Bishop of Verdun one day; on which the legate told him he was an impertinent fellow, a blockhead, *a raw youth*. “For my part,” wrote Vargas, “of all these reforming decrees, I have but one word to say,—they are useless; they are unfortunate for us; but the court of Rome will well know how to turn them to good account.” In fact, it was already said all over Europe, that the only result of the efforts of the assembly to make dispensations more rare, had been to cause a rise in the price of them. And

¹ Fere vagabundi. Second canon.

² Minus idonei, et rudes, ac ignavi, et qui a suo episcopo tanquam inhabiles et indigni rejecti fuerant. Second canon.

this was true. The papal chancery openly rested on the council's prohibitions as a ground for enhancing the payment of the violations it authorized.

The session (the fourteenth) was held on the 25th November 1551. Nothing of importance was done. The dogmatical decrees (penance and extreme unction) were voted at once; the disciplinary regulations gave occasion for repeating that they were accepted only as an instalment, and that much yet remained to be done. It became known next day that the legate had forbidden the printing of the acts of this session; but, as might have been foreseen, copies were taken and sent away in all directions, and these were printed, read, and criticised with more eagerness than ever.

A few days before the sitting, the Duke of Wurtemberg's envoys had arrived at Trent. According to custom, every ambassador, before having an official audience, communicated his instructions to the president of the council. Those of the Elector of Brandenburg had yielded on this point, but the duke's had come with orders to accept neither *de jure* nor *de facto* the presidency of the pope or of his representatives. It was Cardinal Madrucci, bishop of Trent, who acted as intermediate between them and the assembly. They first resumed the subject of the free-conduct. A more explicit one had to be given, or their divines would not come. Now, nothing could have been more agreeable to the legate, and almost the totality of the council, than to find those hindrances thus raised in a question of form, which they durst no more raise on the ground of principle. The legate and the nuncios replied, accordingly, that it did not become the dignity of the council to grant a safe-conduct anew; that this would be to admit the insufficiency of that first issued, and the bad faith they were accused of having shewn in it. The same difficulties occurred on the arrival of the deputies from Strasbourg and other Protestant cities, which, as well as the princes, had been compelled by the emperor to have themselves represented at the council; and when they joined in a demand that in conformity with the promises of Charles V., they should be allowed at least to present to the council an exposition of their faith, the legate declared that neither he nor his colleagues, neither the assembly nor the pope, could ever consent to such a thing.

Finally, there arrived the envoys from the Elector of Saxony, and as their master, daily more and more powerful, shewed him-

self little disposed to suffer their not being received, some means had to be fallen upon for doing so. It was decided that the Protestant ambassadors should all be received on the same day, but not, however, at a public sitting. It was to be, therefore, at a general congregation, and in the legate's palace.

At this very sitting other questions had to be resolved. What place should be given to the ambassadors? As heretics they should get to their knees, or at best remain standing and uncovered, an indignity which could not be asked of them, and still less imposed upon them. It was decided, therefore, that they should have seats, and even honourable ones; but, "from charity and compassion," say the minutes, and without any derogation from the rights of the assembly. The conferences had lasted two months.

That sitting was held at last on the 24th of January. Leonard Badehorn, the Saxon ambassador, saluted the bishops by the title of *Most Reverend Fathers and Lords*. His speech was calm, his demands exorbitant; but it was plain that had they been less moderate they would have been insincere, and he ought rather to have been commended for having prevented beforehand all equivocation. He insisted, before all, that the pope should be declared inferior to the council; in the second place, that all the decrees should be reviewed, and that they should wait for the Protestant divines before setting to work; in fine, that these should have a deliberative voice, and that they should begin by drawing up the safe-conduct in such a way as to free them from all apprehension. He was patiently listened to, and the reply was that the assembly would take his speech into deliberation.

One of those points had been settled beforehand: this was that the deliberations should be suspended until the arrival of the Protestant divines. The following day, accordingly, the 25th of January 1552, a session (the fifteenth) was held, but only to declare that the council would wait for them until the 19th of March. It had been agreed also that a second safe-conduct should be given, and it was read at that same sitting. Although conceived in the most precise terms, the compulsory omission of the name of the pope, whom the council could in no way whatsoever make a party to it, prevented its signifying anything more than the preceding one. The ambassadors at first refused it; then, at the instance of the Count de Montfort, premier ambassador of Charles V., they consented to send it to their masters.

The decree of prorogation bore that the council had discussed the articles bearing on the mass and the sacrament of Orders, as well as the points previously adjourned; that they were about to proceed to treat of the sacrament of marriage, and that the whole would be published together at the next session. Several of these details were far from exact. The decree seems to say that the mass and orders were ready, and this was far from being the case. There had as yet been only a few preparatory discussions; orders, in particular, had hardly been touched upon. The council wished to shew that their discussions were not stopped by other discussions elsewhere; forgetting that Europe had known, from day to day, how the business stood. It was probably, too, for the purpose of veiling these blanks, that the session was celebrated with more than ordinary pomp. With the crowd of ambassadors present, this, it is true, seemed natural. They might have thought they were attending a new birth of the council, whereas it was its funeral.

In fact, it was about to come to an end.

The legate and the Italians began to perceive a disquieting intimacy between the Protestant ambassadors and those of the emperor, an intimacy shared, to a certain point, by several of the German prelates. As much divided as ever upon dogmatical questions, they had only to come upon the chapter of the pope and the court of Rome, to find themselves almost at one. The Protestants were delighted to hear Roman Catholics admit the scandals of an organization to which they attributed all the woes of the Church and Europe; the imperialists, on their side, seemed to feel no repugnance at having them for auxiliaries in the abasement of the pope. The latter, at the Christmas holidays, had created fourteen cardinals, all Italians, at a stroke, betraying sufficiently his fears by such eagerness to reinforce his party. At the same time he turned his regards to Henry II. of France. His secret negotiators represented him to that prince as ready to break with the emperor, and even, in the event of war, to declare for France. In fine, he wearied for nothing so much as to see taken away from both the most dangerous instrument they could bring into play against him—the council. He sent orders, accordingly, to the legate so to arrange matters that all might be brought to a close in two sessions, or at most, three; but as the council had promised to wait for the Protestants, they had either to do nothing, or next to nothing. Although it had been decreed that there should be no interruption of the discussions,

it was felt that they could not well do anything until they had waited for them for a certain time.

It would appear, moreover, that the hope had always been cherished that they would not come, for, we find that, on their arrival, everything was changed. And yet they were but six doctors, two from Strasbourg, and two from Wurtemberg. Instead of a new life, there now followed death. Legate, nuncios, and bishops, would no longer do anything; those whose ardour it had been found most difficult to restrain when it was proposed to close at the end of some weeks, were the very persons that now shewed most reluctance to do anything. The horizon, it is true, had again begun to lower. A general league of the Protestants against the emperor was spoken of; the Electors of Cologne and Mayence had left Trent to be ready for any emergency. On the 19th of March, instead of a session, a congregation only was held, and an adjournment made to the 1st of May. At this sitting the Protestants were neither heard nor admitted, and, several days afterwards, nothing was yet said either about admitting them or resuming business. No one could foresee how matters were to end. The legate was intently occupied about this. He was not long of furnishing in his own person a pretext for new delays. Devoured with anxiety, worn out with watching and with the impetuosity of his character, he suddenly lost his reason. A black dog, he said, was always pursuing him, and staring at him with flaming eyes. The Protestants wanted one of the nuncios to take his place, but the pope was referred to. His reply was waited for, but never came.

All at once news arrived that a Protestant army was besieging Augsburg. The Elector of Saxony had declared himself against the emperor, and having given the signal, had found all the Protestant princes ready to march under his banner. After having spent the winter in ably preparing his alliances and his forces, he had issued his manifesto. As a Protestant he declared that he had no account to render either to the emperor or to the council; as a prince he called upon all the princes of the empire, Roman Catholic and Protestant, to throw off the yoke of Charles V., and this new course he briskly began by besieging Augsburg, the city of the diets. In three days the city was his. Straightway he flies to Inspruck. There he enters by one gate a few hours after Charles V. had gone out by another, and he who a few days before might have thought himself master of Europe, flies, almost alone, into the heart of Carinthia.

At the first noise of this eruption a great many of the bishops fled to Verona, and the nuncios asked the pope for authority to suspend the council. Julius did not wait to be asked. He had made a treaty with Henry II.; he felt himself no longer bound to any forbearance towards the emperor. He gave orders, however, for the suspension to be voted, and a large majority having given their voices in favour of that measure, a session was held on the 28th of April, at which the council was declared suspended for two years, and longer if necessary. It was added, that in the meantime all the decrees already made should be religiously observed; but this article, inserted probably without reflection, for the nuncios could have no thought of offending the pope, was looked upon with a very evil eye at Rome. The last decrees had not yet received the papal sanction; to ordain their observance was to say that they did not require that sanction. And what put the omission in still stronger relief, was that the pope's intervention, forgotten at this place, was mentioned further up, in the article on the future resumption of the council. It seemed, accordingly, to be thought necessary to the legitimacy of the council, but superfluous as respected the validity of its decrees. Here there was Gallicanism without its being intended.

Maurice had known how to conquer; but he was either unable or unwilling to draw from his victory all the advantages it seemed to offer him. Perhaps he felt reluctant to reduce to extremity the man to whom he had owed his greatness; besides, if all the acts of imperial injustice were to be remedied, he behoved to begin by giving back the electorship to the man who had been despoiled of it five years before. This proved the salvation of Charles V. The greater he had been seen to be, the more stupefaction had his fall produced. Abandoned by several of his allies, feebly defended by his few remaining friends, and particularly by his brother and his nephew, confounded himself by so sudden a catastrophe, he did not hesitate to humble himself before his own vassal. He sued for peace, and within four months from the commencement of hostilities it was concluded.¹ Liberty of conscience was restored to Germany, and the *Interim*, which had served only to put everybody in a false position, was abolished. This liberty of conscience did not, however, imply that the emperor was obliged to tolerate Protestantism in his own states; all that he was bound to was to leave the princes free to act in this matter, each for himself, as he might think fit.

¹ Peace of Passau, August 1552.

After having had the suspension of the council decreed, the pope had at first thought of making some compensation to those who had felt aggrieved by that step. He had, accordingly, nominated a commission, charged with the task of submitting to him those projects of internal reform with which the council had not found time to occupy itself. The news of this was coldly received. People did not doubt that the reforms decreed by the pope would be better executed than those of the council, and in this respect nothing was lost; but it was doubted whether any would be decreed at all, and it was thought time enough to be glad when they really appeared. Had he not, at the beginning of his reign, named a commission also—what had been the result? He seemed, however, on this occasion, to attach much interest to it. He composed it of the most eminent personages; he saw also to its being numerous. This was, he would say, that it might have the utmost possible authority, and keep people from regretting the absence of the council; but the grumblers said it was in order that it might not proceed so quickly to work. Whether that was the pope's intention or not, the event justified them. The commission met some five or six times, completed nothing that it had begun, and was soon no more spoken of.

Nor was the council any more spoken of either; never for nearly forty years had princes or their subjects seemed to make less account of it. Now that the Interim was abolished, not only had the emperor no need of a council, but he could no longer desire to see the publication of decrees that his vassals would repel with impunity before his very eyes. The Protestants had lost all desire of appealing to a council; the Roman Catholics, even on their own account, were much more afraid of the contentions that preceded the decrees than gratified at the prospect, then so doubtful, of the unity and the authority that were afterwards to result from them. And Rome, Rome which for forty years had never ceased to tremble alike at the wishes of the former and the recriminations of the latter, Rome could believe that she had gained her suit both against her enemies and against her friends.

She was mistaken. We are but at the middle of our task.

BOOK FOURTH.

Ten years' interruption—Resumption of conferences—Death of Julius III.—Marcellus II.—His views—He reigns only one-and-twenty days—Paul IV.—His character—His incoherent projects—Manœuvres—The States of the Church invaded—Violent acts of the pope—His deliverance—What he meant to make of the council—His pretensions with respect to kings and kingdoms—Ferdinand resumes the offensive—The Reformation spreads in all directions—The Inquisition—Servetus and Roman Catholic historians—Pius IV.—New tactics—Delays on the part of Rome and impatience of France—Attempts to create a diversion—Geneva and its history—David before Goliath—The charity of St. Francis de Sales—*Shows and appearances, infinite protraction of business and disguising of real intentions*—Plan of a European confederation against the Protestants—The project miscarries—A new council is desired, and not the continuation of the old—It is proposed that one should be held in France—The pope is compelled to hasten matters—Third convocation of the council—Difficulties eluded—Of the unity of the Council of Trent—The bull satisfies no one—The six legates—Meeting of the States at Orleans—Bold demands—Catherine de Medicis and the Reformation.

Colloquy of Poissy—The Chancellor de l'Hôpital—Did he attack the pope alone—The Protestants have the ball at their feet—Beza and the Cardinal de Lorraine—Lainez—The praises he receives—What Gallicanism is in the eyes of the popes—Philip II.—The sympathies he could reckon upon in France—The true country of a priest's affections—The colloquy concludes that the cup should be conceded to the laity—The pope consults the cardinals—Their unanimous refusal—The matter referred to the council.

Bad feeling on the part of the court of France—Re-opening of the council—Ambiguous decree—False reasoning—Precautions taken—*Proponentibus legatis*—Question about forbidden books—Historical review—Gelasius, Leo X., Paul IV.—Embarrassment and puerilities—*A monstrous liberty*—Absolute enslavement—An illusory appeal made to the Protestants—Eighteenth session—The safe-conduct and the Inquisition—Spanish Gallicanism—The question of residence taken up anew—It becomes complicated and envenomed—Voting upon it—Reference to the pope—Murmurs—Pius IV. dreads pronouncing upon it—Momentary calm—Several questions of detail examined—Abuses pointed out—These none durst touch without the consent of the pope—His evasive reply on the question of the Divine right—Nineteenth session—No result—Pius IV. conceives a dislike for the council—Would fain dismiss it or have it entirely under his hand—Jealousies among the members—The pope's pensionaries—Offers of money to the king of France—Arrival of the French ambassadors—Satirical harangue—Dissimulation—Another session without result—It is decided that the question of the communion in both kinds should come on, but by giving it a false turn—Twenty demands made by the emperor's ambassador—All becomes complicated anew—the pope blames the legates—He takes up arms—Imminent ruptures—How all things resume their former place—Digression—What the pope was in the eyes of the princes—Their motives for maintaining and sparing him—Pius IV. has again the upper hand—Visconti's mission—Success and punishment.

Is the suppression of the wine in the supper ordained in Scripture or only commanded—Neither the one nor the other—Puerile motives—*It must be acknowledged*—Throughout and always the same; throughout and always entire—Analysis—Divers risks encountered—Of what is the lay person deprived—This question eluded—The question of the concession of the cup resumed—The council seems less liberal than the pope—Urgent demands of the ambassadors—Tergiversations of the legates—Twenty-first session—Unexpected debates—Several points left undecided—Judgments passed by parties beyond the council—General

disappointment—Inconsistencies commented upon—“*They do only what they have a mind to*”—Neutrality of the king of Spain—Advantage which Pius IV. derives from it—The supper viewed as a sacrifice—The appearance of continuing the old council again avoided.

The mass—Definitions and principles—A first and a wide breach—Can there be any parity between the mass and Jesus Christ's sacrifice—*In remembrance of me*—Offered *once*—What we ask of every sincere Roman Catholic—Priests! priests!—How people come to believe everything—Proofs given in the decree—To admit that the mass is not incontestably in the Bible amounts to the admission that it is not there at all—Serious difficulty—To finish as speedily as possible—recreminations

The pope's new precautions—A desire is felt to finish before the arrival of the French—“It is thus that the king and the world are deceived”—Splitting of parties—The *small matters*—Fathers, what is it that I am to teach—Three opinions on the question of the cup—Conditions laid down—Majority against the concession—Project of referring it to the Pope—Frictions of oil—Sundry wise regulations—Absolute prohibition of receiving payment for masses—Doctrinal canons—*Do this*—Long debates—Masses for temporal wants—Masses in honour of the saints—Private masses—A little water in the wine—Worship in Latin—Scriptural objections—Historical objections—True motives—Mysticism—Twenty-second session—Minoritics—Submission and silence.

TEN years were destined to elapse before the third and last convocation of the council; and all that we shall have to notice in the course of that period, will be comprised in the events which, in our apprehension, led from the council of Julius III. to that of Pius IV.

It is not until the diet of Augsburg in 1555, three years after the suspension of the council's sittings, that we come again upon any serious traces of what had long been, as it were, the fixed idea of Europe. Little regard was paid to it. Ferdinand, who, as king of the Romans, presided in the emperor's name, and knew how little inclination his brother at this time felt for it, plainly said that it was not to be dreamt of; that there was no room to expect its proving more auspicious than before; that if people would have something really done, they should endeavour, as a last resource, to bring about a conference betwixt the doctors of the two parties.

This idea was neither a new nor a happy one; accordingly, it was ill received in Germany, and still worse in Italy. Cardinal Morone was instantly despatched from Rome, with orders to oppose any such course to the utmost; and he was to do his best, also, to press on the Protestants of Germany the example of England, which had returned to the unity of the Roman Catholic Church.

This apparent submission of England, the joint result of the pope's skilful management, and of Queen Mary's rigorous proceedings, had been felt by Julius to be a grateful compensation for many painful disappointments, but he was doomed to a short enjoyment

of it. Scarcely had Morone reached Augsburg, when he had to leave it again, in order to take part in a new election of a pope. Julius had died. (23d March, 1555.)

The conclave did not sit long; indeed, it rose so soon, that Cardinal Morone and the Cardinal of Augsburg, although they had made all haste, found the election over. This was not the first time that complaints were made of the law which fixes the opening of the conclave for business for the tenth day following the pope's decease. On most occasions that term is deferred, but there being no obligation to that effect, the election is altogether in the hands of the cardinals that happen to be then at Rome.

This time they made a happy choice. Marcellus Cervini, Cardinal of Santa Croce, whom we saw appear as legate at the first opening of the council, was a man of serious character and pure morals, no bigot, profoundly devoted to the papal cause, but at the same time sincerely desirous of all such internal reforms as should not compromise that cause. In this tribute to his worth, we rest, we confess, rather on the intentions he manifested as pope, than on what little we know of his previous opinions; and although he showed in the council that he was sensibly less of a papist than his colleague, Cardinal del Monte, who died pope, we cannot suppress our conviction that had he given any previous hint of what his severity and projects were to be, he never would have ascended the papal throne. Much was thought to be already implied in his retaining his baptismal name Marcellus, contrary to a practice which the popes had followed for ages, of changing theirs as soon as they put the tiara upon their head. Adrian VI. thirty-three years before, had also retained his, but only at the suggestion of his pupil, Charles V. who had observed to him that all the Adrians had been good popes. Now, it was at his own instance that Marcellus Cervini remained Marcellus; and this fact, though it might not have all the importance some attached to it, proved at least that he was a man who was himself ready to shake off, and who could allow others to shake off, whatever might appear to him non-essential. Besides, as Luther had written some very severe and well-known comments on those changes of name,¹ it was quite possible that people might ask if there was not here a triumph yielded to the Reformer, and if this first concession might not harbinger others that were to follow. Be this as it may, hardly was Marcellus

¹ On Genesis xxiv. 3.

elected, when he openly announced it as his intention to continue the council. Notwithstanding his having had so near a view of the perils threatened by such meetings to the Holy See, he knew, he said, an easy method of ridding them of all that was formidable; this was that the Holy See should leave them nothing to criticise in the Church's administration and discipline. Never was there a greater mistake, inasmuch as a council with no abuses in discipline to occupy its attention, would run a greater risk than any other, of touching on points that, for very different reasons, could ill bear handling. But it was the mistake of a man who meant well. It is painful to have to add, for Pallavicini's denials are not sufficient in our opinion to weaken what has been related by Sarpi and De Thou, that he gave no little thought to astrology, and consulted the planets fully as much as the Scriptures. This weakness, however, was even then more general than one would believe. Paul III., with all his genius, had not been exempt from it. "Never," says Ranke, "would he open any important meeting of the Sacred College; never would he set out on a journey, without consulting the constellations. An alliance with France met with several delays, because he had not found a conformity between the birth of the king and his own." This is ridiculous; what follows is odious. While sorcery had thus its adepts, even on the pontifical throne, obscure sorcerers were not the less persecuted and burnt.

Elected on the 9th of April, Marcellus died on the 30th, and all his projects ended with his life. The short lifetime of the popes is not one of the least defects of the Roman constitution. Bad popes have always time enough for doing mischief; while good popes have rarely time to do good. Few not far advanced in life have attained the popedom; and if it be very natural, on the one hand, that the Church's chief should be a man venerable on account of his years, it has this result, on the other, that the tiara almost always graces either a head that is weak and null, or one rather obstinate than strong.

This last was now to be the case. Paul IV.,¹ elected on the 4th of May, was a severe man also, and full of good intentions. The day that Paul III. had proclaimed his son Duke of Parma, one of the cardinals had dared to absent himself from the consistory, and had openly made a pilgrimage to the principal churches of Rome, as if to ask pardon of God for the grievous scandal that

¹ Peter Caraffa.

had been committed. That cardinal was Peter Caraffa; he was the future Paul IV. All the good sentiments with which he had been animated, he preserved, but they were ill seconded by his temper, which was that of a surly, morose, and obstinate old man. Scarcely had a month elapsed since his election, when this became so evident, that the first personages in Rome addressed him only with fear and trembling. If he desired that there should be reforms, it was only provided none should ask for them. Never did papal omnipotence reproduce itself in a stranger medley of weakness and vigour, of greatness and childishness. Simple in his own person, he surrounded himself with a pomp that had never been equalled; with the utmost contempt for brute force, he committed affairs of the utmost delicacy to his nephew Charles Caraffa, one of the greatest fighting men in Italy, whose helmet he had lost no time in converting into a cardinal's hat. After discoursing, in a pompous strain, on the absolute and divine authority with which he considered himself invested, it was only like an angry child, stamping with passion, that he spoke of compelling kings to humble themselves before his throne. He wished well, but all the good that did not emanate from himself he viewed beforehand as mischievous and criminal. As for the council, it will be recollected that it was he who said that he could not understand how sixty bishops, in a petty town among the mountains, should know more than the pope and the clever folks at Rome.

These clever folks he on one occasion deigned to consult, but in a singular enough manner. He had entertained the idea of commencing his reforms with the rooting out of Simony, or the traffic in spiritual favours. Such a commencement it will be seen at once, had its inconveniences. Not that Simony was not widely prevalent and highly mischievous, but being an evil very difficult to be laid hold of, from the diversity of forms which it assumed, and its almost countless ramifications, it would have been better to proceed first against abuses more positive, and easier both to be defined and to be reached. A commission, accordingly, was appointed. Always in extremes, the pope made it consist of *a hundred and fifty* members, of whom twenty-four were cardinals, and twenty-five bishops; in all, more than double the number of doctors that had yet appeared at Trent. Nevertheless, in speaking of it, he took care to add that he, the vicar of Jesus Christ, knew perfectly what was to be done; although, therefore, he held this sort of council, it was nowise with the in-

tention of following any opinion not entirely conformable with his own.¹

Great, accordingly, was his anger, when from the very bosom of that assembly which owed its existence entirely to him, there issued certain observations on the necessity for a general council. Cardinal du Bellai, dean of the sacred college, endeavoured to appease his wrath, by saying that if a council were desirable, it was not that it might dictate to him the measures necessary to be taken, but to inquire about the means of executing them. On this he exclaimed, that if a council there must be, he would hold it, but at Rome; that he would rather die than see it again met at Trent, *in the midst of the Lutherans*. Then, taking up seriously what had been at first in his mouth only one of the sallies that people had become accustomed to, he caused it to be intimated to all the princes of Christendom, as quite settled, that he was about to hold a council at Rome. In a few days this became his favourite idea. He spoke of it to everybody, particularly to the ambassadors of the various courts; but warning them at the same time not to forget to tell their masters, that on the council being once formally opened, if the bishops from beyond Italy did not appear, their presence would be dispensed with. As for the emperor, and the consent and concurrence of the emperor, not a word must be said. "The emperor!" he would say, "why, he is a heretic."

All at once he learned that this dreadful heretic had just agreed to a truce of five years with Henry II. of France, whereupon he, the very man who had so often said that a pope had only to will a thing in order to have the power of doing it, dismissed at once the contempt he had shewn for oblique methods of effecting his purposes. Two legates were despatched, one to Germany, another to France, for the purpose, say their instructions, of entering into some arrangements with the two courts

¹ "The infallibility presupposed as residing in the pope, is not meant as implying that he is aided by God's Spirit in having the necessary illumination for deciding all questions, but it consists in this, that all the questions in which he feels himself sufficiently assisted with the light required for judging them, he decides, but with respect to others in which he does not feel himself sufficiently assisted with light, he remits to the council."—*Duperron*. Here we have another theory! Were the infallibility fully and frankly admitted, which Romanists-fain would maintain, would there be any such seeking for refinements? The statement is ingenious, but we have not written a page, and will not have to write one, in which it is not contradicted by facts. Few popes, indeed, have professed the doctrine of their infallibility so very bluntly as Paul IV.; but no more is there any one who has ever remitted a question to a council with the avowal, that it was out of his power to resolve it. What right, moreover, could they, after such an avowal, pretend to the power of confirming the council's decrees? After having declared that you are unable of yourself to try a question, how could you decide infallibly that it has been rightly tried and determined by others.

about the holding of the council. One of the two, however, Cardinal Rebiba, whose mission was to Germany, was enjoined to travel as slowly as possible, while the other, Cardinal Caraffa, was to use the utmost expedition, their real object, as the reader must have perceived, having been to bring about a rupture of the truce. In fact, before Rebiba had accomplished his journey, Caraffa had seen and gained over the king of France. But the truce had been ratified by the oaths of the parties. What of that? the pope had anticipated its being so, and was prepared to annul their oaths. But—here there was an objection of greater delicacy—the pope was a greybeard of eighty-three. What warranty could he offer? Neither had this escaped him. He engaged to create, from among the most devoted partisans of France, enough of cardinals to secure the election after himself of a pope who should be hostile to the emperor. The negotiation succeeded; the truce was broken. “Seated for whole hours at the table, drinking that black volcanic wine which is still called *Mangiaguerra*, he broke out with impetuous eloquence against those *schismatics*, those *heretics*, those *accursed of God*, that seed of the Jews and the Moors, that *refuse of the world*, in fine, as he called the Spaniards. But he took comfort, he would say, from those words of Scripture, ‘Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.’ He saw the moment at hand when Charles and his son would be punished for their sins, and when he, Paul IV., should deliver Italy out of their hands.”¹

Had he any hope then of remaining at peace after France and Germany had recommenced tearing each other to pieces? Yet he had at his gates a man sufficiently accustomed to inspire dread, the Duke of Alva, who now held Naples in the name of the emperor. After some parleying, which only brought out more strongly the growing eccentricity of the old pope, the duke opened the campaign, and ere the close of the year, (1566,) almost without having struck a blow, his troops had occupied the entire State of the Church. He would restore it, he said, to the pope that was to be. Yet he did not attempt to take Rome, and even had he made the attempt, it is doubtful how far he would have succeeded, for in fortifying that city Paul had found all the energy of a young man, and all the skill of a general; possibly, too, there was no real desire to push matters to that extremity. Charles V. had by this time abdicated his throne.

¹ Ranke, History of the Popedom.

His brother Ferdinand, who succeeded him in the empire, was too pacific; his brother Philip, who succeeded him in Spain, too devout. He was the very Philip whom we shall find ere long seriously questioning with himself whether he should not cause the body of his father, Charles V., to be disinterred and burnt as that of a heretic. As for that, setting aside the atrocity of causing his father's body to be burnt, and supposing that it can ever be right to burn any one, it would only have been justice. We have had opportunities of seeing, almost at every page, what sort of Catholic Charles V. had been.

Be this as it might, none in the rest of Europe could doubt that Paul was blockaded in his capital, and menaced with a siege. Never did pope at the very acme of his power and glory, issue his directions or his commands with more unflinching courage. Even in Rome itself the more the danger increased, the better he contrived to make himself obeyed. The cardinals that opposed his views lay imprisoned in the castle of St. Angelo; and as all opposition was in his eyes not only revolt but heresy, he talked of delivering several of them to the Inquisition. At the first murmur of discontent the highest dignitaries were cashiered as if mere clerks. Legates employed at the remotest distances trembled at the thought of offending him as much as the cardinals of his household; nations and kings asked themselves who then was this man that he should thus use persons who had always been seen surrounded with tokens of deference, prelates but lately his equals, and any of whom, in the course of a few days, might occupy his throne. But the incoherence of his orders, the feverish violence of his threats, and the odd forms he employed, shewed plainly enough that the pope was neither a Gregory VII., nor an Innocent III., but a poor old creature whose head had been turned on mounting St. Peter's throne.

In the first months of the year 1567, his affairs seemed to take a more favourable turn. "The Duke of Alva hesitated, paused at every step, *fought worshipping*," says John von Müller.¹ The Duke of Guise passed into Italy with a sufficient force to keep the Spaniards in check. But Paul had imagined that the French would march straight to Naples: there was no getting him to understand that this would be contrary to all the rules of good tactics, and that what an army has first to look to is to secure itself against being attacked in its rear. It was found necessary to humour him, but in proportion as the French went

¹ History of Switzerland, book x.

down into Italy, the Spaniards went up to Rome. Every step towards bringing him succour threatened to prove his ruin. At last the news of the loss of the battle of St. Quentin reached the French, and a disaster so deplorable to France, and which seemed to place the pope in the absolute power of his enemies, proved, on the contrary, his salvation. The Duke of Guise having returned to France, the Duke of Alva returned to Naples, and soon began to speak about peace. The vanquished now dictated terms to the victor, and Alva went himself to Rome to seek absolution from the censures he had incurred. This was about the end of September 1557.

Not a moment of peace could the Church and Europe enjoy that the grand affair of the council did not occupy all men's thoughts afresh; but the pope, with the usual originality of his views, had given a singularly new face to it. That which the monarchs of Christendom had hitherto made a bugbear for overawing the Court of Rome, he made bold to use as a bugbear for overawing those monarchs. He spoke of nothing less than of procuring the trial and condemnation by the future council of all who had profited by the disorders in the Church, or had introduced new disorders into it, of all who had anyhow interfered in Church affairs, of all, in fine, who had favoured or tolerated the Reformation; and although none could see well how he should set about executing such condemnations, such a threat produced some alarm. Was it, as some said, a mere trick meant to deter princes from having any wish to see the council again at work? We think not. There is nothing improbable in a man of his impetuous imagination, and with such preposterous ideas of the rights and position of a pope, seriously intending to make the council a court of Justice for the trial of kings. The latter, meanwhile continued as actively as ever to imbrue their hands in the blood of the so-called heretics. Philip II. proceeded with the consolidation of the Inquisition in Spain, and went along with his court, very devoutly, to inhale the smoke of the fires at which its victims were burnt. Henry, or his parliament rather, rejected the Inquisition, but he took care to prove by the number and the cruelty of the punishments inflicted on the Reformed, that the Church of Rome should be no loser on that account.

Nor did this testy pontiff lay claim only to the right of trying kings, or causing them to be tried. Their kingdoms, the empire itself, were but the gifts of the Holy See; and this old dictum, which one might suppose to have been forgotten, was openly

avowed anew in his words and deeds. Henry VIII. had erected Ireland into a kingdom. Paul IV. pronounced the erection null; to the pope alone it belonged to erect a province into a kingdom, as well as to reduce a kingdom to the state of a mere province. If Queen Mary was to be Queen of Ireland, it behoved to be through him. Mary made the request, and the pope granted it. Charles V. having abdicated, the empire passed to Ferdinand, whereupon a furious manifesto was discharged from Rome. "The pope alone," says Sarpi, "has the right of appointing the emperor." And though the popes had been willing to yield that right to the electors, it was in the case of vacancy by death only, not in that of abdication. The election which had taken place, was accordingly null, and the pope was to give the empire to whomsoever he should think best. He engaged himself to nothing; nevertheless if Ferdinand would at once make an acknowledgment that he had not been legitimately elected, and that he had erred in allowing himself to be elected, the choice might fall upon him.

Though Ferdinand might have been in the humour to yield, the electors would not have allowed him, and rather than that, would have nominated another emperor. The death of Charles V. (21st September 1558) seemed at first to have simplified the question; but Paul was not the man to avail himself of a back door, however wide and however honourable for him to use it. Null he insisted the election had been, and null it must remain, as long as the right claimed by the pope should not be formally acknowledged.

"I have often heard it asked," says De Maistre, "by what right the popes deposed the emperors? It is easy to reply, By the right on which all legitimate authority reposes, possession on the one hand, and assent on the other."

This possession, one knows however, besides being very far from dating from the first centuries, was never left uncontested; that assent was never universal or free. Even were it otherwise, the above reasoning would still be a mere play upon words. Uncontested possession proves *human* legitimacy; but, when asked by what right popes disposed of thrones, it is clear that what is meant by the question, is by what *divine* right they did so. And this question is all the more pertinent, inasmuch as the popes themselves, in exercising that right, have always maintained that they exercised it in the name of God.

The council was then made the ground for resuming the offen-

sive. Ferdinand spoke of it in full diet, in the same sense that his brother had done, and as a dyke to oppose to the encroachments of Rome. Much more than this, without saying absolutely that the decrees already published should be quashed, the Protestants were allowed to throw out the idea that what was now to be thought of, was quite a new council, summoned and regulated on quite a new system, such, in a word, as they might offer to submit to. Parties, however, could not come to any such mutual understanding as should lead to a definite conclusion; but, shortly afterwards (April 1559), France and Spain having made peace, one of the articles of the treaty bore that the two monarchs should co-operate towards the resumption of the council. Although less threatening to the pope than the resolutions that had nearly emanated from the diet, this accord in such a quarter was not the less a severe check. Paul saw that he was over-matched, and sank under a surcharge of chagrin and resentment. Germany had completely broken with him, and coolly waited for his death. England, delivered from Mary, had declared itself Protestant, not on this occasion at the command of a prince, but with an all but universal enthusiasm. France might any day do the same, and indeed was more ripe for the Reformation than had at first been the case with more than one of the countries that afterwards became Protestant. Italy, Italy itself was profoundly shaken in its attachment to Rome; there was not a town in it where there did not exist, more or less known, more or less concealed, a knot of Calvinists which might become, at the first shock, the centre of an Anti-Roman Church. In this extremity Paul clung to the Inquisition, as to the sole and last remaining plank of safety for the Church and for himself. In public and in private, in his discourses and in his letters, everywhere, in short, he could speak of nothing else. The ambassadors placed daily before his eyes a list of the executions ordered by their masters; the only balm that could now be poured on his deeply wounded pride. Never had Europe been covered with so frightful a network of persecutions and tortures, and as the tyrant of old ordered the bodies of his slaves to be opened that he might warm his feet in their reeking bowels, the fires at which the Protestants were consumed, seemed to burn afar only to keep up a little heat and life in the ice-cold limbs of the miserable greybeard. At last he died; and his last looks were still turned to the schedules of the executions; and the last words he uttered were a recommendation of the Inquisition, as a

father, at the point of death, would recommend his daughter to his friends.

Yet in the midst of that frightful period which had commenced long before the time of Paul IV., and was to last till long after, among the thirty or forty thousand victims delivered or promised to the Roman flames, there was one that escaped, one destined to be burnt at Geneva instead of Lyons, Paris, Brussels, Madrid, or Vienna, wherever, in fine, Rome might have him in her power; a victim, moreover, whose punishment might have appeared, we do not say just, but certainly more just than all the rest, to such a pitch had the man carried his foolhardiness. And, behold, how the historians of Rome exclaim from age to age against the author of the death of Servetus! Would to God that the Reformation could snatch from its annals that sad page of intolerance and horror! But if those who reproach her with it would begin by first tearing all pages of the same kind from their own, how many, we should like to know, would be left?

After entering the conclave amid the yells and hootings of the mobs that were mutilating and dragging through the city the abhorred statue of Paul IV., the cardinals were sensible that another such reign would, both at home and abroad, prove the ruin of the popedom. They found no great difficulty, accordingly, in coming to a general understanding as to the engagements to be taken before proceeding to the election, and, as in preceding conclaves, among these the calling of a council held a chief place.

Notwithstanding this unanimity in preliminary proceedings, they required more than three months before they could come to agree about the pope they were to elect. At last, on Christmas night (1559), the votes all fell on John de Medicis, who took the name of Pius IV.

With more decency of outward manners and a calmer mind, the new pope but too closely resembled, at bottom, his deplorable predecessor. If from the very commencement of his reign, he shewed a disposition, for he had promised as much before his election, to recognise Ferdinand as legitimate emperor, he nearly spoilt all by demanding compliments conceived in terms that would have sanctioned by implication all the pretensions of Paul. After lengthened conferences, the ambassador, Scipio d'Arco, consented to depart a little from the letter of his instructions. A formula was drawn up, which, without giving too much offence to the emperor, should not wound the pride of the pope.

Ferdinand blamed his ambassador, but did not think proper to go the length of an official disavowal of what he had done.

As for the council, Pius had promised that also, and he did not make bold to say, as Paul IV. had done, that a pope could not suppose himself bound by the promises of a cardinal; but the more he looked at the matter, the more he saw difficulties and dangers attending it. Still he was sensible that in manifesting opposition to it, besides proving false to his promise, he would escape those difficulties only to draw on others, and those dangers only to incur possibly greater. The more, then, thought he, that he should pretend to enter into the views of the secular princes, the better placed he should be afterwards for shewing the inconveniences that would result from them. At last he clearly saw that the question must come to an issue at one time or another, and he had sufficient confidence in himself not to desire at any price to bequeath the hazards of the contest to another. Accordingly, Count d'Arco was agreeably surprised when, at his second audience, the pope spoke of the council as of a very simple affair, and one on which his mind was fully made up.

Meanwhile, month after month passed, the pope renewed his promise on every occasion, and yet made it little a matter of conscience to execute it. In France, where, right or wrong, the council was viewed mainly as the grand cure for heresies, the daily advances achieved by the Reformation made the Roman Catholics fret at the tardy procedure of Pius IV. "The conflagration is at Paris," said John de Montlac, bishop of Valence; "we have the waters of the Seine, and wait for those of the Tiber!" The idea of a national council, so often put forward, abandoned, taken up again, and again abandoned, came in the end to captivate men of all characters; and before coming to any common understanding as to the forms to be adopted, the opening of it was fixed, happen what might, for the 20th of January 1561. Henry II. was dead. His widow, Catherine de Medicis, now governed in the name of Francis II.

Although no offence had been meant to the pope, no small uneasiness was felt as to how he would view the matter. In point of fact, he took it so ill, that unless there was to be an entire rupture with him, which, as matters stood, and in the face of the Reformation, would have been madness, it was soon seen to be impossible to persist in it. What shocked him almost as much as the convocation of the national council, was the amnesty granted to the Protestants who had taken up arms in

Languedoc and Poitou. "Who, then, is your king," said he to the French ambassador, "that he should take upon himself to pardon sins committed against God? Can any one be surprised if the wrath of God press heavily on a country where the authority of the Holy See, and of the sacred canons, is trampled under feet?" Philip II. at the same time besought the queen regent to recall the unlucky convocation, or at least to let it pass without effect. She yielded the point. The idea seemed to be abandoned; but this very condescension gave Roman Catholic France the right to insist on the pope no longer keeping her waiting for the remedy to which she looked for her salvation.

Had he come to see that a council would be of no use in opposing the progress of the Reformation, or was he still influenced by nothing but antipathy and distrust? We cannot say; but, notwithstanding all this urgency, he made no greater haste. "The French fret with impatience," he would say; "well, then, let them begin by seizing Geneva, seeing it is the focus of the contagion?" And forthwith his nuncios were charged to propose that undertaking simultaneously to the King of France and the Duke of Savoy.

How happened it, in fact, that Geneva still stood erect? It had now for thirty years openly declared for the Reformation, and had audaciously offered an asylum to all the proscribed. France was inundated with its missionaries and its books. Without arrogating to itself any supremacy as a matter of right, it had not the less become, in point of fact, the metropolis and the Rome of all the Protestantism of the West. It was, without contradiction, a spectacle unparalleled in history, to see a republic of twenty-five thousand souls, braving with impunity at one and the same time, several states, any one of which, it might be thought, could have destroyed it with a breath. The preservation of Geneva, in the 16th century, is in itself a more extraordinary fact than the successive conquest of Italy and of Europe by the Roman republic, which also was a small city when it began its career; and when it vaunts its having been guarded by Providence, its greatest enemies cannot deny that it has a thousand reasons for believing it.

As little can they deny the invincible confidence it reposed in the goodness of its cause, and in the protection of God. "It was David before Goliath," says its old chronicler, Roset; "but before a Goliath all the more formidable, in that he made gold to flash in his hand as well as steel." In 1559, Alardi,

bishop of Mondovi, came to Geneva, commissioned by Emmanuel-Philibert, Duke of Savoy, who had recently mounted the throne, and now would fain try whether words might not succeed better than arms. Alardi was allowed to appear before the council of the city. "What a life!" said he. "What, always on the watch! Not a man in this city which I once knew so flourishing, who now can call two thousand crowns his own. Ah! how much otherwise would it be, had you the support of the flower of chivalry, the most magnificent prince of the age!" "The prince is great," replied *the Geneva gentlemen*, "but God is greater still." And so the bishop went as he came. "Thanks to the intrigues of a man called Calvin," says a Savoy chronicler.

This time, accordingly, at the voice of Pius IV., it was with the sword that Goliath was to come to the attack. "The serpent," wrote the pontiff, "must be strangled in its nest. Do you require money? You are authorized to raise, for the holy war, tithes from your clergy. I for one have taken the initiative, by getting ready my men at arms, and twenty thousand crowns."¹ Of the three states then invited to the ruin of Geneva, there was not one that had not long cast an angry and covetous eye upon it. The dukes of Savoy had never ceased to claim it back as a part of their heritage; Spain would have been too happy to unite it with its possessions in Franche-Comté; France viewed it as an important post between Savoy and the possessions of Spain. Nothing more easy than for the three to unite for the purpose of taking it; but then, to whom was it afterwards to be given? That question which had saved it hitherto, was to save it once more. The pope had succeeded only in raising one rampart more around that retreat which he pointed out to the hatred and the cupidity of its crowned neighbours. Collectively invited to this holy war, the three princes came to consider themselves bound by a sort of offensive treaty, by which each forfeited in some sort the right to proceed to the attack alone; he could not take Geneva, without reclamations on the part of the other two. And Geneva was destined to survive; and it was to be in vain, ever in vain, that the pope and his satellites were to press to its downfall; in vain was Dubartas to express his amazement at the sovereigns allowing it to live on; like those peasants, we find him say,

¹ J. von Müller, *Hist. of Switzerland*, l. x.

“ whose useless hands
 Leave on the apple-tree some withered branch,
 Where, during winter, may survive till spring
 The noxious caterpillar's brood secure ;

in vain was St. Francis de Sales, the titular bishop of the rebellious city, indignant at seeing it comprised in the treaty of peace between Henry IV. and the duke, to exclaim that “ it is a scandalous blot on that happy peace, which the impious ought not to be allowed to enjoy ;”¹ in vain was he to exclaim, on another occasion, “ Geneva is to the devils what Rome is to the angels. All Catholics, especially the pope and the secular princes, ought to devote themselves wholly, either to the conversion or the destruction of that Babylon ;”² the lowly Babylon was to live on ; and if one day it is to perish, it will be because it has accomplished its task. The miracle of its life shall have lasted long enough for it to carry with it to the tomb, the thought that its death is not God's doing, but man's.

Thus the pope's appeal had been without effect ; nor did he conceal his chagrin. Since it was neither from humanity nor toleration that the three sovereigns respected the independence of Geneva, the court of Rome had reason to consider it far from honourable in Roman Catholic princes, to dare giving thus far the precedence to politics over religion, and to the interests of their glory over those of their faith, but in order to be consistent, the pope himself ought to have had less the air of doing the same thing, and of speaking of Geneva only to escape from having anything to say about Trent. “ The further we proceed,” wrote the queen regent³ on this occasion, “ the more does it appear that nothing is done towards the calling of the council, except in the way of dissembling and mere show, and with infinite delays and disguises.”

Renouncing, then, all hope of making a diversion, the pope called to him all the ambassadors then present in Rome. He told them to announce to their respective courts, that the bull for the convocation would shortly appear, adding, that after having passed a great many cities under review, he had found none so suitable as Trent. But, if he, on his part, was to engage to summon the council, the princes were to engage, on theirs, to cause its decisions to be observed. Why not proceed at once to form a kind of armed confederation, ready to act at a moment's notice, against whatever party, prince or people, should re-

¹ Letter to Clement VIII.

² Mémair addressed to the pope.

³ Letter to the ambassador of France at Rome.

fuse to obey? A very simple idea, no doubt, and eminently Roman Catholic, but, withal, manifestly impracticable; a useless subject for new conferences and new delays.

Not only was no attention paid to this, but the choice of the place raised more objections than ever. Philip II. was the only prince that declared himself satisfied with it; still he required, as if in return for an act of great condescension, permission to levy a subsidy on the clergy of Spain. The court of France objected, as it had always done, that Trent was too much under the hand of the emperor; the emperor that it was too much under the hand of the pope, if not in reality, at least in appearance; and that this would be enough to make the Protestants revolt against all that might be done there.

Both courts, moreover, agreed in saying that there must be a new council, not the resumption and winding up of the old. This was more serious, and went to upset all. The pope, accordingly, hesitated not to reply that he should consider himself as a traitor to the Church, a traitor to the Holy See, were he to allow the questioning of a single point of faith of those that had been previously decided. He was right. On the part of Roman Catholic princes it would have been preposterous and criminal; but we have already shewn how much meaning there was in the fact. Fourteen years only had elapsed since the publication of the first decrees, when lo! Roman Catholics appear, who, without rejecting these themselves, yet propose that they shall be held as never having been passed. Who after this will maintain that the dogma of the Church's infallibility was then admitted in the same sense and in the same manner as it has been since?

Meanwhile, the idea of a national council recovered favour in France. At a great meeting of the royal council held at Fontainebleau (August 21), the bishop of Valence repeated his former advice, and urged it strongly; Charles de Marillac, archbishop of Vienne (in Dauphiny), spoke warmly in the same sense. The Protestants were for this council; not that they looked for any good directly from it, or that they were disposed to submit to it, but in the conviction that it would lead to a rupture with Rome, and, by that alone, would prove a great step towards them. Coligny, their organ in the council, confined himself accordingly to an exposition of their petitions and complaints. His language was that of a serious man and a submissive subject; but the simplicity of his words only placed in stronger relief the immensity of the resources which his party was beginning to have at

its disposition. The Duke of Guise, and the Cardinal of Lorraine, acting as the organs of extreme Roman Catholicism, replied only by soliciting more and more rigorous measures. Why, said they, have a council in France? Wherefore even a council-general? Could there be a doubt that the Protestant opinions were heresies, long ago condemned by the Church? There was truth in what they said. In a dogmatical point of view, any council whatever could not fail to prove useless. The Roman Catholics knew well that they would condemn; the Protestants that they would be condemned. On these representations a middle course was adopted. It was resolved that the bishops of the kingdom should be convened, not as a council, but to deliberate whether it would be proper to hold one.

This pretended preparatory assembly so much resembled that which had apparently been abandoned, that in so far as the pope was concerned, it was almost all the same; and it having been proposed that it should meet on the 20th of January, he saw that his bull must absolutely appear before that date. Pallavicini tries to assign the least influence possible to fear on this determination of the pope; but the details which he himself relates, leave no doubt on this head. Other details may be seen, not only in Sarpi and De Thou, but also in a collection of pieces belonging to that period,¹ published at Gotha, a century ago, and which throws a very valuable light on several parts of the history of the council of Trent. It is there we found, in a letter from Cardinal Borromeo to Cardinal Hosius, bishop of Warmia, among other admissions, the following: "Considering what scandal it would be for all Christendom, his Holiness has resolved to prevent this national council by the celebration of a general and œcumenical council."² This alleged universal scandal would hardly have scandalized, at that moment, more than the court of Rome, and who could foresee at what point the contagion would stop?

The question now was how the bull should be worded. A commission was appointed for this task. Among so many conflicting interests and susceptibilities, the arrangement of a piece of writing which should give these the least possible offence, was no small affair, and what was most of all requisite, was to fall on some mode of evading the question of the continuation of the

¹ *Tabularium Ecclesie Romanæ*, by Solomon Cyprianus

² *Considerans Sua Sanctitas quanti id scandali universo populo christiano esset. decrevit celebratione universalis œcumenicæ concilii nationale illud prævertire.*

council. After many attempts this was accomplished, but not without some strange shifts and fetches. Pallavicini, according to custom, denies the fact in the lump, and then admits it in detail. After a brief analysis of the bull, "In this manner," says he, "the odious term *continuation* was thrown out, but its equivalent was put in." The equivalent is there without doubt, and the sequel sufficiently proved that the pope quite intended to put it there; but yet it presents a curious triumph of skill, for we have a bull several pages in length, after the reading of which, supposing that its history were lost, one might ask whether it related to a council that was to be continued or to one that was to be commenced anew.

As to the question of the place, it having necessarily to be settled, care was taken to give the principal parties opposed to it, to understand beforehand, that the choice made was provisional only, and that the assembly once met at Trent, there was nothing to hinder its being transferred elsewhere. In reality the pope's choice had been fixed invincibly. In the new aspect which the affair now assumed, he could no longer desire to see a translation even to Bologna, or to Rome itself, for that would have made the connexion which it was necessary that he should succeed in establishing between the old sessions and the new, more and more difficult, if not impossible. It was only at Trent that one could thenceforth have the continuation and the close of the council of Trent, and this, indeed, must have been long felt to be the case. The translation of the sittings to Bologna, which had been so ardently desired, and so eagerly pleaded for, must, as any one may perceive, have had a most untoward influence, in all future time, on the authority of the council. If the decrees had been issued, some from Trent, others from Bologna or elsewhere, they might indeed, legally, have had the same weight, but collectively they would not have had that imposing unity with which the council of Trent has been invested in the eyes of those who are ignorant of its history. Will the common herd ever think of inquiring whether ten years elapsed between the decree on the eucharist and that on the mass, two decrees so closely related to each other? Will they ever know that of the seventy bishops who voted the former of these decrees, four or five only concurred in drawing up the latter? Both pass as *The Council of Trent*, and no further inquiry is made.

Yet this bull, so painfully elaborated with the view of contenting everybody, contented none. The secular princes persisted,

each for himself, in making no account of the difficulties with which the pope was beset. The emperor and the court of France even went so far as to call for another bull, in which the council to be summoned should be one entirely new; the king of Spain complained, on the contrary, that the pope had not had the courage clearly to announce the continuation of the other; the Protestants, in fine, had been saying over and over again that they wanted neither the old nor a new of the same kind as the old. Hence conferences without end, which it were useless to detail. The bull had appeared on the 29th of November; it appointed Easterday 1561 for the opening. Easter had arrived, and parties were as far from a common understanding as they had been at Christmas.

The pope, nevertheless, had nominated his legates; these being at first but two, Hercules of Gonzaga, commonly called bishop of Mantua, and Cardinal Du Puy of Nice. Four others were appointed afterwards: these were Cardinals Hosius, Seripandi, Simonetta, and Altemps, the last being the pope's nephew. The Cardinal of Mantua was to preside.

On their arrival at Trent two days after Easter, nine bishops only were found there, and all of these Italians. Leaving these to hold some preparatory conferences with shut doors, let us see what was passing elsewhere.

Francis II. had died on the 2d of December, and had been succeeded by his brother Charles IX., under the regency of his mother and of Anthony of Bourbon, king of Navarre. A meeting of the States-general, held shortly afterwards at Orleans, had served only to throw light on the divisions in the Roman Catholic party. The nobility and the *tiers-état* had declaimed against the clergy; the clergy had found they could not attack the Protestants without attacking those who, without being Protestants, yet scrupled little to agree with them in many things. Now, these half Protestants were daily becoming more numerous. The States of Orleans had almost unanimously voted resolutions, which were, it is true, either left unexecuted or were marred in the execution, yet the boldness of which is a curious symptom of the progress that had been made, unintentionally, in the ways of the Reformation. The meeting had petitioned for the election of bishops by the clergy, with the intervention of a certain number of the nobility and of electors from the *tiers-état*; that the obligation to residence should be absolute; that censures should be pronounced for public scandals; that monastic vows should not

be received at any age under five-and-twenty for men, and twenty for women, &c. As for questions of doctrine or bearing upon doctrine, a letter from the queen regent, addressed to the pope in 1561, sufficiently proves how nearly the two parties, notwithstanding their growing animosities, had really come to a common understanding. In that letter Catherine required, most of all, the supper in both kinds, and the celebration of worship in the vulgar tongue. The mass would be preserved, but without the adoration of the host, which amounted almost to an abandonment of transubstantiation. The worship of images was to be renounced, as having been unknown in the early times of the Church, and forbidden by God in the second commandment. Baptism was to be restored to its ancient simplicity. All ceremonies, the apostolic origin of which should not be sufficiently demonstrated, were to be abolished. In fine, as the regent concluded with an intimation to the pope of the calling of the colloquy of Poissy, which it was well known would amount in his eyes to an invasion of his rights, that letter, notwithstanding the polite terms in which it was couched, was very nearly tantamount to a denial of the Roman supremacy. We cannot know how far it exactly represented the queen's own sentiments, but such a document evidently did not emanate either from a mind or heart very deeply Roman Catholic. The more we study the history of those times, the more we become convinced that had Reformation ideas been allowed to ferment for eight or ten years longer without any intermingling of politics, and without being compromised by the grandees, with their rivalries and their intrigues, France would have been lost to Rome. Catherine de Medicis may have wished the St. Bartholomew massacre out of hatred to the Reformed; but after having written such a letter, she could not have wished it from hatred to the Reformation.

The famous colloquy of Poissy has had no lack of authors to relate its proceedings; we confine ourselves to those parts only that bear on the history we have in hand.

In spite of the pope, but with the advice of the bishops, it had been convoked; in spite both of the pope and the bishops the court had required the attendance of the Protestants. At the very first sitting the Chancellor de l'Hôpital appeared as the organ of Gallican sentiments, and announced these with a frankness, the very echoes of which alarmed and seemed to confound Rome. The chancellor commenced by stating as a principle

what the popes had never ceased to regard as a heresy, or at least as a dangerous and culpable error, that in default of a general council, it was at once the right and the duty of all secular princes, each for himself, to apply a remedy to the Church's wants and defects. "And were there," said he, "at this very hour a general council met, would that be a reason for renouncing the present meeting, or any other such as the king might appoint for the same object? No. A majority of the council-general would be made up of strangers to France, and hence incapable of rightly appreciating the wishes and the wants of the kingdom. Have we not seen in the reign of Charlemagne, several councils met at the same time? Have we not seen a council-general, that of Rimini, where Arianism triumphed, condemned in France by a synod presided over by Hilary of Poitiers? And it was the doctrine of the latter of these synods which, in spite of the council-general, became that of the Church."

Did the chancellor honestly suppose that he attacked only the pope? Assuredly the Protestants could not have said anything stronger against the Roman Church itself; in our general remarks on infallibility we have quoted this same fact. If it be admitted—and how can it be denied?—that the colloquy of Poitiers was in the right as opposed to the council of Rimini, the first colloquy that meets may hope to be justified in opposing the council of Trent.

After such a speech from the chancellor, the Protestants had the ball at their feet, and they will always have the advantage in contending with the Gallicans, however little they may press them. Accordingly, notwithstanding the efforts of the prelates, of the queen, and of the chancellor himself, to make them appear only in the character of accused persons, the simple recital of their faith and of their grievances gave them that of accusers and judges. It was in vain that Beza,¹ who spoke for them, softened the terms he used; it was not in his power to prevent all that he said from having a fearfully telling effect. Did he speak of the persecutions inflicted on his brethren? It was their blood which as he spoke cried aloud against the authors of so much carnage, and the victim is always eloquent when it speaks in presence of its butchers. Did he say nothing of those frightful scenes? This only gave him the air of pardoning them, only made him

¹ They consisted of fourteen ministers. On the side of the Roman Catholics there were five cardinals, forty bishops, and a score of doctors.

all the more eloquent. Did he attack the clergy? He then said scarcely more than had been said at the states met at Orleans, and that Cardinal Ferrara, who represented the pope at the colloquy, was the son of Lucretia Borgia. Did he give an exposition of his doctrine? It was mingled throughout with matter in which he felt he had the support of two-thirds of the court and of the parliament. He was listened to accordingly with a degree of attention as flattering to him as it was calculated to unnerve the prelates. "I could well have wished," said the Cardinal of Lorraine to his intimate friends, "either that this man had been dumb, or that we had been deaf!" But Beza had spoken; the audience had not been deaf; a reply was necessary. The cardinal, to the great annoyance of many of the prelates, who thought it would detract from his dignity, had declared that he would undertake the task; but to avoid the inconsistency of him, a cardinal and a prince, disputing with a heretic of no note, he did what many champions of Romanism do to this day, he laid down, *ex professo*, with great plausibility certain theories and certain facts, and sneered at objections, as if a single unresolved objection were not sufficient to subvert the finest and best constructed theory. On this we have said enough elsewhere; in presence of the smallest error on any point whatsoever, what becomes of the most magnificent exposition of the Roman system on the Church's authority and infallibility? The cardinal struck beside the point; theories never can refute facts. Compelled, besides, to retain his footing on the slippery ground of Gallican ideas, he was perpetually hazarding the introduction of questions of the utmost delicacy. How maintain in one breath the authority of the pope and those liberties which the pope had never acknowledged? How speak in the name of the universal Church, when a right had been assumed to control the decrees of a general council? How press the necessity for there being a chief in the Church, when all the world knew that that meeting had been called in the face of his disapproval? And all that we say of the famous colloquy of Poissy may be said of the famous assembly of the clergy under Lewis XIV. Like the cardinal of Lorraine in 1561, Bossuet in 1682, required more talent and tact to avoid the appearance of demolishing Rome, than he had ever shewn in attacking Geneva.

But at Poissy there was a man to whom Gallicanism was hardly less odious than the Reformation. This was the irascible Lainez, soon afterwards general of the Jesuits, and at that time

attached to the cardinal of Ferrara, the pope's legate at the court of Charles IX. To the calling of the colloquy none had been more bitterly opposed than Lainez. He groaned in spirit while attending its sittings, and even the utter defeat of the Calvinist doctors could not have made him digest the affront of an assembly having been held without the pope, and in spite of the pope. At last he made an impassioned speech, but it was directed against the queen and the court still more than against Beza. The Protestants escaped with merely having to hear themselves called *foxes*, *serpents*, and *apes*; the court was censured at great length, and point by point, for having made a breach in the Church by meddling with matters in which it had no concern. This was heard in silence. What, indeed, could have been said in reply without producing an open rupture? The court had further to submit to hear the praises lavished by Pius IV. on his fervid champion, while he threatened to excommunicate the chancellor, and almost openly undertook the defence of one Tanquerel, who had been condemned by the parliament for having maintained that the pope might deprive of their dominions princes that should rebel against the papal authority. In short, it must be admitted that the Roman unity, of which so terrible an argument has since been made, could not have much impressed the anti-Romanists of that period. Even although the tentative proceedings at Trent had not demonstrated how little reality there was in it, even in matters of faith, what importance could have been attached to it by people so entirely disagreed with respect to the constitution, the seat, the very essence of that power which was said to be charged with the establishment and preservation of this boasted unity? Could that very disagreement be viewed as a thing beyond the sphere of matters of faith? Here we find again, only exhibited in action, all the arguments of our first book. On all occasions on which the popes have thought they might call, or allow others to call, Gallicanism a heresy, they have done it; on all occasions when it has suited them to excite any hatred against France or the French, it has been as heretics that they have denounced them to fanatical nations. In Italy, in Spain, in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, heretic and Frenchman have been synonymous terms. Some of the heroes of St. Bartholomew went and settled in America. Smeared as they were with Protestant blood, what were they in the eyes of the ultramontanists of the New World? Why, nothing but heretics. Philip V.

mounted the Spanish throne. He had taken part in the *dragonnades* against the French Reformed; he appears in Spain under the auspices of the monarch who commanded those dragonnings and who believed himself the most zealous Roman Catholic in Europe, the Church's first-born, a second Theodosius, in fine, as was said of him by Bossuet. For all that he was but a heretic in the eyes of his new subjects. He goes to Naples, and lo! the blood of St. Januarius refuses to liquefy, because, say the priests, the miracle cannot take place where a heretic reigns. Even in the wars of our own age, down to 1823, when official France was more Roman Catholic than ever, but still Gallican, it was on a sentiment of religious horror still more than of national independence, that Spain rested her resistance to French intervention.

To return to the colloquy, it was in Spain also that the government and the clergy were most agreed in blaming its authors. Nor did Philip confine himself to censure. He was deeply interested in the divisions that distracted France, and had long desired to interfere in them. Hence that fatal intervention which was to end in the follies and the horrors of the League. He began by complaining of the dangers which, as he alleged, threatened his own states, from the vicinity of a kingdom where so little regard was shewn to the interests of the faith; he should take good care that after having been at such pains to root out the last remains of heresy from Spain he should not be compelled to see it flourishing at his own gates. He gave no farther explanation, but enough was known to make his meaning sufficiently understood. Two months previous to the colloquy there had been seized at Orleans a sort of petition presented to him by the clergy of France, and that document, notwithstanding the ambiguity of its terms, pointed clearly enough to the necessity for an armed intervention. Although the clergy, as a body, were not guilty of complicity, so many persons were found compromised by it that the government felt it necessary to put a stop to further investigation; it was fain to wink at what it had not the power to punish. Philip II., accordingly, was assured of powerful sympathies; of this sufficient proofs appeared in the course of time. With the Romish clergy the interests of the Church and of Rome have necessarily the precedence of those of their native country. It is only at the expense of his consistency, and at the hazard of seeing himself placed in the falsest positions, that a priest can be a good

Frenchman, a good German, and, in general, a good citizen. Be this happy inconsistency frequent or rare, that is a delicate question which we are not called to examine; the answer to it, moreover, must vary greatly, according to times and places. There are priests, thank God, who are also good citizens, as there are priests also who are tolerant; but just as these last are not and cannot be so without disobedience to their Church, so also, the only consistent and finished priest is he who has no country but Rome and no sovereign but the pope.

The bishops at the colloquy, meanwhile, were fain to grant something, or, if not inclined to do so, felt at least that it would seem strange to have called the Protestants together, all whose opinions, be it remembered, they perfectly knew, without making any concession to them. The supper in both kinds had the double advantage of not being a point of doctrine and of exciting the greatest interest. The council had not decided the question; in consenting to its adjournment it had given room to believe that it was not irrevocably decided in the Roman sense. It was resolved, therefore, that the pope should be asked to yield on that point. Some of the bishops even thought that it was competent for the king to regulate the matter by an edict; but it was deemed more prudent not to commit themselves to so mischievous a step.

The pope replied that that request had been already made to him by the emperor, that, personally, he would have found no great difficulty in consenting to it, but that the cardinals had almost with one mind advised him to reject it. Notwithstanding, out of regard for France, he would consult them once more.

A consistory was held accordingly, (10th November,) and not only was the request refused, but it was made the occasion of the severest recriminations against the country from which it had come. All that the pope thought the cardinals said. Court, parliament, and bishops, were openly accused of heresy. The Cardinal della Queva, who had nearly been elected pope, ventured to say that if ever the pope consented to such a request he himself would go and supplicate for mercy on the steps of St. Peter's, thus intimating that even the pope would in his eyes be a heretic were he to have a hand in such things. The Cardinal of St. Angelo added, that because the French were sick, that was no reason for giving them, under the guise of medicine, a cupful of poison. And when the ambassador from France asked him if the bishops of the first ages had then been poisoners,

seeing they gave the cup to all, another replied that the cup would really have been poisoned, for whoever should partake of it in the belief that it was necessary, since this was to deny, against the opinion of the Church, that the entire body of the Saviour was in the bread.

Notwithstanding this unanimity, the pope hesitated; he pondered with alarm the consequences that might possibly follow his refusal. First, he would fain have had the ambassador withdraw his request; but that minister having replied that this was beyond his power, he then thought of applying for advice to the council. Not, said he, that he did not believe himself fully competent to pronounce on the question, but since the council was about to open, why should he withdraw from its cognizance a matter so closely allied to the questions which it would have to study? Pius promised, moreover, to take steps for its being among the first points to be submitted to examination.

Notwithstanding this, the court of France was less disposed than ever either to send its bishops or to acknowledge a council in which they should not have had a place. By dint of chicanery and ill-nature it had come at last to put legal right, one might almost say reason, on the side of the court of Rome, seeing that for a year the pope had been doing his best to bring the council into a state which might authorize its being opened. Whatever were in reality his feelings and his fears, he could no longer be reproached either with negligence or tergiversations. The sending of six legates from Rome sufficiently shewed that he had no longer any wish to draw back. In consequence of the pains he had taken, near a hundred bishops were at Trent, that is to say, a third more than had appeared at any of the old sessions. In this number there were, no doubt, many Italians; but it was no longer the pope's fault if those belonging to other countries persisted in refusing to come. He thought, therefore, that after waiting for eight months, he might safely undertake the responsibility of opening it, and it was decided accordingly that the first session should take place on the 18th January 1562.

The drawing up of the decree for the opening proved a still more thorny affair than that of its convocation had been. Could the meeting evade explaining its real character? Surely it must present itself to the world either as a new council or as a continuation of the old. The Spanish bishops were strongly in favour of the second alternative; nay, several threatened to with-

draw were there any concession, or appearance of concession, on that point. The Italians were no less unwilling to yield; but they were as much aware as the pope was that any explicit statement would call forth the most dangerous protests from Germany and France. Means were still found, accordingly, for leaving the matter undecided. Nothing is impossible in diplomacy; but it was a sorry commencement to have too little courage for saying what all were unanimous in thinking. "Is it your pleasure that the holy council of Trent, œcumenical and general, be celebrated, commencing from this day, all suspension being removed, according to the form and tenor of our holy father the pope's letters, and that there shall be brought under discussion, proper order being observed, what shall seem expedient as a remedy for present evils?" &c. Thus, *all suspension being removed*, which assumes, it is true, a convocation anterior to the present; but it is not said that that convocation had produced anything. Reference is made to the bull, but that we have seen said nothing more precise. All this, humanly speaking, is very excusable. To have done otherwise would have been to subvert all. But this mendacious decree is not the less associated with those who, we are told, were holy and infallible persons; the council not the less gives itself, in that as well as in the other decrees, the titles of holy, œcumenical, and legitimately assembled, with the assistance of the Holy Ghost.

The opening then took place. A hundred and ten prelates in full costume, accompanied by their officers, their priests, and their doctors, solemnly took possession of the cathedral, amid the sound of artillery and of steeple bells, and between two lines of soldiers. No ambassador had as yet arrived; a circumstance that greatly disappointed Pallavicini. "It looked,"¹ says he, "as if the theatre on which such fine things were passing, had not all the splendour that it required, as long as the representatives of the kings did not figure there." But from quite a different cause than a defect in external splendour, there still prevailed, in fact, a painful sense of isolation and weakness. The number was above a hundred; but better had there been only fifty, had there been among these only a dozen of French and Germans. Yet with all these reasons for humility and fear, the opening sermon displayed as much hardihood as ever. Gaspard del Fosso, archbishop of Reggio, had chosen for his subject the authority of the Church and the power of councils. The bishops had the

¹ BOOK XV. H. XVI.

satisfaction of hearing it declared, as in the too famous sermon of Musso, that the Holy Spirit was about to speak by their mouth. And as for the Church's authority, "Is it not it," said he, among other reasons, "that substituted the Lord's day for the Sabbath, which was instituted by God himself? Did it not abolish circumcision, also instituted by God?" Whence it must be concluded, little room as there was for such reasoning, not that the Church is equal to the Word of God, but that it is much superior. If this were the place to reply, we might observe further, that the Sabbath and circumcision were practices, not doctrines; that these practices have been not abolished, but replaced, the one by the Lord's day, the other by baptism; that this substitution was the work of the Apostles; that, were it even the Church's doing, the right of modifying practices by no means draws along with it that of teaching (new) doctrines. Did the abolition of the Sabbath, and of circumcision, date as so many Romanist ideas do, from the tenth, nay, the twelfth century, should we be bound to subscribe to it? How prove the authority of the Church by decisions which we should be authorized to reject, did they emanate only from the Church? The argument, nevertheless, is in great favour, down to our own days even, in the writings of Romanist controversialists.

A single word which had found its way into the decree, was destined afterwards to excite stormy discussions.

The bishops that had arrived first at Trent, had for several months enjoyed opportunities of visiting each other, and having a mutual interchange of ideas. From such strictly private deliberations, there issued certain projected decrees, prepared for being submitted to the council when fully constituted, but not all equally accordant with the views of the pope. The legates were not much put about in having them rejected; but it was of consequence further, that they should not even be brought under deliberation; and of still more consequence that even as respected decrees perfectly innocuous, a check should be put at once to the perilous course of entertaining individual or collective propositions. Nevertheless, to have it decreed that the legates alone should have the right of introducing subjects for discussion, was impossible; all but the Italians would have protested, and the Italians themselves would not all have subscribed it. An attempt was made, accordingly, to have inserted in the decree for the opening, at least the germ of the right which it was anticipated would be so necessary.

The decrees had hitherto run simply thus, "The holy council, the legates of the apostolic see presiding." This was already a great deal; time was when we have seen what pains were taken to elude the question of this presidency being honorary merely, or of divine right; indispensable, or not indispensable, to the council's legitimacy. This time, it was no more *presiding*, but "proposing and presiding."¹ The terms did not thereby say that it was for them *alone* to propose, but they might thus be interpreted; and we shall see ere long that they were placed there solely with that view. Was this, too, a piece of diplomacy? We are of opinion that even among diplomatists, it would stand a great chance of being called something very different. The bishop of Grenada, and three other Spaniards, said as much in the face of the legates.

This right of proposing did not fail to create embarrassment. As the resumption of the plan of procedure in 1551 was not, for the moment, to be dreamt of, seeing that that would have been to cut short, in fact, the question as to the continuation, the grand affair was to find out some subject altogether new, strictly associated with nothing else, and which might figure equally well at the beginning, middle, or end of a council. The legates proposed then to inquire what should be done with respect to books forbidden, or to be forbidden; a vague question, which could only lead, as happened in fact, to an insignificant decree. What could the assembly be asked to do? Not surely itself to draw up a catalogue of the books to be condemned? That was impracticable; at the most it could appoint a committee to do so. Not to fix the rules according to which they should be condemned; for it was clear that every book that contradicted the decisions of the Church, and especially those of the council itself, was, from that alone, of a nature to be interdicted. Not to decree that the pope and bishops should have an eye directed to all works that might be published; for their attention had long been thus directed, and the Inquisition, moreover, left them nothing to do. Thus what was presented to the council, became a subject of conversation rather than of discussion; and more than one bishop thought it strange that an assembly so numerous, brought together with so much difficulty, and opened so tardily, should be asked to spend its time in any such manner.

The prohibition of certain books began, like all abuses, with measures at once wise and legitimate. It is evident that a pas-

¹ *Proponentibus* Sedis apostolicæ legatis, et præsidentibus.

tor does no more than his duty in pointing out to his flock such writings as appear to him dangerous ; but it is also evident that his right cannot go so far as to interdict them otherwise, than by an appeal to the conscience of the readers. Such was the interdiction which for a long period was alone in use. Towards the year 500, we see Pope Gelasius publish a first general *index* of heretical books, or books reputed to be heretical ; but he merely gave a list of them. The faithful were to know that the Church condemned them ; that was all. By little and little we find threats appear, but still nothing very offensive in these ; it was merely observed, that he who reads a heretical book, knowing it to be heretical, commits the sin of one who voluntarily exposes himself to a temptation. Towards the twelfth century, the custom was introduced of anathematizing at one blow the heretic and his works ; the interdiction is then more severe ; still it is only an interdiction. Finally, it becomes more and more severe, and by little and little excommunication is brought in to sanction it. Thus, in excommunicating Luther, Leo X. pronounces the same penal sentence against those who should read his books. At the epoch of the council, it was the ordinary form of that sort of condemnations.

Paul IV., whose violent proceedings we have related, had particularly distinguished himself in this desperate warfare between Roman Catholicism and liberty. A vast index, drawn up under his eye by the Inquisition of the Roman States, has come down to us as a curious monument of the papal despotism, or, if you will, dotage. As little disposed to respect his predecessors as the secular princes, and without disquieting himself about the breach thus made in his own claims to infallibility, Paul condemns without ceremony works printed in Italy, at Rome itself, under the eyes and with the approbation of the popes ; for example, the Annotations of Erasmus on the New Testament, approved by Leo X. in 1518. According to Pallavicini, nothing more simple : “ Is it to be supposed that the pope, in signing a brief of that nature, can always examine writings personally, or by very capable persons ? Why should not time make one distinguish, upon a second reading, what had not been perceived at the first ? ”¹ All well ; but then we would add, why may not time enable him to perceive, on a third reading, the contrary of what he believed he had seen at the second ? With this reasoning, just as it is in itself, the pope is in the same condition of

¹ Book xv. ch. xviii.

self-correction and of error, as the first doctor you meet; there may always be an appeal from the pope who is ill-informed, to the pope who is better informed. It is Gallican, but hardly orthodox reasoning. Be that as it may, Paul IV. did not look so narrowly into it; he went straight forward—so much the worse for those who stood in his way, though popes like himself. Among the condemned authors, his Index signals out, not only heretics properly so called, but all who had raised the smallest doubt on the rights and pretensions of Rome. Had he not called heretics, in full consistory, those who had wished to remind him of the promise he had given in conclave, not to appoint more than four cardinals at once? There was heresy, according to him, in thinking that the pope could be bound, even by an oath; in what an abyss of heresy were not those then plunged, in his eyes, who dared to speak of placing any other limits on that power, a power more absolute than that of God himself, for none has ever said that God was not bound by his promises, or could have the thought of violating them? Further, in that same Index, all the works published, or that might be published by sixty printers mentioned by name, and, generally, all books that should issue from the presses of a printer guilty of having once printed a heretical book, were anathematized in the lump. In a word, there was not perhaps a single man in Europe that could read, who did not find himself caught, in one way or another, in that decree's anathemas: and the only penalty indicated for all these cases, however different, was excommunication. Were we wrong in speaking of dotage?

This decree, accordingly, had been very much criticised even at Rome. Sensible persons thought this deluge of excommunications much less fitted to keep the population of Christendom in awe than to familiarize them with a punishment which is felt to be nothing the moment it ceases to be the most terrible of all. Thus the council was led at the very first to occupy itself with the measures of Paul IV. The members were agreed in blaming their severity, but they knew not how to meddle with them. Of all the books condemned by that pope, there was not one which an assembly of bishops could consider as altogether blameless; and if there was a certain number which they would have preferred not seeing anathematized, there was none, nevertheless, which they could venture to rescue from the curse pronounced on them. Is it not better, then, said Peter Contarini, bishop of Baffa, is it not better to forbid a thousand works which do not

deserve it, than to permit the reading of one that does? "Ah!" he added, with great simplicity, "are books so rare, then, that we should be so much alarmed about interdicting a few too many!" Pallavicini is inclined to think this opinion *singular*. Let us be thankful he says nothing worse, for it is rare to find him not admiring the things he relates in proportion as they are strange. But if this opinion be singular, what other term shall we apply to that of the historian himself in admitting that Paul went too far, yet persisting in ascribing to the Church on this point a power without limits and without control? And if we mention here the light in which he viewed this matter, it is not because he supported it. Of what consequence is that to us? It is because it has never ceased, and never can cease to be that of the Roman Church. It is not fifteen years since there fell from the pretended chair of St. Peter, those words which so many persons would now fain obliterate from men's memories,—“The liberty of the press is a monstrous liberty, which can never be held in sufficient horror.”¹

In consenting to the revision of the Index, the pope had first taken care that no prejudice should be done to his rights. Considering the prohibitions that emanated from Paul IV. as still in force, he had sent to the bishops of the council permission to read the books which that pope had noted as heretical. This was generally deemed a slur on the council's dignity. People wondered very reasonably at its being assumed that bishops legitimately assembled for fixing the Church's faith and discipline, should further require the pope's special permission to read the books they might have to condemn. Under polite and gracious forms it amounted to the most slavish subjection that the Holy See had as yet imposed on any council.

We have seen the difficulties started under Julius III. about the attendance of the Protestants. As this question could not fail to be resumed, the legates had fancied that they could find, in the affair of the Index, the means of depriving it of all that was most embarrassing. They proposed, therefore, that they should be called, not as divines and representatives of the Reformation, but as authors interested in the framing of the catalogue, and who had a claim to be heard before being condemned.

Nothing could be more illusory, if indeed we can call that illusory which is too clear to deceive anybody. Protestant writings were too openly heretical to make the asking of explana-

¹ See *ante*, p. 111.

tions from their authors anything more than an idle ceremony. These Protestants, therefore, would not come; but this being just what was wanted, the application for a safe-conduct, when made anew by the emperor, met on this occasion with no difficulty. Only two bishops desired that this curious condition should be put into it, that the heretics should come, not to dispute, but to be converted.

Accordingly, never yet had there been so meaningless a decree as that read on the 26th of February. Many prelates were ashamed of it; they even asked themselves whether the title of decree could be given to the mere announcement that a commission had been appointed, and that it would receive with pleasure those who might think that they had explanations to give. Moreover, however insignificant the result of the deliberations, these had been very long, and it was only with much ado that it had been found possible to have the decree ready on the appointed day. All the members wished to speak; all wished to give token of their presence on that theatre which most of them, mere priests at the time of the old sessions, had hitherto only hailed from a distance. When they came to the discussion of the text, the legates were obliged to lay it down as a rule, that it should be passed before the meeting rose, even although they should devote the whole night to it. It was the best way to have done with it; but, at the same time, it did not flatter the assembly with much prospect of independence.

That safe-conduct, too, which to all appearance was to be of use to nobody, cost many days' labour. The Spaniards exclaimed against the abuse that might be made of it in escaping from the rigours of the Inquisition. An accused person might ask leave to get out of prison for the purpose of justifying himself before the council. Was he to obtain this leave, then, at the risk of seeing him go, not to Trent, but to Geneva? They came to an understanding about it at last, thanks to a word furtively introduced at the end of the safe-conduct. What an infernal mockery! See, in the first place, in the decree, the most pressing invitations. It is by the bowels of the divine mercy,¹ that the council exhorts the heretics to come to Trent, to open their hearts, to throw themselves into the arms of that tender mother who is burning with a desire to pardon them.² Next, see in the

¹ Per viscera misericordię Dei.

² Ad tam piam et salutarem matris suę admonitionem excitentur et convertantur: omnibus enim caritatis officiis sancta synodus eos ut iuvat, ita complectitur.

safe-conduct itself, four large pages filled with the most minute securities; only the heretics of Germany alone are as yet spoken of. See, at last, a final paragraph in which these securities are extended to all persons of any other kingdom, nation, city, province whatsoever, "where doctrines opposed to those of the Church are professed." What more would you have? Wait. At the side of these words, "*are professed,*" *with impunity* was slipt in. Thus the Inquisition was saved. Wherever a man was not a heretic *with impunity*, the safe-conduct was null. Accordingly, one does not see that this charitable appeal snatched a single victim from the pitiless tribunal.

The heart shudders at the thought of the frightful militia to which, among the millions of Christians, the execution of the decrees of Trent was committed. They were not yet written at Trent, when they were engraved with burning pincers, in the heart of Spain, on bodies already devoted to the flames. And Rome applauded; and the pope repeated that Philip was, in fact, *the most catholic* king, the most pious and the most orthodox of monarchs, the only one who remained what all ought to have been.

Meanwhile those same Spaniards, who were so zealous in behalf of an institution so dear to the pope, ceased not to cause much uneasiness on other points. There was not a meeting at which they did not make efforts to bring back the famous question of residence and of divine right. The more ultramontane they were in their dogmas, the more did they embolden themselves not to be so in their ideas on the dignity of the episcopate, the part assigned to the bishops in the Church, and the nature and extent of the pope's supremacy. A most instructive history might be written of that demi-gallicanism, to which historians have not yet given a name, and which is so liberal and bold on the one side, and so profoundly despotic and persecuting on the other. We shall yet have to notice many of its peculiar traits, nor can it be thought uninteresting to find in the depths of Spain, in the midst of the sixteenth century, so many auxiliaries against the pope, and consequently against Roman Catholicism, without their suspecting it, for it is not with impunity that a keystone of the vault can be shaken.

An attempt, therefore, had to be made to satisfy them, by proposing, among other subjects which we need not detail, a new examination of the methods by which residence might be made more general. Cardinal Simonetta, one of the legates and head of the ultra-papal party, and of what a Frenchman would

call "of the extreme right," was averse to this commencement of concession; the Cardinal of Mantua, premier legate, and head of the moderate ultramontanes, and, if you will, of the left centre, had positively desired it. Notwithstanding their united efforts to concentrate the discussion on a peaceable examination of methods, it fell immediately on what they had wished to keep off, and thus the question became as complex and as irritating as ever.

We shall not return to what we have already said upon it. Eleven sittings were devoted to it. Hot words and the commencements of tumults often occurred. From the time of the old debates things had undergone no change; the same principles, the same interests, the same passions, all were there. Some were as obstinate as ever in affirming that on residence being once declared to be of divine right, it would be universally practised; others, as obstinate as ever, maintained that matters would be no better, and that, besides, in all things good results do not always prove the truth of the principle. In this they were not wrong. The question was not which of the two systems did most good or most harm, but which of the two was true? Is it by the authority of the pope, or by that of God, that a bishop is bound to reside in his church?

There was nothing then, it would appear, but that on the question having been once sufficiently debated, they should take the votes. Is not the majority of a council necessarily in the right? But the papal faction ardently desired that there should be no voting; and even among the partisans of the divine right there were several who dreaded, for the honour of the council, a voting in which it could be seen beforehand that the members would be far from unanimous. The legates themselves were not agreed. Three wished that the voting should proceed; two were opposed to this.¹ Now, they had orders from the pope always to act in concert; but as it was necessary that they should come to the point, the Cardinal of Mantua, as president, decided that the vote should be taken.

This was done accordingly. Historians differ as to the number of the voters and the repartition of the votes. Let us keep therefore to Massarelli, secretary to the council, cited by Pallavicini as the only correct authority on this point. According to him there were an hundred and thirty voters; for declaring the divine right, sixty-six; against, seventy-one; papal majority,

¹ As yet they were only five in number.

five. But, always according to Massarelli, among the seventy-one votes counted as opposed to the declaration, there were thirty-seven only who were so absolutely; of the other thirty-four prelates, some answered, "yes, provided the pope be first consulted," and others, "no, if the pope has not been first consulted," which sufficiently shews that they were at bottom for the affirmative, and that it was from respect for the pope that they did not join the ayes.

There was in reality then a considerable majority in favour of the divine right. The sitting had been long and stormy; the assembly was dismissed without being asked what it meant should be the result of this voting, and as an escape from this difficulty, the legates interpreted it in the sense of a reference to the pope, although such reference had been positively voted by only thirty-four members, being just a fourth of the council. Accordingly they wished to say nothing about it; but it came out that one of the Cardinal of Mantua's secretaries had set out for Rome, and the Spaniards bitterly complained of it at the following congregation. "Are we a council," said they, "or merely the pope's counsellors? Better to have frankly said that no council is wanted than to call us together only to make us slaves." And these complaints, repeated from day to day, were all the more disquieting in that they were uttered by those who were most zealous in behalf of discipline and the faith. "His holiness," wrote the ambassador of France at Rome,¹ "is much hindered at present on account of the complaints made by these prelates that the affairs of the said council are sent thither and consulted upon here, saying that this is a violation of its liberty."

What still more *hindered* his holiness than the irregularity of the reference, was the reference itself. A letter from the Florentine ambassador to Duke Cosmo, gives an excellent picture of the position of affairs. According to him, after the evident majority obtained by the principle of divine right, Pius IV. was morally bound to pronounce in that sense; but, on the other hand, although his convictions or his interests had not been to the contrary, still he ought to have felt repugnant at erecting into an article of faith what had been so warmly combated by thirty or forty of the most Catholic prelates. But looking at the matter in a merely human point of view, would it not have been a kind of treason towards those men, to whom so much was due,

¹ Letter to Charles IX., 6th May, 1562.

seeing that it was through them that the legates led the council? Hence, had he refused there would have been an almost universal discontent in Spain, Germany, and France; had he agreed, an almost universal discontent in Italy, a discontent more respectful, perhaps, but in some respects more dangerous. We shall see, accordingly, that he took good care not to pronounce either way.

At Trent, the excess of the evil had ended at last in procuring a remedy. The violence of the scenes that had occurred produced a general impression that it would not require much of the same sort of thing to bring the council to a close amid the contempt of Roman Catholics and the laughter of Protestants. Some serious men of both parties in the council came to a mutual understanding not to give such scandal to the Church, or such satisfaction to her enemies. By a tacit agreement there was a mutual abstinence from all allusion to those debates, and thus six peaceful sittings could be devoted to the other points that had been proposed.

These formed an odd medley of all sorts of questions. It was evident that the legates had jumbled together everything they had thought capable of being examined without touching on the article of the continuation. The council had to consider ordinations, parochial cure of souls, dismissals on the ground of incapacity or immorality, collections for hospitals, clandestine marriages, &c.; all matters on which there was, in fact, much to be said and much to be regulated, but which one would not have expected to see all huddled together.

Here, as elsewhere, among the abuses marked for correction, there were some which at the present day we should think fabulous. Thus, for example, one might purchase from the pope the monopoly of collections for such or such an hospital; upon which, on payment of a fixed yearly sum to that establishment, the purchaser went to collect by begging wherever he chose, and to what extent he chose. These privileges, ordinarily highly lucrative, passed from hand to hand, like shares in a trading concern at the present day; often the actual working of the speculation fell to the second or the third hand, and still all the parties interested had a profit. Accordingly, there was no kind of artifice or fraud that the subaltern agents would not call to their aid. Promises of indulgences, prophecies, miracles, everything was good when it was money that was to be got.

Although there was but one voice at Trent in denouncing this

scandal, the council dared not attack it. How could it annul acts, authentically emanating from Rome? Here, then, as in the affair of the Index, the consent of the pope had to be obtained, and upon that new complaints arose that the council was rather at Rome than at Trent. It was asked whether, then, it was for the purpose of habituating it to obedience that the legates had presented subjects of this sort to begin with? In fact, as the greater number of the points indicated lay within the domain of the pope's administrative authority, the boldest of the bishops were compelled to feel that they could not touch them without his sanction.

Meanwhile those few peaceable sittings, signalized by very wise decisions, did not prevent the question of divine right from remaining suspended, as menacingly as ever, over the head of the pope and of the legates. When we say the legates, we are not quite correct: the Cardinal of Mantua, their president, held the opinion of the Spaniards. But Cardinal Simonetta, who enjoyed the pope's secret confidence, corresponded directly with Rome, held the strings of all the intrigues that were on foot, and exercised, in fact, all the rights of the presidency. The reference to the pope was his work; but the pope, ostensibly at least, did not thank him for it. An answer was required, and we have seen how difficult it was to give one. After much thought the pope communicated to the college of cardinals the evasive letter which he had resolved to write to Trent, on which all approved of his pronouncing no decision. He confined himself to protesting, on the one hand, that the council was free, and that he had no intention of anywise hampering it,—while, at the same time, he powerfully reminded them, on the other, that he was the sole legitimate chief of the assembly, and that it never could feel a high enough regard for him.

This reply, read to the cardinals on the 9th of May, could not reach Trent before the session which was fixed for the 14th. The legates were impatiently waiting for it, as likely to lighten the weight of responsibility under which they felt themselves tottering; afterwards they ought to have felt thankful that they had not received it in time, for it would have authorized a definitive voting, and the divine right would infallibly have carried the day. They were enabled, accordingly, to succeed in having nothing more said about it in that session, but only by consenting that no more should the decrees on which they had agreed, be published. In this manner the question had of necessity to lie over.

The public sitting, therefore, went off in ceremonies. Audience was given to some ambassadors who had recently arrived; there was, as usual, the mass of the Holy Spirit, a sermon, pomps of all sorts; but what was read was only a decree a few lines in length, by which the session was prorogued to the 4th of June, and that, it was said, "for just and honourable reasons."¹ Honourable for whom? Not assuredly for the council which had never yet been so openly led by the pope; or for the pope who saw himself morally vanquished; or for the authority of the Church, for it was a very strange spectacle to see so much contention upon a point which ought to have been settled for ages, and which is not settled to this day.

Quarrels of such fierceness were not long of throwing Pius IV. into the old papal track. Like Paul III. and Julius III., he had conceived an aversion for the council. If he did not yet speak openly of dissolving it, he allowed others to speak of this; his counsellors, who had never approved of the convocation, even at the time when he shewed some eagerness in labouring at it, now saw nothing at Trent but a seditious and rebel assembly.

Regrets, accordingly, began to be felt at there having been no announcement, from the very first, of the continuation of the old council, as that would probably have led, thanks to the simultaneous protests of the emperor and the king of France, to the breaking up of the Assembly. And this was all the more regretted, inasmuch as had they begun with that, they might have been sure of having it voted by an imposing majority, whereas, after the contention about the divine right, in which the opposite parties had become so strongly marked, there was reason to apprehend a dangerous nearness to an equality of votes. Nevertheless, the pope was resolved to run the risk. "The great distrust often shewn by his holiness for the prelates, and for the greater number of the articles that have been proposed hitherto, leads many to presume that his holiness desires to find means for abridging or interrupting the said council, and this conjecture is thought to be strongly supported by a despatch, sent off a week ago, for the continuation to be declared."² The legates, therefore, must have had orders to that effect. For the rest, it depended neither on them nor the pope that that question should remain any longer undecided. Besides that it would no longer have been easy to find subjects once more of so neutral a descrip-

¹ *Justi nonnullis ac honestis causis.*

² The ambassador of France to Rome, *de Lis'eri*. Letter of 15th June 1562.

tion as that they should not have seemed to establish a bond between the old sessions and the new, the approaching arrival of the French ambassadors was sure to provoke explanations, and it was known that they would themselves begin with asking them. The bishop of Paris, Du Bellai, who had arrived a few days before, spoke and acted already with an audacity little fitted to re-assure the pope as to the dispositions of his country's bishops. One day that Verallo, bishop of Capaccio, contradicted him in a congregation: "How many souls have you to guide?" said Du Bellai. "Five hundred," replied the Italian. "And I," responded the Frenchman, "have five hundred thousand." Nor was this the first time that the Italian prelates had heard themselves twitted with the petty size of their dioceses. The bishop of Paris glorying in his half million of burgesses, was a small enough lord by the side of certain of the German prelates. What a distance then betwixt the latter and those of Italy; between Verallo, for instance, and his five hundred souls, and the bishop of Wurzburg, who had for his vassals no fewer than thirteen counts, five barons, and three hundred and fifty knights, —almost as many, in fact, altogether as Verallo's whole flock! Those haughty prelates, accordingly, resigned themselves with a bad grace to sitting on the council benches as the equals of these poor mitred priests, thirty or forty of whom had not wherewithal to live when absent from home, and enjoyed a small pension from the pope. Pius IV. had the honesty to complain of the three thousand crowns a month which it cost him to have them at the council; often, in conversing with the ambassadors, he had candidly reminded them of this sacrifice as a proof of his goodwill. Perhaps there was less *naïveté* in it than policy, and that in paying these pensions in open light of day, he hoped to have a little less the air of one who bought votes.

Fain, too, would he have had it in his power, even though it had cost him double or triple the amount, to buy those of the French bishops, now expected from day to day, and who could not fail so far to augment the anti-papal faction. Not being able to address them, he addressed himself to the king. He offered him secretly a hundred thousand crowns as a pure gift, if his prelates would not insist on the votes being taken anew on the divine right; he then offered him a hundred thousand more, under the form of a loan, on condition that the whole was to be applied to the levying of troops against the Protestants. He demanded, moreover, that these troops should be placed

under the orders of his legate, that all the edicts in favour of the Protestants should be repealed, that the chancellor should be dismissed; in fine, that they should not lay down arms until after the entire submission of the rebels. This was a good deal to expect for two hundred thousand, and even for three hundred thousand crowns, if Pallavicini gives the right sum, although the correspondences speak of two hundred only.

While these things were doing the French Ambassadors arrived. Louis de Saint Gelais, sieur de Lansac, chief ambassador, had for his colleagues Arnaud du Ferrier, president of the Parliament of Paris, and Guy du Faur de Pibrac, of that of Toulouse. This last, who was charged with the delivery of the speech, acquitted himself like a man of spirit. One would have said, to hear him speak, that past and present embarrassments were alike unknown to him. He seemed to come before an assembly that had no antecedents, good or bad, no divisions of any sort, no aspirations but such as arose from a love of religion and the Church. "It is a great evil to wish to change everything; it is a great evil also to wish to preserve everything in spite of time and men. There have been councils that were far from free; some, indeed, have been completely enslaved, witness that which terminated ten years ago, and at which several of you had the disagreeable task of being present; but as for you, you who are a council quite new, entirely free, assured of the protection and concurrence of all the princes of Christendom, who would suspect you of not listening in all things to the voice of your conscience, and of receiving besides from heaven the inspirations which you will present to us as those of the Holy Ghost?"¹ Such was the substance and the tone of his harangue. It was nothing but a long and severe satire on the council, on the pope, on all that had been done, on all that they were in course of doing.

An answer had to be made; and, according to custom, had to be given at the next session. Some bishops wished it to be strong and smart. The Spaniards and their ambassador, who never ceased asking to have the continuation distinctly declared, said that that was the only reply to make; but, with the exception of that point, they were very nearly thinking all that Pibrac had said. Others remarked, not without reason, that if an attempt were made to refute some of his sarcasms, they would need to be all refuted, a course that would lead them far beyond the limits of good policy and prudence. Pibrac, besides, before de-

¹ Quoted by Elias Dapin.

livering a copy of his speech, had very much softened it, and the council was presumed to have heard only what it had received in writing. The answer therefore, drawn up in the most general terms possible, bore "That the council had never doubted the good dispositions of the king of France; that it had no reason consequently to take in ill part the observations presented in his name; in fine, that the council intended in good earnest to be free and to remain free, from whatever quarter attempts to enslave it might come." This last stroke was not ill imagined, as giving it to be understood that, failing the pope's doing so, there were plenty of others who aimed hardly less at the enslaving of the assembly. Those princes who exclaimed most against the influence of the pope were precisely those who had most desire to substitute their own in its place; it was thought bad that the Holy Ghost should come from Rome, and unheard of efforts were at the same time made to make him come from Madrid, Paris, Vienna, Augsburg. The council could not have shaken off the yoke of one master without falling under that of another.

In the midst of these distracting influences, the session of the 4th of June could only be a repetition of that of the 14th of May. There were neither decrees of faith nor of discipline, but an adjournment until the 16th of July, nay, in order that a third blank session might not be held, it was put down in the decree that in the event of this last term being put off, this should be done by a simple resolution past at a congregation. Thirty-six bishops craved that the promise of a decree on residence should be inserted, which would have implied an engagement to vote on the divine right; but the majority were opposed to any such engagement.

Then it was that the legates decided at last on allowing the question of the communion under both kinds to come on. Besides that the French and the German ambassadors had never ceased to beg that the council would take it up, there remained but one means of escape from the voting which they did not like to promise, and that was to divert attention, and concentrate disputation on a point of sufficient importance to throw everything else for the moment into the shade.

The legates, accordingly, drew up a certain number of articles which embraced the whole subject. Such was the ordinary course, but on this occasion it had the inconvenience of bringing many things into question against the desire of the emperor and

the king of France. What these, in fact, had asked was not a dogmatical decision on the nature and validity of the communion without wine, but the purely disciplinary authorization to grant the wine to those populations which should require it. This last point being the only one on which the Church could make any concession, there was no need for taking up the others, at least for the moment.

And not only was the question not sufficiently restricted, but it was mis-stated. The first article ran thus :—"Is every Christian obliged by divine right to communicate under both kinds?" Here we at once see a wrong turn given to it. The Protestants, as we have seen, did not say that the wine was absolutely necessary; they asked why, and by what right the Church of Rome had taken it from the people, especially after having allowed it to them for many centuries? "Is anything less received under one kind than under both?" it is said in another article. Another mis-statement of the question. There was no need of inquiring whether Jesus Christ could have simplified the communion and employed in it bread only, but after he had once thought fit to use both bread and wine, could the faithful be obliged to be content with only one of the two?

It is true that to these two questions there was added a third, more in accordance with the demand that had been made. "Do the reasons that have led the Church to deprive the laity of the cup interdict her from ever conceding it to any one?" These words seemed to hint the possibility of concession; but as the two preceding points could not fail to be decided in an altogether Roman Catholic sense, it was evident that a disciplinary concession, preceded by two dogmatical condemnations, would not bring back a single Protestant, and could nowise satisfy those princes who were flattering themselves with the idea of bringing them back.

The emperor's ambassadors, accordingly, who had for some time shewed themselves more tractable, with the view of having the subject taken up, all at once ceased to lay any constraint on their feelings. The day following that on which the questions were put into shape they craved an audience of the legates, and this in order that they might lay before them a fuller and bolder plan of reformation than any that had yet been proposed. They asked :—

That the pope should reform both himself and his court ;

That all the bishops, without exception, should be compelled to residence ;

That plurality of offices should be definitively abolished ;

That all the monastic orders should be reformed, in the spirit of their first institution ;

That the breviary and the missals should have everything taken out of them that is not to be found in Holy Scripture ;

That a certain number of the prayers, if not all, should be in the vulgar tongue ;

That the priests should be allowed to marry, at least in some nations ;

That the revenues of benefices without cure of souls, should be applied to the augmentation of small livings ;

That excommunication should be reserved for a certain number of great sins and great scandals ;

That ecclesiastical laws should not be regarded as equal to the laws of God ;

And many things besides. In fine, to pour a little balm on so many wounds, the twentieth and last article required that the council should abstain from treating all questions of no use and great delicacy, and that, in particular, of the Divine right. A feeble concession in reality, for the council had only to concede two or three of the above points in order to the papal authority being greatly shaken, more so perhaps than it could have been by that vain statement of principles on the essence of Episcopal rights.

Never yet had circumstances appeared more critical ; the legates were now at Trent at best but soldiers, thrown into an untenable post which they could no longer think of keeping, but must abandon with the least delay and dishonour possible. To the annoyances they met with on the side of the ambassadors and the assembly there had been added for some time past that of having unceasingly to justify themselves to the pope. Soured by the defeats he had had, Pius IV. could not understand how matters should go any otherwise than under his predecessors, who always held the mastery, and directed not only the votes but even the debates of the assembly. He laid the blame on his legates. Armed with one right more, that of themselves proposing all the subjects that were to be treated, why should they have allowed that untoward question of the Divine right to be resumed ? Simonetta threw the blame on the Cardinal of Mantua. The latter, although a partisan of the Divine right, had done his best to prevent its being discussed, but had not thought it competent for him to interpose authoritatively. To avail themselves

at the very opening of the council of the more than doubtful right conferred on the legates by the clause *proponentibus legatis* would have provoked an explanation, after which it would have been evident that the majority had nowise intended to confer it upon them. The Cardinal of Mantua offered to resign; this offer the pope dared not accept, for it would have been a public avowal of his chagrin and his fears, and, besides, who was there to put in his place? He was a general favourite, and none but he could hope to maintain some measure of unity and of harmony in the council.

On the reading of the twenty articles the presidents saw at once the imminence of the danger, and could think of nothing but the common safety. The ambassadors received for answer that the question of the cup would probably suffice for the assembly's occupation until the next session; but this was no more than a month gained at most, and then how were the twenty articles to be got rid off? The legates, therefore, wrote a despairing letter to the pope, telling him that they had exhausted all their expedients, and that the only chance of safety lay in dissolving the council.

The pope thought of this. In default of votes in the assembly he was in course of procuring seven thousand good troops, and spoke of nothing less than placing himself at the head of his European confederation against the Protestants. But it is little likely that he believed in the success of that project, for he knew too well the position of all the secular princes. In fact, there were only the king of Spain and himself that were in a position to unite openly for the extirpation of heresy. All the rest had appearances to preserve; several of them, even had they been free from all trammels, would not have liked the pope for a chief, and even Philip himself, eager as he was to offer his arm to the clergy of France, was no more disposed than any other to be the soldier of Pius IV. Nations and kings were accustoming themselves more and more every day to dissociate the popedom from the Church and the interests of religion from those of Rome; nations and kings shewed themselves more and more disposed every day to do without the pope. The opposition of the Spanish prelates, men so far removed, at the same time, from all suspicion of heresy, so fiercely opposed to the heretics, so profoundly devoted to the Roman articles of faith, contributed more than anything else to open men's eyes and detach their hearts.

How was the break in the chain repaired? How at least could interests so various be brought to move again in parallel lines? This is a problem which we find re-occurring at every step in the history of the Church. Let us study it for a moment, not in a general and abstract way, but in the facts which were, at this epoch, once more about to lead to a solution of it. We could not find a better opportunity.

First, then, the very weakness of the pope was about to prove, although it was in spite of himself, one of the causes of his strength. Suppose him to have been in a condition to put in motion an army, not of seven thousand but of an hundred thousand men. He might have dispensed with the services of the princes; might have proclaimed war on whomsoever he pleased; might have openly declared that he would not have the council; he might not only have asked, he might have insisted on a general union for the extirpation of heresy. He would thus have ranked with powers of the first order, but he would also have been subject, like them, to all the chances of arms; like them he would have had to risk all on a single chance. In a word, he might disdain oblique methods and advance straight to his object, but might fall and perish before reaching it.

More feeble than others, he was patient; and in politics it is the patient who are the truly able and the really strong. As it was not with seven or eight thousand men that Pius IV. could march against the emperor or the king of France and demand satisfaction, he had of necessity to affect not to notice their insults. In private he might call them heretics, excommunicate them in thought and intention, bitterly complain of the twenty articles, and curse that insolent Count de Lansac, who had said that the Holy Ghost came to Trent in a courier's portmanteau, and who, quite lately, at a grand entertainment before the bishops, had dared to cry out that they should soon bring the matter to an end by chasing the idol out of Rome; but in public and in his diplomatic relations, if Pius had not the lustre of an idol he had at least its impassibility. It was by devouring affronts in silence that he took from the princes all desire to offer him more, or even to persist in those already offered.

Along with this temporal weakness, which thus appears to us at the most critical conjunctures one of the ramparts of the popedom, Rome had her moral force, her slow but resistless ascendancy over the determinations of the princes. Her moral force, we say; if we do not place it here, either in the first or the second

line, it is of set purpose, and history, we think, fully sanctions this. The pope, in reality, has never been thought the indispensable head of the Roman Catholic unity; the very clergy, when their own interests, or those of the princes, have placed them momentarily out of harmony with the Holy See, seem not to have quailed at the idea of being left without a supreme head. Have we not had a proof of this without going beyond the council? Have the bishops, German, French, Spanish, many of the Italians even, looked like persons who were convinced that they could not do without the Holy See? Philip II. was as much pope in his own dominions as Henry VIII. had ever been in his. The more deeply we study the history of the popes the more shall we become convinced that their hierarchical authority was, in itself, only one of the smallest elements of their influence even over the nations, for it was by the religious orders far more than by the bishops that the popedom attached the people to itself. The indispensable necessity of the Holy See, the *absolute* illegitimacy of all that does not flow from it, are, like infallibility, quite modern ideas. At the time of the council the facts only were in existence; we have already had proofs, and we shall have better proofs still in relating the discussions on the sacrament of orders, that the right never had been admitted.

Thus what we have called the moral force of the popes, was the weight which they could throw into the scale when the balance of power in Europe was destroyed, or threatened with being destroyed. The pope, by himself, was of small account, but the pope could do a great deal for his friends. The princes did not like him; but there was not one of them who did not, with an eye to others, wish to be on good terms with him. The friendship of the court of Rome, accordingly, was in some sort always offered to the highest bidder. From time to time we see one of the competitors for it get impatient, lose temper, and not even abstain from threats—witness the sack of Rome in 1527; but, anon, the tempest subsides; the pope, for want of power to take revenge, pardons, and affairs assume their regular course.

Finally, Rome was a market which the princes had an interest in leaving open, a temple from which it could not be for their advantage that the sellers could be thrust out. There was a multitude of things which they durst not venture to take themselves, or to cause to be given to them by their bishops, and which could always be asked from the pope, either for money, or for this or that concession. The court of Rome has been

praised for having preferred the loss of England to consenting to the divorce of Henry VIII. Were this true,—and we have elsewhere shewn it was not so,—if Rome condemned that divorce, how many others had she permitted or pronounced, though quite as little justified in reason or morality? Even Innocent III., after having shewn towards Philip Augustus a rigour not wanting in nobleness, legitimized, by a solemn brief, children born of a marriage which he had solemnly declared to be adulterous and null. People speak of the usurpations that Rome has prevented; how many has she not sanctioned and commanded? And as for oaths! Who was there to dispense from them, once that there should be no pope? When Regulus set out on his return to Carthage, he repulsed with scorn the pontiff who offered to loose him from his promise; but the pontiff of nominal Christendom had accustomed its princes to less scrupulosity. In 1215, Innocent III. caused it to be decreed, at the council of Lateran, that “oaths contrary to the interest of the Church and to the precepts of the holy fathers, are not oaths but perjuries.” Armed, consequently, with the power of annulling them, shall we find that the popes have confined themselves, at least, to the terms of that decree? No; the right becomes absolute; all oaths come within their domain. The most dishonest princes may ask everything, may hope to obtain everything; nay, and of this our history has furnished more than one example, it is Rome that takes the lead, that counsels perjury, that offers absolution for it beforehand.

But these are perhaps mere individual instances of bad faith or weakness. No; Whatever the popes may have done, they have ever kept within what their doctors have openly declared they had the right to do, and what their own laws, on becoming the laws of the Church, had settled in their favour. Listen to Bellarmine: “If the pope falls into an error, so as that he should come to command vices and interdict virtues, the Church, unless it would sin against conscience, would be obliged to believe that vices are good and virtues bad.”¹ Listen to Gregory IX.:² “Of nothing the pope may make something. He may render valid a sentence which is null, because, in the things that he desires, his will takes the place of reason. He can dispense with right; he can make injustice to become justice.” Is it not clear, after this, that there are reasons for all sovereigns, though at times they may suffer from it, being interested in retaining in the service of

¹ On the Roman Pontiff, book iv. ch. v.

² Decretals, book vii.

their passions such a man, or, to speak more correctly, such a god as this?

It not seldom happened, in fine, that they felt their need of the pope against the clergy themselves. He alone could effectually check pretensions contrary to the royal authority and to the internal peace of states; he alone could grant authority to levy certain imposts on the wealth of the Church, that perpetual object of coveting on the part of the princes. It was with him, in this respect, as with those usurers who are cursed in whispers, and often openly despised, but who yet are tolerated, because it is never certain that it may not be found necessary to have recourse to them.

Even heretics have at times had occasion to apply to the pope, and have not always been repulsed; it has sufficed that Rome, in its turn, has had occasion for their services. Have we not heard Gregory XVI. preach submission to the yoke of Russia as the duty of the bishops of Poland? This was in 1832. Threatened with having his states occupied by the Austrians on the one hand, and the French on the other, he had secretly accepted the offer of a Russian army prepared to defend him from both, and the brief to the bishops of Poland, as has been discovered since, was the payment fixed by Russia. It was published, accordingly, and Europe for some days could not believe it, so utterly incredible did it seem that a pope could have treated in such a manner a Roman Catholic and oppressed people. It might have seemed doubtful, in fact, whether it were from St. Petersburg or Rome that the document came. From the very first lines the emperor is recognised in it as the legitimate sovereign and the sole sovereign of Poland. As for the nation, it is held to have no existence; and the defenders of nationality are called *lying prophets*, whose *mischierousness* and *perfidy* ought, in fine, to be fully exposed. And so it proceeds. The conclusion is, that there must be absolute submission; all resistance is denounced as a crime. Nor is this all. Hitherto the official newspaper of the Roman States had sensibly inclined towards Poland; but no sooner was the cause lost, and the brief published, than the Polish rebels become no better than brigands. One would fain hope that the heart of the pope bled at this, and continued to bleed to his dying day; but the more you would excuse him by saying how much it cost him to hold such language, the more shall we be warranted to say that there is nothing that may not be bought at Rome. If the popedom has sometimes, when its

interests seemed to require it, undertaken the cause of subjects against kings, what king can be adduced who, in keeping on good terms with it, has not found it always ready to come to the aid of his despotism, and to sanction it in the name of heaven?

Armed with all the resources of a position so unique in the annals of the world, Pius IV. had reason, accordingly, not to be alarmed beyond measure at the storms which seemed to be brewing at Trent. He knew that divers winds might yet blow, before the tempest should come decidedly to burst at Rome.

He saw well that the accord among the princes was a factitious accord, and would be dissolved in a few days.

The accord among the bishops he still had more than one remaining means of breaking. Several of them were already trembling all over at their boldness; thirty of those who had voted for the divine right, hastened to write to him, as if to beg pardon for having obeyed the dictates of their conscience; he could already see that he should have one day cause to congratulate himself on having had so many adversaries, seeing that there were so many persons who had, from a regard to their own interests, to expiate their offence by future docility. As for those of the legates who had appeared to believe themselves free to be not entirely his agents, he had only to frown, and all idea of independence on their part was dismissed. After having hesitated about giving them two or three new colleagues, more devoted and sure, he settled it in his mind that he would have at the council a secret agent, whose activity should be directed both to the presidents and to the members, and by whose means he should be kept informed of the smallest incidents that occurred. Nor had he far to look for such a person. Visconti, bishop of Vintimilli, was eminently fitted for the post. An old diplomatist, a man of talent, one who had all along been devoted to the papal cause, he did not even need to have his zeal stimulated by the prospect of a cardinal's hat, which, however, the pontiff took care to promise him; but as he had to do with men less zealous and less disinterested than himself, his confidential powers were almost unlimited.

Erelong, without having ceased to be, officially, a simple member of the council, he found himself its soul and centre. He contrived to attach, by thanks and promises, all the bishops who had sustained the cause of the pope, or who had merely not shewn themselves too much opposed to it; three Spanish bishops, who had not invariably made common cause with their fellow-

countrymen, were the special objects of his attentions. Those who would have most stoutly resisted injunctions or threats coming directly from Rome, were seen to become gradually more and more pliable under the unintermitted watching and attention of Visconti, who, without advertising his powers, did not conceal them. The most ardent would now think twice before allowing a word to escape them which might ruin them in the good opinion of the pope, and the thought would ever recur that, after all, there would ever be more to gain with him than with the kings. Thanks to the question of the communion in both kinds, which seemed to absorb the whole time of the assembly, these changes took place gradually, in the shade, and were only all the more sure. The month of June was spent in part in listening to the opinions of the divines. The debate not having yet commenced among the bishops, Visconti's insinuations were not weakened in their effects by any new excitement. So that able agent was left to the undisturbed admiration of the progress of his operations; and the legates to call him their saviour; and the pope to overwhelm him with daily eulogiums; and the council to return gradually into the pope's leading strings. And the man who at Rome received Visconti's correspondence, the man from whom Visconti himself took his orders for this vast work of corruption and intrigues, Rome placed upon her altars by creating him a saint! He was the pope's nephew; he was the man that was erelong to be called Saint Charles Borromeo. But God did not permit that when that work was accomplished, Rome should destroy or conceal for ever the shameful materials. Those letters are now before us;¹ and in them we have found all the strangest and most scandalous information that has come to our knowledge with respect to the last twenty months and the close of the council.

Of one mind in declaring, as the council of Constance had done, that the wine in the supper is not necessary to the laity, the divines were far enough from being agreed upon either the dogmatical grounds, or the disciplinary grounds, of that suppression.

And first, as for the dogmatical grounds, some maintained that it is ordained in Scripture; others, that it is only permitted there. As for us, we have already said, among other observa-

¹ They have been published at Amsterdam by a French priest, Aymon, who became a Protestant after a long residence at Rome.

tions, that any one who was a stranger to this dispute, would find it no more permitted there than ordained, and would never suspect that the ordaining of it, nor, except in the case of the impossibility of doing otherwise, the permission of it could have been dreamt of. After having read in the institution of the supper the words, "Drink ye all of it," he would never set about searching whether Jesus Christ or his Apostles, in discourses where the subject is not specially in question, have sometimes omitted making mention of the wine; he would see that when a law has to be executed, and the text of that law is anywhere put down entire, we must not look for it where it is merely recalled and partially quoted. It is true that one of the council's divines, D'Andrada, a Portuguese, in discussing the text itself, contrived to start a distinction in it betwixt the laity and the priests. At the commencement of the act, related by the evangelists, he said, the Apostles were not yet more than laymen; Jesus Christ, accordingly, did not give them the bread. But after he had once said,—"*Do this in remembrance of me*, they became priests, seeing that by these words they received the right to celebrate mass. And then they received the wine." An explanation this which is not only absurd, but further it is contrary to the usual practice of the Roman Church, seeing that the officiating priest alone participates in the wine, and that another priest receiving the communion from his hands, receives no more than the laity do.

In the decree, the council got out of the affair by means of a clever enough shift. "He who said, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, is the same who said, *If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever*. He who said, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him*, is the same who said, *The bread that I will give is my flesh*." All which proves pretty clearly what was not contested, to wit, that both species are not rigorously and materially necessary, but does nowise prove that the Church has had the right to withdraw one of them, and to refuse it even to those who ask it.

The council therefore confined itself, in this first part of the decree, to establishing that Jesus Christ had not represented the two species as absolutely necessary. It dared not affirm that there existed any doctrinal motive for maintaining the deprivation in question.

As for disciplinary motives, we have indicated one of these

already: the enhancement, by a privilege so unique and divine, of the ambitious greatness of the priesthood. This motive was the greatest, the first, one may say, the only one; beyond that, nothing but the most wretched pleas have been urged. In the decree, however, it durst not be mentioned. The Protestants were not the only persons that murmured at the barriers thus audaciously raised between the people and the clergy; this was already the most tottering of them all, and to have restored it under this form, would have stimulated Europe to give the final blow to its existence. Other grounds had to be sought, therefore, those especially suggested by the real or imaginary inconveniences of the opposite practice, in order to give a shadow of necessity to the denial of the cup. Down to Luther's time, people had at times amused themselves with the caricature of a rude multitude rushing to cups full of wine; since Luther's time, since there might be seen in Germany, England, Switzerland, as there may be seen at the present, communions in which thousands of communicants have merely wet their lips at the common cup,—it has been found impossible to persist in such old fables of drunkenness and scandal, as certain parish priests, we are told, contrive still to introduce into their pulpit addresses, but which they would rather avoid repeating, except to the ignorant and simple. It was in the minutest details, therefore, that reasons had to be sought for. With whatever respect the faithful may take the cup into their hands, or merely touch it with their lips, how make sure against the horrible impropriety of letting fall a drop of Christ's blood, perhaps even upsetting the cup? And if that drop should fall on the profane hand of a layman? if it were to remain attached to one of the hairs of his beard, or the lining of his coat? All these and many other reasons were urged in full council, and it clearly followed, according to the speakers, that the Church had done well in taking away the cup; but what followed still more clearly was, either that the Christians of primitive times were little scrupulous as to acts of sacrilege, seeing that they risked, from mere wantonness, committing so many,—or that this wine was in their eyes wine, very sacred, no doubt, considering what it figured, but not so as that there would be the smallest harm in spilling and profaning a drop of it involuntarily. Thus, although the council had decided on making not only canons, but chapters of doctrine susceptible of every kind of development, here it deemed it more prudent to enter into no detail, and to declare

simply that the Church had been "moved by grave and just motives."¹

Much had been said, also, in those deliberations, about the danger of leading people to believe that there was a more complete communion under both kinds than under one, an idea contrary to the Church's teaching; especially since the council of Constance, where it had been decreed that the Saviour was fully and entirely present under each kind. This last opinion, too, formed the subject of a chapter. Nobody contradicted it; but little as they had dived into its depths, how many objections did the council proceed to start! And how prudent was it to omit all explanation—all argument. "Although our Redeemer, in that last supper, instituted and handed down to his Apostles this sacrament in two kinds, yet it must be confessed that Jesus Christ, whole and entire, and a true sacrament, are taken under either kind only."² Such is the whole. *It must be confessed.* Reasons there are none. And yet we are still, let us remember, in a chapter that treats of doctrine, that is to say, one of those in which, when the council had reasons to produce, it gave them. It felt itself in presence of one of those difficulties which grow larger under examination, and where the bottom deepens in proportion as the eye penetrates into the abyss. Multiplied by this fresh surcharge, all the objections directed against the real presence form so menacing a host that it is not given to all men to contemplate them without trepidation. Let us contemplate a priest engaged in saying mass. You see him put the wafer to his mouth, and you are told, "It is the body of Jesus Christ. He is there whole and entire under the bread." A few moments afterwards the priest drinks. "It is the blood of Jesus Christ," it is added; "it is his body also, his body whole and entire."—Twice entire? Yes. The priest then has eaten it twice? No. He has eaten and drunk nothing more than those of the faithful to whom he has given the host. But it is spiritually, no doubt, that he has eaten and drunk no more than they? Spiritually and materially. These two bodies were the same. Those thousand, those two thousand bodies which you have seen him distribute, were also the same, always the same, and always whole and entire—whole and entire under each kind, whole and entire under each fraction of the kind, for this also is the teaching of the Church,

¹ Gravibus et justis causis adducta.

² Quamvis redemptor noster in suprema illa cœna, hoc sacramentum in duabus speciebus instituerit et apostolis tradiderit, tamen fatendum esse, etiam sub altera tantum specie totum atque integrum Christum, verumque sacramentum sumi.

although the council liked better not to say it. This new absurdity has not even the merit of being based, like the real presence, on the words of the institution, "This is my body, said Christ, which is *broken* for you." If it be everywhere and always entire, what is made of these last words? We admit that one can hardly stop there. If the wafer is the body of Christ, it would be a hideous and horrible thing to say that it is broken, reduced to pieces, and then eaten member after member. It is clear that the sole way of escape from this abominable consequence, was to declare it always entire. Thus, let an infidel set himself to pound a consecrated wafer, and the Saviour will be present as many times as there are particles in that white dust. Without going so far, make as many suppositions as you please: if they be not all false, if the very principle of them be not absurd,—they will necessarily be all true. A consecrated wafer falls and breaks in two. You had but one body of the Saviour—you gather up two. The Church prescribes your swallowing the whole wafer. When between your teeth you divide it, only one body was given to you; you swallow two. One has a vase full of consecrated wafers. There are twenty; twenty bodies of Christ. This vase gets a slight shake; some of the wafers are broken; and, behold, the body is there not twenty, but thirty times. Another shake, and it will be there forty times; another . . . Enough, enough! Your heart bleeds to find, thanks to the doctors of Rome, so sacrilegious a resemblance between Christ's supper and the tricks of a juggler. "Pastors," says the Roman Catechism, "ought to be very reserved in explaining how the body of Jesus is whole and entire under the smallest part of the kinds." Yes, indeed, let them be very reserved in explaining it; let them be so above all in thinking of it, for did they set themselves to deduce consequences from it, they would quickly find that they could no longer believe it.¹

Another difficulty which it is not easy to avoid, and about which the divines long disputed, is found in the question whether there be more spiritual benefits to be had under both kinds than under one only. On the one hand, it is very difficult to maintain that two things of equal value do not comprise, when combined, more than each does separately; on the other hand, the priest would give great offence were he to avow that there are

¹ The author elsewhere shrewdly suggests (Book III.) that the doctrine of our Lord's entire presence in the host or wafer, is *non* necessary in order to the justifying of divine adoration being paid to that material object.—T.A.

spiritual benefits of which he knowingly deprives you, means of salvation which he refuses you, he, the very man who is charged with the concerns of your salvation. To cut the matter short, it was proposed that it should be merely said that he that communicates, it matters not how, receives Jesus Christ, the fountain of all spiritual benefits; but it remained still undecided whether this fountain be more or less abundant, according as the Supper has been taken under one kind or under both. At that point they stopt; some bishops begged in vain that the matter might be better explained. It was voted that the communion by bread alone does not deprive the believer "of any grace necessary for salvation." It was acknowledged, then, that he was deprived of something; consequently the council overstepped not the natural and legitimate rights of the Church, which cannot be supposed to go so far as the refusal to the people of any one whatever of the spiritual favours offered by religion, but those even which had been arrogated in a previous chapter, where it had been said that the Church could alter *what does not affect the substance of the sacrament*.¹ If the withdrawal of the cup deprives us of any spiritual benefit whatever, even though not indispensable, not necessary to salvation,—the substance of the sacrament cannot be considered as intact, since its effects are not strictly the same.

Satisfied with this unanimity, which was obtained, however, only by leaving all that was most difficult in the shade, the legates seemed more and more disposed to give way in the affair of the cup. Doctrine was safe; discipline, therefore, might shew an accommodating spirit. On this occasion it was from the body of the clergy that opposition was to arise.

The pope had guessed aright that the bishops would not long remain united; and the issue proved that he had acted prudently in trusting to their natural antipathies, while blunt opposition would only have had the effect of keeping them agreed.

No sooner were the first words uttered in favour of conceding the cup, than the Spaniards exclaimed, as if the proposition were not only inopportune, but absurd. They laid hold of all those decrees which had been made for the very purpose of facilitating that concession, by keeping the point of doctrine intact, for the purpose of combating it; and, viewed in that light, their arguments were not amiss. "Is it logical," they said, "that just as we have proclaimed the real presence under each species, we should concede what is demanded by those

¹ *Salva ilorum substantia.*

who do not believe that dogma? The generality of the faithful will look to the fact, not to words. They will not comprehend how an act added to the supper, cannot add anything to it; they will conclude that hitherto they have had only the half of the sacrament given to them." Next, drawn perforce into considerations which the papal party durst hardly hint at, "The suppression of the cup," said they, "passes for being a law of the Church, not a law of God. Be it so. You may repeal it then without touching anything that is essential. Grant that also. But there are many other things besides, that are not God's laws, and on which, nevertheless, you could not make concessions without trenching deeply on the Church. The celibacy of the priesthood, the worship of images, the invocation of saints—these, too, are things that have been established, not by Jesus Christ, but by it. After conceding the cup, what ground will there be for refusing to reform the rest?"

None, in fact; but there was both courage and candour in avowing thus openly how this whole dispute was about a small matter. It is true that this small matter was much in the eyes of the Spanish bishops. None believed more than they in the omnipotence of the Church; and it was chiefly on that account that they believed much less than others in that of the Holy See. They renewed at all the sessions their old demand, to have added to the council's titles that of *representative of the universal Church*, and the famous *proponentibus legatis* always drew from them warmer and warmer reclamations.

Although it was evident that it was from no desire to pay court to the pope, that they thus came in aid of the secret wishes of the papal party, which lent itself only from compulsion to the concession of the cup, it could not fail to put matters on a better footing between them and the Italians. For the first time the assembly was found less liberal than the legates, and a large majority ranged themselves against the concession. In Germany it was said that this result had been foreseen, and that never would the pope have allowed the proposition to be made had he not been sure of its rejection.

It was a point, nevertheless, on which it was not enough for him to have a mere numerical majority. The ambassadors of France and the Empire, ever united in soliciting the cup, were joined by Baumgartner, the Bavarian ambassador, an eloquent and active man, almost a Lutheran in principle, and altogether a Lutheran in hardihood. From his first audience (27th June),

he had demanded the concession, and that not as a favour, or as a thing that might continue to be refused, but as the object of a desire so universally felt, that it were imprudence and madness to disappoint it. The other ambassadors then returned to the charge; first, those of the emperor, in a memorial on the accusation of heresy which some prelates had not spared them; next, those of the king of France, in a paper in which the question of the cup was resumed in detail, with great force and perspicuity, and not without such bold expressions as were worthy of the discourses of Pibrac. "Instead of shewing so much zeal for human commandments," said they, "why is there not a little more shown for those of God, and a reformation of abuses seriously set about!" Accordingly, "These gentlemen would absolutely make themselves Lutherans with the permission of the council," said Doctor Foriero.

Instead of making the legates determine to propose the concession, these urgent calls decided their change of opinion. They saw clearly that, this point once obtained, farther demands would follow; Lansac, a little too frank for treating with Italians, left them no room for doubt on that head. But as they could neither all at once retract their promise, nor openly make the wish of the majority a pretext for doing so, after having made so little account of it on other occasions, they told the ambassadors that the session was too near its close; that with so few days before them they could not undertake to modify the opinions of the assembly, and that, consequently, the surest course was to postpone the question to another session. The ambassadors begged that the sittings might rather be prolonged for some days, but this they could not obtain. Meanwhile, the drafting of the decrees proved so laborious, that the legates had more than once reason to apprehend that they would not be ready by the 16th of July, the day that had been fixed. On the evening of the 15th, the deliberations were still going on, and the meeting rose even before the members had come to a definite understanding.

The next day, in fact, as the members were entering the cathedral, and when mass was about to commence, the bishops were extremely surprised to hear that the legates meant to propose to them that the first chapter should be drawn up anew. It was then discovered that two of the pope's divines, Salmeron and Torrès, after having precedently maintained, but without success, that the command to communicate under both kinds, should be held applicable to priests alone, had returned to the

charge before cardinals Hosius and Madrucci, the one a legate, the other bishop of Trent; that by their means they had gained the legates, and that their opinion was about to pass, saving approbation, into the decree which had been thought to be fixed the preceding evening. "Although this revised draft," says Pallavicini, "was welcomed by a large number, it was rejected by a majority, particularly the bishop of Modena, and the archbishop of Granada. The latter, who was well acquainted with the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, hastily sent for the *summa theologiæ* of that author, and there found the passage where the holy doctor extends the words of Jesus Christ in the supper, even to the laity, because he makes use of them to prove that all the faithful are obliged to receive the eucharist." Upon this there arose a great deal of discussion, and the new draft was withdrawn.

This point, accordingly, has remained undecided: and in support of what we have said above, that there were many besides, the omission of which may be thought strange, we might simply transcribe what Pallavicini reports of the objections raised by those same divines against all the chapters of the decree. In the first, as we have seen, they had complained that the council had avoided saying whether Jesus Christ, in the supper, meant to address himself to priests alone. They wished, moreover, that before taking, at the sixth chapter of St. John, the six passages adduced for establishing the communion under one kind, they should begin by declaring that it is of the sacramental, and not of the spiritual communion, as many doctors have thought, and as the Protestants teach, that our Lord speaks in that chapter. Farther on, they found the Church's authority too feebly established by these words of St. Paul, "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." Farther still, in the article concerning the non-necessity of the eucharist for children, this, according to them, was not demonstrated by its being said, that children having received grace by baptism, and not being in a capacity to have lost it, had no need of receiving it anew. It might be replied, they said, that it could not but be profitable to them to have it augmented. And they concluded that all these articles had great need of being revised. What did they obtain of all they wanted? Why, only a new uncertainty. In reporting the above passage from St. Paul, there had been put down first, "As St. Paul has clearly testified in these words." After their remarks on the insufficiency

of that passage, this was thought more than durst be ventured on, and the sentence was made to run, "As St. Paul *appears* to have clearly testified."¹ It was incontestably wiser to do so; and the decree, in short, is less remote from the truth than it would have been by becoming more positive; but, finally, without our stopping either to approve or to impugn what the two doctors wanted to place there, let us confine ourselves to noting with them what is not decided, and what it might, nevertheless, have seemed impossible that a council, treating the subject in all its depth, should have dared not to decide.

These obscurities and these blanks found meanwhile beyond the council critics who were more disposed than ever to take them up and deduce from them, as militating against the pretended inspiration of that body, all the unfavourable consequences which its timidity and irresolution in dealing with certain points have seemed to us to suggest. This convocation at Trent had never before excited so much interest and curiosity in Europe, except perhaps at the time of its first being assembled. There were now nearly two hundred bishops present. In Roman Catholic countries it began to be looked upon as a general council. Although this was still a fiction, seeing that several countries were not at all, or scarcely at all represented in it, the fiction began to be justified by the augmentation of the total number present. The attention of Europe, accordingly, had increased in proportion; four² sessions also had been held merely *pro forma*, and had thus helped to turn men's regards by anticipation to what was to be done in the fifth. It is a curious circumstance connected with the council of Trent, that out of twenty-five sessions *fourteen* had no result.

After having been looked forward to with such feelings, the decrees of the twenty-first, which had now been held, could not but appear pitiful enough. For to what, in fact, did they amount? Nine disciplinary decrees,³ some of which we have acknowledged were very wise, but which bore only on details, and nowise responded to the desires which we have seen were strongly felt in all parts of Europe; four doctrinal articles, more important, certainly, yet in which the council had hardly done more than repeat the well-known decisions of Constance and Florence. Instead of giving more completeness and clear-

¹ Non obscure visus est innuisse.

² 18th January, 26th February, 14th May, 4th June 1562.

³ Those that had been prepared for the 19th session.

ness to those older deliverances of doctrine now no longer sufficient, since the Reformation, for the guidance of the Romanist doctors in the anti-Protestant controversy, one might have thought it had been the council's object to reproduce them as vaguely as possible. The Protestants said, as is sufficiently demonstrated by the history of the debates, that briefness had been adopted only because the council durst not venture upon great length; the Roman Catholics who could not admit, or at least could not allow it to be seen that they admitted a similar motive, complained, nevertheless, and in some countries quite openly, of being condemned by the council's authority to remain ignorant of so many things. Our preceding observations, in fact, might furnish three or four very simple questions to which a priest, when interrogated by one of the faithful to whom he is about to give the communion, cannot, if he would hold to the decree, absolutely reply. Is it by divine right that the priest alone communicates under both kinds? Is it the supper that is spoken of in the sixth chapter of St. John? What are the faithful made to forego by the refusal of the cup? To all this, if the priest declines giving any reply but such as he is sure is the right one, he must give none at all, for the council has given none.

Finally, there were in the form of the decree inconsistencies which were not allowed to pass without remark.

Thus in the second canon an anathema is pronounced on whosoever shall affirm that the Church had no justifiable motives for giving the bread only to the laity. Now the anathema not being usually pronounced except in questions of faith and of divine right, it could not regularly figure in an article where "justifiable motives" were spoken of, that is to say, where the point of view from which the question was contemplated was that of human right. Had the council begun by declaring, as Salmeron desired, that the depriving the laity of the cup had been ordained by God, then, but then only, could there be room for the anathema.

The same remark applied to the article where it is said that the supper is not necessary to children. The idea, in our view, is quite correct; but as the Church had long taught or tolerated the contrary, it was evidently not a case for the application of the anathema. Nine passages were found in St. Augustine where he has declared in favour of the custom of giving the supper to children; there are even two in which he compares

the necessity of the eucharist with that of baptism, resting, which is more, on a letter of Pope Innocent I. If this do not prove that he viewed the obligation of communicating at every period of life, as obligatory in point of doctrine, it proves at least that he was far from anathematizing those who took that view of it.

As for disciplinary decrees, nothing could be said of them beyond the council, that had not been said already within it. Besides their general insufficiency, people remarked the return to the old subterfuge of giving to the bishops, for the sake of maintaining intact the rights of the pope, the title of delegates of the Holy See; and that while there was accorded to them also, as if by favour, rights which ought never to have been taken from them, there was given to them one manifestly usurped from the civil power, that of imposing subsidies for the keeping up of churches too poor in land or in other sources of income. "We can well see," wrote Lansac on the 19th of July, "that these folks will hear of nothing prejudicial to the profit and authority of the Court of Rome; and, what is more, the pope finds himself so entirely master of this council, having the greater number of voices at his discretion, that many of his pensionaries, notwithstanding the remonstrances the emperor's ambassadors and we may make about anything, do just as they please with respect to it."

Of this a very striking proof was ere long to be given.

Although a special decree had kept the concession of the cup among the points that were to be examined at the earliest, it was remarked that not a word was said about it in the programme of the following session.

On the other hand, the king of Spain had written to his bishops, according to all appearance at the pope's solicitation, that they should allow the question of residence to drop. He commended them for their zeal in the affair of the divine right, but exhorted them at the same time to abstain from all fresh attempts to get a decree passed in conformity with their views, and, in particular, from all protestation against what should be done.

Once assured of the neutrality of the king of Spain, Pius IV. began to make open enough efforts to have the whole question of residence referred to himself, and not only that, but the question of the cup also. In sending an order to the legates thenceforward to give this turn to all their endeavours, he authorized

them to give both the ambassadors and the independent bishops the assurance of a speedy and serious reform in the entire organization of his court; a compensation a hundred times promised, a hundred times eluded, and the promise of which could seduce only those who were seduced already.

In the meantime the programme had been accepted. The subject now to be considered was the eucharist, not as a sacrament but as a sacrifice. In other terms then, it was the question of the mass, with its preliminaries, its accessories, and its consequences. The thirteen points proposed for discussion were those that had been prepared under Julius II. shortly before the second dissolution of the council. The council ventured accordingly, after five sessions, on accepting the heritage of sixteen anterior sessions. That which had just taken place served only to prepare the way. The communion under both kinds had been spoken of at it, but without in any way recalling the decree of 1551 on transubstantiation. Even in resuming the consideration of the thirteen articles prepared ten years before, care was still taken to avoid throwing too visible a bridge of connection between the two councils. It was not until the session following, about a year after, that the old order was openly resumed, and the continuation frankly decided upon—if one can call frankness what appears only after so long, so persevering, so imperturbable a course of dissimulation.

Our preceding remarks on the supper enable us to dispense with long details in speaking of the practical errors with which the Roman Church has surrounded it in the mass. We shall confine ourselves to some of the chief of these.

The communion, in our view, is the commemoration of Jesus Christ's sacrifice.

The mass, according to the Roman Church, is that sacrifice itself renewed, reproduced, by a mysterious act of God's power and the Saviour's goodness, as often as a priest pronounces the sacramental words over the wafer. The consecrated wafer is not only the body of Jesus Christ, it is Jesus Christ upon the cross, Jesus Christ dying for us.

Among the objections started by this doctrine there are several to which no reply is ordinarily made but as in regard to transubstantiation, by saying that it is a mystery, and that there is nothing impossible to God. Here, then, as in the case of the real presence, let us carefully distinguish that which is contrary

to reason from that which is simply above reason. However great improbabilities may be, let us set them aside and look only to the impossibilities.

Now, among the latter kind of difficulties, there is one about which, in so far as we are aware, not much has been said hitherto, although it enters, we apprehend, into the very essence of the subject.

The mass, you say, is the renewal of Jesus Christ's sacrifice; it has all the meaning and all the value of that sacrifice. You do not, however, go so far as to say that it includes also, for the Saviour, the renewal of the sufferings on Calvary; to you it would seem absurd and impious to condemn to tortures renewed indefinitely Him who spoke of his death as his return to a state of endless peace and endless happiness.

Well, then, this restriction, which you cannot but admit, makes a huge breach at once in the system which you hope by it to render less shocking. In the Scriptures, in the Fathers, in all Christian authors everywhere, the Saviour's sufferings are represented to us as one of the essential elements of his sacrifice. The Church has at all times condemned as a heresy the opinion that, owing to his Divine nature preventing it, He did not suffer on the cross; it was seen that any such idea would shake the whole theory of man's redemption from its foundation. The Roman Catechism, though it habitually overstrains everything, not excepting the truth itself, goes so far as to say that "the particular complexion of Jesus Christ's body, as formed by the Holy Ghost, and consequently more perfect and more delicate than are other men's bodies, rendered him more sensible to all these torments?" The Catechism knows nothing of this, and had much better have said nothing about it; but, in fine, nothing could better prove the importance attached to Christ's sufferings, viewed in relation to the object which He proposed to himself in suffering.

Assuming this, in what sense then is the mass the reproduction of the sacrifice accomplished on Calvary? Between a sacrifice in which the victim does not suffer at all and a sacrifice the value of which arose more or less from the victim's sufferings, can there be any parity? Parity in point of results—all well; God, in his mercy, is certainly free to make the one as efficacious as the other. But from the moment that Christ, on the altar, is no longer a sufferer, He is no longer, viewed as a victim, the same that He was on the cross. There is wanting, then, in the

mass, one of the fundamental parts of the sacrifice which it is held to reproduce. Henceforth, as respects that part at least, it is only its image, not its reproduction.

We have already made an analogous observation. In the supper,—“this is my body *which is broken* for you,” said Christ. In the mass it is entire under every fraction of the wafer. “A dispute about words,” shall we be told? A dispute about words, if you will; but are we not engaged in a question about words? The debate, in the end, runs altogether on the word *is*. Take away that word, and what becomes of transubstantiation? Who, looking at the whole of the rest of the New Testament, would ever have thought of seeking to establish it, and would ever have had the idea of it? Thus we have here another point in which the mass is not the supper. In the one the body is broken. In the other we are taught that it is not broken.

Do we find identity at least in the rest? Even should we consent to forget all that we have said against transubstantiation, we cannot avoid reading, in the institution itself of the supper, “Do this *in remembrance* of me,”—an expression singularly inappropriate if it was not a memorial that was meant, and which the Apostles have nowhere commented upon, in so far as we are aware, in such a manner as to shew that they understood it otherwise. We would further call to mind, that according to St. Paul, “we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.”¹ Who can figure to himself a doctor in the Church believing in the mass, in the renewal of Jesus Christ’s sacrifice, and saying, without explanation, without restriction, without adding a single word to prevent the error which he risks teaching, that the oblation was offered *once*. And where do we find this assertion? Why, at the close of a piece in which sacrifices are expressly treated of, where the Old Testament dispensation, with its daily sacrifices, is confronted with the New. “The old law having a shadow of good things to come, can never, with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect; for then they would not have ceased to be offered. But Christ, when he cometh into the world, saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me.” And, in fine, by way of conclusion, “We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all?” Thus the antithesis is as clear and as formal as possible. There we see sacrifices offered year by

¹ Heb. x. 10.

year, daily, because they could not render those who offered them perfect, and thus it was what had constantly to be recommenced ; here, one only sacrifice, because one that is sufficient to sanctify for ever those who shall accept its efficacy. Mark what the Apostle further says, " And every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins, but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." And at another place,¹ " Nor yet that he should offer himself often."

This last expression,—who could imagine it?—although the meaning be so clearly determined by so many analogous passages, some have been bold enough to enlist in support of the mass. It has been said that, in point of fact, Jesus Christ does not *himself* often make an offering of himself, but that these words assume that he has given to others the right and the duty of offering him.

We are truly weary of recurring so often to the same argumentation ; but how is it possible not to feel constrained to say here, with greater urgency than ever, to the ignorant, to the learned, to great and small, to every one that is or fancies himself to be a Roman Catholic :—

Let us see. With your hand upon your conscience, answer. Supposing you were alone in the world, and were to find a Bible, were you to read it over a hundred times, nay, a thousand times, were you to live a hundred years, and that those hundred years were all consecrated to the study of that Bible—would you ever come to the mass? And granting even, by some impossibility, that taking the words *this is my body* in their literal meaning, you were to arrive at the idea of transubstantiation, would you ever advance to that of a daily renewal of the sacrifice ?

Nor let it be said that in proposing this test we transfer the question to our own domain, that of individual and free inquiry. We might reply to this objection at once, by saying that the Council of Trent, on this point, made an appeal to inquiry, since, as we shall see ere long, it devoted a long chapter to an exposition of the Scriptural proofs of the mass. But what we ask for at present, is neither that the Roman Catholic shall set himself to interpret, according to his own judgment, such or such a passage, nor, still less, that he should construct a system for the purpose of putting it in the place of that of his Church ; it is simply that

¹ Heb. ix. 25.

he shall ask himself whether he, the man himself, would have found in the Bible what his Church teaches him on the subject of the mass, if he believes that others could any more than himself have found it there, and this being first answered, whether he can seriously accord to his Church the right to lay down as the basis of doctrine, and as the centre of worship, what he could not have had even a glimpse of in the very book which all Christians own to be the first and the purest of the sources of truth. Ah, ye priests of Rome, it is hard, indeed, to believe that ye never put such questions as these to yourselves! and still harder is it for us to comprehend that they do not wring from you some confessions! "What! this right, so dreadful, so terrible, to offer daily on the altar no less a victim than this, this privilege, which if I hold it not really from God, can be no better than a sacrilegious usurpation, an abominable lie—see, the Scriptures do not mention it expressly once; see, the Council of Trent, my supreme teacher and master, reduced to the necessity of founding it on the figures of the Old Testament, on a few words in the New, on imperceptible details lost in the midst of those large inspired pages, where there would have been such ample room for speaking of it. In the case of a purely human right, that of succession to a property, for example, should I be quite at my ease were I to possess it in virtue of title and arguments of any such kind? It were idle to tell me that the testator had appointed persons to interpret his wishes, and that these adjudge the inheritance to me. If I found no positive mention of my right in his testament; if that deed, still more, were a writing of some hundred pages, full of details on a multiplicity of things of far less importance,—no! I could not but have scruples, and could not but question, although to my own disadvantage, either the intelligence or the impartiality of the tribunal."

Simple as this reasoning is, how does it happen that so few priests make it, so few at least that are courageous enough and candid enough to deduce some consequences? Possibly the very exorbitance of the privilege in question helps to shelter it from the attacks of conscience and of reason. The deeper the abyss, the less difficult it is to shut their eyes and to interdict themselves from sounding its depths. Then, this Saviour descending from heaven at the voice of a man, this God who immolates himself in a sinner's hands for sinners—there is something too great, too extraordinary in it, for the imagination to yield itself to it by halves. Either it is not believed at all, or it is believed with

the whole soul. "At Rome," says Luther,¹ "I ran like a fool through all the churches. I almost regretted that my father and mother were still in life, so much should I have loved to draw their souls out of purgatory by means of the masses which I said every day!" The immolation of the Saviour in the mass has been sung by many a poet who did not believe in it any more than we; it has supplied the theme of many a burst of eloquence to many an orator and many an author, who made no pretence in other respects to being a Roman Catholic or even a Christian, and who would have blushed at being thought to believe such or such another dogma a hundred times more satisfactorily proved to reason, but less confounding. How then wonder that the priest, a man fashioned to believe, and interested in believing, should play the fool in regard to a dogma by which even infidels have sometimes allowed themselves to be carried away.

If any such poetical dream had been hitherto indulged by the members of the council, they must have been most unpleasantly aroused from it by listening to the doctors who had been appointed to elaborate the question. However convinced these prelates may have been that tradition supplied a sufficient foundation for a dogma, more than one of them, assuredly, had never expected to find the Church so rebellious and the doctors so non-plussed. Not one of their scriptural arguments did not end at last in the admission that the mass is nowhere in the Bible. In all grave and momentous questions, the more a man has recourse to small indirect proofs, the more are his opponents entitled to say that the great, the direct, the veritable, are wanting.

Now, the decree on the mass adduces only four proofs. Are these small or great—direct or indirect? We leave the reader to judge.

I. Jesus Christ, says St. Paul, is a priest after the order of Melchizedek. Melchizedek (Gen. xiv.) offered bread and wine. Therefore the priesthood of Jesus Christ, and, as a consequence, the Christian priesthood in general, is exercised by means of a sacrifice offered under the elements of bread and wine.

II. The pascal lamb was a sacrifice. Seeing that it prefigured the eucharist, the eucharist is a sacrifice also.

III. God, by the mouth of Malachi, saith, that one day, in every place, a pure offering would be offered. The supper, therefore, which, in point of fact, is celebrated everywhere, is an oblation.

¹ Letter to John von Sternberg.

IV. St. Paul says (1 Cor. x.) that those who have partaken of the table of devils, cannot partake of the Lord's table. Now, the table of devils means, in this passage, the altars of false gods. The Lord's table, therefore, is also an altar, and every altar supposes a sacrifice. The eucharist, therefore, is one.

See now, Roman Catholics, see what your Church, see what three hundred bishops or doctors, what the council of Trent, in fact, has contrived to find in the Bible in support of the mass: see the sole foundation-stones it succeeded in laying, after the efforts of a month, beneath the splendid altars, where, according to that council, the Christ is immolated! Three Old Testament figures and a word—one can hardly call it a passage—a word from the New. These meagre details, which, supposing that the mass was formally taught elsewhere, could at most have been given as references to it,—see the council adducing them as sufficing for its establishment, and by adducing no others, admitting that they are the best it could find. To lean on such passages, says Du Moulin, is like warning one's self at the moon. Further, it was found necessary, in order to make the case of Melchizedek have the appearance of meaning something, to alter the narrative as it stands in Genesis,—“He brought forth bread and wine,” say the Hebrew text and the version of the Seventy, “now” or “and he was the priest of the Most High.” Thus the text does not say that it was as a sacrifice, or in view of a sacrifice, that he had that bread and wine brought forth. In the place of the *now* or *and*, the Vulgate has put *for*; a manifest falsification, admitted to be so by Cajetan. “What has been put in the Vulgate,” says he, “as the motive of the offering, *for* he was, is not in the Hebrew as the motive, but as a separate incident.”¹

Did they not carry their own refutation along with them, we should only, to refute them, have to transcribe the objections brought against them in the council itself. Not one of these citations, in fact, was allowed to pass unchallenged; not one, which is still more to the purpose, without the admission that it did not suffice for the establishment of the mass, and that without tradition, it could not be affirmed to have established it; not one, in a word, which might not have been followed with the restatement of our fundamental objection, and the confession that for a thing of such consequence not to be clearly

¹ “Quod in Vulgata editione subditur ut causa oblationis, erat enim: in Hebræo non habetur, ut causa, sed ut separata clausula.”

and formally in the Bible, is tantamount to its not being there at all.

There was a point, moreover, which went to the very root of the doctrine, and on which there was no less disagreement than on the choice of passages to be adduced for establishing the mass in general.

When Jesus Christ instituted the supper, did he offer himself as a sacrifice, or did he only announce the sacrifice he was about to offer on the cross?

This last alternative, the only admissible one in our opinion, suggests, when contemplated from the Roman Catholic point of view, an insurmountable difficulty. It is the only admissible one, we say. Suppose, in fact, that after having instituted the supper, Jesus Christ had taken up a new idea, had refused to suffer and to die, what value would there, then, have attached to the supper? Why, none. It had no value, therefore, beyond what it behoved to receive from the great act that was soon to follow.

This being the case, the difficulty is obvious and glaring. If the Saviour, in the supper, only announced his sacrifice, then the supper was not a sacrifice, and the mass, the reproduction of the supper, is no more a sacrifice either.

There was nothing for it then, it appears, but to adopt the former alternative; and yet, there also, there was an insurmountable embarrassment. If the Saviour offered himself in the supper itself, if there were on the Thursday a real and true sacrifice, the redemption, then, was accomplished *before* the sacrifice of the cross, which is contrary to all that is taught by Scripture and by the Church. The council would have shuddered at the mere enunciation of this idea, and yet it approached it very nearly in decreeing transubstantiation.

The only method of escaping from the annoyance of a disputed voting, as well as from the inconvenience of exhibiting as proofs what were felt to be no better, at best, than weak presumptions,—was to abandon altogether the drawing up of the chapters on doctrine, and notwithstanding all that had previously been said about this strange way of getting rid of an embarrassment, more than one prelate inclined to this course. An error had been committed, they said, in habituating heretics to ask reasons instead of simply receiving decrees. What had been gained, in the old council, by drawing up, before passing to the canons, chapters so carefully, so minutely worded? Facilities

had been given for attacks, and the points to be defended had been multiplied. In the case in hand, it might happen that whether from want of time, or from their being unable to find in the Scriptures texts clear enough and precise enough, the objections of the innovators might remain unanswered.¹ Are we, it was said, in fine, advocates or judges? Judges, assuredly; but it would have been wiser surely not to have delayed making this appeal so openly till the very day when the council felt most embarrassed about the judgment it was to pronounce.

These same prelates gave it to be understood that it was of consequence to bring, not the labours of that session only, but the council itself to as early a close as possible. Others replied, that the grand affair was not so much to come to a prompt, as to come to a good termination; that, as for omitting the chapters on doctrine, after spending a month in deliberations with the avowed intention of having such chapters, this would be to cover themselves with ridicule and disgrace. Some of the most outspoken went so far as to say that, apparently, nothing better was wanted than to deprive the council of all consideration, as a pretext for eluding the observance of the disciplinary decrees which had been voted with secret reluctance. Nor was it for the first time that this reproach was addressed to the papal party. Not surely that the Italian bishops had said, "Let us cry down the council." They held as much as others, and more than others, to the maintenance of its moral authority, as long as it should be absolutely submissive to the pope; but it was plainly enough seen, that from the moment they had to choose between the two powers, their choice would not be doubtful, and there was no calumny in the thought that they would in that case be little scrupulous as to the means of humbling the assembly. As for us, we are of opinion that all parties might take this reproach to themselves. None admitted the authority and infallibility of the council, except upon the condition of its not running counter to certain ideas; none was prepared beforehand to submit to it, whatever it might decide, and whatever it might do; and we have seen how small a matter at times was required in order to call out protests, and threats of separation, and of war.

It was evidently in this spirit that the Spanish bishops, notwithstanding the letter from their king, and just as these theological embarrassments were at their worst, again took up the question of residence and the divine right. First they wrote a

¹ The Bishop of Chiozza.—Pallavicini l. xviii. ch. i.

letter to Philip II., begging to be excused for no longer obeying him on this point. Besides, they would say, it was not an order that the king had sent them. His majesty had called on them to follow it only with submission to their own consciences. The moment seemed to them to have arrived, they added, for finally determining a question which, according to them, could not remain undetermined, without rendering all the efforts that had been put forth for the regeneration of the Church, utterly useless.

Judging, accordingly, that, for the moment, any attempt to bring them back must be hopeless, the legates directed their views to the side of France, and the cardinal of Ferrara, nuncio at the court of Charles IX., had orders to obtain from him a letter of a like description with that of Philip II. It was to be addressed in the first instance to the French ambassadors, yet was to be so framed, as that it might be shewn to the bishops of their nation as they successively arrived at Trent. In this manner, unless they also took it on themselves to act against the orders of their prince, they would remain separated from the Spaniards; and if the two nations did not unite on that point, there would be less risk of their doing so on others.

Notwithstanding these precautions, the pope had continued to avail himself of other means of providing for emergencies. He had been for some months insensibly augmenting his troops; the pacific insurrection of the Spanish bishops gave more activity to the exertions made at Rome for levying men and horses. Pius IV. had replied to the French ambassador's representations, that England and the Protestants of Germany talked of coming to the assistance of those of France; and that it fell to him, in that case, to provide for the safety of the council. It was further perceived that he was making secret endeavours, like Clement VII. before him, to form a league among the Italian princes, a scheme which the king of Spain, always trembling for the security of his kingdom of Naples, could not contemplate without great uneasiness. Philip, accordingly, hastened to send him word that he would charge himself with the defence of the council, and that England or Germany would find that were they to attempt an invasion of France, they would have him on the field to oppose them. In fine, as a first pledge of his determination to fulfil his promises, he sent a new order to his prelates to allow the question that so terrified the court of Rome, to drop.

The pope had lost no time in profiting by a respite which

could not last beyond a few days ; so it was soon seen, at Trent, that the legates had received an order to wind up matters with the utmost speed, and, if possible, before the arrival of the French. The ambassadors of France complained of this, on the 10th of August, in a memorial addressed to the legates, to which the latter replied, that the council had now been open for seven months, and that it was not either very respectful to ask that it should be kept waiting long, nor very candid to attack its authority in case of its not waiting. So far they were quite right. The French prelates were evidently trifling with the council ; whether their presence was desired or not, they could no longer allege that anything had been neglected in the way of inviting their attendance. It was they, therefore, that were in the wrong ; but of this the Romish party were incapable of taking advantage, by themselves maintaining a frank and honest position. When the ambassadors asked whether their bishops were to be waited for or not, they were referred to the assembly, and then, when they attempted to address the assembly, the legates declared that there ought to be no official connexion between the ambassadors and the bishops, and that communications could pass only through them, the legates. Next, being asked to consult the assembly, they consulted only the pope, and the pope, already consulted by the French ambassador at Rome, had said that he would report the matter to the legates. "See what ought never to be forgotten," wrote Lansac, "the pope sends back the matter to the legates, the legates refer it to the synod ; the synod is not at liberty to listen to any proposition, and thus it is that the king and all men are deceived."

Such, then, was the atmosphere in which the decrees on the mass were elaborated. Notwithstanding the efforts of many of the bishops to concentrate the discussion on the clearest points, or such as were reckoned the clearest, there was not a sitting in which the disputants were not led back to the grand dispute about the oblation of the Saviour in the supper. Four opinions were formed. Pallavicini gives with great care and exactness the names of their principal champions, the different shades of doctrine discernible amongst them, the fluctuations of the majority, and so forth. He never seems to imagine that it should be thought strange to see the council divided into fifteen or twenty groups on so capital a question, and one which, as we have shewn, could neither be set aside nor decided without great peril to the entire structure of the mass. The Jesuit, Salméron, a partisan

of the real oblation, set so many springs in motion in order to have the majority, that the bishops were obliged to complain of his manœuvres in full assembly. "Let people intrigue," said they, "in disciplinary questions; it is annoying, still these are but human questions. In questions of doctrine, such doings are scandalous, they are sacrilegious." Was it for the first time, then, that there was occasion for this remark?

"It was agreed," says Pallavicini, "that nothing should be put into the decree that did not meet with the assent of all; and that whatever might displease any, should be taken out of it. If you would have individuals conform to what has been agreed to by the greater number, then the greater number must condescend to individuals, by yielding somewhat in small matters." Ever the same tactics repeated. Where the Church ventures to pronounce her opinion, there the smallest matters are important; the salvation of men's souls is involved in them. Where she is forced to be silent, matters of the greatest moment are "*small things*." The seat of authority,—a small thing. The superiority of councils to the pope,—a small thing. Was the supper a true sacrifice?—a small thing. A small thing, although in the dogmatic theology of Rome, it is the foundation of what is greatest. The grand object, accordingly, was to say nothing that might seem to decide the question, and no one can positively say, according to the decree, whether the oblation of Jesus Christ by himself was a *propitiatory* oblation, that is to say, a real sacrifice, or a simple oblation, a sort of dedication preluding to the sacrifice of the cross. An attempt, however, was also made, by means of circumlocutions more or less skilfully framed, to teach a little more than the simple oblation which would have ruined the real presence; but the word *propitiatory*, which Salmeron demanded, and which alone could remove all ambiguity, was carefully left out. It appears only in the second chapter, where the institution of the mass is no more spoken of, but the mass itself. We should have felt much inclined to ask further what would have occurred, if some village priest, entering the hall where the council was met without previous notice, had put this question—"Fathers, what am I to teach?—was the oblation of the supper propitiatory; yes, or no?"

While these discussions were in progress, letters were received from the emperor, in which he required nothing less than the dismissal of the questions relative to the mass, with the exception of that of the cup, of which, on the contrary, he called for a

prompt and satisfactory solution. Farther delay, after so many promises, was impossible. The reply, accordingly, was that the council would set to it immediately, but with this not unreasonable addition, that it neither could nor would delay the publication of any of the decrees that should be ready.

Meanwhile the French ambassadors were for ever insisting that the session, fixed for the 17th of September, should be put off for a month at least. They represented that various secondary questions, which must sooner or later come before them, might be studied in the mean time, and that thus the close of the council would not be really delayed. But the more they urged, the less willingness was there to yield to this demand. It became a subject of alarm that the French might come to think themselves authorized to believe that their presence was necessary in order to give validity to the decisions; moreover, there arose a report that when hardly arrived, breaking abruptly the compromise on which matters had hitherto proceeded, they were to moot the scorching question of the inferiority of the pope. Although, if such was in fact their intention, there were no visible means of preventing them; there was a desire to make sure, by the public promulgation, of all that had been decreed without them.

The council had in the last session reserved to itself power to advance, should it judge right, the day of meeting for that which was to follow. The decrees were ready about the end of August, fifteen or twenty days before the term that had been fixed. The session might accordingly have been held, but it was not to be dreamt of that such an affront should be offered to those who were desirous, on the contrary, that the day of meeting should be put off. There was time left therefore for the discussion of the affair of the cup, so eagerly called for by the emperor, and as the French prelates had given intimation that they did not ask to be waited for with respect to that point, there was no longer any kind of motive or pretext left for not taking it up.

For the first time, then, the matter was directly brought forward. Three opinions arose, or rather had been already formed. One, to refuse it absolutely; another, to grant it, but under certain conditions to be fixed by the council; the third, to refer the matter to the pope. Among the partisans of this last opinion, some wanted a pure and simple reference; others, a reference with reasons, bearing that the pope might make the concession asked for. The Spaniards were always for an absolute refusal. Philip II. dreaded, not without reason, lest the

concession of the cup to his subjects in the Netherlands, should give his other subjects, if not in Spain, at least in Franche-Comté and the Milanese, a hankering for as much; he could perceive that that step once taken, people were little likely not to attempt farther advances.

The partisans of the concession, too, strongly insisted on the precautions to be taken to prevent its giving encouragement to other demands. They agreed, in general, on the five following conditions indicated by the legates:—

I. That the principle be voted, but the application left to the pope, he alone being in a position to judge what were the nations to which it was fit that the benefit should be granted.

II. That the pope, in order to his being properly informed, should send legates or commissioners before hand, to all quarters where this wish had been expressed.

III. That the consecrated wine should never leave the churches, not even to be taken to the dying.

IV. That those to whom the cup shall be conceded, should declare that they do not regard it as necessary to the validity of the sacrament.

V. That they shall, in respect of all other matters, return fully and sincerely to the unity of the Church.

Conditions, in a word, which it was indispensable to lay down, but the two last of which made the concession go for nothing. It was well known that among those who demanded it, there was none so little a Protestant as to declare himself a Roman Catholic from the moment that it was granted.

For several days, and in sittings of several hours' duration, each speaker in support of one opinion, was almost invariably followed by one who supported another. In the end, however, it was seen that a majority was against the concession. The emperor's ambassadors, who had hitherto opposed the reference of that question to the pope, now yielded so far as not only to consent to it but even to ask it; defeated in the council, their object was to have a door at least left open for them at Rome. Strengthened by their concurrence, the legates were no longer afraid to press the reference, and their agents set themselves to work so as to secure a majority on that side.

As they thought five or six days would be required before they could be sure of such a state of the vote, they proposed the regulating of a score of articles, some on a certain number of abuses relative to the mass, others on divers points of discipline and

administration. Although these last were favourable in general to episcopal authority, they were complained of by many bishops. These asked how long it was meant that the great reforms were to be put off, in order to occupy themselves with such only as, whenever the great ones were accomplished, would come of themselves. One of them, moreover, observed that it was beneath the dignity of the council to take up a point here and a point there, and to vote on a thousand things without being able to say why these were taken up rather than others. "Has not the order of business been all regularly laid down?" he added, "Is it not with the Head and his court that reformation should commence? If you would have the planets regain their lustre, begin by telling the sun to regain his." And the bishop of Segovia compared the council to a physician called in to cure an inveterate disease, and who, instead of having recourse to real remedies, should employ mere slight frictions with oil.

Those frictions, so slight when compared with the evil to be cured, were not even directed in such a manner as to leave untouched things that were beyond the competence of the council. Articles viii. and ix. empowered the bishops to interfere with a high hand in the management of hospitals, colleges, lay communities, testaments, &c.; an authority which they did actually enjoy in some countries, but which had been always refused to them in others, and notoriously in France. The superintendence of hospital property by the bishops, had often had good effects; but sometimes also it had resulted only in gradually transforming it into Church property, into benefices, and, consequently, in diverting it from its proper destination. Besides, it was not a question of convenience, but of justice, and the council could not pretend to regulate alone what at so many points touched upon civil legislation and the rights of sovereigns. These it invaded also by granting the bishops the power to examine notaries and to interdict them, in some cases, from the exercise of their functions. In fine, it was not as bishops, but as delegates of the pope, that they were to exercise several of those new powers, another exorbitance which further contributed to provoke the resistance of the sovereign princes. It seemed that the assembly were not fully aware of the bearing and the impropriety of those articles, for they were voted hastily and almost without discussion. They brought occasion for repentance in their train, for they led to the decrees of the council being refused publication in France.

Attached to these there were various rules bearing on the moral and intellectual qualities to be required of a priest in order to his elevation to the episcopacy, the conduct to be followed by the clergy in civil life, the conditions required in order to the legitimate possession of a benefice, &c. Looking at these rules in detail we should hardly have aught but good to say of them ; but the opposition were for ever asking what good end they could serve, what sanctioned them ? and we see, in fact, that the observance of several of them dated no farther back than half a century, without the Church being able even to take to herself the glory of having enforced them. "Begin then," the Bishop of Orense said, "with a decree ordaining that these laws shall be obligatory for the pope, and then only shall you have done something."

Neither were there laid down in what bore on abuses relative to the mass, any regulations but what were very good. People were enjoined never to attend but with due respect, and in a becoming dress ; never to celebrate it hastily ; to remove from it everything that savoured of superstition, for example, certain calculations on the number and the arrangement of the wax lights ; finally, and in the most formal manner, never to take any pay for its celebration. "Before all," says the decree, "as regards avarice, let the bishops absolutely forbid all sorts of conditions and stipulations for any recompense whatsoever, and all that is given for the celebration of new masses, as also those demands for alms, so urgent and so unseemly, that they are exactions rather than calls for charity, and all other things of that sort which are not much removed from simony, or, at least, filthy lucre."¹ How, after this, masses should still be paid for, is what we shall not venture to explain. And it is so well understood in fact that there is no disgrace whatever in making them to be paid for, that the pope himself when he says mass at St. Peter's publicly receives some pieces of money which are intended to represent his stipend.

Some words now on the canons appended, according to custom, to the doctrinal chapters.

In the first we find an anathema pronounced on whosoever shall not think that there is in the mass a sacrifice properly and truly so called. We need not recur to this point.

¹In primis quod ad avaritiam pertinet, cujusvis generis mercedum conditionis, pacta, et quicquid pro missis novis celebrandis datur, necnon importunas atque illiberales eleemosynarum exactiones potius quam postulationes, atque ejusmodi quae a simoniaca labe, vel certe a curpi quæstu non longe absunt, omnino prohibeant.

In the second, anathema to whosoever shall not believe that in saying these words to the Apostles, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Jesus Christ instituted them priests, alone competent to say the mass. This had, down to that date, been only an opinion, sufficiently modern, seeing that at the time of the council of Constance it was hardly beginning to make head. "Take, eat," said Jesus Christ, "this is my body which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of me." Such, in their whole amount, are the Saviour's words. *Do this* cannot be separated from what goes before; from what is indicated as *to be done*; and that which is pointed out as to be done is not only the breaking of the bread, it is also, and above all, seeing the imperative is used, the taking of it and the eating of it. If *Do this* be only for the priests, *Take, eat*, is only for them also: they only then have a right to communicate. Do we at least find these words in all the Evangelists? No; of the three who have given a narrative of the supper two omit them. How can it be thought that they would have omitted them had they seen in them a matter of so much importance as the institution of the priesthood? To these scriptural difficulties there is conjoined another, still more serious for the Roman Catholics. The priest is not only the minister of the mass, he is that also of all the other sacraments, in particular of penance. Can it be said, consequently, that Jesus Christ made priests of men to whom for the moment he gave no more than the right to say the mass? "They might then," says Du Moulin, "have chanted it while Jesus Christ was as yet upon the cross or in the sepulchre?" No doubt they might have done so, had they believed what the council teaches. Only it would have been somewhat difficult, on that first occasion, to believe in the real presence. Can you figure St. Peter or St. John under the persuasion that he had in his hand or in his mouth a body which he had seen taken down from the cross, and which he knew was lying in a tomb? This canon, accordingly, just before the close of the session, gave rise to a violent altercation. The Archbishop of Grenoble combated it as contrary to the opinion of St. Denys, of St. Maximus, and of St. Chrysostom, who refer the collation of the priesthood to those words pronounced by Jesus Christ after his resurrection, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*. "The Fathers," says Pallavicini, "wearied with so many speeches, and with the obstinacy of one man, who opposed the views of all the rest, exclaimed with one voice that the council must keep to what had been decided."

One man—All the rest. The historian seems then to affirm that the Archbishop stood alone, and yet, after having related the discussion that followed, he says, "The party that supported the canon became so numerous that *at last* there were hardly *thirty* in the opposition." There were more than thirty then at first; and he might have added that those thirty were among the members who had best studied the subject, the most habituated to sober reflection, to calmness in voting, and to frankness in dealing with difficulties.

In the third canon, anathema to whosoever shall maintain that the mass is no more than a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, benefits none but the person who communicates, and ought not to be offered for sins, penalties, satisfactions, *and other needs*. These last words called forth various remarks on the danger of authorizing masses said on all occasions and for all sorts of needs; but the custom had become so universal that to condemn it would have been to condemn the Church, and moreover, would have damaged one of the chief sources of its influence and of its revenues. To have a mass said for the cure of an invalid, for the return of some one on a journey, for the success of an honourable or hazardous undertaking, is sometimes very affecting as a manifestation of piety; but as we are nowhere told that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ had for its object, or for any one of its objects, the obtaining for us of temporal favours, one does not see how the mass, if it be its exact reproduction, could have any object other than that of the sacrifice itself, that is, the pardon of sins and the salvation of souls. Twenty-five prelates were of this opinion.

In the fourth canon, anathema to whosoever shall say that the sacrifice of the mass is a blasphemy against Jesus Christ's sacrifice, or that it derogates from it. This is not clear; but if the meaning be that the immolation on the altar ought not to diminish in the eyes of the faithful, the importance of the immolation on Calvary, what is required is an impossibility. The offering has been made *once*, says St. Paul. The offering is made daily, and an hundred thousand times a day, says the Church. How, then, admit that the greatness of the act cannot be impaired by such a reproduction of it?

In the fifth, anathema to whosoever shall call the celebration of masses in honour of the saints an imposture. Imposture! No; that would be saying too little. When the inhabitants of Lystra, supposing Paul to be Mercury, (Acts xiv.,) would have offered

sacrifice to him, he rent his garments, he turned away and was horrified. "Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you!" Suppose him come back to this earth, and that he were to hear men speak of renewing *in his honour*—What! The sacrifice of his Master—that immolation of which he never spoke but with adoration and awe—and say if it would not have been with far greater horror still that he would have exclaimed,—“Sirs, why do ye these things?”

In the three following canons, anathema to whosoever shall condemn either the liturgy of the mass as containing errors, or the ceremonies of the mass as superstitious, or the custom of having masses in which the priest alone communicates. As for this last point, if the mass be a sacrifice, there is nothing, in fact, to prevent one man alone from offering it for others, even though absent; if it be not, no man could entertain the idea of celebrating it otherwise than in a congregation of the faithful, assembled for the purpose of communicating. Accordingly, it is not a weak argument against the mass that there is nowhere in the history of the early times of the Church, any trace whatever of the supper being celebrated in private by the priest, or in public without those present participating. When Chateaubriand puts into the mouth of one of his personages in *The Martyrs*, that he is going to *celebrate the holy sacrifice for Eudoxe*, he is guilty of one of the most complete anachronisms that occur in that book in which so many might be pointed out.

As for the liturgy in which it is forbidden, by authority of the council, to see any errors, a Roman Catholic, durst he venture, would find more to reprehend than we. Made up of ancient forms of prayer, it has retained some curious traces of those times when people had hardly begun to enter on the paths which were eventually to lead to the mass. Thus, after the consecration, when the priest presents the victim to God, “Deign,” says he to God, “to cast on these things a propitious and serene regard, as thou didst deign to accept the offering of Abel.” Strange words these to use when presenting to God the body of his Son!

There was no idea, therefore, of this when that invocation was drawn up. When the supper had ceased to be a repast taken in common, it came to be an established usage to carry to the church, and to place upon the communion table, a larger or smaller quantity of bread, wine, and sometimes even of fruit. Such was this offering, in imitation of Abel’s, on which God’s blessing was invoked previous to part of it being set aside for

distribution at the supper; the rest went to the poor. Such is the explanation of what is added in the liturgy,—“We supplicate thee, O God! to command that *these things* may be borne, by thy holy angel, to thy heavenly altar.” Such, further, is the explanation of that phrase,—“It is by Christ, O God! that thou dost create, sanctify, vivify and bless *all these good things* ;” for it would be sufficiently absurd for any one in presenting to God, under the form of bread and wine, the body and the blood of his Son, to set himself simply to bless him for having given us in nature, bread for our hunger and wine for our thirst. As respects all those passages, and many others, it is only in consequence of seeing them in the canon of the mass that people have come to lose all perception of their unsuitableness there, and how far they are from expressing what people, believing in the real presence, could not have failed to say at the daily renewal of the sacrifice of Christ, &c. There is one, however, which would have been quite too contrary to those new ideas, and that has been changed. “Cause this oblation to be reckoned to us, that it be reasonable, acceptable, because it is *the figure* of the Lord’s body and blood, who, on the night of his passion, took bread,” &c. Such is the prayer as quoted in St. Ambrose.¹ In the canon of the mass let the reader mark the change,—“Deign, O God, to cause that this oblation be in all things blessed, reckoned, &c., *in order that it may become for us the body and the blood of thy dear Son*, who, on the night of his passion,”² &c. And such is the way in which people set themselves to write—the mass! Notwithstanding this, put that liturgy into the hands of any one who does not know that it is the mass, and he will hardly see it there any more than in the Gospel.

Finally, in the last canon, anathema to whosoever shall maintain that the mass ought to be celebrated in the Vulgar tongue, or who shall condemn the practice of putting a little water into the wine before its consecration. What foundation is there for that practice? It is possible that the wine employed by Christ was, in point of fact, mingled with water; possibly, too, it was not. What know we about it? What can we know about it? “St. Cyprian and several councils teach it,” says the Roman Catechism. True, but what knew they about it? And if Scripture speaks of nothing but wine, why speak of anything else?³

¹ De Sacramentis iv. 5.—Quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri.

² Ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri.

³ There seems to be among Roman Catholic divines a necessity for outrunning and tor-

Nevertheless, according to that same catechism, that mixture is so important that its omission must be a mortal sin. Only, "Let the priests be careful to put very little water into the wine, for, according to the divines, that water must change itself into wine," before the whole is changed into blood! Another miracle! But the Romanist doctors seem not quite to trust to the former. Put very little water, they say. But why? If the transformation really takes place—little or much, what does it matter? Ah! it is because too much wine infused would greatly risk not having quite the taste of pure wine, and thus the faith of the priest would be exposed to too rude a trial.

As for the other point, that of the mass in the Vulgar tongue, let us stop for a moment to consider it.

Shall we begin by quoting the passage in which St. Paul seems to have had a foresight of what was afterwards to be done, so emphatically does he declare and repeat that he that speaks in the church ought to be understood by all? "Except ye utter by the mouth words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? For ye shall speak into the air. For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful."¹ And this idea re-occurs two or three times in the same chapter.

Shall it be said that the Apostle, in this part of his writings, speaks not of tongues merely *foreign*, but of unknown tongues? The reasons he adduces are too general to have their cogency in the least lessened by this distinction. He desires, such is the plain fact, that he that speaks shall be understood.

St. Paul adds, it is true, that he that has spoken in an unknown tongue might still profit others by interpreting what he has said. "Now, it will be said in reply, "the Church has never refused to interpret her Latin liturgies; it is easy to procure translations of them." Now-a-days it is easy; the time was when it was very difficult, and we all know, besides, how many there are who cannot read. Even at this day do we see many, especially in countries entirely Roman Catholic, who understand or care about understanding the Latin offices? Most frequently, moreover, nothing is heard. The use of a language which is not understood has led to the habit of speaking low,

turing Scripture, even when they have no interest in doing so. Know you why the supper is regarded as a repast of union and love? Think you it is because it recalls the love of God to men, our equality before Him, &c.? Not at all. According to the Roman Catechism it is because the bread is composed of many grains of wheat, and the wine of many single grapes mingled and confounded. Such is the union; such is the Church.

¹ 1 Cor. xiv.

rapidly, and indistinctly; it is only by following in a book the words spoken by the priest, that even one who knows Latin can go along with what is said.

Although all men should be able to read,—and Roman Catholic countries are far from ranking first in this respect,—although all men were to compel themselves to have the book constantly in their hand, the objection would remain the same. Why Latin rather than the language of the country? Why go round about when there is nothing to prevent your going straightforward? You allow the French to follow the mass with a French translation; if they avail themselves of the permission, it is as if they heard it in French. Will it lose its virtue? You do not say that. What reason have you, then, for not granting to everybody, by speaking in everybody's language, the favour you grant to whosoever can use, and chooses to use, a translation? Then, was not this language, which is at this day a strange unknown tongue, to the great majority of the faithful, originally the Vulgar tongue? Here, therefore, is a point on which you cannot call in the aid of tradition. Do we find that during the first centuries of the Church, there was ever a thought of imposing Latin on the members of the Eastern Churches? Had the Eastern Churches, on the other hand, ever a thought of imposing Greek on anybody? And yet they had by much the stronger reasons for attempting it. The Apostles wrote and preached in Greek. In Greek the history and the sayings of Jesus Christ found their way into the west. Were Christianity to have a sacred language, it is the Greek; the Hebrew, if you will have it so; but the Latin it is not.

But why should we speak of a sacred language? Is not the very universality of Christianity, which is regarded by every one as one of its essential and distinctive characters, an argument against that unity of language with which Rome would endow it? It is only in countries where the institution of caste prevails, among the ancient Egyptians, and among the Hindoos, that we find a language specially employed for worship, and by the priests. When a religion appears with the announcement, that it is to belong not only to all nations, but, further, in each nation, to all the individuals that compose it, when it comprises nothing which ought not to be revealed to all men,—it is contradictory to its very essence, to make it ever speak to men in a language that they do not understand.

As for the rest, it is not by chance that Rome is here found as-

sociated with Egypt and India, rather than with the altogether civil organization of Roman Paganism; no more was it by chance, or from caprice, that the Reformers were so urgent for the abandonment of the Latin tongue. They were thoroughly sensible that it would not depart alone; and Rome, without saying so, had the same conviction. The mass in French, in German, in English, is no longer the mass. The form has incorporated itself with the substance, and cannot undergo a change without seriously affecting the substance. The miracle of transubstantiation is wrought by these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*; let the priest say, *This is my body*, and the charm is half destroyed, even to those who equally understand both. We have seen Roman Catholics, in reading the mass for the first time in their own tongue, experience the utmost disappointment. They saw nothing bad or false in it, but no more did they see aught that seemed adequate in point of grandeur to the mystery that had previously fed their imagination. And it is not only with an eye to doctrine that Rome persists in having a language of her own. Like the taking away of the cup, it is a barrier between the clergy and the people—a barrier less impassable, it is true, since a man may learn Latin, but which, besides that it is impassable for the great mass of mankind, still helps, nevertheless, even as respects the literate classes, to guard the precincts of the sanctuary.

Accordingly, in our own times, it is only by reasons of a more or less mystical sort that its maintenance has been sought to be justified. "Prayers in the Latin tongue," says Chateaubriand,¹ "seem to redouble the religious feelings of the multitude. In the tumult of his thoughts, and of the miseries with which his life is beset, man, as he pronounces words little familiar or even unknown to him, seems to petition for things that he wants, and yet of which he is ignorant."² The vagueness of these prayers constitutes their charm." The vagueness of the thoughts, perhaps; never the vagueness resulting from the words being unknown, unless, indeed, among the charms of prayer, we are to reckon the facility of praying with words, without any effort beyond keeping one's self, well or ill, in a certain abstracted state more or less resembling sleep. De Maistre, as usual, is still more frank; "As for the people," says he, "if they do not understand

¹ *Génie du Christianisme*, 4^{me} partie.

² The word Hallelujah, which is Hebrew, is adopted, as it stands, in the mass, to express, by a foreign word, joys unknown to this life.—Innocent III., *Treatise on the Mass*, ii. 53.

the words, so much the better. There is all the more respect and none the less intelligence." All the more respect! Possibly so; but what sort of respect? That of a statue on its knees. Is that the respect God requires from intelligent beings? None the less intelligence! We admit that many things are said, among Roman Catholics, in Latin, which would not much enrich the mind; but would they once begin to speak in such a manner as to be understood, they would soon be compelled to say better things and more of them. "An antique and *mysterious* language," says Chateaubriand again, "a language which has for ages ceased to undergo any change, is suited for the worship of the eternal *incomprehensible* Being."—"You do not comprehend God," he would seem to say; "it is natural, then, that you should address him in a language which you do not comprehend." Is not this, at bottom, the true meaning of all that is said to us on this subject? Put away all these brilliant pictures, all these poetical veils—and what do you find behind? A chaplet, a praying machine, and man himself becoming a praying machine.

We have said that the affair of the cup had been suspended until the majority should be found disposed to refer its determination to the pope.

The session drew nigh. Whatever form might be given to the decree for the reference, that decree had against it, in addition to all who wanted the thing regulated in the council, many of those who blamed the concession of the cup, and were afraid that the pope might grant it. The day before the session, the legates thought they might gain some votes by adding that the pope, *with the consent and approbation of the council*, should do what he thought fit; but this clause, though agreeable to the pope's adversaries, was warmly opposed by the Roman party, and the legates even felt themselves reproached with it as a sort of treason. In the evening, not knowing how to make up their minds, they sent a request to the ambassadors that they would not insist on the council voting on it next day; but the emperor's party would not hear of such a thing. They said they would rather break with the council than consent again to any delay whatever. On the next day, accordingly, they came to a vote; the decree passed, but thirty-eight prelates voted against it, and the same minority appeared in the session.¹

As for the almost equally large minorities which we have seen

¹ 17th September 1562, twenty-second session.

announce their opinions in the voting of decrees concerning the faith, they were found, as usual, very much diminished in the session. Of thirty bishops who had persisted in not believing that the *Do this* involved the ordination of the Apostles, fifteen at most in the public sitting voted against the canon in which that opinion is erected into an article of faith. Shall we charge the others with cowardice and inconsistency? No; the inconsistent, on the contrary, were those who were daring enough not to submit immediately to the infallible voice of the majority. There is no consistency in Roman Catholicism, but in submission and silence.

BOOK FIFTH.

All begins anew; one might suppose he had mi-taken the page—Eight successive prorogations—Opening of the debates on the sacrament of orders—Imprudent haste—Are orders a sacrament?—Calvin's opinion—In what sense were orders instituted by Jesus Christ?—Scriptural and historical discussion—Roman system—Few advantages and many inconveniences—The seven orders—No scriptural foundation—Difficulties that cannot be resolved—The council evades them—The mass the basis of the Roman priesthood—*Order and the orders*—Grace in ordination—Endless uncertainties and obscurities.

The hierarchy—Is Episcopacy to be found in the New Testament—In what sense it is legitimate—Contradictions of the Roman system—How these were removed at Trent—The old question of the divine right changes its aspect—It becomes simplified on the one hand, and complicated on the other—New efforts to leave the pope out in the discussion of it.

The popedom—*Thou art Peter*—St. Peter in the New Testament—History—Writings—Is tradition more favourable—How the Fathers explained *Thou art Peter*—Whatever Peter may have been, is the pope his successor—Chronological difficulties—What is required in order to the testimony of the Fathers being conclusive—Irenæus—The *apostolical constitutions*—The Roman element—Internal difficulties—How to link the chain—Independence of the Apostles and of all the pastors established by them—The patriarchs—The right of conquest no right—Contrast between the embarrassment of the Church's doctors, and the hardihood of the popes—Gregory XVI. in 1832—Some facts—Nice—Carthage—Gregory I.

The pope is necessarily all, or nothing—Pangs of the Roman party—The vote is taken but the discussion continues—It comes upon the ground of the authority of the council—The perilous position of things becomes more and more evident—All the objections reach farther than is thought desirable by those even who make them—The cause is committed to Lainez—His speech—The Church is essentially subject—It was to Peter alone that it was said, "Feed my sheep"—Absolute ultramontanism—A Roman Catholic has logically no reply to make—Irritation increases—Complaints of the bishop of Paris—The French of that time, and those of the present day.

The Cardinal of Lorraine—Precautions taken—Still the decree on the institution of bishops—Urgency of the Spaniards—Rumours and factions—Men become more moderate—New draft of the decree on residence—A return to what had been prepared in 1551—Roman Catholicism caught in the act—Point of issue—Arrival of the Cardinal of Lorraine—His

speech—What were at bottom his projects—New causes of distrust—The pope's illness—Should he die, who was to elect another—The cardinals—Historical remarks—No foundation for their rights.

The Cardinal of Lorraine describes the calamities of France—Du Ferrier's conclusions—Ours—In what sense the Church has a horror for blood.

New fluctuations on the cardinal's part—The council falls back on the discussions on the residence of bishops—A bad Frenchman, a bad Spaniard—Complaints of the extreme prolixity of the speeches—Fabian delays—The pope sends three formulas on the institution of bishops—They say too little, or too much—*In partem sollicitudinis*—Agreement on any point impossible.

Battle of Dreux—Pius IV. considers the success gained contemptible—Demands of the court of France—The pope pretends to dread a revolt—He takes the affair into his own hands—Offers of money—Nothing is ready—The cardinal's journey to the emperor—Disquieting articles which Ferdinand caused to be examined—His complaints against the council and the pope—The court of France sends to inquire what have become of the promised reforms.

Marriage—Is it a sacrament—Scriptural and other objections—In giving it this title, has it been really rendered more sacred—The Church's despotism—Objections of jurisconsults—Indissolubility of marriage—*Except it be for adultery*—Divorce—It may be made a law, but not a dogma—Weakness of the arguments in favour of the decree—Other difficulties—Civil elements of marriage—Quibbles—If marriage be a sacrament, the civil power has nothing to do with it—The march of ideas—Side by side with so much strictness, unheard of dissoluteness of morals—Abuse of dispensations—Sophisms of the ultramontanists. Can a Roman Catholic treat them with contempt?

The celibate—Can we examine whether it be, in itself, more holy than marriage—Monks and the monastic life—Suicide—Convents in poetry—Convents in reality—Forced vows—Scruples of jurisconsults—Celibate of priests—Right and abuses—The celibate and the Reformation—The Jewish law—The Christian law—St. Peter—Ideal and realities—What the clergy are where it prevails—Why the celibacy of the priests is persisted in.

Political pre-occupations—Death of the Duke of Guise—Cardinal of Mantua's letter to Paul IV.—Letter from the emperor—The council has remained obnoxious to all the blows then levelled at it—The pope's reply—Constantine and Theodosius—What has been made of them, and what they were—Philip II. and his prelates—Tumults at Trent—Two new legates Morone at Inspruck—Negotiations—Peace in France—The pope's ill humour—At Trent weariness and disgust.

THE farther we proceed the more does our task become difficult and repulsive. Nothing can be more miserably tiresome than to find one's self on the morrow after each successive sitting, placed in view of the same intrigues and the same reclamations, with the same facts to note, and the same reflections to make. In the more minute histories of Pallavicini and Sarpi, a careless reader might often suppose that he had mistaken the page and was reading over again what he had read already. Notwithstanding our utmost efforts to avoid the same evil, we feel at times in despair of success. Thus, with respect to the dispute about the divine right of bishops—although we have spoken about it so often, and shall have to speak about it again—we shall, after all, have only indicated its principal phases. As for

the reclamations of the prelates, or the ambassadors, on the exorbitant influence of the pope, the insufficiency of the reforms that had been decreed, the giving to the legates the exclusive right to make propositions, and the tortuous course of business in general—we have spoken as rarely as possible, and we could not have spoken less of them without renouncing the idea of giving a true picture of the council.

The twenty-third session had been fixed for the 12th of November. Prorogued eight times, it took place only on the 15th of July in the following year. This of itself may suffice to shew what a chaos of embarrassments and discussions we have to disentangle and elucidate.

It had been decreed that the two last sacraments should be brought under deliberation—those of sacred orders and marriage; but the very next day the French ambassadors renewed their protest and their demands. They represented that if the council proceeded immediately to doctrinal questions, there would be none, or almost none remaining when their prelates should arrive; they insisted that these divines should be waited for until the end of October, and that, until then, matters relating to discipline only should be taken up. That same day the imperial ambassadors presented an analogous demand. Their master, they said, had been struck, as everybody had been, with the little time that had been given to disciplinary matters, though from them alone was there any prospect of the return of order and peace. “He would rather not,” the ambassadors added, “that they should enter so deeply into points of doctrine as to vote on things with regard to which Roman Catholics were so little agreed, and which the Church had hitherto left prudently in the shade.”

The legates replied that it was a settled rule, adopted since the commencement of the council, to make the examination of points of doctrine and that of disciplinary matters proceed abreast; that they could not therefore consent to the kind of suspension that was asked for; that, nevertheless, they would so arrange matters that one only of the two remaining sacraments should be taken up for study—that of orders.

They had their own reasons for preferring that one of the two. The deliberations on the sacrament by which men are made priests, would necessarily revive the question about residence, and it was of importance, if they could no longer hope to be able to set it aside, that it should be decided, at least, before the

arrival of the reinforcement promised by France to the partisans of the divine right. To provide against possible contingencies the pope sent numerous reinforcements from Italy. Care was taken, at the same time, to have it hinted to the French, and to the Cardinal of Lorraine in particular, that after having delayed so long, they had better give up altogether the idea of coming at all. "Was it befitting their dignity to have anything to do with a council where they could merely show themselves and no more, since the whole was to be brought to a close in a few weeks? They could hardly act any but a Protestant part in opposing the decrees already made, a course which could only have the ultimate effect of shaking, with the authority of the council, that of the whole Church, in France as well as elsewhere."—Nor were such representations unreasonable.

Instead of, as had been hitherto done, handing over all the questions collectively to all the divines, the latter were divided into six classes, and to each of these there was assigned a special department. Moreover, among other regulations, it was agreed that no speech should exceed half an hour. It was not the first time that an attempt was now made to restrain the prolixity of the doctors; but none of the rules intended for that purpose had lasted beyond a few days. In the absence of any precise rules the council was often observed to show its impatience by murmurs, talking among the members, shuffling of the feet, &c.; practices all of which are common enough in political assemblages, but which many will be not a little surprised to find prevailing at the Council of Trent.

These arrangements, accordingly, were very wise, but the time for their introduction was ill-chosen. Promises had been made of slow procedure, especially with regard to doctrinal articles, yet steps were now taken for proceeding faster than ever. The court of Rome had ceased, or believed that it had ceased, to have any further grounds for alarm. It allowed itself to run into that state of impatience which the calmest and the ablest cannot but experience when some great task is approaching its close, and to this we must ascribe those imprudences which at any other time it would have avoided.

II. The point at issue, in the first question, was to determine "whether orders be or be not a true sacrament properly so called, instituted by Jesus Christ, and not a simple ceremony for instituting the ministers of God's word and the sacraments."

We might remark, first of all, that this question is ill-stated,

since it does not admit any mean between these two extreme opinions. It nowise necessarily follows from your attacking orders as a sacrament, that you make them a purely human institution, or even that you cease to acknowledge their institution by Jesus Christ.

As for the reasons that lead us to refuse to them the name of sacrament, we must refer to what we have said elsewhere on the sacraments in general. Orders are one of those on which the question is one of words. If you will have it that *sacramentum* means *oath*, then it is clear that orders are a sacrament, for the priest swears that he will consecrate himself to the Church; but it is clear, also, that they are not so in the same sense as baptism and the supper, seeing that the latter are for all, and the former for a small number only. "If I have not put it (the imposition of hands) among the sacraments," says Calvin, "it is because it is not ordinary and common to all the faithful."¹

Sacrament or no sacrament, can it be said that orders were instituted by Jesus Christ?

If by this people restrict themselves to the idea that Jesus Christ really contemplated establishing, in his Church, certain persons who should be specially devoted to religious matters,—we conceive that they are in the right. "Go," said he to his Apostles, "teach all nations," and as he could not think twelve men would suffice for this, he evidently authorized them to give themselves assistants and successors.

But if it be the Roman priesthood that is contemplated, with the profound separation which it establishes between priests and people, with the privileges it arrogates to itself, the mystical meaning it attaches to ordination, the *absolute* need that the Church, according to it, has of its ministry, then we deny that its institution can be traced to Jesus Christ, or to his Apostles, or to the disciples of the Apostles.

Not to Jesus Christ, we say. Had it been his intention to create priests in the Roman sense of that word, it must be admitted that the Apostles very much misunderstood it, and that an author who should set himself to trace in what is recorded of their history, the lineaments of the Christian priesthood, would hardly find it was that of the Roman Church. Chosen by the Master himself, manifestly guided by the Holy Spirit, they have not, nevertheless, the air of men who have any idea that, in the Church, they form a distinct and separate class. If they speak

¹ Christ. Inst., l. iv.

of their quality as Apostles, it is always as of a mission which they have received, not as of an internal character which has been stamped upon them. If necessary to the Church, it is as Apostles, *sent out*, missionaries, preachers of the gospel; but as for their being *priests*, pontiffs, having anything else to do but to teach certain truths, and being, in fine, required by the faithful for any other purposes than edification and instruction,—all this is what we shall never discover from either the letter or the spirit of what we read about them. And what they thought of themselves, they were all the more likely to think of those whom they associated with themselves. Read over, from this point of view, Paul's two epistles to Timothy, those few pages in which the Church of Rome has contrived to find so many words in her favour, and where we, on the contrary, find so many ideas that are positively opposed to her. There, as elsewhere, you will find a mission to be accomplished, an immense responsibility before God and before men; but, let us add, nothing more. In that multitude of directions, of all sorts, which the Apostle gives to his disciple, no mention is made of the administration of the sacraments. Take away the commission to teach, to direct, to reprove; what will remain to Timothy above the mere believers? Nothing, absolutely nothing. This, nevertheless, was a question of fact as well as of doctrine. Allusions, granting that there are such, still do not amount to proofs. Were the principles held by St. Paul on the priesthood, even remotely, those of the Roman Church, it was not a matter in which he, a founder of churches, could, in writing to a founder of churches, fail to express himself with precision. In his other epistles, the same omission. To whom are they addressed? To the *faithful* of Corinth, of Thessalonica, of Rome. In several of them he makes no mention of names, or of any chiefs whatever; in others, if he gives some names which might be supposed to be those of the pastors of the Church, or who, in fact, were so,—these names, as in the case of the epistle to the Romans, are mingled with those of persons who manifestly were not at the head of the flock, for sometimes they are women, sometimes whole families. If all this do not prove, as some sects have maintained, that there was nowhere a distinct and regular pastorate,—as little can we see that any one can maintain, after having seriously weighed these facts, either that the pastorate was a priesthood, or that it acted in any fashion the part which has been assumed by the Roman priesthood.

Will it be said that this opinion weakens the authority of the

evangelical ministry? We proceed to see if this be true; but were it true, that would not be an argument. There never has been a usurpation or abuse of which it might not also be said that those that attacked it assaulted the power that profited by it. We have not to decide whether a mysterious and indelible consecration be or be not necessary to the authority of the Gospel minister; we have only to see in the writings of the Apostles whether such was the view they took of their functions, and we go on to shew that there is nothing of the kind there. Meanwhile, is the fact alleged true? Does that mysterious and supernatural character tend to give to the laity more respect for the priests, to the priests more respect for themselves? No. Merit being equal, we have never seen the priest more respected than the Protestant pastor; and as for self-respect, that is to say, dignity of manners and language, it appears to us incontestable that the Protestant clergy are generally superior.

Now, if the idea that Rome has formed of the priesthood, if the supernatural and divine power which she has recognised in it, lead not, in point of fact, to any beneficial result which might not be obtained without it, how much has it not had, and does it not continue to have that is bad! Think but of that pride, and of all those individual and collective pretensions that have so troubled the world, and drawn upon Christianity so many attacks, so many sarcasms, so many bitter enmities, and say, where was the first source of all these, if not in the mendacious doctrine of a barrier raised by the hand of God himself betwixt pastors and people? What we have already said of the power of performing, in the celebration of mass, a greater and more extraordinary miracle than any of those by which Jesus Christ himself manifested his glory, we might repeat here with respect to all the powers that Rome assumes for her priests. All that she has thought to give them of the striking and supernatural, is easily effaced by people getting accustomed to it; all that she has, at the same time, created in the way of pretensions, tyranny and audacity, has been but too well kept from being effaced by pride and interest.

It is not only as respects the essence of Orders that Rome seems to us to have departed from the true apostolical traditions. What shall we say of the complications successively introduced into the organization of a ministry which appears to have been in the days of the Apostles a thing so simple, so profoundly clear and one? The Roman Church admits seven degrees in the

sacrament of orders, and, by an odd caprice, which her doctors differ in their efforts to explain, the episcopate is not one of them. These orders are divided into two classes. Four are of the minor class, those of porter, exorcist, reader, and acolyte. Three are of the major class, the sub-deaconship, the deaconship, and the priesthood properly so called. We cannot blame in an absolute manner the establishment of certain degrees to be passed before reaching the priesthood; but this number, seven, indicates at once pretensions to mystery and symmetry more worthy of ancient Egypt than of the renewed world, and of Pythagoras than of Jesus Christ.

While we admit that the Church may not have erred in establishing lower grades, we do not mean to say that their institution has a scriptural foundation, or is sanctioned by the example of the Apostles. We do not even think that one can appeal in their support to the institution of the deaconship, as related in the book of the Acts, and the council seems to us to have had recourse to a play upon the words when, speaking of the seven orders, it says, "Scripture makes positive mention not only of priests, but also of deacons." Now, in point of fact, what do we read? Desiring to devote themselves entirely to the care of souls, the Apostles request that they may be relieved from certain secular concerns. Seven men are to have these committed to them; and as their functions will meanwhile tend also to the spiritual benefit of the Church, they are to have the imposition of hands. They are to receive the Holy Ghost, and, should occasion require, take the place of the Apostles. Amid all these details not a word occurs that leads to the idea of this new office being instituted as an intermediate step to the ministry. It was a ministry apart, and inferior if you will, as respects the habitual nature of its functions, but not one that implied inferiority of character. Stephen, one of the elected seven, is exhibited to us immediately afterwards discharging all the functions of a pastor and an Apostle. Twice St. Paul¹ enumerates various charges exercised in the Church, and adds nothing that might lead us to suppose that they were so many successive degrees. The functions are entirely parallel; they present different branches of duty among which each might make his choice according to his peculiar talents, his convictions of duty, and the inward call addressed to him by God. That the deaconship was at a very early period regarded as a step to the minis-

¹ 1 Cor. xii., Eph. iv.

try is very probable. The institution does not exclude this view of the matter; but we think it evident that it does not point it out to us, and cannot consequently serve as a legitimate basis to the seven degrees of the Roman Church.

Extreme unction has led us to state beforehand one of the most serious difficulties attending this subject.¹ It is for the Roman Church to ask itself how six inferior orders, considered necessary for a man's reaching the seventh, can be reconciled with the idea of this last being a sacrament, and a sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ. The only method of escape from embarrassment would have been to make the six inferior orders a mere preparation for the priesthood; but at the time when this difficulty first challenged attention, the six preparatory orders had long been considered as conferring collectively a notable portion of the ecclesiastical character. Henceforth the difficulty subsists in all its magnitude: we have here a sacrament, which is stated to have been instituted by Jesus Christ, and which we find to be conferred in part by formalities which Jesus Christ did not institute, nor his Apostles either.

Did he at least insinuate them? Fain would the council have been able to say so. One divine made an attempt to prove it. Although Jesus Christ, said he, did not positively institute the series of seven orders, he suggested it by going through the series himself. When he drove the sellers out of the temple, was he not a porter? In curing those possessed by devils, an exorcist? In reading and explaining the Scriptures, a reader? In concerning himself about preparations for the supper, a deacon? In celebrating it, a priest? This far-fetched argument would be less ridiculous did it not leave unexplained why the Apostles speak of the deaconship as quite a new institution, suggested to them as required by new exigencies, and not connected in their minds with any injunction, any saying addressed to them by their master.

Another rock against which the discussion constantly struck, was the making the seven orders seven sacraments, connected together by their concurring to the same end, yet distinct as they each and all confer something sacramental. Some of the divines did not shrink from admitting this idea. In their view

¹ We might have noticed one at the time of the seventh session, at the date of the decree on the sacraments in general. That of Orders is put in the number of those which cannot be reiterated. In point of discipline nothing could be better; but in that case the Church must renounce teaching that the laying on of hands, as mentioned in the New Testament, was the Roman ordination, for St. Paul received it twice. (Acts ix. and xiii.)

there was something mysterious and divine in it; *one sole* sacrament and *seven* sacraments seemed to them happily to recall the idea of one God in three persons.

After long and solemn discussions,¹ the council durst not pronounce in favour either of the daring mysticism of the one party, or the timid puerilities of the other. Repeating what it had done so often before, it left vague all that it did not feel itself in a condition to determine.

Thus, in the first chapter, it confined itself to stating the existence of a visible priesthood established by God in the Church; but the proof of it which it adduces is valid for those only who admit without contestation all the anterior decrees on the supper and the mass. "In all religions, the idea of a sacrifice to be offered, and that of a priesthood instituted for the purpose of offering it, have been by the will of God intimately associated together. Since then there is in the Church a sacrifice, the mass, there is necessarily a priesthood." This line of argument is far from wise, since it exposes the Roman priesthood to all the objections that may be brought against the real presence, the mass, &c. On the other hand, is it at least true to say, that the two things have always existed together and advanced abreast? No. The Roman priesthood appears to us to have been fully constituted long before the mass was the mass. The uniform conjunction of priesthood and sacrifice in other religions is of small importance; here, it is not the priesthood that has been instituted for the sacrifice, it is the sacrifice that has been gradually introduced in order to complete and legitimize the priesthood. In the sixth, in the eighth century, at the time when there began to be priests in the full strictness of the word, while the transition was hardly more than in the bud, the people might have said, like Isaac to Abraham, "Behold a priest and an altar, but where is the victim?" And it was necessary, no doubt, that one should be found.

The line of argument in the second article is neither more solid nor more prudent. "The priestly ministry being a Divine thing it was natural that there should be several orders of ministers." Nothing more natural, in fact, if the inferior orders are only a preparation for the priesthood, but if they form a part of it then the argument is all the other way; the more the

¹ The first congregation general, held 23d September, reckoned, besides the legates, three patriarchs, eighteen archbishops, a hundred and forty-six bishops, five generals of orders, and eighty-four divines.

priesthood is divine, the more repugnant is its being split into parts. That, therefore, was the place at which the council behoved to have said whether the inferior orders are sacraments or parts of a sacrament, or a mere preparatory course to the priesthood, but, as in the first article, it said nothing. Thus, in the first, it speaks *of order*; in the second, *of orders*; in the third it returns to the word *order*. But in what manner *the orders* are *the order*, and *the order* is *the orders*, it does not say.

Another very serious question, serious, if not in itself, at least as respects the exactness of the system, is also evaded in the third article. It is there said that the order is truly and properly one of the Church's sacraments; and the reason adduced is because grace is conferred by ordination. In support of this, the words of St. Paul to Timothy are adduced:—"Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." But the Church itself has never taught that all that confers grace is in virtue of that alone a sacrament; we see cases, besides, of the Apostles giving the imposition of hands to persons whom they had no idea of making pastors. Moreover, there had been great disputes on the question how we are to know what kind of grace is conferred in ordination. On the one hand, it was very difficult to specify any which the priest might not already have received or might not yet receive, as simply one of the faithful, in one or another of the other sacraments; on the other, no sooner did people set themselves to speak of graces exclusively appropriated to the functions of his ministry, than the objection was raised that if the priest does not draw any fruit for himself from ordination it no longer answers the idea of a sacrament. Many would fain have inserted that it confers both these kinds of grace at once, inward graces for the priest's individual sanctification, and outward graces for the sanctification of the faithful under his ministry; but still this distinction had many opponents, and it was thought best to say nothing.

Nothing has been more attacked in the Reformation than the uncertainty which, we are told, it leaves on the character and authority of pastors. Had we to refute this objection we might observe that that is assumed as a fact which Protestants deny, and which must first of all be proved, namely, the necessity of a priesthood precisely such as that of Rome. The Protestant pastor would, in fact, be very much embarrassed if asked to produce his authority for remitting sins, or renewing daily on the

altar, with a few words, the sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on Calvary; but if he confine himself to the functions positively prescribed for him in the New Testament, particularly in the two Epistles to Timothy, the true code of instructions in this matter, he does not perceive that any thing is wanting to him for the exercise of all of them, and we see that his authority is, in fact, far less contested and far less attacked than is that of the priests where these are not omnipotent. But the details into which we have gone authorize our giving quite a different reply. You affirm, we should say, that the non-Roman pastor cannot explain in what the ordination which he has received consists. Can the priest do so really any better? Does not this flimsy coating of logic and assurance conceal some uncertainty, some serious difficulty? Two hundred doctors, twenty sittings, speeches and discussions without end, and then, at the close, a decree which promises proofs and gives mere assertions, three canons which are silent on three matters that are absolutely necessary to be known in order to the right understanding of what they say,—such is the answer which this history would furnish for us.

We now come to another article in which there was more need than ever to evade difficulties. It is that concerning the hierarchy.

It is a point which we can concede that the sacerdotal hierarchy, like the succession of orders, is not in itself a bad thing and to be condemned. If we disengage it, in our own mind, from the odiousness too often charged against it, we come to the simple idea of a pastor chosen from among some others to superintend them, direct them, and should the occasion require, censure them. Such a pastor will naturally hold always the first rank. As respects ordinary functions he will remain on an equality with his colleagues; as for the extraordinary, consecrations, installations, dedications, they will be devolved upon him, be it of right, but of right purely ecclesiastical and human, or simply in consequence of the position he occupies. At Geneva, for example, although the pastors are all equal, it is their yearly president who is charged with the conferring of the ministerial character by the imposition of hands.

Such is the sole reasonable and historically true origin that can be assigned to the episcopate. All the attempts that have been made for the discovery in the writings of the Apostles of some traces of inequality among the *Presbyteri* (from which *presby-*

ter and *priest*) and the *Episcopi* break down entirely, alike before ideas and words, before the general tenor and the details. Even were these attempts a little less fruitless it would be a powerful argument at once against the Roman system that so laborious a search must be made for its germs, without finding in the whole New Testament a single formal mention of a true inequality between bishops and presbyters. But not even the germs are to be found there; wherever men may fancy they have found them we could shew close at hand something that destroys them. The words *priest* and *bishop*, *elder* and *overseer*, we ought to say, for such is the true meaning, are perpetually used there the one for the other. Were this the case but once or twice we might already conclude from it that this question was not for the Apostles a question of importance, and, still less, a question of divine right. Can any one figure to himself a Roman Catholic so ignorant or so careless about the right use of terms as to call his parish priest bishop, and his bishop parish priest? But it is not once or twice, it is everywhere that the Apostles fall into this confusion of terms. "I left thee in Crete," says St. Paul to Titus, "that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting and ordain *elders* in every city as I had appointed thee: If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children. . . . For a *bishop* must be blameless, as the steward of God." Thus we have *elder* at the commencement and *bishop* at the end, with a *for* connecting them. In the book of the Acts (chap. xx.) Paul sends for the *elders* of the Church of Ephesus, and tells them among other things that the Holy Ghost had made them *bishops*, to feed the Church of God. Elsewhere it is St. Peter himself who addresses the *elders*, and employs for the designation of their functions the Greek verb *episkopein*, to *oversee*, which ought to be applied only to *bishops*. At another place, (1 Tim. iii.,) in a passage on the duties of the ministers of the Church, St. Paul speaks first of bishops and next of deacons, and betwixt those two classes speaks of none. "*Likewise* must the deacons," says he, "be grave," &c. Elsewhere he names the *episcopi* without naming the *presbyteri*, or the *presbyteri* without naming the *episcopi*, and all that he says of the one he says of the other. They had to receive the same ordination, to fulfil the same conditions; there is nothing, in a word, to indicate any superiority or inferiority whatever. If these two words were not in his view synonymous, if he believed the one to be superior to the other, and that by Divine right, the manner in which

he confounds the two, would indicate not only negligence but the most complete want of common sense.

Thus, however ancient may be the tradition in virtue of which bishops are chiefs of the Church, whatever reasons of discipline, unity, and order, may be urged in its favour, it remains evident that the superiority of the bishops over the presbyters or priests is a matter of ecclesiastical arrangement, and is human and mutable.

This being laid down as incontrovertible, the episcopate not being in Scripture, had the Church any right to establish it?

The question is double, and we must, first of all, clearly separate its two faces.

As soon as a church has more than one pastor it is natural and necessary that one should preside over the rest. It is natural too, we have said, though less necessary, that certain functions should be reserved to him. In fine, should the Church see fit that this precedency should be for life, that he who exercises it should govern with sovereign power, that he should nominate to all charges, and should have a right to all the honours, this is neither necessary, nor, according to us, natural and proper, but still it is not contrary to the essence of the pastorate. It produces an inequality of jurisdictions, not of powers, or, if you will, the administrative powers are unequal, but the spiritual powers remain the same.

Religious society, then, like civil society, can give to the administrative authority of its first magistrates as great a superiority as it may think proper; but as respects spiritual authority, if the equality of pastors is taught in the Scriptures we do not see what right the Church has to disturb it. The very idea of sacrament which the Church of Rome has attached to ordination is an additional argument against the spiritual supremacy of the bishops. A sacrament may have effects more or less marked according to the more or less excellence of the dispositions of those who receive it, but, in point of principle, it is inadmissible that the same sacrament should confer on some more, on others less.

It is in order to escape this objection that the Church of Rome has viewed the series of orders as closed at the seventh, and that the Council of Trent confirmed that view. The episcopate is not reputed as order, but as an office in the order. The bishop is no more a priest than is a mere parish priest; he is a priest charged with superior functions.

Shall we accept this distinction? The Church must necessarily herself accept the consequences of it; and we can prove that she does not accept them. If the bishop has only a superiority of office, and not of real powers, if he be no more priest than a priest, then a spiritual act cannot be null from the sole circumstance of his having had no part in it. But, ask the Church of Rome what she thinks, for example, of an ordination performed by a simple priest. She would pronounce it null. Of confirmation administered by him, null also; null, mark well, not only in the administrative point of view, but further, and especially in the sacramental. The child confirmed by a priest is not confirmed; the layman ordained by a priest remains to all intents and purposes a layman still. There are then really in the bishop spiritual powers which the priest has not, and he cannot even delegate those powers to a priest. It must be himself that confirms and himself that ordains, in such wise that if all the bishops of the Church, including the pope, were once to disappear, there would be no longer the means of having new priests, and the priesthood would be at an end. Here, then, we have spiritual inequality in all its rigour. A hundred thousand priests all laying hands on a man, could not make him a priest. The bishop can here do nothing; the pope himself, according to most canonists, cannot give a priest, without having first made him a bishop, the right to confer orders. There is then functionally in the bishop something more than in the priest. This something cannot be delegated; accordingly, it is not simply and solely an affair of jurisdiction. Why is it natural that a priest should not be able to delegate his functions to a deacon? Because the priest has received seven orders, and the deacon only six. It is contradictory, then, that the episcopate should not be an eighth order, and that there should be functions for which the men of the seventh, the priests, are radically and absolutely unfit.

All this was said in the council, with many delicate reservations, it is true, and still more with many protestations on the part of divines, that they by no means sought to unsettle an organization that had been sanctioned by ages. All they wanted, they said, was to have the question well stated and elucidated; but they elucidated it a great deal too much, and having done so, had the air of stopping only from motives of complaisance and respect. Many of the speeches made on this occasion seem, to the extent of three-fourths, to have been written by learned

men who were opposed to the Roman episcopate. Scriptural difficulties, historical difficulties, difficulties arising from the theory of the orders, all is there; then, all at once, the speaker wheels right about and concludes—as one could hardly avoid concluding in the presence of two hundred bishops.

This discussion led to a curious result, that of changing the face of the old question of the divine right. The reader will remember how it began. It was in 1546, at the time of the first discussion on residence. Nothing was contemplated in the first instance beyond the determination of the nature of a bishop's obligation to residence. Was it an obligation of divine right, that is to say, emanating immediately from God, or an obligation of papal right, that is to say, emanating from the pope, universal and only bishop, of whom all the rest, in this system, are only the delegates and the vicars? We have seen how the court of Rome held to this last opinion, and how, in despair of having it proclaimed by the council, it had always contrived so to manage that nothing should be decided on the subject.

In presence of the perilous difficulties which came to be started on the very nature and the essence of the episcopal authority, the question widened out and became complicated. It was not only in its bearings on residence and the pope that people felt themselves obliged to discuss it. "Is it by divine right, or only by ecclesiastical and papal right, that the bishop is superior to the priest?" Such was the problem which was to be agitated, only to be finally left without solution, the last year of the council.

Had it been possible in this case to attack and to resolve but the half, that, to wit, which concerns the inferiority of the priests, the council might easily have come to an agreement. The bishops of all countries, and of all parties, asked nothing better than to have to return to their dioceses with this additional buckler against the pretensions of their clergy. Not, however, that even then, the question would have been absolutely without thorns. If this superiority of bishops over priests be of divine right, that is to say, willed, ordained, and instituted by God himself—the silence of the Scripture becomes an argument of such force, that it is almost impossible to get over it.

Nevertheless, we have no doubt that many would have been bold enough to do so; but the Roman party felt, that on the divine right being once declared with regard to the inferior clergy, it

would become impossible not to declare it also with regard to the pope. If the bishops possess anything whatever that does not come from him, but directly from God, it can hardly any longer be said, correctly, that they exist only by him. It was with this feeling, then, that the Roman party again set themselves to have the question set aside under this form, as they had so often before set it aside under the other.

Already it had only been by dint of skilful management and address that the council had succeeded in keeping the pope out of sight in the first debates on the sacrament of orders. The more, in fact, the members were at one in recognising him as, in point of presidency and jurisdiction, supreme head of the Church, the more were they puzzled, in the theoretical and sacramental point of view, where to find a place and a rank for him. All the reasons they had had for not making an eighth order of the Episcopate, might be urged for not making a ninth of the pope; but, on the other hand, the superiority of the pope's spiritual powers was so evident, at least in fact, that it would have been manifestly absurd to make him again no more than a priest, equal to others in point of character, and superior merely as respects his office. It was seen, although it was not avowed, that though the administrative supremacy of the pope might dispense with the testimony of the Scripture, his spiritual supremacy could not but require to be precisely and formally indicated there, if not in words, at least in facts, the sole unexceptionable commentary on words. With the utmost possible willingness to leave him in possession of all his rights, it was very difficult, little as people set themselves to reason and search for proofs, not to feel that a power of that importance must become doubtful, and more than doubtful, from the moment that it was found that there is not a vestige of it in the New Testament.

Not a vestige, we say. What then do we make of the famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church?"

What do we make of it? Why, what we have ever made, and ever will make of all isolated passages which the Scripture and scriptural facts have left in their isolation.

First of all, and this is very serious—it is only in one of the Gospels, St. Matthew, that we read these words. We by no means, hence, conclude that they must be considered as apocryphal; but had they had originally the force and meaning attached to them afterwards, who shall explain to us the omission

of them in the three other historians of Christ? One thing alone could make this omission, of which we think too little notice has been taken, a little less extraordinary; and that is, that these three historians should have omitted the whole conversation in which St. Matthew has introduced these words. But no! turn to St. Mark, the abridger of St. Matthew, who has copied from him almost word for word, all that immediately precedes, and all that follows. He omits only three or four lines, and those the very lines in question. Turn to St. Luke, habitually so minute in details, and you find him relate all the rest, yet he equally omits them. Turn to St. John, who wrote after the other three, and must have been a witness of the consequences that those words behoved to have had, if they really had such consequences, and him too we find not deeming them of such importance as that they might not be omitted. Thus, let the Roman Catholic, who after having seen it so often repeated in his Church, could not feel surprised were he to find it appear in twenty different places in the New Testament, know, that he will find it there only in one, although the mere course of the narratives called for its being there at least in four. Let this, then, or any other Roman Catholic, imagine himself engaged in writing a life of Christ, and let him tell us if he would have forgotten these words, and if he could understand how three out of four could have agreed in forgetting them, and that, too, in relating the very conversation that led to them.

In the second place, if there be a point where the authority of tradition ought to go for nothing, in so far as not found to be clearly based on Scripture, it is this. Here, in fact, we have not to do with an idea, of which, as of some others, it may be said, that Jesus Christ has been content to leave it to his Church, as it were, in the germ, committing the care of its development to human intelligence, aided by the Holy Ghost. But we have to do with a fact; and a fact which might, and ought, if the Apostles had admitted it, to have distinctly developed itself from the very earliest days of the Church, and of which we are entitled to desire to have traces immediately after the Saviour's death.

"All the Apostles," says Pallavicini, "were not the less subject to St. Peter,—although such were their virtue and wisdom, that hardly was there ever an occasion for his exercising this jurisdiction." *Hardly ever*, is saying too much; *not at all*, is what ought to be said, inasmuch as we see, in the whole history

of the Apostles, but one of their number that was ever reprov'd by another, and the Apostle thus reprov'd is no other than St. Peter. "I withstood him to the face," says St. Paul, "because he was to be blamed." But let us leave these details; the question does not lie there. That Peter, supposing him to have been head of the Church, should not, in fact, have had any occasion to reprove, to punish, and to depose the Apostles, is very probable; but it is evident that he must have had occasion every day to intervene in the direction of their labours, in the establishment of churches, pastors, and bishops, since so much is said to us about bishops—in all those things, in fine, in which the pope maintains that he has a call from God to intervene.

Assuming this, take the book of the Acts, and ask yourselves, but seriously, and as in God's presence, if that piece of writing leaves you with the impression that Peter was the head of the Church, that he considered himself as such, that his colleagues recognised him as such.

In the first five or six chapters, it is true, we see him in the first rank. On the day of Pentecost, it is he that makes a discourse to the people. Shortly after, immediately on the effecting of a miraculous cure, it is he, too, that addresses the crowd. It is he, in fine, that pleads the cause of the infant church at the bar of the magistracy.

Well, then, in these very chapters, we may challenge any one to point to a phrase, or so much as a word, from which it can be inferred that Peter exercised any supremacy whatever, or that he did anything in virtue of some special office, peculiar to himself. Such as we see him in the Gospels, even before his Master addressed to him the words which have been so much abused, such do we see him also here; prompt to put himself forward, prompt to speak, except that he had sometimes shown little maturity in his ideas, whereas now, directed by the Holy Ghost, he speaks as his Master would have spoken. Next, amid these details which, strictly speaking, might be reconciled with the fact of a certain superiority, we behold others which cannot be so reconciled with it, and others still that are positively contrary to it.

First, then, all that Peter does the other Apostles do, and that without the slightest indication of direction or command on his part. After having reported his first address, the historian says that the faithful "continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine," and every time he recurs to the union of the new brethren, it is

the Apostles in a body whom he represents as the heads of the Church. In the cure wrought on the lame man, Peter, though accompanied by John, seems to have acted alone, but it had been said shortly before that many wonders and signs were done by *the Apostles*.¹ Was a successor to Judas to be elected? It is Peter that makes the proposal, but he does nothing more. He ordains in no way whatever; he says nothing that seems to come from a man in a position to ordain. Nevertheless, he was not, at that moment, alone with his old colleagues, to whom one might imagine that he might possibly, from a kindly feeling, avoid making a display of his authority; above a hundred disciples were present. On the proposal being acceded to, is it he, do we find, that is to name the person to be appointed? Not at all. He says nothing about him; nobody mentions him. It is the assembled believers that present two candidates, and it is the lot that decides. Does Peter proceed at least to consecrate this new colleague? Of this the historian says nothing. "Matthias was numbered with the eleven Apostles." Are deacons to be elected,—a matter of great importance, for it was a new institution that was to be created,—here Peter is not even named. "Then *the twelve* called the multitude of the disciples unto them and said,—the saying pleased the whole multitude,—*they* chose Stephen, Philip,—whom they set *before the Apostles*,—*who laid their hands* on them." Finally, when Peter, agreeably to divine intimation, took it upon him to baptize a pagan without having referred the matter to the Church, it was not only his colleagues, but "the believers," the mere believers, "contended with him;" and not only does he justify himself with the air of a man who thinks it quite natural that he should be asked to account for what he had done, but his discourse contains no allusion to any superiority of any kind. We could very well conceive that Peter, even on the weightiest occasions, may have adopted a very different tone from that which the popes were afterwards to assume; but not to utter a single word that could bear that meaning, never to make a single appeal, or the slightest allusion, to a pri-

¹ "Peter," says Bossuet *on the Unity* (of the Church), "appears the first in all things; the first to make a confession of the faith—the first that confirmed the faith by a miracle." Here the error is obvious. The cure of the lame man *in the Acts*, occurs in the 3d chapter, and it is in the second that mention is made of the miracles wrought by *the Apostles*. The same remark applies to Bossuet's other assertion, that Peter was *the first to confess the faith*. He was, in point of fact, the first to say, in reply to a question from the Saviour, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God;" but this does not imply that he was the first to believe in the divinity of his Master, if, indeed, it can be said that any of them believed in it previous to Christ's resurrection, and the sending of the Holy Ghost.

macy with which he must have believed himself to be invested by a formal act of his Master's will; this would amount to improbability, carried to a higher degree than had ever been reached in any history.

"Had St. Peter," says De Maistre, "a distinct knowledge of the extent of his prerogative? I cannot tell." Such, let us remark, is the pass to which one of the most ardent defenders of the Holy See is reduced. The man who scatters his *yes* and his *no* where everybody before him had hesitated. "I cannot tell," says he! It is perhaps the only confession of ignorance that his book contains. What a confession then! And what must not have been the cogency of the conviction that wrung it from him! Thus you hear him say, we dare not affirm that the very man to whom it was said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," saw, inspired though he was by the Holy Spirit, in these words what his pretended successors would fain see in them.

To historical improbability, let us now join that resulting from the silence of the Apostles, comprising that of St. Peter himself, in their writings. St. Paul says (Epistle to the Galatians) that he went up to Jerusalem "to see Peter," "to confer with Peter," a phrase marked by a strange simplicity, if it were really in order to receive orders from the Church's chief,—it is Paul who, in the same epistle, when speaking of another journey to Jerusalem, names Peter after James; it is Paul also, always in the same epistle, who dares to write, "when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face." And how did he withstand him? As an inferior who takes the liberty to make some remarks? We have already quoted his words: he withstood him to the face, "because Peter was to be blamed." And, a little farther on, "When I saw that they (the Jews and Peter) walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel, *I said unto Peter before them all.*" &c. Mark that this took place *fourteen years* after the journey to Jerusalem, that is to say, at an epoch when Christians and Christian Churches were beginning to be seen everywhere, and when St. Peter's primacy, were it even in spite of himself, ought to have had a thousand occasions of being overtly exercised; mark, also, that the epistle from which this is taken was itself written a long time after the stay at Antioch, and, which is still more significant, was written from Rome: from Rome where St. Peter, if ever he was there at all, must necessarily have been then; from Rome, in fine, the Church's

centre, and the see of the Church's head. If then St. Paul believed in the primacy of his colleague, this epistle was not only an act of rebellion against him, but a piece of actual perfidy towards the Galatians, seeing that it left them entirely beyond the pale of that Roman unity, beyond which, we are told, there is no salvation, and prevented them from so much as suspecting either the necessity or the existence of any supreme head of the Church other than Jesus Christ.

And why speak we of the Galatians? Not only the Galatians, but the Corinthians, the Ephesians, the Thessalonians, the Romans themselves, the faithful of all countries, in fine, have been left by the authors of the epistles in ignorance on this point. When there were so many different Churches, threatened with so many dangers, united by so many spiritual ties, but otherwise so isolated, of so little account in the eyes of the world, so lost in the immensity of the empire, is it possible that there could be men, and men, too, inspired by God, that could have written fifteen epistles without telling them, without reminding them, at least, if they knew it, that God had given them a common head! For it is a poor subterfuge to say, as is sometimes said, "The thing was so universally known that it was needless to mention it." The more you suppose it to have been universally known and admitted—impossible though it be to maintain this in the face of the words and the conduct of St. Paul—the more will it be absurd to conceive that St. Paul, or St. John, or St. James, or St. Peter himself, should never have made the slightest allusion to it.

Assuming this, it is clear that we need little disquiet ourselves about what tradition may teach contrary to facts so potent and so indisputable. Should St. Peter's primacy be found positively mentioned by authors of the second or of the first century, still, with the epistles in our hand, we may pronounce those authors mistaken.

But it so happens that more than four centuries had elapsed before the words "*Thou art Peter*," began to be generally interpreted in the present Roman sense. Down till then, notwithstanding the visible advances made by the idea that was finally to carry all before it, the most widely diffused opinion was precisely that which has been adopted by the Protestants for the explanation of these words. "On this stone," says Chrysostom,¹ "that is to say, *on the faith of this confession*, I will build my

¹ Fifty-fifth Homily on Matt. xiii.

Church. This confession is that which the Apostle made in reply to that question of the Master, 'And what say ye that I am?'—'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' was St. Peter's answer." "Then," says St. Ambrose,¹ "the Lord replies to him: On this stone I will build my Church, that is to say, on this confession of the universal faith I build the faithful that they may have life." "What," says St. Augustine,² "is the meaning of this saying of Jesus Christ? It is this: I will build my Church on this faith, on what has just been said, to wit, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" And elsewhere,³ "On this rock which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church; for the rock was Christ." "It was Christ," says St. Jerome also.⁴ Christ or his vicar, we shall be told. Yes, it is thus indeed that the matter is arranged at the present day; but it will ever remain not the less true that these two Fathers do not say so, and that at the moment when, if ever, they might have been expected to express themselves distinctly. Whatever leaning they, in common with the age in which they lived, might have had for Roman centralization, they were still far from regarding it as founded on a command emanating from God; the idea of a certain preference accorded to St. Peter, did not yet carry along with it in their minds that of a real, permanent, transmissible supremacy. Hence those contradictions, those incoherences, which behoved to disappear on the system being once regularly established, but which sufficiently prove how far that still was from being the case. Origen, for example, after having said somewhere that the rock is St. Peter, says not the less at another place,⁵ "The rock, that is, every disciple of Christ. Is it not for all the Apostles, for each of them that he has said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church?'" Here then we have only in a more practical form the explanation given by Jerome and Augustine. The rock, that is, the confession of faith made by Peter, and every believer who shall make the same confession with him, may apply to himself the saying of which he had, as it were, the first fruits on this occasion.

Thus, whatever meaning may be given to these words, it still remains to be proved that it was Rome, that it was the pope,

¹ On the 2d chap. to the Ephesians.

² On the 1st Epistle of St. John.

³ On the Gospel of St. John.

⁴ Commentary on St. Matthew. See also Cyril on the Trinity, l. iv. Hilary on the Trinity, l. ii. and vi. Basil of Seleucia's Homily on St. Matthew, &c.

⁵ Commentary on St. Matthew.

that was exclusively called to reap the benefit of them. Were it demonstrated that St. Peter was the head of the Church, still the Roman question, properly so called, would not thereby have been the more advanced, or made the clearer.

First of all, how shall we dispose of chronological difficulties? We do not insist that the quarter of a century assigned by tradition to the episcopate of St. Peter shall be proved to us to a day, to a year, to about two years; but, indeed, make the calculation in what manner you please, it is not two, or four, or ten years that are wanting: one knows not where to find a single year that could have seen that Apostle at the head of the faithful in Rome. Tradition places his death, as well as that of St. Paul, in the year 66. Now, the book of the Acts shews him to have been at Jerusalem, at Cæsarea, at Antioch, until the year 51 or 52. Thus, already we have but fourteen or fifteen years left over. Were these fourteen or fifteen years passed in Rome? In the year 57 or 58, St. Paul writes the epistle to the Romans, the longest of his epistles, and not a remembrance, not an allusion, not a word is there for the alleged founder and head of the Church to which he writes. Nay more, he who at the close of his letters salutes ordinarily no more than five or six persons, and often not so many, on this occasion salutes *twenty-seven*. And Peter is not among them. In the year 62 or 63, he writes from Rome to the churches of Philippi, Ephesus, and Colosse; he gives them a multiplicity of details about what he has seen and heard, yet not a word about Peter. In 66, the very year of his death, again he writes from Rome to Timothy. He tells him his position, his isolation, his sufferings. "All men forsook me," says he, "except Onesiphorus." Where, then, was Peter?

Before these arguments of facts, of figures, what can tradition avail, even supposing it to be as clear and constant as we have seen that it is vague and variable? Is it not a problem to explain how there could have arisen, unless from a total forgetfulness of the New Testament, the idea of Peter's episcopacy at Rome? Is it not also a problem, and a very sad problem withal, to conceive how there should be men who know these details as well as we, and who not the less persist in placing at the foundation of Roman Catholic unity, this old and eternal lie which they are sensible falls to dust in their hands?

And now, that we may not altogether pass over a point which the preceding remarks, nevertheless, would authorize our setting aside, is tradition, as we have expressed it, at least clear and constant?

We might take one by one all the passages in the Fathers which are adduced in favour of the popedom, and we might shew that there is not one of them positive enough to be of any serious avail in a question where the matter at issue is to prove at once the law and the fact. Let a single passage be pointed out to us, not where something is vaguely said about the privileges of St. Peter, of the rights of the bishop of Rome, but where it is positively said—

That St. Peter was the supreme head of the Church ;

That the other Apostles were subject to him ;

That all his rights have passed to his successors ;

That the pope is thus the sole legitimate source of all the spiritual powers exercised in the Church ;

And then, then only will the subject be worth discussing. Are we asking too much ? The antiquity of this fact, now held as incontrovertible in all the pages of all the Roman books that have been written for the last thousand years, so impossible is it from the moment of its being admitted, not to speak of it at every turn,—the antiquity of this fact some would fain we should consider as proved by a few lines of a Father who, in works filling ten volumes, shall have two or three times said something approaching it ! But we have only to open those Fathers to find passages in which it is utterly inconceivable that they should not have spoken of the pope, had they believed in him ; and for one word from which people hazard the inference that they believed in him, we should find a hundred which we might defy a Roman Catholic to be able to write at the present day without ceasing to be regarded as a Roman Catholic.

So much for the Fathers of the third and the fourth centuries ; what then may we expect to find in those of the second and the first ? In the second, we have Irenæus. He admits, no doubt, a journey made by Peter to Rome, a journey which might in fact have taken place, although it is far from likely, in the course of one of those years in which we cannot precisely determine where that Apostle was ; he makes him concur with St. Paul in the founding of the Church of that city ; but it is neither he nor St. Paul, it is Linus, the second bishop of Rome, according to present tradition, whom he names as having been the first. It is to Linus also that the *Apostolic constitutions*¹ give this title, and what is still more convincing, they represent him as having been installed by St. Paul. In the first century we find Clemens

¹ Book vii. 46.

Romanus, the third or the fourth of the popes.¹ In his epistle to the Corinthians he speaks of St. Peter as having died in the west, but he does not say that it was at Rome; an omission altogether inexplicable, had it been the general opinion that he died there. But does he not speak of him at least as having been bishop of Rome? No. As supreme head of the Church? No. Does he, the bishop of Rome, represent himself as his successor? No. He puts at the head of his letter, "The Church of God which is at Rome to the Church of God which is at Corinth." Like St. Paul, he confounds *bishop* and *presbyter*; he puts the *episcopi* in the first rank and the *deacons* in the second. A strange pope indeed! Nevertheless, this is the very epistle which, as we have said, was very nearly inserted afterwards in the New Testament. What would the popes have made of it? Alas! they would have done the same with it as they have done with those of St. Paul and St. Peter. Not the less would they have been popes; not the less haughtily would they have trumpeted the primacy, the popedom of St. Peter, and all the consequences they have drawn from it. Once engaged in a false course, of what moment is a little more or a little less?

It was not this, then, to return to our council, that proved the worst cause of embarrassment to the doctors of Trent. Never departing from the Roman Catholic point of view, they found no difficulty in keeping themselves easy with respect to the Protestant objections, even though, like many of those we have stated, they had all the eloquence of figures. Other difficulties, all the more untoward, in that there was nothing Protestant about them, risked intruding themselves into the discussion.

See, then, the pope, head of the Church, exclusive source of all spiritual powers, &c. If such he be at the present day, he must necessarily have been so, in point of lawful title at least, since immediately after the death of Jesus Christ. Looking back to that period, what are we to make of the other Apostles?

Let us accept, as fully as you please, the pre-eminence of Peter; still you cannot get rid of two facts which obstinately refuse to bend to the Roman system,—one, that the colleagues of Peter received from Jesus Christ, like him and at the same time with him, their authority and their commission; the other, that they acted constantly, in the sequel, as persons entirely free to

¹ The *Apostolic Constitutions* were long attributed to him. It is now admitted that they belong to the 4th century, with posterior intercalations, which renders the omission of St. Peter's pontificate still more striking.

transmit that authority and commission from themselves to whomsoever they might deem fit. Paul laid his hands on Timothy; Timothy laid his hands on a number of pastors, of *bishops*, to adopt the language of Rome; and in all the instructions given by Paul on that subject there does not appear to have been any question about establishing, or maintaining, any bond whatever between those pastors and a supreme head.

Now, in whatever manner the relevancy of these two facts may be sought to be lessened, they have a mighty bearing on the point at issue. If there could exist, it matters not when, a single generation of legitimate pastors independent of St. Peter, the Roman chain is broken. Although it should be successfully proved that in the next following generation, Peter, or his successor, had become the centre, still we should be authorized to see in him only a head in fact, not in right, and to view the popedom only as an institution more or less useful in regard to unity, not as an institution necessary for the transmission of powers. Mark what Luther said at an epoch when he still proclaimed, as loudly as any, the necessity of there being a supreme head of the Church,—“The bishop of Rome is above all by his dignity. To him we must address ourselves in all cases of difficulty. *Yet I admit that I know not how I could defend against the Greeks the supremacy that I concede to him.*”¹

But Luther, perhaps, without being aware of it, was already detached from that unity which he still preached, and this may have magnified to his eyes the objections to it. Let us turn, then, from the man of the sixteenth to the man of the third century, Origen,—“If you believe that God has built his Church on Peter, and on Peter alone, what will you make of John, the son of thunder, and of each of the other ten Apostles? Was it not for the Apostles, for each of them, that it was said, “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it;” and again,—“Upon this rock I will build my Church?”² It is curious that the Roman Church forces us to go to the Fathers to confront her out of them more surely, with objections which we should find quite as well in the Apostles themselves. Origen’s idea is no other than that of St. Paul, when writing to the Ephesians,—“Ye are built *upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets.*” There is nothing even in the Apocalypse, where we do not approve in general of dogmas being looked for, that does not here come to our support. What are we to conclude respecting those “twelve foundations,

¹ Letter to Dungersheim, 1519.

² Commentary on St. Matthew.

and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb?" How can we imagine that this could have been written, even in an allegory, by one who believed in that high primacy of one of the twelve?

We have said accordingly: let there have been but a single generation of bishops, legitimate, though independent of St. Peter, and the chain is broken. But have we but one generation to appeal to? Who will shew us in the second, or in the third century, a single trace of the intervention of the pope in the ordination of bishops? What astonishment, what profound stupefaction, would have seized the believers of Jerusalem, Ephesus, and Antioch, had any one bethought himself of telling them at that epoch that their bishops were usurpers and intruders, seeing that they had not derived their powers from Rome! Four or five centuries later, in the west, in Italy itself, amid all those waves which were impelled by the same wind towards Rome, Churches still were found that, like islands, opposed that immense current. It is only in the tenth century that we find that of Milan submit definitively to the papal supremacy. Less than one hundred years before that, Roboald, bishop of Alos, when consulted on the subject by the archbishop, replied that *he would rather have his nose split up to his eyes*¹ than advise him to submit.

The Roman Church has even been obliged to make some concessions in this respect, and little as the consequences have been pressed, they would lead far enough. It gives the title of patriarchs, with certain special honours, to the bishops who occupy, or are understood to occupy, the seats of St. Peter's colleagues. We must refer the reader to Hurter² for the long tentative efforts by which Romanists have come at length to explain, for better or worse, by evading what seemed too stubborn to bend to their purposes, the co-existence of patriarchs and the pope, of a supreme head and of primitively independent heads, and whose position cannot, in point of right, have undergone any change. In the actual state of things, as the patriarchs are all either beyond the pale of the Roman Church, or mere archbishops appointed by the pope, this system presents no serious inconveniences to the central authority; all that it costs is the

¹ Quod prius sustineret nasum suum scindi usque ad oculos. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*.

² Institutions of the Church, ch. v. The very name of *pope*, long given to a certain number of bishops, became official only under Leo I., and exclusive under Gregory VII. towards the year 1080.

putting upon the altar, when the pope officiates pontifically, a lofty tiara surrounded by five mitres, as emblematical of the pope-dom amid the patriarchates. But if, without keeping ourselves to things as they are, we were to ask ourselves what they might be, to what results might we not come? That each of the Apostles had been established in a town; that that town had been governed ever since by an uninterrupted succession of bishops, successors of the first,—so that we should have eleven patriarchs, eleven bishops warranted to believe themselves as independent of the bishop of Rome as the eleven Apostles were of Peter; eleven bishops, consequently, entitled to ordain other bishops, to establish bishopricks, to exercise, in fine, each in his own sphere, the plenitude of the present papal power. Here, then, we have the pope no more than *primus inter pares*, and if other dioceses should at all comprise, as might also have happened, a country of some extent—one France, another Spain, another Germany, and so on—what would there have remained for the diocese of St. Peter?

All this is not the case, but all this is possible, and when we come to speak of right, possibility suffices. If the bishop of Rome could once have risked being, and remaining, merely the bishop of Rome or of Italy, his quality of universal bishop is a bare fact which does not prove the right. The Church, let us assume, may have had the power, if she had the will, to concede to him a certain universal jurisdiction; but in point of divine right, he is only a bishop, or at the most only a patriarch like another.

We see the patriarchal see of Constantinople, erected so long after the other three,¹ obtain almost immediately the pre-eminence, and this, says the Roman Catechism, because Constantinople became the seat of the empire. That of Jerusalem, on the contrary, which might have preferred so many claims to be considered as the first, was reputed the fourth. Why? Because Jerusalem was, politically, the least considerable of the four cities. Thus Rome herself makes the admission; it was for reasons purely human that the second capital of the empire saw her bishop become the second of the Christian world. The same motives, therefore, might have sufficed for raising to the first rank that of the first capital, and the conquest of the Roman empire by the popes no better proved their right to possess it than the formation itself of that empire proved the right of the

¹ Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

ancient Romans to be the masters of the world. A conquest, made in what manner you please, is but a fact. The question of right remains the same after as before. It is for the same reason that we leave untouched, and that without any injustice, the services which the popedom may have rendered to Christianity and to Europe. Even were there no shade to mar the picture that is presented to us, the theological and the moral question is not thereby advanced. Every despotism has necessarily some happy results; peace, order, progress in the arts and literature, have not, within certain limits, a surer basis to rest upon. Never was France more peaceable internally than under the reign of the man who had said,—“The state, that is myself.” Shall this be held a proof that he had the logical right to say so? “The Church, that is myself,” said the popedom. The benefits it has conferred, were they incontestable, would not, therefore, prove that it was in the right, and it is only by a sophism that the discussion can in our days be transferred to that ground.¹

Such was, in fact, the conclusion at which, in the discussions of the council, all those divines or prelates arrived who sought for reasons rather than words, and were bold enough to utter them when found. We could wish that the leading speeches delivered on this occasion were in the hands of every honest and reflective Roman Catholic; we could hand them over to him with the utmost confidence, without altering a word, and adding nothing but an invitation to deduce the consequences that flow from them. Not that they do not further involve more than one principle which we should have to contest, seeing that it was in the interests of the bishops, not of religious liberty, that the speakers talked of abasing the pope; but, putting all things together, we should not let these much disquiet us. The pope once given up, what would become of the rest? and notwithstanding all their protestations to the contrary, those certainly

¹ De Maistre indirectly admits this. “The French,” says he, “have had, thanks to Charlemagne, the honour of constituting, humanly speaking, the Catholic Church in the world, by raising its head to a rank—without which he would have been no better than a patriarch of Constantinople, the pitiable sport of Christian sultans.” Is not this saying clearly enough, that if the popes had not become kings of Rome, the sovereigns would not have seen in them anything more than patriarchs? Is not this tantamount to saying, a little less clearly, that previous to that, they were nothing else? Let us agree with him also in what he says of Charlemagne, for we are aware there are some who will absolutely have it that Rome was given to the popes by Constantine, the first of the Christian emperors. Although Ariosto sets down this donation as among the number of falsehoods which Astolphe found in the moon, with the prayers of the wicked, lovers’ sighs, &c.—so many historical lies are brought into credit again that we must not be too sanguine in thinking that we have done with them in this case.

did give him up, who, at Trent, made the speeches of which our objections are almost an analysis and an abstract.

With regard to the harsh truths which came out in the course of this debate, it would be curious to confront them with the assertions of the popes, when, speaking without control, they trace the bold picture of their rights. We should not go in search of the raving tirades of a Gregory VII., a Boniface VIII., a Paul IV., or a Sixtus V.; the most moderate bulls would suffice for our purpose. "Let all remember," it is said in the Encyclical Letter of 1832, "that it is to the Roman pontiff that there has been given by Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, directing, and governing the Church, as has been declared by the Fathers of the council of Florence." The Fathers of *Florence!* Why, then, not those of Trent, whom you are so fond of quoting, and who, in fact, are quoted some lines farther on, upon the question of the infallibility of the Church? Why, because at Florence, under the pope's dictation, the matter had passed without discussion; whereas, at Trent, where discussion was ventured upon, the popedom was quite happy at the members being so complacent as to say nothing about it at all. Yes, Roman Catholics, not a word! The very man who is pointed out to you as at the summit of the hierarchy, the Council of Trent, in the course of a long decree on the hierarchy, has not found the opportunity of naming. You might read that decree from beginning to end without ever suspecting that there was a pope in the world. Of the eight canons that follow, you might read seven without any more suspicion on the subject; then, quite at the end, you would find one condemning the opinion that bishops named by the pope are not legitimate bishops; but even there it is not said that they are the only legitimate bishops.

How are we to reconcile this excessive moderation with the warmth of indignation which seized the assembly one day because a Spanish bishop, Avosmediano, had advanced that the intervention of the pope in the institution of bishops is not absolutely necessary? "Some prelates," says Pallavicini,¹ "with an imprudent or affected zeal, exclaimed, 'Turn him out!' Others went so far as to exclaim, Anathema! Like insults resounded on all sides; others again tried to prevent his being heard by shuffling with their feet or hissing." Had he had less reason on his side, would there have been such a noise? He would have done better indeed, to say the truth, not to have

¹ Book xix. ch. v.

stated that the Archbishop of Saltzburg named and instituted his four suffragans, for one could reply that it was in virtue of a concession on the part of the pope ; but what answer could be made to all he urged before he had referred to that ? He had said that the Chrysostoms, the Augustines, the Ambroses, had not been instituted by the pope ; he had said that the canons of Nice, in regulating what related to the institution of bishops, make no mention of the pope. If this was true, why make a tumult ? If false, why not decree the contrary ?

But Avosmediano was not alone. Guerrero, Archbishop of Grenada, declared, that all bishops, including the pope, are equal and brethren, and that the sole veritable inequality existing among them is an inequality of jurisdiction, an ecclesiastical and human inequality. In support of this view he quoted a large enough number of the writings of the first ages of the Church, where not only do popes give to mere bishops the name of *brethren*, which might, strictly speaking, be from politeness only, but where bishops themselves addressed the bishop of Rome as their brother and colleague. He shewed that even at the epoch when the pope began to be generally recognised as head of the Church, the bishops still spoke to him only as an administrative and hierarchical head, not at all as a man from whom they could have believed that they held their authority ; witness Augustine, who in his epistles treats popes Innocent I. and Boniface I.¹ as colleagues ; witness Jerome also, writing to Evagrius, that whatever be the place where a man is a bishop, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, each bishop has the same merit and the same priesthood, and all are successors of the Apostles. The archbishop made those especially the objects of his raillery who had said that no doubt the Apostles had been made bishops by Jesus Christ, but that Peter alone had had the right bestowed on him of making others ; he asked them if they had never then read the book of the Acts. He made very merry also with those who alleged that the Apostles, before setting themselves to the work of the ministry,

¹ Hoc etiam *fratri et consacerdoti* nostro Bonifacio, *vel* aliis earum partium episcopis, pro confirmando isto canone, innotescat. (Council of Carthage, 419.) This passage has often been adduced in favour of the popedom ; it only bears more powerfully against it. Are we told that the Carthaginian Fathers here recognise the primacy of the pope ? True, but in this they call him *brother* and *colleague*, which absolutely excludes the idea of a primacy such as Romanists would have had it to be since. They ask from him the confirmation of their canons, it is added. By no means, but of *one* of their canons, the *forty-seventh*, where the question relates to the apocryphal books. (See above, b. ii.) In fine, is it addressed to him alone ? No. It is not even to him and some other bishops, but to him *or* to some others.

had had themselves ordained bishops by their colleague; which, nevertheless, is the only explanation whereby to escape from the alternative of having either twelve popes or none. He adverted, in fine, to the famous letter of Pope Gregory I. to John, Bishop of Constantinople, who affected the title of universal bishop, "Have you come to this," wrote that pope to him, "that despising your brethren, you desire to be called the only bishop!" "Let your holiness acknowledge," he went on to say, "how you puff yourself up with pride when you affect being called by a name which no one ever pretended to who was truly holy. No doubt, as your fraternity knows, the pontiffs of this apostolical see which I fill, have received as a mark of honour, from the venerable council of Chalcedon, the title of universal bishops. And yet not one of them wished to be called by that name; none of them took to himself that rash qualification, for fear lest, should he arrogate to himself in the episcopal dignity the glory of being unique, he might seem to refuse it to all his brethren."¹ There is no end to the conclusions to be drawn from this curious piece. Conclusions from the words: it is a pope who uses the expression *your holiness* in addressing a bishop; it is a pope who says to him, "despising *thy brethren*," a proof of the equality of bishops, including that of Rome, for it is clear that if any one insults you, and you complain to him that he has despised *his brethren*, you do not look on yourself as essentially superior to him. Conclusions from the facts: when was it that the title in question was given to the popes? At the council of Chalcedon, in the middle of the fifth century. How was it given to them? as a matter of right? No; as a mark of honour. Did they accept it? No one, down to Gregory I., that is, down to the close of the sixth century, would consent to take it. And why? Because it was a *rash* qualification. Accordingly, it was not only in its literal signification, but even as an honorific formula that it was rejected by Gregory I. If he blames Bishop John, it is not for having taken it away from him, Bishop of Rome though he was, but for reasons drawn from the nature itself of that title. Thus, whatever the pretensions of the See of Rome were even at that early epoch, it is evident that the man that

¹ Ad hoc perductus es ut, despectis fratribus, episcopus appetas solus vocari. Vestra autem sanctitas agnoscat quantum apud se tument, quae illo nomine vocari appetit, quo vocari nullus praesumpsit qui veraciter sanctus fuit. Numquid non, sicut vestra fraternitas novit, per venerandum Chalcedonense concilium hujus apostolicae sedes antistites *universales*, oblato honore, vocati sunt. Sed tamen nullus unquam tali vocabulo appellari voluit, nullus sibi hoc temerarium nomen arripuit, ne si sibi in pontificatus gradu gloriam singularitatis arriperet, hanc omnibus fratribus denegasse videretur.

could have traced those lines, considered himself as neither universal bishop, nor as the source of the authority of the bishops.

Such then were the memorials of the past which those who desired to have the superiority of bishops to priests declared to be of divine right, were not afraid to evoke in the midst of the council. We have said already, that this opinion in itself was not displeasing to the ultramontanists. They dreaded it only in view of the consequences that flowed from it, and the arguments to which recourse was had might suffice to shew them its full bearing. Farther doubt was impossible; to arm the episcopate with the divine right as respected mere priests, would be to arm them with it as respected the pope.

There was kept, therefore, perpetually suspended, like a sword above the assembly, this alarming consequence, which the Spaniards themselves, no more than the Gallicans, proposed to deduce in all its rigour, but at which they, like the others, would have shuddered had they better understood the results to which it might lead. Logically there is no middle point; the pope is everything,¹ or nothing; the keystone of the arch, or a stone which has no more importance of itself than any other; the sole universal bishop, or a mere bishop accidentally elevated to the presidency of the episcopal body, and whom the Church might either replace by another, or reduce to the common level without even replacing him. However great the danger might be, the legates and their adherents, who saw it best, had not even the resource left them of converting it into an argument; for it was necessary that they should provide for the case of there being a majority, notwithstanding all they might say, in favour of the divine right of bishops, and they had to guard against depriving themselves beforehand of the means of attenuating the bearing of that vote to the utmost extent possible. Had they exclaimed with an excess of zeal and alarm that it would be tantamount to voting the ruin of the hierarchy and the Church, what, in the event of that being voted, could they have replied to the heretics who might take advantage of it as involving such a result? It was only in secret, therefore, and with many precautions, that they represented to the waverers the frightful mischief they would do were they to join the Spaniards. Next, as they did not venture as yet to reckon on a respectable majority, they tried to prevent the voting from taking place. "The Confession of Augs-

¹ "Without the pope there is no Christianity."—DE MAISTRE.

burg," it was said, "was silent on the point: what good purpose did it serve to defend what was not attacked?" It was replied, that though the Confession of Augsburg did not treat the matter dogmatically, it decided it sufficiently in point of fact, seeing that it did not acknowledge either the pope or the bishops of the pope; that there was in this, therefore, very really in the eyes of Roman Catholics, an error which the council could not avoid condemning. Thus the subterfuge proving of no avail, they had to submit to the questions being voted upon.

The vote did therefore take place, in order to give precision to the question, on the adjunction of the words *de jure divino* in the decree, where it is said that bishops are superior to priests. Fifty-four voices were given for and a hundred and twenty-seven against. Is it true, as Sarpi affirms, that a certain number of the bishops who were partisans of the divine right, not daring to vote according to their conscience, and not wishing to vote against it, staid away? Pallavicini says no; but a letter from Visconti to Cardinal Borromeo positively attests it, and Payva¹ makes the number of prelates at this time attending the council amount to two hundred and thirty. There were about fifty, then, who did not vote at all. Certain it is that the legates durst not avail themselves of this vote as a ground for stopping discussion. We see it recommence the day following, and the more the dispute waxed in fierceness the more was it forgotten that the heretics would take advantage of all the admissions made on both sides.

Hence it was that, in one of the last sittings, the Polonese Zeschowid, Bishop of Segna, was not afraid to transfer the question to the ever perilous ground of the constitution and authority of the council. "If the authority of the bishops," said he, "does not proceed from God, what can that of an assemblage of bishops amount to? An assembly, however numerous, can derive its authority only from the same source from which the members themselves derive theirs. If each of us be nothing but what the pope makes us, the council is nothing but what he makes it, and our authority sinks to the level of a body of doctors pronouncing, but not infallibly, on the questions submitted to them. This assuredly is not the idea of the council, that the nations and kings that have been urgently calling for it had formed to themselves. As for myself," said he, "had I not had the conviction that we should be here with the sanction of God and of the Holy Ghost, never should I have come to Trent. Since

¹ *Defense du Concile de Trente*, l. 1.

there possibly may come to be, what I never suspected, uncertainties with respect to the nature of our authority as council, from the first, what Christendom, what we ourselves, ought to believe and to teach upon this point? In secular law proceedings, from the moment that there is the slightest doubt with respect to the competence of the tribunal, does it not begin by examining that question itself, and by declaring in virtue of what sanction, its judgment will be pronounced?"

The Bishop of Segna very well knew why this had not been done, and what were the hindrances opposed to its ever being done. As for his arguments, we heartily agree with them, but with this remark with regard to them as well as those of all the prelates of the opposition, that they went a great deal farther than he had the appearance of believing. "If each bishop," said he, "derives authority only from the pope, then no more will an assembly of bishops derive theirs from any other source." What, then, would have been his reply, if, pursuing the same line of argument, but giving it a different application, it had been said to him, "Each bishop is fallible; an assembly of bishops, therefore, cannot be infallible?"

This speech effectually opened all eyes to the perils of the situation. Many of the leading partisans of the divine right began to be seriously alarmed at the consequences that might result from a dispute which nobody knew how to bring to a close.

The ultramontanists were confounded. What was now to be done? To raise the cry of heresy! But those same Spaniards had shewn themselves, in all questions relating to doctrine, the stiffest defenders of Romanism. They had repeatedly held firm when the pope himself had been disposed to yield; they were, moreover, the representatives of the only prince who had as yet made no concession to heretics. Should they proceed to vote? But a vote had been already taken, and the discussion had continued notwithstanding. The majority durst not avail itself of the vote they had obtained; they felt that to vote was not to reply, especially on a question in a great measure historical, and on which every one might exercise his own judgment. They proceeded, therefore, to attempt a reply once for all, and that through Lainez as their organ, the general of the Jesuits, towards whom the eyes of all Italy had long been turned. Ever since the colloquy of Poissy, where he had won the esteem and admiration of the Roman party by his audacity, he had been

rapidly rising in reputation; the court of Rome and the ultramontanists of all countries had magnified him in proportion to the services expected from him and his order. To your task, then, thou eldest born of Loyola! Behold the scaffolding that requires being propped! Behold Spain, most Catholic Spain, setting herself to unsettle its foundations, though never unsettled before. It is time, and more than time, that help were at hand.

On the 20th of October Lainez addressed the council. His friends had contrived to secure an entire sitting for him. Great was the expectation on both sides.

Shall we take his speech, then, as reported in Sarpi or in Pallavicini? They both state that they had transcribed it from an authentic copy, and yet these two speeches have almost nothing in common. That given by Sarpi is the better reasoned of the two; that in Pallavicini is the more subtle, more *Jesuitical*, using that expression not offensively, but merely as expressive of the feeling we experience from it. The historian, accordingly, considers it as "magnificent," though he admits that that of Sarpi has fine passages in it, and that he himself long believed it authentic. For the rest he gives no warranty for his own being more so. All things well considered, that of Sarpi seems to us to do more honour to Lainez than the long tissue of quibbles of which the historian makes him the author. Moreover, the doctrines laid down in both are the same, and our observations will bear as much as possible on what forms the essence of both.

Thus, according to Sarpi, he first laid down the principle that all comparison between the Church and civil societies was necessarily inexact. Civil societies have in themselves, said he, the source of all the powers by means of which they constitute and maintain themselves; the Church, on the contrary, has neither made nor constituted itself: it was Jesus Christ, its sovereign monarch, who began by laying down laws, and then set himself to construct the body which those laws were to govern. From this we see that the Church came into being posterior to the laws, in virtue of which she is what she is; essentially subject, consequently, she has not in herself, and by herself, any kind of liberty, jurisdiction, or power. Is she not constantly represented in Scripture under the image of a field that has been sown, a net thrown into the sea, a building? But a field is not sown by itself; a net does not go of its own accord into the sea; a building has not, and cannot have any influence on its own construc-

tion. Now, the first and only foundation on which the Church has been built, in so far as it is a divine building, but destined to perpetuate itself on the earth, is St. Peter. To him were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven; to him alone it was said, "Feed my sheep," and no one will affirm that the sheep have anything to do with the direction of the flock of which each is only a unit. When Jesus Christ was upon this earth, it is evident that none of the believers had the smallest power or the smallest jurisdiction. The pope being his successor, nothing is changed, nothing can be changed, in this primitive order: it is in the pope, therefore, that we have to look for the plenitude of power and jurisdiction. Moreover, it was to St. Peter alone that Jesus Christ said that he had prayed for him "that his faith might not fail,"—there is not, and there cannot be, anything infallible except in the pope.

Assuming this, still following Lainez, it was to St. Peter that the charge reverted of conferring the quality of bishops on his colleagues. Did he do so? The opinion is very probable; if not, the simplest thing is to say that Jesus Christ did for once what behoved to have been done by his vicar. The bishops, consequently, are the successors of the Apostles only in the sense of their being in their place, but just as a bishop does not pretend to derive his authority from his predecessor, so the Apostles were no more than the predecessors of the bishops, and having nothing properly inherent in themselves, had nothing which they could leave to them. Will it be said that, according to this, the pope would have it in his power to abolish the episcopate? No. It is of divine right that there are bishops in the Church; but this hinders not that each bishop, viewed individually, may exist only by papal right. The pope cannot destroy at once all the bishoprics, since it is God's will that they should exist; but he may pronounce, in a sovereign manner, on the existence, or the non-existence, of each bishopric in particular. Though St. Paul has said that "the Church is the pillar and foundation of the truth," this does not mean that she is so by herself; the Apostle thus expressed himself only because he contemplated the Church in conjunction with her head, from whom she cannot in fact be separated, and who, in virtue of that intimate union, renders her infallible by the sole fact of his being and remaining at her head.

It will be seen that Lainez did not stop half way. Then, as now, there was nothing complete and logical, but ultra-

montane Roman Catholicism—the Roman Catholicism of the Jesuits.¹

Happily the terms logical and complete, no more now than then, are synonymes for reasonable and true. Shall we attempt to refute the above strange line of argument in detail? The falseness of the principle from which it starts throws sufficient light on the absurdity of the consequences deduced from it. Lainez begins with saying that the constituent laws of the Church existed before her, and the conclusion he draws from this is, that, born in dependence, in that dependence she has necessarily remained. No doubt, indeed, if it has been so ordered that she should be subject to the pope, she ought to be so, and to be so always. But has it been really so ordered? That is the question. The more you insist on attributing to God the institution not only of a head, but of a head such as the pope conceives himself to be, such as he says that he is when bold enough to do so,—the more force should you give to the silence of Scripture on the alleged consequences of certain words addressed to St. Peter. But in proportion as the line of argument pursued by Lainez would have shewn little tact in dealing with Protestants,—free to attack the principle directly, and to go up at once to the primitive equality of pastors,—it was embarrassing to men who had to uphold with one hand what they were pulling down with the other.

As to the question of the council's authority, he had only to follow out his deductions, and the conclusion was prepared to his hand. What others had omitted as a serious objection, namely, that according to his system an assembly of bishops would be nothing but by the pope, he adopted as a consequence quite as plain, and quite as legitimate, as any other. Among the reasons he adduced there are some precious ones to be noted, bearing against those who imagine that they escape all objections by giving up to us the infallibility of the pope, and throwing themselves on that of councils. "Each bishop is fallible," said Lainez; "an assembly of bishops therefore is fallible also; and if you admit their decisions as infallible, you admit, by that of itself, that this infallibility comes from elsewhere—that is to say, from the pope, for he alone is called to confirm its decrees. Did the authority of councils proceed from the bishops who com-

¹ "I venture not to cast the smallest doubt on the infallibility of a council-general, all I say is, that it holds this high privilege of its head, to whom the promises were made."—DE MAISTRE.

pose them, how could we give the name of councils-general to those which were never reckoned more than a very small part of the episcopal body? Under Paul III.," he added, "have we not seen the most important questions decided by fewer than fifty bishops? If their decrees have become laws of the Church, it is not, evidently, because fifty bishops have been found of the same opinions, but because the pope, approving of their opinions, has given them the force of law. In every council, however numerous, if the pope be present, it is the pope alone who pronounces, witness the formula *Approbante concilio* or *Præsente concilio*, employed in this case, according to which it is clear that the pope begins by pronouncing, and that the part of the bishops is reduced to a simple declaration of adhesion, a declaration which they could not refuse, either individually, or as a body."

He was right. This is no more than we have never ceased to say and demonstrate from the first page of this history. When a council and a pope meet, one of the two must necessarily be everything, the other nothing; every intermediate solution is illusory in point of theory, and in practice impossible. Ultramontanism involves the annihilation of councils; Gallicanism the annihilation of the pope. But as Gallicanism, in the end, cannot do without the pope, while ultramontanism does very well without councils,—all explanation of difficulties among Roman Catholics is inevitably to the advantage of the ultramontanists.

No speech as yet had been more praised or more criticised. The ultramontanists extolled it to the skies; the others saw nothing in it but audacity, senselessness, and impudence. At Rome, the only feeling was that of alarm; the speaker was well-nigh censured for having spoken out so harshly the whole bearings of the papal system. The legates even besought him not to publish his speech; and that time might be given for the subsidence of the angry feelings it had excited, the sittings were suspended.

But those angry feelings did not subside. The bishop of Paris and the French ambassadors distinguished themselves by the bitterness of their complaints. "The Church, then," said a bishop, "is no longer the spouse of Jesus Christ, but a slave prostituted to the caprice of a man! This monstrous system, invented scarcely fifty years ago, we must hear supported in full council! And by whom! By an isolated and unknown

doctor? No; by a man openly protected by the pope, openly cried up at Rome as the champion of the Church. The other religious orders, it would appear, have not done enough of mischief, so that a new one was required, already more famous for its encroachments within than for its successes without the Church. If there ever were councils in which the pope alone pronounced, it was an abuse and a usurpation. In the decree of the council of Jerusalem, transcribed at length in the book of the Acts, the preamble runs,—‘The apostles, and elders, and brethren.’ Not only is St. Peter not mentioned, but the decree is drawn up in conformity with the advice of St. James, who spoke the last.¹ As for the rest, we ought to be very glad that the chief of the Jesuits has so clearly unmasked the principles of his order. One may now see whether the University of Paris was wrong in condemning their society as dangerous to the faith, and likely to disturb the peace of the Church.”

All was not equally correct in these recriminations; but Pallavicini is still less so in the assertions he opposes to them. “It was not fifty years ago,” said he, “but two centuries ago, that the doctrine of Lainez was maintained, and by a Frenchman, too, Noël Hervé.” Two centuries! That brings us a great way, indeed, in the settlement of a question bearing on a matter which ought to have dated, not from two but from sixteen centuries before! It is true that one might further quote Albert, Bonaventura, Durand, and others, more ancient than Hervé, who, “without openly professing it,” adds the historian, “speak of it in a very favourable manner.” Though they had spoken of it still more favourably, it would only be carrying the date two or three centuries farther back; what shall we make of the nine or ten remaining centuries? Betwixt the opinion of Lainez and that of the Apostles, said the bishop, there is an abyss of sixteen centuries. No, says Pallavicini, this is a calumny. The abyss is one of only a thousand years. Singular candour! Then, says he also, is it not a calumny, “furious and extravagant,” to make this bishop speak thus? As if he had said anything that was not then in the mouths of all Gallicans! But let us mark, at least, how matters then stood with almost the whole higher clergy of France, and that in the middle of the

¹ “St. James spoke in his turn from the elevation of his patriarchal see,” says De Maistre, “only to confirm what the chief of the Apostles had decided.” So to arrange the narrative of the Acts, is not only to alter it but to parody it. One might as well represent St. Peter with the tiara on his head, and surrounded with cardinals, as he is seen in some paintings of the fifteenth century.

sixteenth century, in the face of the conquests made by the Reformation, when all things seemed to urge them to press closely round their Church's head. What a change has taken place since then! And how surprised would be the bishops of that period, and those, too, of the seventeenth century, with Bossuet at their head, to see their successors now on their knees before the pope and the Jesuits! Is this any just matter of astonishment? The human mind has no liking for false positions. The consequences of Gallicanism have been felt; it has been clearly seen, that in presence of an essentially reasoning age, a choice must be made between Rome and liberty. But liberty is Protestantism, if not in its theological doctrines, at least in its principles, and the same principles quickly lead to the same doctrines. There was a recoil; there was a shudder. But Rome opened her arms, and men have thrown themselves into her embrace. There has been a plunge made into false principles; but with the consolation at least of its having been made according to the strict rules of logic.

The unflinching spirit of the bishop of Paris still farther increased the alarm, already so violent, felt by the Italians at the approaching arrival of his colleagues. The Cardinal of Lorraine was announced as likely to reach Trent early in November. It was known he had vaunted that he would have limits set to the power, and still more to the gains of the court of Rome; his arrival, accordingly, says Pallavicini innocently, was contemplated with great horror. The legates had been for some time occupied in noting certain abuses beyond Italy, particularly in France, and more or less cherished by the French episcopate. These they kept in reserve, ready to be proposed for reformation as soon as the new comers should shew themselves too urgent on other points; and the Cardinal of Lorraine, who had accumulated benefices to the amount of three hundred thousand crowns, was more interested than any one else in not provoking reprisals. Nothing was neglected, whether in the way of insensibly augmenting the number of the Italians, or, still more, of keeping them united and docile, for one or other of them every day seemed to acquire a taste for those dreaded ideas of divine right and episcopal independence. Finally, as a resource against the worst that might happen, the legates had asked from the pope new plenipotentiary powers for transferring the council to another place, or dissolving it altogether.

The commission charged with elaborating the decrees had long been exclusively occupied with the canon on the institution of bishops. On the 20th of October, after the speech of Lainez, that commission had been augmented by an addition of four members. "It is not to be believed," says Pallavicini,¹ with what diligence and what attention those who were charged with drawing up that canon, laboured to invent and compare an infinity of forms, turns of expression, and terms. It was of importance to find some that would plainly declare what was the faith upon this article, without, at the same time, furnishing to ardent minds occasion to make interpretations either contrary to the faith, or little in conformity with its teaching? Ever *the faith* and *the teaching of the faith*. Where was this teaching then, since it was upon the very essentials of the question that it was found impossible to come to a common understanding, and that, after infinite new efforts, it was resolved in the end that nothing should be said? The Roman historian speaks always as if the council had perfectly known what it had to say, and had been ill at ease only about the forms. "In the end," he goes on to say, "one was found which the legates proposed to the Spaniards on the evening of the 28th, so that there might be nothing to prevent its being put to the vote in the congregation which was to meet on the following day. The Spaniards still rejected it. Then, indignant at those prelates whom nothing could soften, the legates resolved to make the council vote on the draft as proposed, and to declare it final should the majority accept it. *The cool night air, however, having moderated their ardour*, they again met with some prelates who enjoyed their confidence, and tried to find new means of conciliation."

Upon this the Spaniards craved an audience. They had come, they said, to see if it was to be finally decided that a canon, embodying their views, should be proposed. After such long discussions, and amid the excitement they had produced throughout Europe, the council could no longer abstain from pronouncing a decision. They declared, in fine, that, should their request be rejected, they would attend no more congregations.

Upon this the whole city was in commotion. Two score Italian bishops repaired to the legates, in a body, to ask, on the contrary, that the question of the divine right should be left out, and that the council should keep to voting on what had been proposed. The agitation went on increasing. Everybody was obliged to take

¹ Book xviii. ch. 16.

a side, and the Spanish faction, recruited with several Italian prelates, openly formed a band apart from the rest. Division spread even among the legates. The Cardinal of Mantua, as we have seen, had at no time been much opposed to the Spanish doctrine; he often allowed it to be seen that his charge alone prevented him from making common cause with them. Cardinal Seripandi, too, was not very far from holding their views; but it was Cardinal Simonetta, an ultra-Roman, that led the majority. Cardinal Hosius had never had much influence, and Cardinal Altemps had gone away.

It was necessary, however, that they should again set to work. This was hazarded on the 3d of November; and, thanks to the feeling generally entertained of the mischief done by these interminable disputes, the prelates all proved a little more calm. The Spaniards had, moreover, received from their king a new letter, exhorting them to do nothing to the prejudice of the Holy See; a vague letter, and manifestly solicited by the pope, but to which they could not altogether dispense with paying some attention. In fine, as the question of the divine right was, after all, a less serious one in the old subject of residence than in that of the institution of bishops, since this last touched upon the institution and the very existence of the pope, it was decided that they should fall back upon the other, and stop first at it.

The legates, accordingly, presented the draft of a decree, in which, setting theory aside, they established a complete jurisprudence of rewards and punishments, for the purpose of engaging to residence, and, if necessary, compelling to it. Of all possible solutions, this was the least honourable to the Episcopate. Money played the chief part in it; and it was on the side of money, also, that the affair was doomed to come to nothing. The decree, among other clauses, bore that resident bishops should not be forced to pay to sovereigns tithes, or subsidies, or any tax whatever; and the ambassadors began to protest.

The bishops, on their side, could hardly appreciate a favour of this nature. They were too well aware that the affair was not within the competence of a council, and that there would always be found occasions when the pope could not refuse to sovereigns permission to tax the clergy. The decree, accordingly, could not even be submitted to deliberation, under that form at least, and it was afterwards reduced to a simple explanation of what had been decreed in 1547. Meanwhile, notwithstanding the greater willingness to come to a better agreement with each,

other, none could confine himself to the less dangerous ground to which it had been hoped that the discussion might be brought. The institution of bishops was found, as before, the first and only subject of debate.

The bishop of Segovia having declared, that to the best of his recollection, the question had been decided in 1551, and that in the sense of the divine right, it was necessary to have recourse to the minutes of that period; but as the bishop insisted, considering that he could trust better to his memory than to all that might be adduced by those who had not been present under Julius III., this incident occupied some days. It was proved that the draft of the decree, to which the bishop wanted to appeal as his authority, had not then been either voted by the assembly, or so much as examined in congregation-general; but, on the other hand, the Spaniard was not mistaken,—the divine right was there. However, as the divines of the old council likewise had ever been at far more pains to be obscure than to avoid all equivocation, several phrases gave rise to warm disputes. Although the words, *divine right*, were found there, still it might be maintained that, strictly speaking, the thing itself was not. At the same time, this discussion presented a striking enough example of the effects of the Roman system of authority. Although this old draft of a decree was the work of a commission, and dated but a dozen years back, it was already spoken of and examined with a sort of respect. The partisans of the divine right recalled it as an argument of great weight; nor would their adversaries have ventured to say that it gave them no uneasiness. Do not we here find Roman Catholicism, as it were, caught in the act? The history of her doctrines may be said to be all comprised, in this constant tendency to consider more or less as legitimate and true, all that is not new, and to make years, in some sort, the first element of truth. Far less importance would have been given to that same draft, to which so much weight was attached because it was ten years old, had it been only four or five; but had it been a hundred, or two hundred years old, and not contrary to the views of the majority, that majority would have seized on it as a precious and unassailable tradition. See with what assurance the Roman controversialists give the first rank, among their proofs, to antiquity. In popular polemics, it often happens that they do not even attempt to give any other. We hear every day repeated, regarding Protestantism and the Protestants, what the pagans used of old to

say in this respect of Christianity. Yet, what was the answer of the Fathers? "That it was not by the lapse of time that the authority of religion is to be measured."¹ "The pagans vaunt their antiquity, as if truth hath need of being ancient. It is a diabolical custom to make antiquity an argument in favour of lies."²

So this matter was once more left without issue. It had been hoped that it might be concluded before the arrival of the French; but when it was seen that this was not to be dreamt of, the legates were the first to propose that they should be waited for. It was at least a mode of gaining time. The Cardinal of Lorraine travelled slowly, attended by a retinue like that of a prince. On the 9th of November, when word came that he had entered Italy, it was decided that the meeting should be suspended until he was in Trent; and, at all events, that no session should be held until the 26th. He arrived on the 13th, and was received with great honours. The legates went to meet him, accompanied by a crowd of prelates, and conducted him in procession to his hotel. Several French bishops accompanied him, and several followed soon after.

Next day the legates received him at an audience as bearer of a letter from Charles IX. He gave them an agreeable surprise, by the moderation and mildness of his language; but it could not be doubted that politeness and prudence had much to do with this. He protested that he came with good intentions; he declared that he had no wish to propose anything to the assembly, without the previous assent of the legates and of the pope. As for the grand debate of the day, he said that in his opinion people should not shew too much eagerness in diving into theoretical questions; that although he was inclined to hold the divine right, he did not see the necessity of teaching it by a decree. He added—as had never ceased to be repeated, ever since the opening of the council, by all that were not in the fetters of the Roman party—that a good and solid disciplinary reformation was the sole means either of bringing back the Protestants, or of confirming the Catholics. On this latter point he spoke truly; as for the Protestants, he had viewed them too closely not to know that the finest reforms could no longer induce them to shut their eyes to questions of doctrine. He complained, in fine, that

¹ Cyprian, against the Gentiles, b. ii.

² *Hic est mos diabolicus, ut per antiquitatis traducem commendatur fallacia.* (Augustine, Questions on the Old and New Testament.)

the king had not yet been able to get more than twenty-five thousand crowns of all that had been offered to him. He remonstrated, that if people persisted in exacting, as conditions of gift and loan, declarations contrary to the liberties of the kingdom, it was tantamount to saying that they would give nothing.

On this last article it was replied, that the pope had too much love for France, and for the king of France, to have added to his benefits any conditions which his conscience did not imperiously dictate. This amounted to saying, frankly enough, that the pope could not in conscience enter into any sort of terms with the Gallicans. The legates were frank enough, also, on some other points. They said the time was gone when one might hope to bring back the heretics by means of some disciplinary concessions, some reforms of abuses; that the Catholics, therefore, and they alone, were to be looked to. As for internal ameliorations, they dared not boast of the little that had hitherto been done; they too well knew that the cardinal was one of those who thought that they had done nothing. They confined themselves, as during the past, to protesting the good intentions of the pope, who, they said, had already begun the reformation of his court, although to the detriment of his finances.

In a word, the cardinal's language little accorded with what people believed they knew of his intentions and those of his fellow-countrymen. What, in point of fact, were his projects? We shall reach the close of this history without knowing more than we learn here. Man is never more impenetrable than under the garb of frankness; the Italians were children in presence of this great actor who ascended their stage, to leave them, nevertheless, in the end, if not the honour, at least the profits of the piece. As for the instructions he had received—but with authority to exhibit them only so far as he might deem fitting, the chief points, according to Pallavicini, were as follows:—

In discipline, they included the reform of the clergy, and the correction of all the abuses that it was possible to reach:—that the cardinal should not be too eager to attack such as had their seat principally at Rome; that he should approach these by little and little, always putting in the foreground the king's intention to apply himself vigorously to the extirpation of all those of his own kingdom.

In doctrine and in worship, they included the concession of the cup, not only to the Reformed, but to all the king's subjects;

the mass and prayers in French, except in monasteries and non-parochial churches; the psalms to be chanted in French, but after being revised and approved by the bishops. Next, but to be proposed to the council only as circumstances might require, the marriage of the priests, and the abandonment of ecclesiastical property.

Such then was the secret baggage of the Cardinal of Lorraine. Many French prelates openly talked over it, and this he did nothing to prevent. Certain enough information, moreover, had been got, that he had come to a secret understanding with the king of Spain, with the emperor, and even with the king of Bohemia, son of the emperor, and almost a Lutheran. In fine, notwithstanding all his reiterated disavowals of having political objects in view, no one would allow that so powerful and able a prelate could come to Trent as a mere French archbishop, with the simple object of adding one more to the council, and quietly concurring towards the passing of the decrees.

Two events, one of small the other of sufficient importance, soon complicated the state of affairs, after being apparently simplified by the cardinal's arrival.

On the 19th of November the Archbishop of Otranto gave a grand dinner, and not only were Italians only invited, but he had been so imprudent as to have it intimated to them to be careful not to absent themselves, as their attendance was of consequence to the Holy See. What passed at this entertainment may have been of no great consequence, for real conspiracies never court attention in such a way; but not the less did it lead to the belief in a general combination of the Italians against the Spaniards and the French.

The other circumstance was as follows. The pope had fallen into a serious illness. Hardly had he recovered when he heard that the French ambassadors had intrigued at Trent, and even at Rome, to secure that the next pope should be elected by the council and not by the cardinals. Now, of all the prerogatives of the court of Rome, if there be none greater in its eyes than that of electing the Church's chief, no more is there any of which the foundations are more doubtful, more fragile, more manifestly human. Even were it not proved that the faithful of all the churches, at Rome as elsewhere, long had a part, and a great part too, in the election of their bishops, it would ever remain to be explained why the clergy themselves have not the power of electing their head. Shall we be told that the extent of the

Church, and the impossibility of assembling her pastors, have led, by the sheer force of circumstances, to the creation of a permanent and more compact electoral body? Surely Rome then ought to have begun by recognising in the cardinals the quality of delegates of the Church, which she has never done, which she even could not do, since it is the pope that names and has the sole right of naming them. On the other hand, the more you tend to exalt into popes all bishops that have sat at Rome, the more you will have of them who have neither been elected by the cardinals nor been cardinals themselves; whence we must conclude, if not that the cardinals are useless, at least that their concurrence is by no means absolutely necessary in the election of the Church's head. It is evident, therefore, that if a council-general wishes to name a pope, it has the power of doing so, and that if it seem good to it not even to take him from the college of Cardinals, it may do that too. Such was the reasoning at Trent of the French ambassadors and their adherents.

And it was not for the first time that the sacred college heard the questions put, "Who are you? Where do you come from?" Long before the council of Constance had settled the question by making a pope, more than one bold hand had dared to draw aside the purple veil which was always becoming thicker and thicker between the Church and her head. The cardinals had not risen to such a pitch of greatness and pride without some having dared from time to time, were it from nothing but jealousy, to inquire into the foundations of their grandeur. Moreover, there was no need for these researches to go very deep. All the world could know, that the title of cardinal had long been a mere epithet commonly used in many dioceses to distinguish parish priests from simple clergymen, the *incardinati*, or men attached *by hinges* to the Church, from those who served it occasionally only, and without any fixed tie; that the cardinals at Rome, consequently, had begun by being merely the curates of the Bishop of Rome; that if, at that period, they concurred in the election of the pope, it was as parish priests, and along with the rest of the clergy. At that time when a cardinal became bishop, he dropt his title of cardinal; he could no more have had the idea of keeping it than a parish priest on becoming a bishop would at the present day retain that of parish priest. In a diploma of the year 943, the parochial churches are called cardinal churches. In 997, seven priests of Aix-la-chapelle received from Gregory V. the title of cardinals. In the eleventh

century the title began to be considered one of honour, several Italian bishops assumed it of themselves, and yet were not on that account charged with usurpation. We see it borne by the prebendaries of Compostella, Orleans, London, and several other cities. At Ravenna it was still in use at the time of the council of Trent, seeing that it was abolished by Pius V. in 1598. In fine, it is proved that in 1196, the cardinals that were not bishops had not as yet obtained the precedence of bishops.¹

Thus it would not even be consistent with the truth to say that the cardinal curates of the Bishop of Rome had risen in importance at the same time and in the same proportion with him. The Bishop of Rome was pope, fully pope, long before the cardinals were cardinals in the sense attached in later times to that title. But their rise, though slower, did not the less follow the same course. We see them gradually separating themselves from the rest of the clergy. They continued to be reckoned as attached each to a parish in Rome, but they no longer were so. Beyond Rome they had honours paid to them at first only when they arrived as the pope's envoys and representatives; ere long we shall find that it was in virtue of their mere title that they took the precedence of bishops, of kings' ministers, and sometimes of kings themselves. Notwithstanding, it was only in 1059 that Nicolas III. made them sole electors of the sovereign pontiff; the clergy and the people retaining their right of ratifying the election. A hundred and twenty years afterwards, in 1179, Alexander III. abolished this last restriction, and the election of the popes is now entirely in the hands of the cardinals.

Thus it was not four hundred years since the cardinalate had been definitively constituted; it was not a hundred and fifty since the Council of Constance had energetically recalled the Church's ancient right to elect its sovereign. And this last council had been at least led to it by circumstances; but if the Council of Trent, in full peace, had taken it into its head to do as much, it would have proved the ruin of the cardinals, and in many respects of the popedom itself. Hence the mental throes of the pope; hence a new source of mutual distrust and animosity between the prelates of the two parties.

The Cardinal of Lorraine proved impenetrable, at least he

¹ See, for more details, Hurter's Institutions of the Church. In 1187 a bull by Pope Clement III. in favour of the prior and canons of the Church of St. Andrews, is signed by Pope Clement, two bishops, and seven cardinals, shewing that the bishops had the precedence. See Lyon's History of St. Andrews.—Tr.

believed himself to be so, for one of the doctors in his suite, of the name of Hugon—secretly sold to the pope, kept the legates informed of his minutest actions, which, to say the truth, rarely betrayed all that was passing in his thoughts.¹ The day on which the king's letter was read at the general meeting he found another opportunity of making a long speech, without shocking, but also without satisfying, anybody. He dwelt particularly on the calamities of the kingdom, of which he gave but too truthful a picture. Everywhere mortal feuds, outrage, pillage, and murder prevailed; everywhere, among Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, the royal authority was contemned. "To whom," he added, "must we attribute these evils? To heresy, no doubt, but not to heresy alone. For myself, I am ready, if necessary, to say with Jonah, as already adduced by the legates of the Holy See at the first opening of the council, 'Cast me forth into the sea, for I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you!'" Alluding, probably, to the three hundred thousand crowns of benefices; but he proposed nothing, concluded nothing.

The conclusion was yet to come, and the task of drawing it had been committed to the second ambassador, Du Ferrier. The legates had started difficulties to his being permitted to speak. The cardinal had almost had to demand it, so as to make himself responsible for all that he was to say, if not for his words at least for the general bearing of his ideas. But ideas and words were alike warm and pointed. "The king might have appeased all the disorders that afflict France in three days had he so desired, by convoking a national council, or by making, by his own authority, the concessions called for. As the eldest son of the Church, he has preferred not obtaining them for himself except through the Church: but should they be refused, he should certainly feel compelled to provide himself a remedy for his kingdom. After all, what was the amount of his demand? Nothing that is not to be found in the Scriptures, the Fathers, and in the canons of the first councils; nothing but what long subsisted in the bosom of the Church, without preventing it from expanding itself before God and men. When Josias wished to appease the troubles of the Jews, and to recall them to the religion of their fathers, he found only one means, but that was the best of all; he had only to cause the book of the law, after its long conceal-

¹ The Spaniards also had a spy observing them in the person of one of their countrymen, Sebastian, bishop of Patti, in Sicily. All these details are taken from Visconti's Letters.

ment by the malice of men, to be read and observed.¹ And if you ask why France is suffering from this surfeit of disorders and evils, the only answer that can be made to you is that of Jehu to Joram,—‘What peace so long as’—You know what, added Du Ferrier, interrupting him as he spoke;² and if reformation does not come from you, in vain should all the princes come to the aid of France. As for all who shall perish, even although it be by their own iniquities that they have brought ruin on themselves, you, and you alone, will be held responsible for their blood.”

Some of these shafts were more severe than just. At the point to which things had come, the council could do nothing towards appeasing the wars of religion short of declaring itself Protestant. Nevertheless, taking a higher view, this very injustice was just. The council could do nothing; but it was the organ and representative of that Church which had for ages had it in its power to do all, and yet had made use of its power only to disfigure Christianity, and to bury under the commandments of men those laws which alone were capable of bridling the passions of kings and peoples. An aged and infirm mother must plead in vain her present inability to repress the disorders of her son; if she was the original cause of those disorders, there can be no injustice in holding her responsible for them. Yes, Du Ferrier was in the right. For all the blood that had flowed in France, all that was yet to flow there, the Church was responsible, and doubly responsible; responsible as the mother of all those errors and of all those abuses which had provoked the Reformation; responsible also as having given but too much sanction, by her acts of violence, for those terrible reprisals exercised by the Reformation in some of the places where it had the upper hand. And why speak we here of the acts of vengeance done by the Reformation? The Reformation had never ceased by its chief organs to preach order, the support of government, and peace. No Synod, no Church that we know of, had ever decreed revenge for the massacre of the Albigenses, or any other old and bloody grievance; but it was the Roman Church, properly and duly represented by its chiefs, its doctors, and its pious butchers, that had decreed the destruction and taken upon itself the whole

¹ Pallavicini, ordinarily so prolix, has avoided reproducing these details. “Du Ferrier,” says he, “explained his meaning by an ingenious application of several examples from the Sacred Books.”—Book xix. ch. iv.

² “So long as the whoredoms of thy mother and her witchcrafts are so many.”—2 Kings ix. 22.

responsibility of the extermination of those same Albigenses. What audacity in Roman Catholic historians when they complacently register the crimes committed in the name of the Reformation during those epochs of desolation and of blood. Not an act of violence to which we could not, with history in our hand, oppose a thousand; not a Roman Catholic corpse which we could not cover with a heap of the corpses of Albigenses, Waldenses, French and German Protestants, victims of the Inquisition in Italy, in Spain, in Belgium, everywhere, in short, where that frightful tribunal succeeded in establishing itself. Ah! wo, doubtless, wo to those who know not how to forgive, and to prove the superiority of their faith by the superiority of their feelings and of their patience! But wo also, wo above all to the Church that had so long given, and that was still so long to continue to give—not only during epochs of tumult and violent excitement, but coldly and systematically—the example of all atrocities.

One knows, for the rest, by what an abominable subterfuge the Church sought to reconcile its bloody persecutions with its pretended horror for blood. The Inquisition did not condemn to death; it was held to ignore what the secular power did with the unhappy victims whom it handed over to it. It was even the custom, at first, to insert at the end of the sentence a formula in which the magistrate was besought to spare the culprit's life; an atrocious farce which people had sufficient sense of shame at last to suppress, but always continuing to abstain from asking for any punishment whatever. Accordingly, when the condemned person came to the place appointed for his punishment, it was only by accident that there happened to be there a stake and fagots and executioners to kindle them. The Church washed her hands of all this. Had she not decided in 1179,¹ that, without ceasing to reprove the shedding of blood, she could accept the offers of *succour* made by the civil powers? it being well understood that a prince who should take it into his head, after the Inquisition had been once established in his territory, to refuse this kind of *succour*, might find himself in no enviable position; the king of Spain himself would have perilled his crown. The number of victims that perished under the Spanish Inquisition in the time of the second Inquisitor-General, Thomas of Torquemada, has been estimated at ten thousand, that is, about two per day during seventeen years. And

¹ Council of Lateran, canon xxvii.

this is not a round number, put down at random from data more or less inexact; Llorente¹ has given all the details of the calculation from which he deduces this result. To these ten thousand persons burnt alive we must add about seven thousand burnt in effigy, that is to say, who would have perished like the rest had the Inquisition had them in its power. Torquemada has not been canonized, but his predecessor, Peter Arbues, was made a saint, and that, mark well, not in the fifteenth century, at the height of the fanatical enthusiasm of which he was the minister, but almost two hundred years after his death. It was in 1664, in the time of Pascal, of Arnault, that Rome placed upon her altars the ferocious organizer of her bloody tribunal.

On the 26th November, the day on which it was expected that the session would have been held, matters were as little ripe for it as on the day of the cardinal's arrival.

All eyes continued to be directed to him. Perplexed and flattered by turns at the part that people persisted in giving him, he was forced to feed alternately the hopes and the fears of all. He one day held a meeting in his hotel, at which the French bishops voted unanimously for the divine right; another day he renewed at the general meeting his proposal that that point should be left undecided. On the 1st of December, at the close of the tumult, occasioned as we have seen by the boldness of the bishop against whom the Italians declared anathema, he seemed desirous of giving a decided opinion; but his speech, which began with a keen attack on those who had thus attempted to restrain the freedom of voting, ended again in vagueness and ambiguity. There was nothing positive in it but his proposing to replace the words *divine right* by the simple statement that bishops are instituted by *Jesus Christ*. However, the legates having immediately referred the matter to Rome, he ventured one step farther, and complained openly enough of that manner of proceeding. The Italians, on their side, were daily more and more out of temper. Behold, said they, we are fallen out of the Spanish into the French disease. The French laughed at the jest, and repaid it with interest; but the Spaniards, who could not laugh, were mortally offended.

With all this agitation there was mingled that of political news, the interest attached to which was prodigiously increased by the presence of a member of the house of Guise. On the 7th of

¹ History of the Inquisition, chap. viii.

November, intelligence was brought of the death of the king of Navarre, and all knew that that event might call the Cardinal of Lorraine to the head of affairs in France. He himself allowed it to be well enough seen that he regretted not being on the spot, so as more surely to take up the inheritance of his rival.

In Germany, Maximilian, son of the emperor, and already king of Bohemia, had been elected king of the Romans and heir to the imperial dignity. On the occasion of his coronation, (Nov. 30,) the emperor had had conferences with the Protestant princes, in which he made one attempt more to prevail on them to accept the council, and these efforts had only served, as they had always done, to provoke demands which they well knew would never be granted, that in particular of having all that had been done at Trent declared null and void. Yet, whether from policy or from secret sympathy, the emperor had testified no displeasure. He even offered to go in person to Trent and to present their demands, on this sole condition, that they should soften down a little whatever was too much calculated to wound the feelings of the council and of the pope.

While the canon on the institution of bishops was on its way to Rome along with the amendment proposed by the cardinal, the council once more fell back on the question of residence. The cardinal, against the advice of several French prelates, persisted in saying that it was not necessary to mix it up with that of the divine right of bishops. As for residence, in itself, he seemed to be moderately desirous to see it become obligatory, according to the plan proposed by the legates, by means of fixed rules and a proportionate penalty: but, himself a court prelate, he had no wish to condemn himself to vegetate at his diocese of Rheims; he had the air of one who was little convinced of the good results to be expected from a law on this matter. He thought that, on the subject of residence, everybody was more or less crazed, and that this remedy could as little as any other prove a cure for all evils.

Notwithstanding this half-abandonment of the main difficulties of the question, he was disappointed by finding that none, or almost none, sided with him; he further knew that this began to be a subject of remark, people asking if this was the omnipotent influence that he had flattered himself he was about to exercise. The *French disease* had quickly been replaced by the *Spanish*; that is to say, the Spanish prelates had again put themselves at the head of the opposition, a post at which it is easy to

draw attention to one's self and to appear important. To them, and not to the French party, those Italians who had broken with the papal party now attached themselves. Even the French were at times sufficiently disposed to murmur against their chief. They were angry at his demi-defection on the divine right, and said they saw well "that it is not easy for a cardinal to make a good Frenchman."

About the same time, in fine, the legates having presented the draft of a decree on various abuses relative to the sacrament of Orders, the Spaniards complained that they saw hardly any of the things in it which they had all along insisted should be taken up and examined; and forthwith joining the German prelates, they resumed with fresh vigour the subject of residence in the view of the divine right. Might we not well say that one might suppose that he had opened at a wrong page, and that he was reading over again what he had more than once read already. And yet we could wish the reader to remember that we abridge to the best of our ability, and that we often compress into a few lines whole pages of Sarpi and Pallavicini. The council had never yet spoken more or done less.

In the congregation of 16th December, one of the legates had thought it his duty to complain of the extreme prolixity of the speeches. It was remarked, in fact, that several prelates, habitually mute till now, had taken a fancy for speaking. Every one having had time, and more than time, to study the question thoroughly, there were few who did not deliver their opinions at great length, even although it was but to repeat what twenty others had said already. Newly arrived members, little informed of all that had been said and done, daily appeared on the scene, and unintentionally renewed discussions about matters of detail which people had every reason to suppose had been finally closed. In short, the council was like a ship beaten upon by such opposing winds, as to do little more than revolve on its own axis, and find itself at night in the same place as in the morning. For the rest, the legates had no cause to complain. Lassitude was their surest auxiliary. Already it had many a time saved the pope's affairs; it alone could save them still.

The pope, however, was impatient in good earnest. Although informed from day to day, and hour to hour, of all that was spoken at the council, he could form no correct idea of the position of the legates. Accustomed to reign himself, it appeared to him that were he in their place, nothing would be easier than to

have the mastery. His courtiers shared in the same mistake, and even the common people began to fret. It was like the Romans of old murmuring at the delays of Fabius. To all the other cares of the legates, accordingly, there was added that of having unceasingly to apologize for themselves to the pope and their colleagues at Rome. They begged that at least formal orders might be sent them; but, to say the truth, the pope found himself as much embarrassed as his ministers.

He had been thrown into the greatest uneasiness, in particular, by having to give an opinion on the formula proposed by the Cardinal of Lorraine. After much hesitation, on the strength of the consent of that prelate, he ventured to pronounce against the doctrine of the divine right, or at least against the insertion of those words in the decree. Availing himself, therefore, of the idea that bishops are *instituted by Jesus Christ*, an idea sufficiently vague to admit of a hope that it might be turned in a manner favourable to the ultramontane view,¹ he fixed upon three drafts of a formula, elaborated in a commission of cardinals. One, and the vaguest of these formulas, bore simply an anathema against whoever should say, that the bishops *are not in any manner instituted by Jesus Christ*; another, a little clearer, but which quite departed from the question, anathematized whosoever should believe *that the episcopal rank has not been instituted by Jesus Christ*; the third, in fine, anathematized whoever should teach *that the bishops chosen by the pope, and on whom he relieves himself of part of his solicitude, are not chosen by the Holy Ghost for the guidance of that portion of the Church which is confided to them*. This last, the best according to the Italians, was naturally thought the worst by the others, for it was equivalent to the positive negation of the divine right. Nothing would have been easier than to deduce from it, eventually, the universality of the Roman episcopate, in its most absolute meaning, to wit, that the pope is the sole bishop by divine institution, and that all the rest exist only through him. One might even have contrived, in case of need, to make a new prerogative spring from it. If the bishops chosen by the pope, are chosen by the Holy Ghost, this is, as it were, a new branch of infallibility accorded to the successor of St. Peter. How to reconcile this fact with that other fact, that there are bad bishops, is what we do not very clearly see; but it matters

¹ By saying, with Lainez, that *the bishops, the episcopal body*, exists by divine right, but that each bishop individually exists only by papal right.

not. Is ultramontaniam ever embarrassed about the difficulty of reconciling papal infallibility with the existence of bad popes?

About a whole month, marked by several incidents, in regard to which we shall ere long have to say a word or two, had passed in waiting for a reply from the pope. The Christmas festivities, designedly celebrated with extraordinary pomp, had diverted the attention of the prelates for a time; but the first week of the year 1563 found them impatient, soured, and disheartened.

The courier arrived at last. It was now the 15th of January. The council resumed its labours next day; and the third formula, as the most fully developed and the clearest, became the principal text of discussion. The efforts of the French and Spaniards were mainly directed against that part of the phrase in which the bishops are said to be chosen by the pope, in order to be charged by him with a part of his solicitude. The Latin expression, *in partem sollicitudinis*, was to be found in respectable Latin authors; but it was remarked that it is one thing to employ certain words cursorily, and another to insert them in the rigorous statement of a system. Besides, said the opposite party, the best proof that we ought not to employ that expression is, that we are not yet come to an agreement about its meaning; and that, consequently, after we are dead and gone, there will be still less agreement about it. The Italians, in fact, would have it that *in partem sollicitudinis* did not necessarily involve the idea of the pope's universal episcopate; to which the rest replied, that if such were not the bearing of the words, this ought to be stated; and that in the decree itself a warranty ought to be given to those who dreaded its being interpreted in that sense. Many offered to declare themselves satisfied, if the other party would consent to have it run thus,—that *bishops have been established by Jesus Christ, for the purpose of being charged by the pope with a part of his solicitude*; but this middle course gave little satisfaction. And as the question of residence re-appeared at every turn, the two parties passing perpetually from one to the other, according as they could see their way to the gaining of a little ground,—the end of January arrived without their having come to an understanding on any one point.

The first news of the battle of Dreux (17th December) had been received and celebrated in the council, as that of a great triumph; but more detailed reports had modified this first impression, and while the enthusiasm of the Roman Catholic popu-

lations continued to be maintained by means of pompous thanksgivings, still there was food for bitter reflections. Granting that the Protestant army had been completely beaten, still it was seen at once to be no small matter for the Reformation to have an army, and an army, too, capable of confronting the combined forces of the king of France and Philip II. ; but although beaten, it was known to have lost fewer men than that of the Roman Catholics ; that it was neither discouraged nor broken ; and, when an army does not consider itself defeated, it is not really so. The only positive result of the battle of Dreux, accordingly, had been to raise, both in a political and military point of view, the party of the Reformation to the level of that of the king ; after the two armies had fought on equal terms, these two great parties might treat as one power would with another.

The pope had judged more soundly on the subject than any one else. The ambassador, De Lisle, in his letters to the queen, complains of not having succeeded in getting him to consider this much vaunted triumph as a real victory. "His holiness," says he,¹ "persevering firmly and with words full of disdain and discontent, will not allow me to speak of your victory, and says that it has been none." But patience ! Only nine years later, Rome was to resound with cries of joy for another victory, apparently a more complete, and a still finer one in its eyes,—that of St. Bartholomew's eve.

In the early part of January, the French ambassadors had presented to the council a project of reformation, with which the cardinal had affected not to meddle, and which, having emanated from the government, had not in fact met the approbation of all the French bishops. The rights of the pope, without being attacked in theory, were touched in it at more than one point, particularly in money matters. The seventeenth and eighteenth articles established the right to communicate in both kinds, and to celebrate worship in the vulgar tongue. The worship of images, the collation of benefices, dispensations of every description, were also made the object of dispositions, more or less contrary to the ideas and to the interests of the court of Rome. The victory of Dreux began to bear fruits that were not all equally pleasant. The more it was vaunted, the more was the French government placed in a position to require concessions from the council, and to make concessions itself to the Protestants.

¹ Letter of 8th March 1563.

The legates were so alarmed at the effect that this memoir might have on the old pope's health, for he had been for some months in a sickly and dying state, that they lost no time in sending one of his confidential friends, the bishop of Viterbo, to soften the rudeness of the blow. But the impression it produced was terrible notwithstanding. The pope exclaimed that France was in revolt. The bishop succeeded in calming him, but not without difficulty, by urging that there were thirty-four articles, and that the French never surely could have the idea of obtaining them all,—that one might easily grant some, modify others, and reject a good many. In fine, and this was the most consolatory circumstance, the Cardinal of Lorraine had secretly commissioned the bishop to make an offer of his services to the pope, if not for the purpose of conjuring the storm, at least to turn it in another direction, and to moderate its violence. The cardinal, at bottom, was neither ultramontane nor Gallican; his religion was simply that of an ambitious man, that is to say, he was ready to change it any day.

The pope, accordingly, began to take up this affair, about which, nevertheless, he was supposed to know nothing, seeing it had been transmitted, not to him by the ambassador residing at Rome, but to the council by the ambassadors residing at Trent. The Cardinal of Ferrara, as legate in France, had orders to reply to the king, "That there were in fact good things in those articles, and that the pope asked nothing better than to see them examined; that he could not suppose that any one, least of all, the most Christian king, could intend to deprive the Holy See of any portion whatever of the powers which it holds from Jesus Christ; that if such or such church-dues were burdensome to the kingdom, one might proceed to lighten them amicably; that, besides, there were things in the memorial which were little fit to be treated of in a council." One of the reasons, the pope added, on account of which these articles did not all equally please him, was, that some were not less contrary to the king's authority than to that of the pope. Slightly dependent on the Holy See, the bishops would find facilities for being still less dependent on the king. Finally, all these observations were to be supported by the Cardinal of Ferrara, with a new advance of forty thousand crowns on the hundred thousand previously offered as a gift. These money presents, openly made by one prince to another, offered and accepted without the smallest shame, however inadequate the sum might be to the greatness

and opulence of the two parties, form one of the curious traits that mark the political history of that age. It seemed generally admitted that a full purse was as good an argument as any other, and that one had no more reason to blush at receiving a good round sum than at admitting the conclusiveness of a good sound argument. But if merely curious in political affairs, in religious it was certainly something more.

Nothing being ready for the session, it was found necessary to prorogue it again. Although it was but the commencement of February, the legates proposed to put it off till Easter. This suggestion was strongly opposed; all the more as the legates talked of taking up the article of marriage, and it was thought strange that new matters for discussion should be sought for, when they could not make an end of the old. Many wanted the vote to be taken on all the points that had been sufficiently examined; but the Italians, though sure of victory, dreaded obtaining it in this way. The Cardinal of Lorraine, while he consented to delay, had the air of one who lent himself to that course only from complaisance; but he had his own reasons for not being displeased at it. He projected making a journey to the emperor, and the affairs of France were still in too entangled a state to admit of his seeing clearly what it was best to do in the interest of his party.

This journey, which had been long talked of, was a subject of much uneasiness. It was thought certain that he had in view, besides the political affairs of France and Germany, a closer union between the French and Germans in the affairs of the council; the emperor, and still more his son, were too much disaffected to admit of the cardinal returning from them without bringing projects with him of a more or less hostile nature. Rumours were afloat respecting certain questions which the emperor had submitted to the examination of his own divines, and which were not the most encouraging, among others:—

If the pope had good grounds for his desiring that the legates alone should have the right to propose, and if the clause *proponentibus legatis* ought not to be expunged as contrary to the authority and the liberty of the council;

If the pope could transfer it to another place, or dissolve it, without the concurrence of the secular princes;

If means might not be found for making the bishops at the council independent, as well on the side of the pope as on that of their respective civil rulers;

If there was no possibility of protecting the minority from the violence or intrigues of the majority ;

If, in the event of the pope happening to die, the next election would belong to the council ;

And other points, among which public rumour placed some that were still more menacing.

The cardinal left Trent about the middle of February, after having made the legates promise that the question of marriage should not be agitated in his absence. Here there was new matter of uneasiness. He had, it would appear, views on this point which might not be those of the majority. He remained five days at Inspruck. Every effort was made to penetrate the secret of his conferences with the emperor ; but all that could be known was, that he remained every day at least two hours with him and his son. On the cardinal's return no one was a whit wiser. He merely reported to the legates that the emperor had broken out, when he was with him, into bitter complaints that not one of his demands had been so much as proposed for deliberation ; that he had been very hot on the subject, insisting that the assembly had done nothing yet of any importance, that the pope was deceived either by the council sitting at Trent, or by *his own council* sitting at Rome, &c. &c.¹ The cardinal added that he had done his best to soften the emperor ; but, says the historian, " he said all this in the tone of a man who not only relates the sentiments of another, but desires also to add weight to his own by giving them the support of a superior authority." On the following days he spoke almost openly of the emperor as an ally, a friend ; he went so far as to say, that if things were to continue in the same state, some great scandal would be the result. This scandal was evidently that the princes would decree, of their own authority, what they should have failed to obtain from the council or from the pope. Thus agitation and mutual distrust went on increasing.

In fine, while the Cardinal of Ferrara was in France communicating the ambiguous answer made by the pope to the thirty-four articles which had thrown Rome into a fright, the French ambassadors, having communicated to the council, by a letter from the king, the official news of the battle of Dreux, took that occasion to ask what had been done with those articles, and what it was proposed to do with them. Then, with a malicious show of candour and simplicity, " If any are surprised," said Du

¹ Pallavicini, Book xx. ch. v.

Ferrier, "that we have stuck to these points rather than to others, and that we have omitted so many things of importance, we would reply that we have been desirous to begin with lighter matters, with the view of clearing the way, and thus facilitating our reaching the most important. Think not," he added, "that Christians are now what they were fifty or a hundred years ago. If there are many still who want nothing better than to remain Catholics, those very persons are already too much awakened to abstain from judging, according to Scripture, whatever you shall have presented to them as what they have to believe and to do." Why, then, did such persons, and he himself as the first of them, put off any longer declaring themselves Protestants? Had not the council decreed enough of things contrary to Scripture, to warrant their ceasing to wait for more?

The debates on the doctrine of marriage, after being delayed for some days by a dispute about precedence among the divines, were opened in the course of February. Eight articles, not necessary to enumerate, had been presented by the legates. Let us confine ourselves to the three points on which the discussion was chiefly to run; marriage in itself; marriage as a tie; and celibacy.

Is marriage a sacrament? It is easy to affirm this, but not so easy to prove it. This the divines sufficiently admitted, if not in set terms, at least by the length and the embarrassment shewn in their speeches.

Let us first recall, to refresh our memories, what we have already said or suggested elsewhere. That it seems little agreeable to the very notion of a sacrament to give that name to what is found in all religions; that in order to find ancient Christian authors who make a sacrament of marriage, we must go back to times when the word *sacrament* was applied to all religious acts whatever;¹ that Scripture, in fine, nowhere speaks of it as it would be natural for it to speak of an act pertaining to the new law, and fellow, so to speak, of the supper and of baptism. If this last, although in use previous to Christian times, has become a sacrament, it is because Jesus Christ positively appropriated it,

¹ "Marriage is, according to St. Paul's expression, a great sacrament in Christ and in the Church."—Encyclical Letter of 1832.

"A great *mysterij*," says the Greek text. We have already had an example of this same play upon words, (Book ii.) Cardinal Cajetan admits the falsification. "Non habes ex hoc loco, prudens lector, a Paulo, conjugium esse sacramentum. Non enim dixit esse sacramentum, sed mysterium."

and made it as it were the seal by which his disciples were to be marked, when he said, "Go, therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, *the Son*, and the Holy Ghost." We find nothing of this sort respecting marriage. The New Testament speaks of it only in a moral point of view. It takes it up as a fact; it purifies and elevates it; but nowhere do we see there either institution of the fact, or modification in its essence. Thus, religion sanctifies, but does not create it; the Church proclaims it, and blesses it; but it would exist without her, and has really existed, at some epochs, among pagans, as much respected and as sacred in men's eyes as ever it was among Christians.¹ But, give what definition you please to the term sacrament in general, never would it logically apply to an act where the part taken by religion and the Church is a mere intervention which, strictly speaking, might be dispensed with. Every act, every transaction on which you would call for God's blessing and the Church's prayers, would, by parity of reason, be a sacrament.

What, besides, would you make of a sacrament, the true and immediate object of which has nothing religious about it, and does not even in any respect touch upon religion? Though the marriage state, when blessed by godliness, becomes an abundant source of sanctification and salvation, this, after all, is only an occasional result. The conjugal union may have none of those blessed effects, yet not the less would it continue to subsist. Marriage is not, therefore, of itself a religious act; it exists independently of religions; it is, therefore, essentially different from the supper and baptism, and all those other sacraments, if people will insist on there being others, since these, if you abstract from them their religious meaning, signify nothing, and are absolutely nothing.

Let us take up for a moment, one of the most favourite ideas of the Roman Church, that of the superiority of celibacy to the married state, and forthwith a new objection occurs. All the other sacraments have, or are reputed to have, for their object, the exercise of a salutary influence on the soul, and the increase of its spirituality; but here the case must be quite otherwise. If the unmarried be a holier state than the married, and marriage nevertheless a sacrament,—we have a sacrament immediately resulting in the transference of the soul into an inferior condition, in its being bereft of part of its spirituality, and, in

¹ For example, at Rome in the early times of the Republic.

fine, in its having certain sources of salvation closed against it. The Roman Church admits marriage only as a necessary evil; can it be thought logical, then, to view that as a sacrament which creates an evil? And if it be replied that it is natural for religion to lay hold of this evil for the purpose of lessening it, and drawing forth all the good that can be in it, this only takes us back to the objection stated above, "That there can be no sacrament where religion does no more than bless what would exist beyond its sphere and without it."

For the rest, it were much to be desired that the Roman Church had never taught anything more dangerous. In placing marriage in the number of the sacraments, a good object may have been aimed at, that of enhancing its sacredness and inviolability. We might only inquire, then, if this has been the consequence, and if the conjugal tie be really held more sacred in Italy than in England, in France than in the United States, at Rome than at Geneva, and we might fearlessly look for the answer that every enlightened traveller, and every candid Roman Catholic would be sure to give.

But if the good results are doubtful, it is not so with the bad. On becoming a sacrament, marriage passed into the domain of the Church;¹ the Church alone had from that time forth the right to lay down its conditions. This right has proved an exhaustless source of influence over individuals, families, kings, and nations. Civil society thus became bound to the Church by fibres that rooted themselves profoundly in all the interests and affections of mankind. And what a strain has been put upon those fibres! What delight has been felt in multiplying difficulties and impediments of all sorts! At the commencement of the thirteenth century, the bar to marriage constituted by relationship, was extended to the seventh degree; there were no ties of relationship, even down to adulterous ones, that did not constitute a sort of kin in which the interdiction of marriage extended to the fourth degree. In the midst of this maze of impediments there was hardly a marriage which the Church might not possibly prevent, were she in the least desirous to apply her rules rigorously; and in that case the only resource was to petition and to pay. Often, too, impediments coming to be discovered after the marriage was over, there had to be fresh petitions and fresh outlay, if people wished to be married according to the

¹ "Marriage, forming a part of holy things, is consequently subject to the Church."—The Pope's Encyclical Letter of 1532.

rules. Spouses united for twenty years might still feel not quite sure that their marriage was valid, and their children legitimate; the latter, even after the death of their parents, might some fine day hear of their being declared bastards.

From the times of the Council of Trent, it has not been quite thus. Universal complaints had constrained Innocent III. to reduce to four the normal number of the degrees; use had, moreover, given the force of law to divers mitigations in detail, and what remained too oppressive in the law was left to be alleviated by dispensations. Notwithstanding this there prevailed a general feeling of uneasiness. Civil society strongly tending towards its own emancipation, its attention was incessantly directed to the most delicate of the points of contact between the spiritual and the temporal. The Reformation had called upon the Church of Rome to say by what rights she alleged that she alone was competent to lay down laws on the subject of marriage, and the Church of Rome, beyond the argument of authority, which people would no longer admit, had not much to reply. Many Roman Catholic juriconsults had, on this point, come to entertain ideas nearly approaching those of the Protestants. In France, in particular, people began to see that marriage was an essentially civil act, which religion consecrated, but did not create. It was perfectly understood that the Church retained the power of determining in what cases the priest was to grant or refuse that consecration; but it began generally to be understood that, as respects society, it is an accessory. In fine, the civil power began to believe that it too had the right to fix within its own sphere the conditions beyond which the Church could not proceed to celebrate a marriage. Such was the commencement of that system, which, after remaining long in abeyance, was to become, as it is at this day, that of France and many other states.

These discussions on the essence of marriage, necessarily led to the next question of those above indicated, namely, that of marriage viewed as a tie.

This tie the Roman Church had pronounced indissoluble. Viewing the matter in its social and moral aspects, weighty reasons may be alleged in favour of this system; but the question was, how do we know that the Church had a right to establish it? Now, with the Scriptures before us, this cannot be maintained, least of all if we are to hold that marriage is a sacrament. For a sacrament—this the Church has always maintained—is beyond

her power. She may regulate the use of it, she may modify its accessories, but its essence she cannot modify. If marriage be a sacrament, and Jesus Christ nevertheless did not regard it as indissoluble, its very quality of sacrament deprives all parties whatsoever of any power of changing it. Assuming this, what do we find said of it by Jesus Christ? "It hath been said by them of old time, Let him give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, *save for the cause of fornication*, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery."¹ *Whosoever shall marry that woman.* It was permitted then to marry a repudiated woman. Does Jesus Christ forbid it? By no means. He confines himself to saying, that if the repudiation has not had a valid motive, the new marriage shall not be legitimate. It would be so then if the repudiation has been so. Will any one maintain that had he wished to teach its indissolubility, he would not have done so at this place? Or that what our Lord said was from a desire to defer to the ideas and the usages of the Jews? We cannot conceive that the Son of God could carry compliance so far as to grant, even provisionally, what would have been contrary to God's will, and to the essence of the sacraments under the new law.

Here we have nothing to do with the question, whether certain states have done well or ill in sanctioning divorce in other cases besides that of adultery. It is enough to have demonstrated that the absolute prohibition of divorce, cannot with any shew of reason be invested with the authority of a law of God. It is hardly worth while to refute the charges which have on this score been levelled at the Reformation. Some authors will have it that this impossibility of dissolving marriage cannot be taken off without opening the door to the most scandalous disorders. Happily here, as in the sacramental question, we have only to appeal to facts. Where are those disorders to be found? Shall we be told of many cases where the prospect of divorce has loosened ties which, but for that would not have been loosened? It is of course understood that we do not speak of that brutish divorce which history shews as in use among some nations, but of divorce legal and solemn, such, in a word, as we find in all the Protestant countries that have admitted it. There, encompassed with all the civil restrictions which morality and social order demand, it never occurs without formalities and delays

¹ Gospel according to St. Matthew, ch. v.

such as are tantamount to its being declared beforehand impossible, if it shall be found in the least that the motives that have led to its being asked are insufficient or of a temporary character. Hardly will there be found a case to be adduced, at distant intervals, in which, upon the whole, more good has not been done than evil; and how many cases, on the contrary, do we see occur, in which the indissolubility of the marriage produces more evil than good? Next, we repeat, this is not the question. Although the permission of divorce had only untoward results, the Church has no right to interdict it as long as it remains uninterdicted by Scripture. All very well to dissuade people from it; to do all that is humanly possible to prevent, in each several case, the spouses from coming to that deplorable extremity is a positive duty; nothing better than that the civil law should be asked to be severe in repressing it, to require minute examination of the circumstances, and to interpose salutary delays; but when the law of God does not expressly say no, the Church cannot say no.

We find these ideas re-occurring in the opinions delivered by almost all the divines who elaborated the questions relating to marriage at Trent. The argument which might have been drawn, and which is with such confidence drawn to this day, from the words of Jesus Christ, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder,"¹ was found to be defeated by anticipation in the passage where he admits divorce on the ground of adultery; a rule could not be promulgated as absolute after he himself had admitted one such serious exception. On the other hand, it was felt that a law of this importance could not be made to rest solidly on the Church's sole authority. Infinite pains therefore were taken to find for it some scriptural foundations, but here as on so many other points, there was no resource but to travesty into doctrinal declarations certain words of Scripture which are evidently nothing of the kind. Thus in the decree itself the indissolubility of marriage is made to rest first of all, on these words of Adam, "This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh;" next, on these words of St. Paul, "A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh;" lastly, on these words, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." But not a word does the council say as to the exception pointed out in the case of adultery; more than that, in

¹ Gospel according to St. Mark, ch. x.

the seventh canon, an anathema is launched against whosoever shall maintain that the Church is mistaken in teaching the indissolubility, even in case of adultery. Let us repeat what we have already said: this point is one on which we could most willingly forgive Roman Catholicism for being in contradiction with the Bible; but not the less is the contradiction there, patent, flagrant. There might be some plea for making indissolubility a law, but to teach it as a dogma is a lie.

To this first difficulty there were added others, lighter of themselves, but for which, when complicated by the idea of marriage being a sacrament, no solution was possible. Among the conditions attached to marriage some are purely human; the consent of parents and tutors, the minimum of age allowed in the spouses, &c. Now, supposing one of these conditions wanting, what is the marriage?

Would you pronounce it null? But it is contrary to the essence of a sacrament to suppose that it can be annihilated by the mere omission of a civil formality. In vain would you, like many of the Trent divines, call in the scholastic logic to your aid. "Every sacrament," they would say, "must have a sacramentary material. Just as there can be no baptism where there is nobody to be baptized, so there can be no marriage where there is nobody to marry. If, consequently, the spouses have not the requisite conditions, there are no materials for marriage. The act, therefore, is null, just as would be the baptism of a dead child or of a stone." Miserable subtleties, to which, moreover, there was needed but one word of reply, to wit, that the civil conditions of marriage are not everywhere the same, and that it involves a contradiction, and is absurd, to say that the same sacramental words might create an indissoluble tie, or have absolutely no meaning or effect, according as the same priest may have pronounced them on the same persons to the right or the left of a brook, if that brook happens to be the boundary between two states differing in their civil laws relative to marriage.

There is but one way of escaping from this absurdity, and that is by insisting that the civil power has absolutely nothing to do with marriage. As long as the Church shall have failed of reaching the point of regulating, in a sovereign manner, all its conditions, alike in the civil and in the ecclesiastical order, the sacramentality of that act can only be for her a source of embarrassments and rebuffs. The council of Florence, accordingly, had taught that the consent of the contracting parties is the only

indispensable condition. This is good logic. When you baptize a child, it is in vain that his father may not have consented, the child is baptized. In like manner, if marriage be a sacrament, in vain may the parents have said no: from the moment that the formula has been pronounced, there has been a marriage. One might, always in consistency with sound logic, have gone even farther than this. The child you baptize has neither sought nor accepted baptism. If marriage be a sacrament, if the formula of marriage has the virtue, like that of baptism, of operating a certain infallible effect,—one does not see how the priest might not marry of his own authority, as many people as he may think fit, without asking the consent of parties, without even informing them of the fact.

Here, then, as in so many other things, what contributed most to the force of the Church when she was omnipotent, contributes now only to her humiliation. What really is the civil marriage, as it is called, recognised now by most states, but the standing negation of the idea, so dear to her ambition, that she alone can make lawful marriages? That idea, nevertheless, she has not abandoned; she cannot, indeed, abandon it, seeing she has made it a point of faith. She is reduced, therefore, to the necessity of submitting to the affront in silence; she dissembles it by appearing to ignore it. Civil marriage, in her eyes, has no existence; if she ever spoke of it, it could only be as nothing short of an impious usurpation. Excellent as her theory of marriage might be, looking to an epoch of omnipotence, it was, at bottom, the fruit of temerity rather than of skill; her advisers ought to have provided for the case of her ceasing to have the mastery of Christendom, and to have secured at least some outlet for the retracing of her steps. But no. Who could have ventured to foresee or to predict the final close of that omnipotence which had been so fondly dreamt of, and towards which new advances were made every day? Was not the very transformation of marriage into a sacrament one of the things apparently most likely to lead to it, and to secure its permanency? Looking at that continued encroachment made by Roman Catholicism for a thousand years, one would say that it was an army which advances, which is ever advancing in proportion as the tide retires, without reflecting that those waves which are fleeing before it, may yet return faster than they have fled. Wherever the Church could plant her foot, there she planted it, and behold the tide approaches; behold the foot which cannot withdraw itself, seeing that a single

step backwards must insure an utter defeat; behold the Church encompassed with the billows of secularity. She well knows how to drive them before her, does she say? Vain hope, indeed! The tide of ideas is not one that ebbs and flows. Once that it has begun to rise, it rises, ever rises. God alone could arrest it; and, further, he could arrest it only by arresting and crushing the human mind. Sad miracle, which God will never perform, but for which Rome has ever been found but too surely preparing all minds that have not revolted at the blind submission she preaches.

Side by side with these tyrannical restrictions there were placed the most unheard of relaxations. Of all the obstructions to marriage, there was hardly one the removal of which might not be purchased with money; the very indissolubility of marriage, admitted as a doctrine, was often reduced to no more than a mere word, if we look at the infinite number of causes of nullity, one or other of which it was always easy for princes and other great folks to find suited to their purpose when they had a mind to change their wives. Divorce, in fact, did exist, but under its worst form, that of a retro-active judgment, annulling the union that had previously existed, and denying that there had been a marriage. By means of ready money and submission all was obtained when wanted. Provided the question of right was yielded, the court of Rome was not in the least offended at becoming, practically, the humble serving-maid of the secular princes. The Reformation has, in these matters, led to infinitely fewer disorders than Rome covertly legitimized.

The subject of matrimonial dispensations accordingly became, at Trent, a perpetual theme of complaint and lamentation for the Spanish, German, and French bishops. Only it was painful to see personal interest so often peeping out in the reproaches they cast on others. Many of them were manifestly less distressed at dispensations being so multiplied in number, than at the law according to which the pope alone was authorized to grant them and receive the price. Be that as it may, at some meetings of the council, one might have fancied himself at that of a Reformed Synod, so little did the divines and prelates restrain themselves in denouncing those abuses. The most violent charges ever launched against the Reformation, as relaxing the conjugal bond, were now hazarded by bishops, and without any calumny against the head of their Church. Some proposed that the number of obstacles should be reduced to the lowest possible

amount, but that these should at the same time be declared absolute, so as not to be removable even by the pope himself. This was tantamount to a decree pronouncing the council to be supreme; it was what the ultramontanists, as was to be expected, would not listen to or endure to be spoken of. Many of them even, in the course of the discussion, made bold to assert in set terms the omnipotence and absolute irresponsibility of the pope, being what had never before been maintained at Trent. The Portuguese Cornelio, one of those who commanded most attention of all the doctors of the Roman camp, laboured to prove that there was nothing in the world that the pope could not grant a dispensation for, excepting only belief on points of faith: of all else, of the commandments of God, as well as of those of the Church, of the canons of councils as well as of the decrees of the Holy See, he was supreme arbiter. And, on this occasion, the party were not afraid to resuscitate even those wretched arguments, based on single words and syllables, which one would think must have been buried for two centuries. "Abolish dispensations! has not St. Paul said that the Church's ministers are the *dispensers* of God's mysteries?" Such was the serious argument which a Dominican, of the name of Valentino, had the honour to propound. Fortunately, there happened to be present a Frenchman called John of Verdun, whose keen satire made him pay dear for this honour. In general, when any of the members ventured to make themselves ridiculous in presence of the learned doctors of France, it was not done with impunity. But, alas! what availed them all their wit? Even while making game of the ultramontanists, were they not bound by the same chains? And if they jested at the Romish arguments, if they stood out to the last against certain exclusively Roman pretensions—how many arguments were there not a whit more valid, yet of which they durst not make a jest? How many points were there quite as far from being well established, and yet of which they durst not expose the fragility without renouncing their profession as Roman Catholics?

All these discussions resulted only in obscure decrees, presenting a crude medley of discipline and doctrine, in which each party remained free to find more or less the opinion which itself had endeavoured to introduce into it. Of this we shall ere long give some examples.

The council kept its promise to the Cardinal of Lorraine, and

accordingly it was not till after his return, in the congregation of the 4th of March, that the great question of the celibate was broached.

First of all, the principle was laid down that celibacy, in itself, is holier than marriage. On this first point the meeting was unanimous.

Is this a question, we have asked ourselves, which can fairly be put under the form of a comparison between the relative merit of the two states in life? We think not. Marriage is the normal state of man; celibacy is not so, seeing that it would end at last in the destruction of the human race, a result manifestly opposed to the designs of God. Hence a first objection. Can it be admitted that with a Creator supremely wise and powerful, there is in the creation anything whatever in which what is abnormal, is essentially more pure than the normal? The barren fig-tree, then, says an ancient controversialist, was purer than had it been loaded with fruits. In the second place, the apologists of celibacy have never said, nor could say, that it saves infallibly and of itself; no more have they ever said, in so far as we know, that people cannot be saved in the married state. You cannot, then, establish a direct comparison between them in point of intrinsic merit; neither the one nor the other saves; neither the one nor the other consigns to perdition. "Which contributes most to salvation?" Such is the only question that can reasonably be started. The matter in hand is not to know which of the two states is the most *holy*, but which is best fitted to *make people holy*.

Now, in these terms, any general and systematic answer is impossible. Such a one will find salvation in celibacy without any marring of his comfort and happiness; another will find nothing in it but ennuï, disgust, temptations, evil thoughts of every kind. "When I had pronounced my vows," said Luther,¹ "my father, who had strongly opposed my doing so, exclaimed, May it please heaven this may not prove a cunning trick of Satan!" In marriage, the same diversity of effects. One will grow better and better in it, thanks to the salutary pressure of his new duties; another will see in it only a yoke, and those same duties will have proved but the occasions of new faults. Therefore, we repeat, the question is one of facts, not of principles. Such an one may have been lost in celibacy, who might have been saved in marriage. It is as impossible to say, *a*

¹ Letter to Link, 1521.

priori, which of the states is the better of the two in respect of its effects, as to prove by serious reasons the intrinsic superiority of the one over the other.

Celibacy, in the Roman Church, is imposed on two categories of persons, monks and nuns forming the one, and priests the other.

As for the former of these, if we once admit their existence, it is clear that celibacy is the necessary and indispensable element of their condition. We cannot therefore attack the celibacy of the monks; it is the monks, it is the monastic life itself, which we are called to attack in the name of Christianity and of reason.

In the name, we say, of Christianity; and if we had to do so here in detail, we should not stop at the idea—weighty as it is, however, that monasticism is not to be found in Scripture, and that it is not easy to understand how a thing destined to play so important a part in the Church, should not have had so much as a single line assigned to it in the New Testament; no, we should go straight to the root of the matter, and would ask, “Is it in fleeing from temptations, or in combating them, that man is best brought fully out, and answers best to the views contemplated by his Creator?” In denouncing the crime of suicide the idea that most naturally occurs is, that a man has no right to quit the post assigned to him by God. What, then, does that man do who buries himself in a monastery? And if although this mode of committing suicide may have less guilt attached to it, because it may originate in Christian motives, and have some happy results, still is it not essentially the same act?

Suicide, it is, in fact, and that of the saddest kind, since it not only results in death to the world and the trials of the world, but often, too, in the death of the victim's mind, the death of his heart, the death of piety itself. What, indeed, can there be in common with true piety, in that gross religiosity in which Christianity becomes a craft, worship a duty, and the sentient and immortal soul a praying machine? Have not even the wisest religious orders pushed this last abuse to the most incredible excess? At Cluny, besides religious offices of a frightful length, conducted in common and individual prayers without end, *one hundred and thirty-eight psalms* had to be recited every day. How is it possible that such worship could fail speedily to become mechanical? Accordingly, when the Reformers set themselves to attack the monks, they found nothing to say that had

not already been said a thousand times over. Their ignorance, their sloth, their gluttony, had already been for ages the laughter of the witty, and the despair of the godly.¹ Is it much otherwise at the present day? Revolutions have passed over the face of Christendom, and their bloody rake has rid it of many abominations; but go to Italy and to Spain, and you will have no difficulty in finding, in all its turpitude, the old type of the monks described by Rabelais and Erasmus.

Let us beware, then, of trusting to the poetic reveries of so many sentimental folks by whom convents and monasteries are never seen except through the clouds of the imagination, or the mists of party spirit. Hurter, too, becomes eloquent in his pictures of the monastic life.² But when he descends to history he finds himself compelled to go into details which are equivalent to a confession that he had been hitherto speaking only as a poet. Even writers that have been no friends to the Roman Church, have for the most part allowed themselves to be too much seduced into the belief that monasteries and convents gradually degenerated, and that it required the corrupting influence of ages before they could be brought into the condition in which the Reformation found them. Looking to what they were as early as the thirteenth century, when almost under the eye of their founders, and when controlled by so severe and powerful a pope as Innocent III., we must ask ourselves where, then, we are to place those days which are so often appealed to, and so eulogized, and the golden age of monasticism flits from us almost as much as that of Saturn.

Conventual establishments, then, according to many, are places where man is wholly devoted to God; they are celestial infirmaries for the reception of all the ailments of man's mind and heart. That it has often been of use to have some such refuge to offer to *wearied and heavy laden souls*, to use the words of Scripture, may be admitted; notwithstanding, on this very ground, where the Church of Rome appears so strong, we might still venture to ask if a soul so regenerated as to pant sincerely, not from sloth, but from piety, for the repose of the cloister, would not be sufficiently regenerated to rear for itself, without the intervention of material walls,—possibly indeed with more difficulty, but with more true progress also,—a barrier between it

¹ "Did they alone perish it were an evil, yet one which could be endured. But, circulating throughout Christendom as the veins do in a human body, their deprivation brings with it the ruin of the world." Memorial addressed to Paul III., 1533.

² Institutions of the Church, ch. vii

and the seductions of the world. We might ask, on the other hand, if the possibility of ending their lives in a house having the reputation of sanctity, and viewed as the gate to heaven, were not for many an encouragement to lead ill lives, spending whole years in utter forgetfulness of God, but with the prospect of returning to Him for a few days, and dying in the cell, or only, as was long the fashion, in the dress of a monk. But, let this never be forgotten, those who have become monks and nuns after having known the world, those for whom the cloister has been a seriously felt desideratum, have ever formed but a very small minority. It has been in youth, often in very childhood, that they have thrown themselves, and are to this day throwing themselves, into monasteries and convents. The monastic state was one in which there was hardly any thing to do, for the few monasteries to which we are indebted for useful labours can never be put in the balance against the ten thousand conventual houses which have only had to consume their revenues.¹ What has there not been said of the services rendered by the monks in preserving the manuscripts of ancient times! People forget that what they have preserved in manuscripts—and in what a state too!—is not the hundredth part of what they have suffered to perish.

Should it be said that the men, at least, entered with their full consent into the cloister; as for the women, how many were there whose vocation was not the result either of constraint or of moral influences equivalent to restraint? The heart shudders to think with what impious coolness a father, a mother, would condemn a daughter from her birth to the eternal icy widowhood of the cloister. Every daughter to whom her parents saw no prospect of their being able to give a portion suitable to the rank of the family, it was considered as a matter of course should have no vocation but the convent. “Instead of having one daughter destined to the cloister, behold I shall now have two!” said a great lord, one day, under Louis XIII., after having lost a large sum at cards. The Chinese, we are told, kill those children whom they dread being unable to support. Are they much more cruel than such parents? Although the authors of the last century have somewhat damaged the cause of the nuns by the

¹ In the space of a century and a half (1066-1216) five hundred and fifty monastic establishments were founded in England. The year 1200 beheld the rise of twenty-three abbeys of the same order, (*Cîteaux*.) At the close of the thirteenth century Florence had more than a hundred monasteries and convents. See on this subject a curious bull of Innocent X., (October 1652.) Protestants never said more or spoke better against the multiplication of monks and their houses.

bombast of their infidel pleadings, how can we but groan to think of those millions of existences which have fled away, valueless, incomplete, suffering, under the vaults of the cloister! and yet we should not commiserate and lament so much if those poor women had at least found there a God in spirit and in truth; we should not even dream of regretting, on their account, their never having known the endearing ties of spouses and mothers, if it were at least ties truly celestial that were given to them instead. But, as we have said already, piety is nowhere more gross, more childish, more miserably carnal, than in convents; nowhere is the worship of God more scandalously effaced by that of the Virgin, of the saints, of images; nowhere will you find more deeply rooted, more miserably pushed to its remotest consequences, the idea that salvation is acquired, is purchased, is paid for, by dint of external practices and vain repetitions. And the Roman Catholic historian, in speaking of convents, has not even the resource of being able to point to some that have rendered services to the world. People imagine they have said all in citing the Sisters of Charity; but they forget that it is not two centuries since they began to exist, and that Roman Catholicism remained a thousand years all-powerful, loaded with riches, without doing what she now vaunts having done. Where were there, at the commencement of the sixteenth century, the greater number of the answers that the Romanism of our day thinks itself entitled to give to those who criticise it?

Nor were the assaults then made on monachism confined to the principles or to the realities of the system.

There were, further, questions of religious and of common law on which the Church had rough adversaries to deal with, some among the princes, others among the ranks of her ordinary members. People asked themselves if she had any right to insist that the vows should be perpetual, irrevocable; if, in the case where a monk, or nun, wished them broken, she had lawfully the power of constraining such an one to remain faithful to them, the power at least of any constraint beyond that of censures. Here there was, in fact, a singular anomaly; controversialists, it strikes us, do not generally press it enough. The Roman Church glories in the credit she assumes of having abolished ancient slavery, and yet she has established a new slavery, still more absolute, since redemption is impossible. The monk and the nun were monk and nun for ever, neither could any more quit the monastic life than a prisoner his prison or a condemned

criminal the hulks. No doubt there was a personal engagement to this effect, but every vow is, in its own nature, an affair between man and God. It is God who receives a monk's vows; the Church does no more in reality than regulate the form. But the greater or less solemnity neither augments nor diminishes the worth of the promise before God, so that one does not see how the Church could be more entitled to exact by force the fulfilment of a solemn vow than that of an engagement made in the recesses of a man's heart. Starting from this idea, several juriconsults, even before the Reformation, asked themselves how an engagement of the conscience can be regarded as comprised in the domain of public jurisprudence; more accustomed than the divines to positive reasons, they sought for a logical transition, but could find none. Next, being the party best acquainted in general with the Bible, at least as a collection of laws, and finding absolutely nothing there to support the pretended rights of the Church in so serious an affair, oftentimes they ventured to doubt whether she could have any legitimate right to establish, of her own authority, laws that pressed so hard on the most essential and the most inalienable rights of man.

Since the Reformation the discussion had borne principally on the celibacy of the priests. There the question of right was less complicated. A Church may, strictly speaking, fix by her own authority the conditions on which a man is to become her minister. If a master has the right of choosing to have bachelors only in his service, one cannot refuse to a society that of imposing celibacy on the men whom she pays.¹ The evil lies in this, that Rome has made it a matter of divine right. The priest's liberty is alienated for ever. It is vain for him to quit the Church's ministry and to renounce every kind of function and stipend; he is bound, eternally bound; the Church will never recognise a marriage contracted by such an one.

Thus we see the abuse immediately follow the right. We acknowledge that temporary celibacy may be required; it is another matter knowing how far it were well to exact it. As for perpetual celibacy we should say, as in the case of monastic vows, that we cannot comprehend how a human authority can impose it on those who do not feel it to be binding in conscience,

¹ This reasoning surely rests on a false foundation. The Church is not an absolute mistress. It is her duty not to make arbitrary rules, but to obey those of her Divine Master, who, as will appear from what follows, not only does not choose to be served in the pastoral office by the unmarried only, but seems to give a preference to the married.—Tr.

and who should renounce the functions in view of which they had submitted to it.

Much noise has been made about the influence which their being tired of celibacy may have had on the priests who embraced the Reformation, and in particular on Luther and Calvin. As for the latter, it is the most gratuitous calumny that was ever forged; and as respects Luther, it is far easier to declaim against what have been called his carnal tastes, than to prove that they had any influence in the first movements of his revolt against the papal yoke. Was it a matter of such difficulty then to procure for himself, while remaining a priest, those gross enjoyments which some are bold enough to reproach him with having sought in marrying? Theodore Beza in his youth had been under no necessity of making himself a Protestant in order to his indulgence of those irregularities for which he is so absurdly reproached to this day, as if those disorders had not been committed by a Roman Catholic and a priest; as if history did not stand by ready to say how many priests and monks did as he did, and worse than he did.

And wherefore, besides, wherefore should we be so anxious to establish the point that the question of celibacy had absolutely no influence on the progress of the Reformation among the priests? Of all the yokes of bondage imposed by Rome on her ministers, none weighs more sadly on their existence, and on all the portions and details of their existence. Here is a law which pursues them everywhere, which condemns them never to taste joys which their Church herself pronounces legitimate and pure everywhere but with them; and can it be any just matter of surprise that that law should contribute more than another to suggest their inquiring into the right, in virtue of which it has been imposed on them?

The authority from which it emanates is that of the Church, but of the Church alone, standing apart from all divine precept, from all analogy even with divine lessons and facts. Under the Old Testament law the priests were married; the high-priest himself—he of whom the most scrupulous purity was required in his person, in his habits, in his most insignificant actions—the high priest was married. That law is abolished; the New Testament has superseded it. To make Jesus Christ come down daily upon the altar is more, it may be alleged, than to enter once a year into the most holy place. Be it so. But if celibacy be one of the consequences of this superiority of the Christian as

compared with the Jewish priesthood, how are we to account for the silence of Scripture on this new condition that was to be exacted? For, in fine, if it be a question of purity, it is inadmissible that it should not have been resolved by Jesus Christ, by the Apostles at least, and that the supper should have been so long administered by hands radically unworthy of the honour. How much grandiloquence has been wasted, especially in our own days, on this pretended profanation of the holy mysteries, should they happen to be committed to married men! Yet St. Paul speaks of this profanation, and that too without horror, without censure, without the slightest trace of disapproval. "A pastor," says he, "must be the husband of one wife, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity."¹ And at another place, "I left thee in Crete," he writes to Titus, "that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children," &c. Had Chateaubriand read this when he dared to write that Protestant ministers "*repudiate the Creator* for the sake of espousing the creature?" Were these lines to fall under the eye of a heathen it would not be easy to convince him that the latter of those two authors was a disciple of the former. In another passage, it is true, St. Paul seems to counsel celibacy; but to whom does he there address himself?² To pastors? No; what he says is said to everybody. Does he venture to establish a law? Not at all, for he elsewhere³ ranks among the disciples of Satan those who should venture to preach it. What then is the drift of the Apostle's counsels? He speaks of persecutions that had to be endured and precautions that were to be taken. In such a case it is clear that celibacy is attended with advantages; the fewer the ties to be broken, the more prepared is a man for suffering. Such is the amount of what St. Paul says; nothing more. The precept is one entirely of circumstances; even were it more general, the fact that the author had spoken elsewhere of a bishop's being married as a thing perfectly natural, and about which there could not be two opinions, were enough to dissipate any idea that the contrary counsel could in the smallest degree appear, in his eyes, a question of purity. And why do we speak only of St. Paul? He whom the Church of Rome has made the prince of the Apostles, the vicar of Jesus Christ, the channel of

¹ 1 Tim. iii.

² 1 Cor. vii.

³ 1 Tim. iv., "doctrines of devils, taught by seducing spirits . . . *forbidding to marry.*"

conveyance to this earth of all the spiritual powers, and of all the graces that descend upon it—St. Peter was married! He was so when the Saviour addressed the words, which, according to Rome, made him sovereign pontiff; he was so when he became, according to Rome, the bishop of the world's capital, for it was certainly less than twenty-five years before his death that St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians,¹ speaks of his colleague's wife. The Church of Rome has no great liking for this detail. She who has made male or female saints of all the persons named or alluded to in the New Testament, and even of some who are not named or alluded to there, for example, the father and the mother of Mary, has taken special care not to grant this honour to the wife of St. Peter, although St. Paul represents her as accompanying the Apostle in his painful and perilous journeys. So successful has Rome been in saying nothing about her, that a great many Romanists never heard her mentioned all their lives, and that they hardly believe their eyes when what St. Paul says is shewn to them. "My dear friend," wrote Luther,² "let us not affect a higher flight than Abraham, than David, than Isaiah, than St. Peter, than so many holy martyrs and holy bishops who have not been ashamed to acknowledge that they were men created by God, and, according to his word, have not remained alone."

See then reduced to its poetic value—if poetry can be where truth is not—this fundamental argument in favour of the law of celibacy. What yet remains to be said? That it is fitting and proper? But facts are at hand to prove that in this argument, as well as the other, there is more poetry than reason. Nothing more beautiful than what has been said, in prose, in verse, under all possible forms, especially under that of insults to the Protestant Churches, on this intimate and mysterious union between the priest and the Church, on this celestial marriage by whose duties he is entirely absorbed, the joys of which so fill up his soul as to leave no room for those of domestic life. That this ideal picture may possibly have been sometimes realized we deny not, nor do we deny that it may be so still; we confine ourselves to looking at facts as they are, and ask ourselves if Romanist priests generally bestow more time and pains on their churches than Protestant pastors do on theirs. *On their churches*, we say; *on the Church* is another question. There are by much too many, on the contrary, who see nothing but the Church; who

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 5.

² Letter to Reissenbach, 1525.

never dream of anything but the Church, who live and breathe only for the Church; but this devotedness is too much alloyed with human ideas and human interests to admit of our allowing it, in Christian consistency, to be taken into account. Is the Roman clergy, then, on the whole more devoted to its flocks than are Protestant pastors? Are those men who have no families to tend, sensibly more ardent in tending the poor? Are those men who have less need of money, generally reputed to love it less? Do those men who have no children of their own to occupy their time, find more time to devote to the children of other people?—is the instruction of the peasantry, for example, better attended to under them than under the Protestants? Do those men who are not distracted, it is said, by the cares of this life, appear, taking their life as a whole, to be more absorbed by thoughts of heaven? Are they more serious, more spiritual,—not at set hours, or set tasks, with a mass to say and a breviary to read, but with a living spirituality mingling with everything, and based on an incessant contemplation of divine things?

We make no reply. All churches, we know, have their own sores; pride, bitterness of spirit, too readily insinuate themselves into parallels of this kind. And yet, without entering into any details, all that we have said elsewhere of the incontestable superiority of the Protestant clergy, viewing the matter in the general light of excellence in the functions of their office, we might repeat here. We would address ourselves, in the second place, to all who have seen Protestant churches, not as they are represented in Romanist writings, but with their own eyes; and we would challenge them to say, whether they have not usually found the pastor having an eye upon all the wants and distresses of his flock, and at the head of all charitable or pious undertakings. We would ask, in particular, if it has often been discovered that the duties they have to discharge as fathers and spouses, really clog their duties as pastors; if the co-operation of a helpmate of the other sex be not, on the contrary, useful and desirable amid a host of cares in which the pastoral dignity would risk being compromised. We would appeal, in fine, to those who have lived at one time in a Protestant, at another time in a Roman Catholic country, and would ask them where they have found the clergy lying under the popular charge of being ignorant, lazy, avaricious, and negligent of their duties. We may admit that there have been certain ameliorations in our days; still it remains to be seen whether this great pastoral zeal has not had its source,

more or less, in the eager and feverish revival which we behold everywhere struggling for the mastery. Even were it momentarily pure from all human alloy, still we have here a general question to deal with; the pastoral zeal of the Roman clergy, at such or such a period, cannot be of itself an argument in favour of their celibacy. Were they, then, a married clergy of whom, as they existed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, even the most Roman Catholic historians are compelled to say so much evil? Are they a married clergy who are found to this day in so many Roman Catholic countries, so lazy, so worldly, so dead? "What strikes one first in the Italian clergy," wrote Lamennais, while still dreaming of nought but the revival of Roman Catholicism, "is something sluggish, apathetic, cold, indifferent, in one word, it is the absence of life, and in this respect Rome itself forms no exception. Everything goes on as it best can by a sort of old habit and half-worn-out mechanism. Nothing more rare than true zeal, an ardent love of good, self-devotion, self-sacrifice. They live by their profession, and that is all." No; it is not for the good of the Churches that the celibacy of the clergy has been, and is still, thought desirable. The churches, the pastoral life, the parish, have never been matters of more than second or third-rate interest to Rome. We find proofs of this in all the revelations which her encroachments forced from the lips of members of the council. The grand affair, everything in short with her, was *the Church*, centralization, unity. The clergy are, in her view, an army. The same motives which lead every conqueror to desire such soldiers only as know none but their own leaders, and have no other tie, have led Rome to enjoin celibacy. If ideas of purity, devotedness, and moral fitness prepared the law, it was not long before these proved mere pretexts. Soldiers Rome behoved to have, and it was only at this price that she could have them. Not that it is to be said that at the very origin of the affair, it was explicitly declared, "We want soldiers, men entirely devoted to us; we ordain that they shall be unmarried." No; but the spirit of such a declaration was there; in following out their mischievous propensities, corporations, like individuals, have no need of openly explaining, at the very first, their ultimate design. By a gradual process, that which had been given out at first as a human law, came to be imposed as a divine law. The vow of celibacy became of all vows the most sacred. According to Innocent III., it adheres so profoundly to the very bones of the monks, that the pope him-

self cannot absolve them from its obligations.¹ Among the secular clergy there have been examples, at wide intervals, of priests marrying with the pope's consent; rare practical alleviations, which did not prevent the theory from ever becoming more and more severe and absolute. One would have said that the guilt attached to the violation of this law of celibacy, was great in proportion to its utter want of any foundation in reason, or in the Gospel. Even at this day, when a priest leaves the Church, his former colleagues generally express more pity than hatred. But if he proceeds to become a married man, oh, then, no invectives are thought strong enough, no malediction can be found proportioned to his crime. That which Jesus Christ permitted in the man whom Romanists pronounce the first of the popes, that which St. Paul formally authorized among bishops, that which the Church long left free to all her ministers, has now become transformed into not only an act of disobedience, but a crime, a frightful profanation. The celibacy of a priest has entered into the very essence of his priesthood; some doctors have gone so far as to teach that whoever has once lived in marriage, however long he may have been a widower, is for ever disqualified for offering the sacrifice of the mass. Celestine III. was very nearly giving this tenet the force of a dogma. In fine, to return to the council, among those very men who had been heard preaching up the the pope's absolute power of dispensing with all laws, civil, ecclesiastical, and divine, there were some who refused him the right of allowing a priest to marry. And they did not understand that this right was to be taken from him by the council; they went much beyond this; according to them it was a right which the popes never possessed, or could have possessed, any more than that of annihilating what exists, or of creating what does not exist. Such was the importance attached to the maintenance of the law of celibacy! So much need was there felt for having piled around this palladium of the Roman Church all those ramparts which people were not allowed to raise round laws that had emanated directly from God.

This question, moreover, like all the rest, had come before the

¹ Numerous details will be found in Hurter, (ch. vii.,) on the progress of the question in the Middle Ages. Resistance to it was far more prolonged, and more obstinate than is generally believed. The Danish clergy, who were the last to submit, were powerfully supported by the peasantry, who said "they had to look to the safety of their wives and daughters." A proof this of the disorders which they saw following the celibacy of the clergy in other countries. It will be observed that we leave this side of the question entirely out of view. Of all the arguments against forbidding the priests to marry, the picture of their own morals has long been the most powerful. The improvement now seen in that respect, cannot blind us to the recollection of what they were during whole centuries, and what in some countries they still are.

council, not in its simple state, but associated with a train of political interests and prejudices. People were curious to know whether in the event of the pope being admitted to have the power of allowing a priest to marry, the French would ask his sanction for the marriage of the Cardinal de Bourbon, who might be called in right of birth to the throne. But the French themselves did not yet know how they should act, and were waiting for instructions from their court. The Cardinal of Lorraine, whom the queen-mother had almost left to follow in this matter whatever course he might deem best, was more undecided than anybody. On the one hand, in the event of the Cardinal de Bourbon leaving the Church, he would become the premier prelate of the kingdom, and in the possible contingency of a breach with the pope, he might consider himself patriarch of France; on the other hand, in the case of Bourbon remaining a priest, the Bourbon family might become extinct, and the house of Lorraine ascend the throne.

It was in the midst of these uncertainties that he heard (9th May) of the death of his brother, the Duke of Guise, who had been assassinated at Orleans. That event, though viewed at first in Italy as the worst of calamities, was ere long to prove almost as fortunate for the pope as for the French Protestants. Deprived of its main stay, the court, it is true, found itself compelled to make peace with these last; but, on the other hand, it felt, at the same time, that it had need of being on better terms with the pope, and must now look abroad for those means of resisting the Reformation, which it despaired of finding any longer at home. It was not even thought necessary to send orders to the bishops to moderate their zeal. They did so instinctively; from the very first days that followed the news, the Roman party could see that they had not intractable foes to deal with. And when so many difficulties that once appeared insoluble were seen to disentangle themselves as if by enchantment, "Poltrót's ball," it was said some months afterwards, "has rebounded as far as Trent. It has cut the knot by which the chariot of the council had been indefinitely stopped."

Possibly, too, there was, although on a different account, some softening down of their terms on the part of the pope and his party. He had received, much about the same time, two letters which could not fail to have so far influenced him.

The one was from the Cardinal of Mantua, the premier legate. We have seen that he was a straightforward and pious man.

Many a time he had testified his repugnance to being made the blind minister of the interests and the wishes of Rome ; many a time had he groaned to see that unless he chose to become her declared opponent, he was condemned to contribute more than any one else to the success of her intrigues. The pope, in fact, after having repeatedly expressed his profound discontent, had come to give him his entire confidence. It had been perceived, at last, what advantages might be derived from his popularity in the council, and from the favour with which he was regarded by the secular princes. Sick, worn out with anxiety and watching, he received an order to go and meet the emperor. But what was he to do at Inspruck ? He was not even clearly told what, but the Cardinal of Lorraine had gone thither ; and this was enough to induce the pope to send some one too, however painful the part he might have to perform.

Hard, indeed, was the service exacted by the court of Rome ; a man's self-esteem was often exposed in it to as hard rubs as his conscience. The cardinal began to weary of constant obedience. First, he dictated to his secretary a respectful letter in which he shewed the uselessness of the journey ; next, taking up the pen himself, he summoned courage to speak out his mind. He was weary, he said, of perpetually repeating to ambassadors and bishops promises which he had begun to see would not be kept. He blushed both for himself and for the Holy See, when he thought of these interminable tergiversations ; he trembled for the future prospects of the Church, while thus obstinately refusing all the reforms which Europe, led on by her kings, loudly demanded. He added that he was sensible that his end was drawing near, called God to witness to the purity of his intentions, and felt remorse at having, against the voice of his conscience, taken part in so many efforts to perpetuate abuses. Six days elapsed¹ and the writer was no more.

Such was the first of the two letters ; the second was from the emperor. As strong and much more frank and explicit than any that the pope had previously received from the sovereigns, it was not unlike the Cardinal of Mantua's postscript in its essence. The emperor told him, in substance, that he had come to Inspruck in order to have a nearer view of the council's proceedings, and that he had not as yet perceived anything but intrigues, doubtfully good intentions, and too manifestly bad ones ; that matters could not remain on this footing ; that the council was

¹ 2d March.

about to fall to pieces of itself, to the intense satisfaction of heretics and the everlasting confusion of the Church; that he would not, however, suppose the pope to be capable of any such selfish purpose as that of allowing an assembly, on which so many hopes had been built, to pass away in smoke, but that were such really the pope's intention, matters could not go on worse than they did. Three things, the emperor added, had especially struck him, and not him only, but all his prelates, all his subjects, in short, all Europe. The one was, that the decrees all came ready made from Rome; next, that the legates alone had the right to propose matters to the council; lastly, that the prelates from Italy formed a party, and took post openly as the champions and the advocates of the court of Rome. Now, it lay with the pope, and with the pope alone, to rid the council of these three plagues. Certain rumours of translation and dissolution had reached the emperor's ears; but he would not insult the pope by suspecting that he had given any ground for them. His Holiness, doubtless, understood better than any one else, that after having convened the council at the instance and with the assent of all the secular princes, he could not dissolve it without their approbation.

This last point was not quite clear. The pope had never acknowledged, in point of right, that he required the assent of the secular princes in convoking the council; and as all Roman Catholics were agreed that there could be no council-general without his concurrence, they, by that alone, acknowledged that he had the power to dissolve it. But if Ferdinand on this point went too far, it is not the less instructive to see what was thought of the council, shortly before its close, by a pacific prince, a man full of good intentions, a sincere subject of the Holy See, and sincerely desirous that the Church should recover her claims to the esteem and the confidence of the nations. Pallavicini, accordingly, struggles hard to weaken the purport of this letter. He insists on the compliments, the excuses, the expressions of respect and submission with which the emperor had mingled his remonstrances. Sarpi, according to him, saw only the dark side, the rude strokes, and these he tried rashly to embellish. "The emperor's letter," says he, "contained not a single grain of that aloes which springs up only in Sarpi's garden; though I ought to call it rather colocynth than aloes, seeing the bitterness of the one has a healing virtue, whereas the other is poisonous."¹

¹ Book xx. ch. viii.

Notwithstanding this, Sarpi's analysis, down to the very strokes of politeness, hardly contains anything which is not to be found in his tart rival. He has only forgot to mention that it was secret. This was an additional piece of politeness, but a proof at the same time of the severity of the contents. Thus, according to the emperor, the assembled prelates had not yet performed anything that the world expected from them. They had lost consideration in the eyes of all right-minded and godly people; there was nothing good to be expected from them as long as they should remain as they were. Well, then, did his letter put an end to all that he referred to as ruining the council's authority beyond its own circle? Certainly not; on the very day of its closing, in December, he might have repeated, word for word, all that he had said at the beginning of March; his letter might only have been richer in facts, reproaches, and objections. Such as the council had appeared to him at the earlier period, the same it ought to have appeared at the last, and in the same colours would he have painted it, had he not been induced to refrain. As for the dogmatical authority of the council and its infallibility, the letter says not a word. The emperor speaks of the council as of an assembly altogether human, occupied with human affairs, actuated by human passions. He does not even ask how one could make the nations believe that it was under the guidance of the Holy Ghost; he has not the air of a man who supposes that any one could entertain the idea of seriously presenting its decrees as having emanated from God. Once more, we do not mean to say that his was the language of a Roman Catholic; we simply remark the tone in which a good Roman Catholic still could make bold to express himself, in the first months of 1563, in speaking of an assembly whose most insignificant decisions have been magnified into oracles.

Pius IV. caused a memorial to be drawn up in which he insisted strongly on what did not depend upon him, but said little about what he was personally responsible for. He declared that he had never put force upon the council; but this was not what the emperor had said. It was well known that there had been no open violence; what was complained of was the occult and continuous action, in presence of which it was no exaggeration to say that the council was at Rome, not at Trent. The pope, moreover, affirmed that he had never forbidden the council to vote without his previous advice. Officially, this was true; in reality every one knew that it was false. When he had sent off

his advice, he added, he had never alleged that the council was bound to follow it. This, too, was true in one sense, but not true in another, since the pope well knew that all that came from Rome was sacred in the eyes of the majority. The great evil, according to him, was, that few people formed to themselves a correct idea of the council's rights, duties, and proper place. Had all the princes imitated the piety and followed the example of a Constantine and a Theodosius, all things would have gone on regularly of themselves.

The pope would no doubt have been very angry had he been taken at his word, and had his crowned adversaries been strong enough in history, or bold enough in logic, to think of placing themselves, in their relations with the Church, in the same position with the emperors he had named. Those two great names, or rather those two great words—Constantine and Theodosius—are still in great favour among certain defenders of Roman Catholicism, some of whom are ignorant enough to appeal to them in good faith, others because they think they may safely enough reckon upon the ignorance of their readers. The Church has never been less independent of the civil power than under the first Christian emperors; the profound sense of obligation with which she accepted the imperial favours sufficiently shews that she had no idea of claiming any of these as a right. When ancient ecclesiastical writers speak of the calling together of a council, is it the pope, or the emperor, whom they represent as having ordained its convocation? Have they ever said, for example, "the council of Nice under Melchisedech," or "the council of Constantinople under Liberius," in the same manner as "the Lateran council under Innocent III.," or "the Council of Trent under Pius IV.," came afterwards to be spoken of? "It was from a spirit of concession," one author tells us,¹ "or, at least, of toleration, that Constantine and his successors convened the first councils-general. Accordingly, it is very bad reasoning to say, the emperors convened the first councils; the right to convening councils, therefore, belonged to them." This, we admit, would be bad reasoning; but, let us add, it is not we who say it. Our sole conclusion is the following: If councils-general, reputed legitimate, could have been convoked by an emperor, then it is not indispensable to the legitimacy of a council that it be convoked by a pope. "But that arose from *concession—toleration.*" Ay, and such is the view

¹ Promptsault.

that must absolutely be maintained, else the whole system must be abandoned. But where have we the proof? The Fathers at Constantinople write to Theodosius that in calling them together himself, he put an *honour* on the Church.¹ That, you say, was a mere compliment. Agreed; but you will not go so far as to insult an œcumenical and infallible council, as to think that it could have turned into a compliment what it considered to be at bottom an act of sacrilege. Next, what was the object for which that very letter was written? Shall we say that it was from toleration, too, that the council asked from the emperor, and that in the most formal terms, the confirmation of its decrees? "Giving to God the thanks that are due to him, of necessity, also, we refer to your piety those things that have been done in the holy council."² Such were the expressions of the Constantinopolitan Fathers in the year 381. In a word, it is not because we are at all taken with a state of things in which councils were in the hands of the emperors; but this is widely different from their being in the hands of the popes, and their being nothing without them.

With this exception the reasoning of Pius IV. was correct. It is clear that if all the sovereigns had maintained the respectful immobility which it was alleged Constantine and Theodosius of old were observed to maintain, the council would long ere this have come to a close. It would have been shaken off in a few months, after having launched some anathemas against heretics, and having effected a few reforms in matters of detail, unless, indeed, a still shorter course had been adopted, that of not convoking it at all.

The Cardinal of Mantua was dead, and so his letter might be tossed aside. That from the emperor suggested some serious reflections; but they ended only in redoubling the precautions taken against all that was not delivered over to the pope and his partisans to be dealt with as they pleased. The reply of Pius IV. was not even sent off. "It was thought," says Pallavicini, "that this matter, so abundant and so crude, required being gradually mollified and prepared for deglutition, by the vital warmth of suitable words, so as to make it easier of digestion." The pope, accordingly, wrote only a very short brief, in which he thanked the emperor for his devotedness to the Holy See, for his zeal for the good of Christendom, his advices on the subject of reforms,

¹ Litteris, quibus nos convocasti, ecclesiam honore prosecutus es.

² Agentes autem Deo debitas gratias, necessario quoque ea quæ acta sunt in sancto concilio ad tuam referimus pietatem. Rogamus igitur tuam clementiam ut per litteras quoque tunc pietatis ratum habeatur concilii decretum.

and, finally, for his caution in listening to false reports. He added that Cardinal Morone was about to set off for Germany, and would present to him, in greater detail, the observations he had to make on his letter.

The pope, at the same time, paid the utmost attention to cementing a closer union between himself and the king of Spain. The arrival of an ambassador extraordinary was about to give him the occasion of making greater advances towards that, without too much condescension. Don Lewis d'Avila was received, therefore, with the highest honours; Pius gave him apartments in his own palace, and loaded him with courtesies. His instructions, which were a curious medley of submission and boldness, of ultra-Romanism on some points, and ultra-Gallicanism on others, faithfully represented that frank, yet false position, which we have seen invariably held by the Spanish prelates at Trent. Philip II., while formally protesting, on the one hand, against the concession of the cup, loudly protested, on the other, against that old subject of scandal, the *proponentibus legatis*, with which, said he, the council never could be free. He regretted that the continuation had not been openly avowed at the very first session after the council had resumed its sittings; but the more faith he had in the authority of the council, the longer was he of seeing the assembled prelates apply their hands to all that had to be reformed in the Church. The king, in fine, craved the pope's sanction for his levying, during five years, the subsidy that had been granted to him on the property of his clergy; he required, also, a dispensation for the marriage of his sister with his son, a ticklish case which the council had spoken of putting among those for which a dispensation could never be granted. On this latter point the pope said that he would have the matter submitted to examination, and that he would refuse nothing that he had the power to grant; as to the former, that he was quite disposed to grant the subsidy, but could not in conscience do it, as long as the Spanish prelates should remain at Trent and be subjected to so many expenses there. Let the king, then, but help towards the winding up of the council, and the subsidy would be granted immediately.

But what could Philip II. do? Notwithstanding his advices and his orders, the Spanish prelates continued to display the most independence of any. In the question of the authority of the Holy See, they astonished the Gallicans themselves; they were nearly jumping at once into consequences from which the latter recoiled.

“Let the pope give us back our own, since we leave him more than his own!” said the Archbishop of Grenada, one day. Angry feelings had gradually spread even into the numerous throng of footmen and other domestics with which so many ambassadors and prelates had crammed the city. Bloody brawls disgraced the streets. *Italy, Spain*, became two war-cries which in a few minutes would bring hundreds of combatants together. On the 12th of March a general fray took place; some were killed and many wounded. At last the excess of these disorders led to serious efforts for their suppression: but the congregation-meetings were for several days interrupted, and never had the council less of the appearance of a council.

We have seen why it was that the pope, even though very ill-pleased with the Cardinal of Mantua, had retained him in the presidency. That prelate's death left him at liberty to select a more devoted representative, and such he found in Cardinal Morone, to whom was added another legate, Cardinal Navigero. Hardly had they left their homes for Trent when news arrived of the death of Seripandi, who discharged the office of interim-premier legate, and survived his colleague only a few days. Thus, there remained at Trent, only Simonetta and Hosius. It was resolved that business should be suspended until the arrival of the two new legates, and the keenness of controversy was a little moderated in consequence. Two deaths happening so near to each other, had produced a profound sensation; the present looked dark, and the future darker still. Two thoroughly ultramontane legates could bring with them only new elements of distrust, and, in that respect, the ultramontanists themselves looked for their arrival with apprehension.

They travelled slowly. The pope, it was positively said, had enjoined them to reach Trent so near the time of the Easter holidays that no one could expect the sittings to be resumed immediately. The president, in fact, arrived only on holy Saturday. A magnificent reception was given him. At the first congregation, held on the 13th of April, the members learnt from his own mouth what had previously been a flying rumour, namely, that he was about to set out immediately for Inspruck. This news had something in it to displease almost everybody, Spaniards as well as French, as indicative of an alliance between the pope and the emperor; the Italians, as a weakness, for they thought it little becoming in the president of a council to put himself about for the sake of visiting a temporal prince;

the impatient, as causing delay; the religious, in fine, as proving that the council was to continue to be, before all things, and in all things, a mere political affair.

As for the Cardinal of Lorraine, who had eagerly made interest for the title of legate, and for this end had made advances little in consistency with his Gallicanism, he had gone to hide his ill humour at Venice, but not without exhaling it, in the company of his friends, in terms little fitted to make the pope regret his not having named him. Morone, on the contrary, greatly desired to see him before setting out for Germany; but as the crafty Lorrainer had no wish to come under any engagement, by no means could he be induced to return in time. He arrived on the 20th of April, and Morone had set off on the 16th.

This embassy into Germany had been officially announced as a mere matter of courtesy and good understanding betwixt the pope and the emperor; at bottom, it was an affair of the greatest delicacy and gravity that had occurred for a long while. First of all, as the pope began to see no hope of safety but in a *coup d'état* which should put the council absolutely in his power, it was necessary that Ferdinand should be brought to consent to the eventuality of a translation to Bologna. In the second place, as he had spoken of coming to Trent, and the pope dreaded this extremely, it was necessary that he should be induced to renounce this purpose, and to engage him at the same time to come to Bologna, in case of the assembly transporting itself thither; the pope would repair there also, and would solemnly place the imperial crown with his own hands upon his head,—a ceremony by which Pius IV. would have been happy to verify, at least in point of form, the right of distributing crowns claimed by the Holy See. Moreover, once at Bologna, the pope would naturally find himself at the head of the council, but this, people were assured, only to bring it to an auspicious termination by himself proposing many of the reforms that were demanded. In fine, the emperor had to be induced to desist from pressing a large part of the demands which he had presented or approved. With this view, Morone had orders to promise him that, on the council being brought to a close, he would obtain directly from the pope all that should be judged necessary for the good of his States, and, in particular, the concession of the cup. It is not explained how the pope could permit himself to be carried away by the hope of such a change in the ideas and plans of the emperor.

Meanwhile he thought he was bound to pronounce an ener-

getic protest against the treaty of peace that had been concluded between Charles IX. and the French Protestants. Contrary to one of the most ancient privileges of the kingdom, in virtue of which no bishop could be tried in the first instance except in the country itself, and by twelve of the bishops of the country, ten of them were summoned to appear personally at Rome as heretics and favourers of heresy. So much despatch and secrecy had been employed that the French ambassador had had no time to protest; he confined himself to remonstrating that this irregular summons would not be received, and that even were the bishops willing to obey, the parliament and the court would oppose their doing so. In fact the summons fell to the ground, and while it was published at Rome the parliament of Paris registered the edict of pacification, bearing among other things that were little suited to please the pope, "that the kingdom had suffered enough; that the king was determined to make peace, and to grant liberty of conscience, under certain restrictions, in the hope that with time, by means of a holy and free council, whether general or national, all disunion would at last disappear." This was a prospect for the future hardly warranted by the past; but we have here a fact confirmatory of what we have superabundantly demonstrated, to wit, that the Council of Trent, down to the close of its sittings, was almost nowhere considered as free, or as really general, or as having answered to the object that people had in view in calling for it.

And it was not in the very midst of the assembly that least doubt was expressed, if not upon its legitimacy, at least upon the authority and permanent force of its acts. At the epoch at which we now have arrived all the correspondence by letters, all the written accounts, bear the impress of weariness and disgust. We see men who have ceased to have any confidence either in themselves or in their work. Some we see blindly throwing themselves into the inconsistencies of Gallican liberalism; others pressing more and more eagerly round the pope; but as for people believing apparently in the council, in its divine commission, in the future subsistence of its acts, we see none, or next to none. Europe is there, all around, as if at the side of the bed of a dying person who still breathes, but who is spoken of as if already dead. Ambassadors, and even princes, protest no longer. Formerly the king of France would have thought himself obliged at least to say why he did not accept the council; in March, 1563, he does not so much as mention it. A free and holy council, says he, will succeed at last in consolidating

peace. He speaks like one quite unaware that there is anywhere an assembly calling itself a council. It is true that that assembly had little answered hitherto to the ideal that he had traced of it in speaking of consolidating peace. The gulf between the Reformation and Rome was deeper than ever. A thousand matters of dispute that had lain buried hitherto in the dust of the schools had been brought out into open sight of Christendom. "O, city of Trent! O, inhospitable city!" exclaimed the Bishop of Budoa, "with good reason wilt thou be put to the ban by the nations as a hotbed of troubles!" And upon this thesis he had constructed a whole burlesque parody of Isaiah's threatenings against Jerusalem. A poor joke and a foolish bishop; but, after all, he merely gave a farcical interpretation to what was said by some and thought by almost all.

Meanwhile nothing, or next to nothing, was done. Cardinal Navigero did not arrive until the 30th of April, the bearer, he said, of an order from the pope to labour seriously at the work of reforms; but he had orders, also, to do nothing before the premier legate's return. The latter had been followed to Inspruck by an envoy of the Cardinal of Lorraine, charged with instructions to urge the emperor to keep to his resolution. Accordingly he met with no success, and the imperial doctors continued peaceably to work at the far from Roman articles that had been submitted to them.

In fine, while the Cardinal of Lorraine was intriguing against the pope at Inspruck he sent one of his secretaries to the pope himself with the assurance of his most profound devotion. Caricatures were circulated accordingly, in which he was represented with two faces, one looking arrogantly to the north, the other looking humbly and submissively to the south. The pope, officially, saw only the latter; the former, without appearing to see it, he saw better still. Was the cardinal, then, the only man that had two faces? If any one had attempted to give a portrait of the pope, how many would he have needed to give him? Had the council itself never more than one face? And, in short, would not one rather have said of it that it was like one of those theatrical scenes in which the personages see each other, hear each other, almost touch each other, without apparently seeing or hearing each other? Happily the piece has not disappeared with the actors; and that piece has become something too serious for us not to be entitled to scrutinize the worth at which it was estimated in the eyes of the spectators at that time, and in the eyes of the actors themselves.

BOOK SIXTH.

Glance at the position of parties—The assembly—The Roman Catholics—The Protestants—The Pope—Rome—The emperor begins to fail—The Cardinal of Lorraine goes over to the ultramontanists—What is a heretic in the eyes of the Church—Consistency with her requires persecution—The question of divine right resumed—The cardinal makes a second step—The council is led away into the field of the pope's authority—The opinion of Lainez on dispensations and the right to dispense—Almost everybody shocked by his ideas and the tone in which he announced them—He excuses himself—The cardinal stops the protests.

Dispute betwixt the ambassadors of France and Spain—State of the question—A bias and its sequel—Violent acts of the French ambassador—Compromise—Other disputes of the same kind.

Why such an indisposition to vote on the question of the divine right—It is definitively withdrawn—Consequences of the vague state in which it has been left—Disagreement among the doctors—Is it true that it was a question of little importance—Silence of the council on all that relates to the popedom—Is it true that this silence was quite voluntary—Historical sketch of the discussions.

Almost as many questions omitted as decided—An attempt made to draw up a table of the functions of the seven orders—It fails—The council admits, in spite of itself, the legitimacy of the suppressions made by the Reformation—Theological difficulties—If a layman be fit for certain sacerdotal functions he cannot be absolutely unfit for certain others—The Roman system is logical and clear only at the surface.

The Spaniards persist in requiring explanations—They desist—The legates are delighted—Twenty-third session—Decree of Reformation in eighteen chapters—Residence—Conditions and formalities of ordination—Conditions as to age—Other points—The seminaries—Historical review—The seminaries are one of the fruits of the Reformation.

Universal astonishment at the view of the omissions—The assembly resumes the question of marriage—Discipline and dogma mingled more in this than in anything else—Ambiguous decree—Fifty-six bishops are for the council speaking clearly, without troubling itself about consequences.

Forty articles presented to the ambassadors—Articles which the latter wished to be added to these—Why so many cardinals Italians, and always an Italian for pope—The princes think of taking their guarantees against the bishops—Pius IV. urges matters to a close—The princes exact the suppression of every article contrary to their rights—The ultramontane party—Intervention of the Cardinal of Lorraine—His journey to Rome—Draft of decree on the princes—Exorbitant pretensions—Du Ferrier's protest—Other protests—The council is more than ever a chaos—An explanation of the *proponentibus* consented to—A congregation in confusion—Twenty-fourth congregation held, in greater confusion still—Pallavicini's success.

Objections to twelve anathemas of the decree on marriage—Contradictions, incoherencies, shifts, and quibbles—Why was the indissolubleness of marriage not formally taught—Disciplinary articles—Clandestine marriages, dispensations, &c—Reformatory articles—Elections, provincial and diocesan councils—Visits, preaching, censures, draft of a catechism, penances, salaries, competitions, ecclesiastical procedure—Why, after so many decrees, did people still complain of the insufficiency of the council?

The Queen of Navarre is summoned to Rome—Protest of the Queen of France—The pope seconds the views of Philip II. on that kingdom—It is decided that the close of the council shall take place before the close of the year—The discussions hastened by the bad state of the pope's health.

General review of the questions on purgatory, the worship of saints, &c.—Question of purgatory—Scriptural discussion—Involuntary admissions in the Protestant sense—Could purgatory fail to be expressly mentioned in Scripture?

The worship of the Virgin—Mary in the Gospels—In the Acts—In the Epistles—In the Apocalypse—Historical review—The Virgin in the writings of the Fathers—Great eulogies, but no trace of worship—Epiphanius, Cyril, Proclus—The worship of the saints—Silence of Scripture—What all prayer addressed to a dead person pre-supposes—The peace of those who pray to the saints—Pagan objection—Luther and the saints—Is there anything wanting in those pious persons who do not pray to them—What would be lost, in general, by not praying to them—The worship of the saints is forbidden by implication in many passages of Scripture—There is but *one sole* Mediator.

Abuse of the worship of the saints—Has it ever remained and can it remain within the limits traced by the council—The common people invoke them as present everywhere and as possessing power of themselves—Proofs—The saints according to Chateaubriand—Does the Church combat the tendencies of the common people—What would be thought by a pagan entering Rome again after eighteen hundred years' absence—Juliana of Liege and the cut in the moon—"You might steal God from them, and they would never notice it"—A *mandement* of the Archbishop of Lyons—Falshoods and sophism—The Virgin queen of the universe—Proofs—Citations—The mob of saints—How they are fabricated at Rome—Relics and worship of relics.

Worship of images—The Second Commandment—Fraud—Discussion—If the images are nothing in themselves, why are some more venerated than others—Is the worship of images really different from what it was among the pagans—The worship of the Virgin, worship of beauty—Questions to her worshippers.

Indulgences—Historical review—The council tries to purify the practice, but leaves all the obscurities of the theory untouched—Discussion—Several *wherfores*—Ridiculous facilities—Although salvation were to be bought, the greatest of the saints would not have wherewithal to pay for it—It is a matter, therefore, in which none except Jesus Christ can lend aid to any one.

Reformatory decree on the subject of the religious orders—Divers details—Encroachments on the rights of the civil authority—Decree of general reformation—Wise measures—New encroachments—Digression on the acceptance of the council in France—Variations of the clergy.

The dogmatic decrees are thought superficial and little worthy of a council—Everybody, with the exception of the Spanish ambassador, wishes it to be closed—The pope is dangerously ill—More and more haste made—Threatening difficulties—These are smoothed down—The pope's confirmation to be asked for—All the old decrees to be read in public—The decree on the princes to have everything removed from it that can shock them.

Twenty-fifth and last session—Unlooked-for article in favour of the pope's authority—Prorogation until next day—The decree on indulgences past—Resumption of the session—Fasts, festivals, the Index, the Catechism, questions of precedency, &c.—Reading of the old decrees—One further difficulty eluded—Final voting—The pope's confirmation asked for—Dispositions of Pius IV.—Those of his court—Resistances—View taken of the confirmation by those even who advise it—It is given—The pope reserves to himself the interpretation of the decrees—Rome can as little trust the decrees of Trent as she can trust the Bible.

Conclusion.

As we draw towards the conclusion it will not be uninteresting to explain in a few words the position of the parties chiefly interested. To describe in detail all that was in agitation in Trent, and around Trent, at this time, would be to describe chaos.

Among the members of the assembly, as we have already said, there prevailed weariness and discouragement, to which we may add an almost general neglect of dogmatical questions. A stranger never would have imagined that any of these yet remained on the orders of the day; he would have supposed himself rather in a diet than in a council.

Among the generality of Roman Catholics, we have already said also, there were disappointment, distrust, unanimity in feeling, and almost unanimity in saying that this was not what had been expected.

Among the Protestants you might see that the council was forgotten and despised. They were no longer spoken to about submitting to the council. Matters had come to that point that it would not only have been unreasonable, as it had ever been, but ridiculous, to give them for oracles of the Holy Ghost the decisions of an assembly where so many passions and intrigues were fermenting.

The secular princes, who had always, and before all things, seen in a council the re-establishment of unity, an illusion which vanished from the time that the first sessions were held, the princes, we say, now concerned themselves about the council as people concern themselves about affairs that they have once taken up, but on which they have ceased to found any hopes. Besides, with excellent views and excellent intentions relative to abuses in general, each held to the preservation of those from which he himself in particular derived some advantage, and, as Pius IV. very well said, each wanted to reform everybody but himself.

The pope, in fine, while loudly complaining of the selfishness of the princes, knew assuredly better than any one else, that there lay the anchor of his own salvation. Had they all been agreed on all points, resistance would have been hopeless. But what was asked for by some was not asked for by others, or the very contrary was asked for. If this was not a reason for absolutely refusing, it was always one for putting the matter off indefinitely, or for referring it to the judgment of the pope. Hence some of the most delicate points had successively escaped being judged by the council. Not that there was not more than one on which all sovereigns were agreed; all, for example, were for the divine right in the episcopate. But as they had no common understanding as to the importance to be attached to the question, as to the necessity for having it settled, and the form to be adopted for that effect, ample room was afforded for tak-

ing advantage of these divergencies and avoiding a decision either way. The pope, moreover, although he had more to hope from time than from any other auxiliary, was more impatient, more fatigued, more sick-tired, than the council. Seventeen years of struggling had led the court of Rome to unmask, one after another, all its batteries, to let the world see all its fears, and even all the details and all the various shades of those fears. It reckoned up with terror all that it had lost by the council, if not in positive rights, at least in moral authority; it durst not believe in the stability of the decisions that had been taken according to its views; it knew too well, and care enough was taken to tell it, that its intrigues had been manifest to everybody, and none had been deceived but those who wished to be so. Had it been told that the day would come when the collection of the canons of the council would be the citadel of the Church of Rome and of the popedom, it would have thought the prediction an idle dream; the best thing, according to all appearances at that time, that it could expect was that, the council once over, not a word should ever be said about it, either good or bad.

The essential matter, accordingly, was to bring it to a close. Morone had come back from Germany after long and useless conferences, and with nothing but vague and far from encouraging answers to communicate to the pope. The emperor had said that the transference of the council was not to be thought of without the consent of the kings of Spain and France; that the good intentions of the pope, which, for his part, he had no wish to doubt, would not prevent unpleasant suppositions as to the object of the translation; that all the bishops, according to him, ought to enjoy the right of proposing measures, and that either the *proponentibus* must be expunged, or a declaration made to the effect that there had been no intention of asserting an exclusive privilege; that, in fine, he could not renounce his demand for the examination of all that had been presented, both in his name and in that of the king of France.

But when he saw that same prince begin to give way on all points, one after another, except that of the translation, and to shut his eyes on all the expedients that were employed for bringing, right or wrong, the council to an end, it was not to be believed that that unbending reply had been really his last word to the papal envoy. The report was circulated that Morone had been more fortunate than had been thought at his return, or

than he himself had seemed to believe. It was not supposed, nevertheless, that he had converted Ferdinand to the views of the pope; but it might have been supposed that by shewing him how very enormous the obstacles were, he had indirectly put him in the predicament of having to choose between a rupture with Rome and a speedy termination of the council, alternatives between which a Roman Catholic prince could hardly hesitate, especially in Germany at the centre of the Reformation. We cannot know up to what point these suppositions were well founded; but they were justified by the event. True, we shall still see the emperor's representatives throwing obstacles occasionally in the way of the assembly's course; but whether they were in the secret of his policy or not, their opposition will be observed to have always stopt at the point beyond which it would have been a declaration of war, and we shall see the emperor express neither open gratitude for their efforts, nor formal regrets for their want of success. We shall also see the Cardinal of Lorraine, whether in accordance with him, or at his own instance, enter definitively into the same course of deference towards the pope, and of conciliation towards all.

This was perceived, on the 7th of June, on occasion of a speech made by the President de Birague, sent by the court of France, to justify before the council the peace that had been granted to the Protestants. That peace, in a Roman Catholic point of view, had much need of justification. If you are asked what a heretic is, and try to define this, assuming as a basis the Roman anathemas, you will make him to be a creature in perpetual and voluntary revolt against all that is most sacred, a species of monster, who is less to be dealt with in the way of covenant than the worst of brigands,¹ seeing that a robber may go to heaven on a single movement of repentance, whereas a heretic, unless he abjures heresy, is irrevocably excluded from it. That being so, it cannot but be a crime, and an enormous crime, to leave them in peace; by so much the stronger reason was it criminal to have authorized them to celebrate their worship, and to remain constituted in churches. The Roman Church has the misfortune of finding, that she cannot be tolerant, even by halves and provisionally, without setting herself in contradiction with the laws that have emanated from her, and which owe their rigour, not to passing necessities, but to principles

¹ Those heroic Vaudois (Waldenses) who have suffered so much, and forgiven so much, were called by Gregory XVI., in 1832, "the scum and opprobrium of the human race"

which she has proclaimed, and still proclaims to be necessary, immutable, and eternal. With Protestantism, consistency requires toleration; with Romanism, the same consistency requires persecution.

De Birague had represented peace as a political necessity, a truce to last only till something better could be had. But from what quarter was that better to be expected? From the council, he had said. An old compliment which re-appeared in all the harangues, and which had long ceased to be really one, since there never failed to be added, or hinted, that if the council was to do any good it must be by its beginning to be something very different from what it had hitherto been. The speaker had concluded, as was always done, by disparaging all the council's doings hitherto as inadequate to their object. A great internal reformation alone could, in his view, open the way to a return of unity.

The Cardinal of Lorraine having risen to speak on the reply to be made to this communication, it was remarked that setting aside all that bore upon reforms, he confined himself to enlarging upon the political motives that had been stated by the ambassador. This he did with great vigour and eloquence. The pains he took to argue from the ground of necessity alone, without giving the slightest place to considerations of justice, toleration, compassion, anything, in a word, that could be regarded as favourable to the Protestants, was accepted as a pledge given to the Roman party, as a first step in a course where all was about to be smooth.

Erelong he took a second. The never-ending question of the divine right, repelled under so many forms, had never remained a single day without re-appearing, sometimes feebly, as if by way of memorandum, sometimes with fresh vivacity. It then became anew, for some days, the only important question. Each party reproduced its reasons, and after a crisis of longer or shorter length, and more or less stormy, each found itself just where it had been before. The intermediate distance had not been narrowed by a single hair-breadth.

The Cardinal of Lorraine had said on his arrival, that he was for the divine right, but that he did not insist that mention should be made of it in a positive decree. Afterwards, without openly contradicting himself, he had made common cause with the partisans of that opinion; it was too much bound up with all his other views to admit of his abandoning it, even had he wished to do so. On coming out from a conference with the

Cardinal of Ferrara, he himself had made it known that that prelate had eagerly urged him to consent to a decree in which that question should be eluded, but that he had refused and would ever refuse. Great, therefore, was the surprise, alike of his friends and his enemies, when on the 11th of June, at a semi-official conference between the legates and a score of bishops, he declared that his opinion remained unchanged, but that, in order to have done with the matter, he had ceased to insist on its insertion in the decree. He interposed this condition only, that no more should the decree contain anything contrary to that opinion, even, he added, to the idea of the superiority of a council over the pope.

Thereupon, notwithstanding the joy that must have been felt by the Roman party on receiving such an overture, great was the quarrel that ensued on that scorching question about the authority of the pope. The Archbishop of Otranto so far lost his temper as to tax with heresy the opinion which he knew to be that of the cardinal; no one but Lainez had as yet expressed with such frankness his faith in the absolute and full superiority of the pope. The cardinal replied, but with great moderation, and with the evident intention of wounding nobody. The contention, skilfully diverted, then ran chiefly on the dispensations. As always,—for there was not a question in which the parties did not revolve in a circle,—some wished that there should be cases in which no dispensation should be accorded, others that the pope should remain sole judge. Tired of the contention, the parties paused; but there had been enough of bitterness betwixt the Cardinal of Lorraine and the legate Morone, who had a few days before accused him of attacking, in general congregation, things that he had in private seemed to approve. The cardinal could perceive, accordingly, that he had much to be forgiven, and set himself more and more to obtain forgiveness. A fine opportunity was now about to present itself.

On the 16th of June, Lainez announced that he would reply to all that had been said or insinuated against the pope's authority. Starting, accordingly, from the principles announced in his previous speech, he reviewed the various applications of the papal power, and endeavoured to shew that there is none of them that is not of divine right. According to him, to say that a dispensation from the pope does not discharge from an obligation towards God, is to teach men to put the decisions of their conscience above those of the Church, and to throw themselves, in

fact, on the Protestant principle. "Embracing in its universality all times and all men, the divine law is irrevocable; but as for ecclesiastical discipline, whose precepts have for their only object *the facilitating to men the observance of the laws of God*,¹ it may undergo modifications, and it is for this end that the Church has a head who can dispense from the observance of her laws. That authority has been committed by Jesus Christ to the pope; none therefore can dispute his possession of it without setting himself in opposition to the will of the founder of the Church. A law which should forbid the pope to exercise the right of dispensing would, by the very fact of its having had men for its authors, be revocable of its own nature; and *although the pope should engage by a solemn oath never to use that power, his promise would cease to be obligatory from the moment that charity should counsel the violation of it.*"²

Thus the only right that Lainez refused the pope, was that of interdicting himself even by an oath, from using the right of dispensing. Here, then, we have omnipotence pushed to the last conceivable extreme, that in which it has not even the power of binding itself. In vain would a pope swear to the observance of a law; in spite of his own very will, he remains free to violate that law.

As for the council, always according to Lainez, the pope being incontestably superior to each of the members, one does not see how he should not be superior to the assembly itself. To him alone belongs the power of reforming, if they have need of it, each of the churches of which the bishops compose the council; it cannot, therefore, be maintained that those bishops, assembled together, have that of reforming the entire body of the Church.

Never yet had the bishops heard so frank a declaration, that they were nothing, and could do nothing. The very Italians, habituated as they were to a sense of their own nullity, but who could not be altogether insensible of the pleasure of being something as members of a council, thought these hard words. They said nothing, however; but the Spaniards could not repress their impatience, and still less could the French. What shocked them most, was the tone in which Lainez spoke. He alone arrogated to himself the right to speak from the centre of the hall, seated on a chair that had been brought for him. There he sat, like a

¹ May we not say that there is the fundamental principle of Jesuitism? Its dogmas, its morality, its policy, all that it has done of evil or of good, all is there.

² Pallavicini, Book xxi. chap. vi.

professor in his chair, nay, almost like a magistrate on the bench of justice. The greatest personages did not obtain from him a direct refutation, and his haughty looks formed a fit accompaniment to the cold inflexibility of his language.

On that day, however, he felt that he had gone a little too far. Having learnt that the French prelates had met at the Cardinal of Lorraine's to deliberate about the course to be taken after such a manifesto, he sent them the offer of an apology, saying that he had not had the least wish to offend any one. That small meeting prepared itself to the best of its power; all present, not excepting Hugo the spy, who was prompted either by anxiety to conceal his connexion with the pope, or by conviction, spoke only of attacking Lainez. One recalled one passage, another another, and all mutually exhorted each other to omit nothing, to forgive nothing. Thus everything promised some vigorous attacks on the following day. The cardinal seemed to approve. Then scruples gradually suggested themselves. "What will be the result of this contention? The majority will not on that account be the less ultramontane, and ready to vote, on being pushed to it, in the direction desired by the Jesuit. What we have most to wish, is that there should be no voting at all." These scruples insensibly took the form of advices; and the advices of the cardinal were equivalent to orders. The prelates gave up the idea of refuting Lainez; from that moment the legates and the pope saw that the cardinal was entirely theirs.

Before proceeding farther, let us say some words on a quarrel foreign to the proper business of the council, but which had long contributed to complicate all difficulties, and to envenom all debates.

In all the public ceremonies of Europe, the pope or his representatives had the right of figuring in the first rank, and the emperor or his representatives in the second. The third, after having long pertained to the king of France, had been latterly disputed by the king of Spain. Under Charles V., who was at once emperor and king of Spain, there had been no room for contention on the subject; but after having enjoyed the right of precedence for forty years, the Spaniards were less than ever disposed to yield it.

Count Claud Quignones di Luna, ambassador to Philip II., had arrived about the end of March, and near two months had been spent in trying to discover how an audience might be

granted him, without giving him such a place as would not offend either him or the French ambassadors. It was settled, accordingly, that for this time he should have a seat by itself, in the middle of the hall; but it was understood that this should form no precedent for or against either party.

Thus the question remained entire. The legates referred it to the pope, and, while waiting for his decision, the two rival ambassadors avoided coming into each other's presence. The pope had submitted the affair to a commission of cardinals. Their unanimous opinion was that in such matters, the rule of antiquity is the only one possible; precedence, accordingly, belonged to the French. But, for the moment, the publication of a decision unfavourable to the only prince that appeared friendly to both the council and the pope, was not to be dreamt of. After several months of deliberation, an expedient was supposed to have been hit upon at last, but it was thought prudent not to say a word about it, until the moment of its being put into execution. On the 29th of June, St. Peter's day, after all present had taken their places in church, and high mass was about to commence, an arm-chair appeared, brought in by footmen, and set down in the line of the prelates, between the last cardinal and the first patriarch. At the same instant the Spanish ambassador arrived and placed himself in it. Thereupon great was the buzz of voices. The mass commenced, but nobody attended to it. The French murmured aloud; they sent to inquire in what manner the offering of incense was meant to be arranged, for, thought they, then it must be decided whether to commence with France or Spain. The legates replied that there would be two censers; on which the French declared that it was not equality they wanted, but precedence. It being found impossible to make them give way, the count was besought to agree at least to the incense being presented to nobody. He first refused, and then consented, and the mass was finished amid the greatest agitation.

What particularly aggravated this affair, was that the legates declared that they acted only upon an express order from the pope. Pius IV., therefore, found himself directly implicated in the quarrel; but while he had at least the approbation of the Spaniards, the legates were chagrined to see that they had discontented everybody,—the Spaniards, by not having fully carried through the pope's decision in their favour, the French, by having kept it a secret, and attempted to execute it by surprise. The Cardinal of Lorraine was particularly shocked at such con-

duct, he to whom the promise had so often been made, that nothing would be kept concealed from him. He complained of it with much warmth; and when the legates complained that they could not refuse to execute the pope's order, on the following Sunday, should the Spanish ambassador require them to do so, he declared that he himself would go up into the pulpit, and call on the prelates to leave the church, so as not to be witnesses or accomplices of such a scandal. The legates, in great alarm, prevailed with the count not to require anything for some time, and once more the whole affair was remitted to the pope.

There had been perpetual conferences at the houses of the ambassadors. The Spanish seemed ready at times to give way, and again would demand the strict execution of the pope's decision, that is to say, the maintenance of the place that had been given him on the 29th of June, and the simultaneous presentation of incense. As for the French ambassadors, they had made up their minds to protest and go away. Their protest, they said, would not be against the legates, the king of Spain, or his representative, or against the Holy See, but personally and directly against the pope, the author, according to them, of all the mischief. That poor pope, whom they had persisted in speaking of with a certain respect, as long as they had found themselves contending with him only on the great interests of the Church, was treated as a monster from the moment that he had dared not to be strictly just in a question of etiquette. Many of the French spoke of nothing less than refusing him his very title of pope. They had in their possession, they said, proofs that he had purchased votes at the conclave; that thus, in terms of the ancient canons, his election was null, and null also, must consequently be any council convened by him.¹ Du Ferrier drew up a long protest; without going so far, he confined himself to representing the pope's having had for his sole object embroiling France with Spain. "He, the common Father of Christians, wished to disinherit his eldest son, the king of France; making Scripture to lie, instead of bread he gives him a stone, and for a fish, a serpent. A man who casts off his son is no longer a father; the French can no longer recognise him as such."

Had not this protest risked calling forth others, the legates need not have felt much uneasiness at so foolishly passionate a

¹ When Clement XI., in 1709, declared himself against Lewis XIV., the French ambassador, the Maréchal de Tesse, left Rome declaring that that city was no longer the seat of the Church.

document. It was too manifestly absurd for Roman Catholics to think themselves authorized to call for the dethronement of a pope, because he had wronged them in an affair altogether human, and in which he had unwillingly interfered. But as the smallest attack, even although unjust, might lead to a terrible concussion, the legates made desperate efforts to prevent its getting abroad. The emperor's ambassadors communicated on the subject with the Spanish ambassador, and the Cardinal of Lorraine with those of France. The rigour of his first threats was succeeded by too much calmness, not to make it suspected that there had been an affectation of more indignation than he really felt; and it was surmised that he had caught at an opportunity of making a parade, in quite an accessory affair, of an independence which he was no longer prepared to exercise on essential questions. Notwithstanding these suspicions, which his conduct was ere long to change into certainty, he shewed enough of testiness on the subject of French honour, to admit of the king of France's ambassadors listening to what he had to say. They consented, accordingly, to allow the count the arm-chair that had been brought in for him on the 29th of June, and the count, on his side, no longer pressed the subject of the incense. It was decided that this arrangement should be regarded as provisional, but should be maintained until the ambassadors should have received new orders from their masters. These orders, it was tacitly understood, were not to arrive before the close of the council.¹

We have omitted various contentions of the same kind, that had successively arisen between the ambassadors of Portugal and Hungary, of Bavaria and of Venice, &c. Without making so much noise, they had contributed not a little to keep up the prevailing dissatisfaction and irritation.

When this storm had blown over, the council resumed its labours, but with the conviction that they would never come to an understanding on the question of the divine right; and that unless it were left out altogether, everything would be brought to a halt, and that indefinitely. For the Roman party, as we have already said, it was not a question as to the majority; there was no doubt that a general voting would give them the victory. What made them pause, therefore, was the dread of too strong a

¹ It is known that the question was not definitively settled in favour of France until the time of Lewis XIV., just a hundred years after.

minority, and of protests too warmly urged to admit of their daring to regard the vote as finally settled; and then what was to be done? "Nine-tenths of the Fathers," says the Jesuit Biner, "were agreed in acknowledging the pope's superiority to the council, and yet, on the reclamations of certain Frenchmen, it was not declared." *Nine-tenths*, that is saying a great deal; the anti-Romanists, at that epoch, formed at least the fourth part of the assembly. Be that as it may, we cannot admit with the author whom we have quoted, that the council was to be commended for this. Were it the case of a political assembly, we should willingly admit that it would have been prudence, reserve, and a wise respect for the minority; but in that of a council, it furnishes, it would appear, far more matter for blame than praise. You admit that human considerations prevented the voting of what nine-tenths of the assembly, according to you, considered to be a truth! So the Holy Ghost quailed before "certain Frenchmen!" The council's enemies never said anything stronger against its pretensions and its tribulations.

It was not, however, without difficulty that the leaders of the majority prevailed on their followers to be quiet. Heated by contention, and sure of carrying the day, many Italians wished for the vote; but the legates, by express orders from the pope, compelled them to abandon their purpose. It was the Cardinal of Lorraine who took in hand and proposed the omission. As nothing more, then, than a motion on a point of order had to be put, a mere majority sufficed. The vote was taken, and the question was definitively withdrawn.

Here, then, we have this fundamental article of the Roman hierarchy shoved away for ever among the uncertain points of the system. With the decrees of Trent in his hand, the bishop you may consult will answer you without hesitation, without possibility of error, according to him, on a multitude of subjects which revelation does not teach, and which man is quite incompetent to see or to know; but ask him if he is by divine right superior to priests, and whether it is from God or from the pope that he holds his power? he will hold his peace. If he speaks, he can but give you his private opinion. Did it appear to you to be good, and had you nothing to reply, you might always object that it is his opinion, that he cannot warrant its correctness, that his Church, in fine, makes herself infallible, and convenes councils only to leave in uncertainty a subject even of that importance. The certainty which Rome maintains that she

alone is in a condition to give, the bishop has not, and without a new council never will have, on what every man called to any ministry whatever, has most need to know, the nature, namely, and the source of his authority. Will he maintain that it suffices for him, in practice, to speak and to act in the name of the Church? He is neither elected nor instituted by her; he does not receive from her any commission. Then, the question is not one of practice, but one of right. From whom does he receive his commission to speak in the name of the Church? That is the question. Will he reply that he receives it from the pope? That again is true; but true actually, true in fact, and what he must be able to say is, that it is true in point of right, true absolutely, and it is here that the want of harmony commences. At Fribourg, "every bishop who has not been instituted, or recognised by the pope, is an intruder, a false pastor."¹ At some leagues from Fribourg, "legitimate bishops are those who are instituted *according to the rules of the Church*, and who are in communion with the pope. According to the present discipline of the Church, which has been in force for *several* centuries, it is our Holy Father, the pope, who institutes bishops."² Between these two teachings, though identical in their present results, the distance is great, it is immense. In the one the pope is the source; in the other he is only the channel, and even the *present* channel only; the Church might delegate to others, did she think fit, the power to institute bishops. It is, accordingly, as if in one and the same state, two political catechisms were to teach, the one, that authority emanates from the prince, the other, that it emanates from the people. It were in vain that the practical results were momentarily the same—who would assert that the two authors were agreed? Who would think the difference of their views unimportant? This, however, is what has to be done in order to save the unity of the Roman Church. But even although common sense were not to exclaim that this question is on the contrary at the basis of all, let it be remembered how the council devoted more time to it, and threw itself with more ardour into it than any other, falling back upon it, in spite of itself, at every turn,—and then, after all this, let people say, if they can, that it was thrown aside because it was thought of no moment.

But it was not only on the popedom viewed in its relations with the episcopate, but on the popedom itself, its essence, its

¹ Fribourg Catechism.

² Catechism of St. Claude.

origin, its place in the hierarchy and in the Church, that our council maintained the most complete silence. We have already remarked this; but we would also call attention to the contrariety to facts, to be found in the answer that Romanists have had to make to the arguments deduced from this strange omission. "If the council," it is said, "has taught nothing on this point, it is because the supremacy of the pope had appeared to it to be sufficiently established by the universal assent of the Church." Nothing is less true. For first, the council nowise restricted itself to speaking only of things that required to be fixed. We have seen it teach many things in which, for a long while, there had been no want of certainty among Roman Catholics. There was not, therefore, any reason on that ground for its not having spoken of the pope. In the second place, we have seen that the assembly always preferred attaching itself to those points that were attacked by the Protestants. Now, what had they attacked more keenly than the pope? On what, then, would it have been more natural to confound them and anathematize them? In fine, let us proceed to facts. In order to maintain that if the council omitted this point, it was because it saw no need of speaking about it, one must be able to say that the council had decided from the first that it should be set aside, and that there had been no attempt to give it any place in the decree. Far from that; from the first presentation of the articles on the sacrament of orders, that is to say, eight months before the session in which we have seen that they were published, it was proposed that one should be drawn up on the pope. No formula was as yet officially proposed, but none of the speakers seemed to think that they could dispense with looking for one; to speak of the pope on the occasion of the sacrament of orders, seemed as natural in their eyes as to speak of the mass when the eucharist was under discussion. After five weeks' debating, during which the question of the popedom was not for a single day separated from that of the priesthood in general, the Cardinal of Lorraine proposed two canons, one of which declared the bishops to be instituted by divine right, while the other anathematized the opinion "that St. Peter had not been established Prince of the Apostles, supreme vicar of Jesus Christ; that a sovereign pontiff is not necessary; that the legitimate successors of St. Peter have not constantly held the primacy of the Church." Attacked by some as giving too much to the pope, by others as not giving him enough, that article served as the topic of discus-

sion for a month. It was communicated by the legates to the pope; the pope added to it what he considered to be wanting, and sent it back to the legates. In the new draft of it, there was anathema to whosoever should say, "that the legitimate successors of St. Peter have not constantly been the fathers, the pastors, the teachers of all Christians, and that there has not been given them by Jesus Christ, in the person of St. Peter, full power to rule and govern the universal Church." And on this new ground the discussion was continued for three months. Thus it remains an unquestionable fact that neither bishops nor legates, neither the pope nor any one, had the intention originally of not speaking of the pope; that thus, as we have asserted, the sole cause of the silence observed in the council's decrees on that head, was the impossibility of coming to a common understanding upon it. The best proof, in fine, that they did not consider themselves to be agreed by the sole fact of their being so, in the gross, on the primacy of the pope, is, that it was never once proposed that they should get rid of the difficulty by adopting an article in which they should acknowledge, in two words, that primacy. The least scrupulous felt that it would be ridiculous to merge under one term the profoundly diverse opinions which had come to light in interpreting it. Is there any better agreement upon it at the present day? It would appear so. But not the less is it an historical fact that the Council of Trent did not dare, or was not able, after several months of effort, to teach anything on the subject of the pope.¹

The grand obstacle was now taken out of the way. In putting their hands, in order to have done with it, to the omission of a point of such importance, each party had, in some sort, taken an engagement to abandon in like manner every question on which inability to come to an agreement was dreaded. We shall have to notice that thenceforward, to the close of the council,

¹ What a contrast betwixt this silence and the boldness of the popes when they have to dogmatize on the misty origin of their pretended rights! Hear Alexander VII. writing to the University of Louvain: "That excellent precept, *so often inculcated by the Saviour's voice*, to keep the Church's commandments, and to listen to the voice of the pastor whom he has established his vicar." And yet this is what Cardinal Pacca quoted, fifteen years ago, as an oracle. If there be no small audacity in even so much as asserting that Jesus Christ ever intended to create for himself a vicar, what term shall we apply to the inconceivable impudence with which a pope dares to affirm that the order to obey him was put into set form, was *inculcated*, and that *so often*, by the very voice of the Saviour! With these lines in one hand, and the Scriptures in another, there is enough to disgust with the popedom whosoever detests fraud, and has also the courage to exercise his powers of reflection.

almost as many questions were omitted as there were questions decided.

The first thing done was to take from the draft of the decree on residence everything that could shock either the partisans or the adversaries of the divine right. Residence was found not to have been ordained either by the pope or by God; the council confined itself to prescribing it as natural and necessary. This was in many respects the best thing that could be done, for there is no better way of recommending a duty than by frankly referring it, without any cavilling, to the sacred law of duty; but there was wherewithal to make them a little confounded at the thought, that they had for years been quarrelling about residence, only to say at last what might have been said the first day they began, had they but contrived to keep to plain common sense.

After having decreed the seven orders, it would have been natural to point out the different functions attached to them. The attempt was made; but the enumeration, elaborated at great length, was found so unlike the actual state of things, that it was soon seen to be absolutely impossible to embody it in a law. For several centuries, in fact, the three major orders (subdiaconate, diaconate, and priesthood) were the only ones the existence of which was not purely nominal. The impossibility of finding for all churches a porter and an acolyte in orders, had led to their being replaced by laymen, often by children. Even in churches provided with that kind of ministers, it was not they, but beadles, sacristans, singing boys, as is generally the case to this day, that watched the doors, took care of the church materials, served at the altars, &c.¹ To decree that these should receive orders corresponding to their functions, would have been to incorporate them with the clergy, a course which would have had great inconveniences; to decree that the titulars should condescend to discharge such humble functions, would have been to lower the sacerdotal dignity, for it would have been hopeless to attempt leading people to regard as honourable and sacred what they never could recollect having seen done by any but domestics. On the other hand, to do nothing towards preventing these four orders from falling definitively into desuetude, would have been to admit that the Protestants had been in the right when they abolished them as useless. A middle

¹ The functions of reader and exorcist, considerably curtailed, were discharged by the priests.

course, therefore, was adopted. Setting aside all details as to the functions of these orders, it was decreed, in principle, that they should be exercised only by persons regularly ordained. The application of this rule was then restricted to cathedral, collegiate, and parochial churches, *in so far as can conveniently be done*.¹ It was added, in fine, that in default of ordained and unmarried men, any man of good morals, provided he was not a bigamist, might exercise these functions. The council, accordingly, did no more, upon the whole, than consecrate what usage had everywhere established. This was wise; but to recognise so openly the possibility of dispensing with ordained porters, readers, exorcists, and acolytes, was but a pitiful way of attaining the object indicated in the preamble of the decree: "Lest these functions should be traduced by heretics as tending to idleness."² Moreover, after such large concessions, what becomes of the canon in which the admission of the seven orders is ranked among points of faith? How can one pronounce an anathema to whosoever shall not acknowledge seven, while admitting that there are four that the Church can dispense with, and with which it actually does dispense.

This admission is not less serious as tending to confirm all that we have said on the theological difficulties of the sacrament of orders. If the seven orders are so many parts of one same sacrament, and if, nevertheless, there are several whose functions can be performed by laymen, where shall we set the limit to this? At what point shall the intermixture of laymen begin decidedly to be a sacrilege? What notion shall we form of a sacrament, one sole and perfect sacrament, in which some parts are of an indispensable and absolute necessity, while certain others are useless? Viewed in the light of discipline and good order, the Church has reason incontestably to desire that certain charges shall fall exclusively to her ministers; what we wish to say is, that if necessity suffices for authorizing a layman to discharge the functions of four orders, one does not see any more why the same reason should not authorize him to discharge the functions of five, six, or seven, and why, for example, in a desert island, some shipwrecked seamen might not choose one among themselves to dispense to them the supper. Here, then, we are brought back, by another road, to the objection that had already presented itself to us in the question of baptism. If a layman can baptize, we say, it cannot be logically maintained,

¹ Quantum fieri commode poterit.

² Ne ab hæreticis, tamquam otiosa, traducantur.

even although the apostolic history should not prove the contrary, that he is radically unfit to administer every other sacrament. If a layman, we now say, may discharge certain parts of the sacrament of orders, which is one sacrament, on what ground shall he be declared radically and absolutely unfit for the functions conferred by the rest of the sacrament? a new proof in support of what we have so often had occasion to repeat, that the clearness of the Romish theories is found oftenest at the surface, and that there is no need of going very deep in order to find embarrassments and obscurities.

By dint of omissions, hopes began to be indulged that the session might take place on the day fixed, to wit, the 15th of July 1563. The Cardinal of Lorraine had got his part acted out, and it was no fault of his if the council was not ready several days sooner. Unfortunately the Spaniards had not yet all given in, and did not speak of doing so. In the congregation of the 9th, the Archbishop of Grenada took it upon himself once more to say that it was shameful to have so long amused the fathers on the subject of the divine right, only to leave it at last unresolved. He declared that neither he nor his friends would ever change their opinion; that it was, in their eyes, not only an error, but a heresy, to think otherwise. He well knew, however, that that *heresy* was the opinion of the court of Rome and of the majority of the council. How did he contrive to reconcile all this with conscientious views as a Roman Catholic and an archbishop? And when he spoke of never changing his opinion, what then did he mean to do, if the council, in accordance with the pope, had decided the question in a sense the reverse of his own? On the day before the session, he again waited on the Count di Luna, to exhort and to protest, in the name of Spain, against the omission of the decree which he and his colleagues were resolved to call for up to the last moment. Strange, indeed, would have been the spectacle of an ambassador protesting in favour of a dogma; already it was odd enough to see bishops asking him to take such a step, and we might join this fact to all those that have appeared to us to shew how little common understanding there was, at that epoch, on the nature and the extent of the authority of a council. The count refused to comply; he even tried, but in vain, to divert his countrymen from their projected protest. The legates ignored this conference; they thought themselves at the end of their labours. "At the moment they

were closing the despatches which they were sending off to Rome to announce the joyful news, they received a message from the Spanish ambassador. It was to inform them that he had made great efforts, but in vain, in order to induce his countrymen to give way; he thought that, consequently, the session could not be held without the risk of giving offence to the whole of Spain."¹ The legates persisted. They called a last general congregation. Italians, French, Germans, and others, with the exception of six, adopted unanimously the decrees as they had been arranged; the Spaniards were immovable. They voted in silence, but were to protest in full session. Anxiety was now at its highest pitch; the legates deliberated; they durst neither hold the session nor put it off. What was to be done? The ambassador was to be implored to make another effort with the rebel prelates. He saw them, accordingly, once more; besought, urged, conjured them, and, at last, wrested from them, in the evening, the promise not to protest next day. Let us now hear Pallavicini. The delight felt at this news by the legates seems to have become his own; his style rises into poetry. "The legates," he says, "had laid themselves down that they might taste that rest which has long to be waited for, even on a bed of down, when the mind is tormented by an excruciating sting, at the moment they received this joyful news. To them it was like the intoxicating liquor with which Homer inebriates his heroes. They did taste a few moments' sleep until Aurora called them to a session, the fruit of so many fatigues and perspirations, the object of such lively and such various hopes. Very ignorant or very malicious must be the man who should accuse nature, as an unjust stepmother, for having given this pleasure at the cost of so much fatigue and suffering! Just as the bee distils the sweetness of its honey from the bitterness of the thyme, so by present toils we prepare matter for future joys." Here, truly, is a grandiloquent way of telling us that the legates had been in great trepidation, and it is the first time, to our knowledge, that people ever thought of proclaiming a victory when they had only escaped from having a battle.

After ten months of delays, accordingly, this famous twenty-third session took place. The Spaniards kept their word. They did not protest, and the greater number even voted without making any observations. Three or four, that they might not seem to abandon their old opinions, declared that they voted in

¹ Pallavicini, Book xxi. ch. 11.

the hope that the council would, ere long, develop what required development. They well knew that that would not be done.

The reformation decree contained eighteen chapters.

We have spoken of the first, that on residence. Full of good things, but of exhortations rather than of orders, it could not have, and actually has not had, any more effect than that of the sixth session. Among the legitimate motives for non-residence, there had been put the "service of the Church;" to which the Cardinal of Lorraine, who never forgot himself, had caused to be added "the service of the State." Obligation to residence, however, on the part of the cardinals, not without much opposition on the part of the ultra-Romanists, was inserted in the decree.

The subsequent chapters regulated the disciplinary conditions and formalities of ordination, whether for bishops or for priests. The twelfth fixed that no one should be made sub-deacon under twenty-two years of age, deacon before twenty-three, and priest before twenty-four. The sixth, that no benefice could be obtained by any one under fourteen years. As they were frequently given to perfect children, this rule shewed some progress; but it is clear that at the same time it sanctioned a serious abuse. A boy of fourteen is no more capable of being an abbot than one of twelve or of six. It had been put into the first draft that bishops appointed by princes should, after being instituted by the pope, be examined by the metropolitan; but this security had been rejected by the Italians as contrary to the pope's independence, and by foreign prelates as calculated to give offence to the secular princes. Those chapters, in short, comprised some excellent regulations, to which nothing has been found wanting but their being better executed.

In the fifteenth, it was said that no priest, secular or regular, should confess in any diocese without the sanction of the bishop; an important law which the bishops had vainly solicited in the early times of the council.

The sixteenth bore that no priest should be ordained without being attached to a church. Many of the prelates had asked that it should be the same with bishops, but the Roman party had insisted on preserving for the pope the right to confer the episcopate as an honorary title.

The seventeenth treated of the minor orders. Of these we have already spoken.—In the eighteenth, in fine, the institution of seminaries is handled. Let us pause for a moment at it.

Had the Council of Trent produced nothing but this decree, we are told it would have earned perpetual claims to the Church's gratitude. Possibly so. The idea was beautiful, it was great; we shall not stop to recall how many inconveniences, nevertheless, are found to be combined in them with incontestable advantages. We shall only ask why it was that such a decree should still have remained to be made. With all her power, and all her wealth, the Roman Church had never yet seriously set herself to secure for her ministers an education worthy of their calling. All had dwindled down, on this point, to some vague injunctions, a few ancient canons, fixing the minimum of learning, or rather the maximum of ignorance, which the candidates might bring with them, and even those rules were constantly violated. The slight mental cultivation enjoyed by so many priests at this day, particularly in countries altogether Roman Catholic and not in contact with better educated nations, sufficiently shews what they must have been before the institution of seminaries, and at an epoch when to be able to read was sufficient to place a man above nine-tenths of the population. At all epochs there have been learned men: but how many? Beyond the universities and the higher charges, that is to say, throughout nearly the entire body of the inferior clergy, hardly can we discover here and there a man that participated in the feeble enlightenment of his age. The Reformation, on the contrary, had no sooner enjoyed some moments of peace, than it made the utmost endeavours to secure for itself educated and capable pastors. If it had not established seminaries,—having always thought these, not without reason, much too like monasteries,—it had everywhere founded schools, which, in a few years, rivalled the ancient universities. The Roman Church had been struck with this. She felt herself carried along, like the world around her, towards an epoch in which ignoramuses would be left on the back-ground. Without waiting for the orders or the aid of a council, several bishops had already made efforts to procure priests a little less below their calling. Seminaries, in fact, already existed: the council had only to generalize their establishment. The bishops were authorized to raise from Church revenues of every kind the sums required in order to cover the expense. It was ordained at the same time that every theological canon should be bound to discharge in those schools the teaching functions already attached to that title, or to find, at his own expense, a capable substitute. The whole

decree is very well conceived ; we have thought it therefore of consequence to shew how much the Reformation had contributed to render it necessary, and to prepare matters for its being carried into execution.

Still, its utility was not so very evident as to prevent the public from exclaiming against the barren results of a session prepared for at such length, and so laboriously. The dispute about the divine right had, during the whole of that time, kept all the divines, all the universities, all Europe, on the stretch of expectation. It had been seen, with redoubled interest, to reach by slow degrees the domain of the popedom itself; friends and enemies were alike kept in a state of inexpressible suspense. Accordingly, even after the decree had been for some days before everybody's eyes, people still continued to ask themselves if the council could have dared to say nothing on such a subject.

At Trent, as it was much to be dreaded that the discussion might recommence, the decree on marriage, already elaborated, was resumed without delay. It had been thrown aside, in the last instance, not only because the other absorbed all the council's attention and time, but also on account of the difficulties found in it. No subject had, in fact, occurred as yet, in which doctrine and discipline were more mingled, and we have already seen how many inconveniences arose from this medley. No sooner was it resumed than the same difficulties occurred, augmented by all the arguments for or against each opinion which a long delay had allowed the parties to prepare. The most delicate question, we have said, was that of the validity of marriages contracted without the intervention of the civil power. The council durst not pronounce them good ; and yet, in spite of all the distinctions imagined in order to explain how a sacrament can be null without any of its religious elements being wanting, logic continually returned to the charge. People said, in spite of themselves, that if marriage be a sacrament, the omission of civil formalities can no more make it be considered as null, than it could prevent transubstantiation from taking place wherever a legitimate priest shall pronounce the sacramental words of consecration over the wafer. One might have gone even farther than this, for if the Church cannot make the consecrated wafer to become bread again, one does not see how the sacrament of marriage, after being once performed, can in any case be reduced to nothing. What caused alarm, not without reason, was the consequences ;

it was the reclamation of the princes, for they had never ceased to protest against clandestine marriages, and the French ambassadors, in particular, had formally demanded that they should be declared null. Priests might indeed be forbidden to celebrate such marriages, but the case had to be provided for of priests paying no attention to this, and how, after that, could the council dispense with determining what was to become of the sacrament so administered?

After fifteen days of contention, there was no means of coming to an agreement, or of appearing to be agreed, but by drawing up a decree in which each party would find more or less of his views, saving that the practical interpretation was to be left to the bishops and to the pope. They began, therefore, with simplifying the question by deciding that it should be spoken of only in the disciplinary articles, where they hoped they might avoid pronouncing, in precise terms, either a yes or a no on the validity of clandestine marriages. After getting rid of this first difficulty, the following shift was adopted:—"Although it be certain that secret marriages have been true and valid marriages, in so far as the Church has not annulled them,—although the council anathematizes those who do not hold them to be such, together with those also who maintain that fathers and mothers may annul marriages that have taken place without their consent, the Church, nevertheless, has always forbidden and detested them." Then come diverse regulations prescribing the public formalities to be observed before the celebration of a marriage, but not a word is said about the intervention of the civil power.

Here but one point is very clear: it is that fathers and mothers must not believe that they have power to annul, by simply refusing their consent, a marriage celebrated in secret, and without their participation. The annulling could come only from the Church. Was the Church, then, to annul all marriages that fathers and mothers might refuse to ratify? Were it to engage to do this, it would leave one door for the admission of an idea which it had expelled by another; fathers and mothers could not but believe, in fact, that it is they who annul, or, at least, who have the right to exact the annulling. Hence this studied obscurity. Are such marriages valid? Yes, *as long as the Church has not annulled them*. Then the Church can annul them? No doubt. Does it annul them thenceforward? No answer. The council only makes a step that prevents its advancing farther.

One point more, consequently, on which the council durst not express its thoughts, and recoiled before the rigorous application of its principles. This ambiguity displeased many of the bishops. Fifty-six were for frankly keeping to the theological legality of marriage, without disquieting themselves about the civil legality. This opinion being at once more logical and more favourable to the sacerdotal authority, had great charms for the Roman party; the legates had much to do to prevent its passing openly into the decree, a result that would have produced the most dangerous protests. Such was the way in which a place was tacitly contrived for the civil legislation; but that place the articles, viewed as a whole, tended to make as small and as inconvenient as possible. We shall notice, farther on, those which contributed to prevent the reception of the council in France and elsewhere. Other facts which we cannot leave behind now require our attention.

Immediately after the session of 15th July, the legates had sent to the ambassadors forty disciplinary articles, with a request to have their opinion upon them before submitting them to discussion. These articles, although put together in such a way as to do no prejudice to the pope, and even, as we shall see, to favour his authority, were generally good; had the close of the council not been so near, they might have been accepted with joy, as an approximation to reforms of a more important kind, and really such as Europe desired them to be. But the Roman party talked of bringing matters to an end in one session, or at most in two; those articles, accordingly, risked being the last, and there was but a small number that answered directly to the desires of the secular princes and their subjects.

This was remarked by all the ambassadors. On the 31st of July, those of the emperor presented a memorial, in which they shewed how far people still were from that reformation *in the head and the members*, so often solicited, so often promised for a century. They called attention to a dozen of points hitherto omitted or rejected, and without which, they held all that had been done, or might yet be done, would end in nothing. They placed in the first line a severe revision of the laws and customs relative to cardinals and conclaves. The French ambassadors, whose answer did not appear till three days after, insisted no less strongly on this last article. They required, among other things, that the number of cardinals should be restricted to twenty-four; that the pope should not elevate to this dignity either his own brothers or nephews, or the nephews or brothers of a living car-

dinal; that they should all have an equal and fixed revenue; in fine, that there should never be at one time more than eight of the same nation. At all times, in fact, there have been murmurs against the exorbitant privilege accorded, on this last point, to Italy. Why should so many of the cardinals be Italians? Quite recently, on the death of Gregory XVI., there were fifty, while all the rest of the Roman Catholic world reckoned only ten, not one of whom took part in the election of the present pope. Besides, why always have an Italian for pope? There is little consistency, surely, between the universality which the Roman Church arrogates to herself and this absolute preponderance indefinitely accorded to one nation.

The Spanish ambassador, who replied only on the 7th of August, began by declaring himself content with the forty articles, but afterwards insisted still more strongly than the rest on the insufficiency and the nullity of a reform that should stop at that point. He required, also, that among the prelates of each nation a committee should be named for proposing the reforms which they severally might want. He declared, in fine, as had been done already by the French and German ambassadors, that his present remarks were not to be considered as his last words on the subject, but that before pronouncing definitively, he waited for instructions from his court.

Several things, in fact, were contemplated in which the secular princes behoved to look well to their interests before committing themselves. If the bishops laboured to re-conquer from the popes those ancient rights out of which they had been cozened, the princes, on their hand, had need to see to it that these conquests did not turn to the detriment of the royal authority. Those pretensions which they might lend their aid to destroy in the heart of Italy, they could never wish to find starting up in the heart of their own states. Accordingly, the ambassadors of Charles IX. had added to their demands in behalf of the bishops, that they should be interdicted from meddling in any way with secular affairs. The rest, without going openly so far, had also said enough to let it be seen that neither Ferdinand nor Philip would forget to take their own precautions. It does not appear that there resulted from this any perceptible coolness between the ambassadors and their prelates; but one may be allowed to think that for the latter it was a new motive to be more accommodating to the pope, and not to protest too strongly against the approaching close of the council.

Pius IV. eagerly pressed towards that object. Repeatedly, during these late times, when danger seemed to him to be augmenting, the suspension or dissolution of the assembly had been in question between his legates and himself. After the auspicious termination of the debates upon orders, the legates had almost advised this course; seeing, thought they, people could not flatter themselves with the prospect of not being driven to it, they ought not to wait until a new crisis should come, when they might have no resource but an ignominious retreat. The pope had thought otherwise. He had ordered them not to dream of any suspension, unless the necessity was present and absolute; but he had at the same time sent them word to have done with the council as speedily as possible and at any cost. In consequence of this, they first of all retrenched from their forty articles six of those which, after hearing the remarks of the ambassadors, they thought might lead to long debates or contested decisions. The remainder were submitted to deliberation only on the 21st of August, and all that raised, or seemed likely to raise difficulties, the legates hastened to retrench. Thus the forty articles were reduced to twenty-one.

While these things were doing, (27th August,) the imperial ambassadors received from their master a memoir on those very articles. He warmly complained that they comprised nothing good, nothing in accordance with the wishes of the princes that was not accompanied with clauses contrary to their rights. It would appear, said he, that the design has been to make this reformation insupportable to them, so that they could not but reject it, and that the disgrace of its failure might fall on them, while the court of Rome would persevere in its disorders without disturbance.

The French ambassadors received (11th September) letters from their king. Knowing as little as the emperor, that the greater part of what might displease the princes had already been retrenched, he enjoined his ministers to declare that he would never subscribe to it.¹ But what he ordered them specially to oppose, was the draft always announced and always kept in reserve since the time of Paul IV., of a special decree of reformation applicable to the princes.² He protested beforehand

¹ "I am very far from (obtaining) what I expected from the council, if the Fathers proceed to the judging of these articles, which will make the claws of kings be pared, while their own are allowed to grow, a thing I shall not endure."

² "Seeing that each falls upon us. His Holiness is of opinion that for the love of God you should allow or cause the council still to continue harping on the reformation of the

against all invasion of the rights of the civil authority, enjoining his ambassadors, his prelates, and, in particular, the Cardinal of Lorraine, to leave Trent the very day that that decree should be proposed by the legates.

The legates seemed to have no wish to do so; but there had arisen among the Italians a powerful and bold party, with which all were forced to reckon. More popish than either the pope or his ministers, this party had resolved to oppose all internal reform as long as the decree on the princes remained undrawn up and unvoted. Neither the entreaties of the legates, nor those of the pope, nothing, in short, could keep them quiet. They would not be quiet, they said, unless they were openly commanded to be so; and how think of putting such an affront on most devoted servants? They were about a hundred in number.

On this side, then, as well as others, the pope saw no way of safety but through the intervention of the Cardinal of Lorraine. But although this prelate had for two months gone with the Roman party, he was still far from being its master. He had no choice, therefore, but to burn his vessels; at that cost he was sure of being listened to. The pope invited him to come to Rome; this was a decisive step. He first hesitated, then promised. The session having been notified for the 15th of September, the legates thought for a moment of holding it with the articles on marriage, being the only ones ready, or in the way to be ready; but the ambassadors opposed this, dreading, not without reason, that the reform decrees, if omitted once, would be so a second time, and perhaps altogether. Not wishing, therefore, to delay the cardinal's departure, the legates asked for an adjournment until his return, or until the 11th of November. To this the majority consented, and the cardinal set out on his journey.

He was received at Rome as few princes had ever been. The pope lodged him in his own palace, and, a thing quite unexampled, paid him a public visit. Are we to believe, as it was reported, that Pius IV. promised to point him out as his successor, and to neglect nothing that could secure his election? Be that as it may, we shall see there was reason to believe that they were quite of one mind.

A few days after his leaving Trent, the legates had to yield

princes. You will also act in such a manner that we shall not seem to have any hand in it."—Letter from Cardinal Borromeo to the Legates, June 1563.

to the ultramontanists, and to propose the decree on the princes. In substance it was as follows :—

It began by establishing the principle that a clergyman cannot be tried on any occasion or in any cause whatever, even criminal, by laymen, without the previous consent of his bishop.

The incompetence of lay courts was next extended to every kind of causes, not spiritual only, but touching more or less closely upon spiritual things, upon clergymen, upon the Church's property and privileges.

Consequently, to every layman who shall have constituted himself, or allowed himself to be constituted judge of a clergyman, or in an ecclesiastical clause—excommunication.

To every clergyman who shall have accepted from the civil power a commission to try a clergyman—suspension as a priest, deprivation of his benefices, incapacity for possessing other benefices.

Should a prince have made an edict or ordinance concerning the clergy, the affairs, or the possessions of the Church, the edict shall be null, and the prince excommunicated.

He also shall be excommunicated who shall attempt to interpose the smallest obstacle to the publication and circulation of ecclesiastical sentences, especially those that emanate from the pope.

He also shall be excommunicated who shall make bold to levy at his own instance, any kind of impost or subsidy on the goods of ecclesiastics, even on those that belong to them not as Church property, but patrimoniially or by purchase.

Thus it was not only religious independence, but the right of being a state within a state which was sought to be secured. Was there any hope of success? Should a vote have come to be taken could there be any hope entertained that it would be accepted by the princes? In order to this one must have believed himself to be in the twelfth century, for such pretensions were hardly more admissible in the sixteenth century than they would appear to be in our own days. This very principle, that a clergyman can be tried only by clergymen, has been made a sort of axiom by the Church; and it was, in fact, as an axiom that it had been a long time admitted without a proof being asked or sought for. But when people began to take it into their heads, in this as in other matters, to desire to have reasons, what was there found that could serve as a basis to this doctrine? First of all, under the Old Testament, we find nothing of the sort.

The Hebrew priests were amenable to the tribunals of the country. Beyond their religious functions they fully owned the authority of the kings, and we do not find that the prophets, those inflexible guardians of the rights of religion, ever made any reclamations on this head. After the prophets came the apostles. They, like their master, preached submission to the civil authorities. St. Paul submitted, without a murmur, to being tried by a Nero. He could do no otherwise, it has been said. What could Nero have understood about a reclamation based on ecclesiastical law? Nothing, in fact; but St. Paul wrote about the same time to people capable of understanding it, and prepared, moreover, to receive as emanating from God whatever he might have said to them on the subject. Does he make any reservation? Does he not, at least, lay in some few words the foundations of what was afterwards to be the law? Not at all. After him, under the pagan emperors, whole centuries elapse without the clergy having the idea of withdrawing themselves, in temporal matters, from under the jurisdiction of the civil judges. That that independence which was afterwards acquired in the course of the decomposition of the empire had some good results is incontestable, but, as we have already said in speaking of another question, human possession cannot establish a divine right.

The protest by the French was not long of appearing. Du Ferrier was entrusted with it. It is a piece of cutting sarcasm, which we would willingly produce from beginning to end, not that we approve of it without reserve, for it is here and there very unbecoming and very unjust, but as a specimen of what a man of talent, an ambassador of the king of France, might still think and say of the council, in full council, and in the face of the pope and of Europe. "The Jews," said he, "were very well off indeed in having had only twenty-seven years to weep while waiting for their deliverance! As for us, we have been waiting a hundred and forty years for ours, and now, instead of getting it, people talk of tightening the yoke. Where do we see, in the earlier times of the Church, this independence of the clergy? Did Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, and so many other princes, never make laws then for any but laymen? Have we not, on the contrary, a host of decrees past by them of the same sort as those that people now pretend to anathematize? Have you done so much, then, for the reformation of the Church, that you are authorized, and have time, to set about reforming

the civil powers? Let us see; what progress have you made?" And forthwith this bold ambassador began to run over all the decrees already made, shewing, as it was not difficult to do, that not on a single question had they gone to the roots of the evil. Then passing under review the last decrees that had been proposed, "Is this," said he, "is this the healing balm of which Isaiah speaks, and which is to close the wounds of Christendom? Is it not rather the dressing of Ezekiel which makes the wound to be seen and opens it when closed?" Thus spoke Du Ferrier, and his animated diction, set off with quotations, was at once biting and violent.¹

The form spoilt the substance. The French prelates were obliged to disavow a discourse which was nothing but a long sarcasm. The Cardinal of Lorraine, then at Rome, apologized for it to the pope.

Nevertheless, sarcasm apart, there always remained a fact—the king's protest. To it, although with more reservations, the emperor added his. The Spanish ambassador, in presenting that from his master, had seized the opportunity of asking once more that the clause *proponentibus*, with which he said the decrees would never have the consideration due to those of a council assembled freely and in accordance with the ancient canons, should be expunged or explained. Other states, and Venice in particular, also solicited, some of them by simple prayers, others by protests, according as they ventured to express their thoughts more or less openly, the softening down or the omission of the decree on the princes. As for the Church's enemies, they might well desire that the decree should pass; nothing could be better fitted to snap asunder the last ties that bound together the sovereignties of Christendom and Rome.

The ultra-Romanists persisted. The discussion was about to open. It then came to be known that the ambassadors were concerting a common protest, and the prelates felt that they were not in a condition to face such a manifestation. The council consented, therefore, to confine itself, for the next session, to the decrees on marriage, together with such of the disciplinary decrees as the members were almost quite agreed upon. Meanwhile there would be prepared the materials for purgatory, indulgences, the worship of saints and of images, in a word, all that remained for examination before the circle of doctrinal instruction could be complete.

¹ Pallavicini, Book xxiii. ch. i.

Commissions were actually named for elaborating these various subjects; but the assembly had very little time to devote to them. The month of October and the early days of November were spent in discussions, either on the points already ripe for voting, although not yet voted, or upon the *proponentibus*. The pope was daily called to intervene, either openly, when obstacles occurred which he only could remove, or secretly, when the legates asked from him counsels or orders. Of these they had more need than ever. One cannot imagine the state of confusion, of chaos, the assembly then presented. As the members had become a little drilled into parliamentary usages the sittings were less tumultuous than formerly; but this calm and this order served only to facilitate the bringing out of all the diversities of opinion that prevailed. The legates seldom succeeded in concentrating the discussion on one point. Discipline, dogma, clandestine marriages, the *proponentibus*, disputes about precedence, bishops' grievances, princes' grievances, each and all were perpetually returning, on all occasions, in everything, everywhere. With the discussions which we have related, or to which we have alluded, there were mingled many more of which we have said nothing.¹ One's head becomes dizzy, says Pallavicini, in perusing the inextricable history of those last times of the council. Nowhere can you perceive a guiding thread, or fixed marks, or probable end; it would be impossible for you to say if the council is to extricate itself in a year or in a month, within a few days or never.

Unlikely as it was that the council would close soon, judging only by the state of the debates and the multiplicity of business before it, that event was, in reality, highly probable, if we look to the resolution that had been taken, as we have seen, to abandon whatever should be too long, or, still more, if we look to the extreme lassitude of parties in general and of all the prelates in particular. The way was further prepared for it by consenting, by the advice of the pope, to an explanation of the *proponentibus* in a liberal sense. Of what now was there any risk? Everybody was so eager to come to an end and to go away that there was little fear of any party making serious use of that right of proposing which had been hitherto confiscated to the advantage of the pope's representatives. There was added, therefore, to the decrees, a declaration, bearing that there had been no in-

¹ Contention between the emperor and the pope about the election of his son as king of the Romans; affair of the patriarch of Venice, Grimani, who was accused of heresy, &c.

tention of making any change, by this word, in the ordinary practice of councils-general; but as several doctors had rigidly maintained that in these councils the right of proposing did not belong to the legates, that declaration was too vague for the Spaniards to be satisfied with it. They accordingly rejected it, but without being able to obtain any clearer expression of opinion on the subject; and, in fine, on the solicitations of the Cardinal of Lorraine, who arrived from Rome, they decided on accepting it.

Nothing farther being opposed to the holding of the session fixed for the 11th of November, a general congregation met on the 10th for the definitive settlement of the decrees. That last sitting threatened the loss of all. Those members who were most disposed to yield seemed to hold themselves bound once more to express their whole opinion. All seemed ready to begin anew; and if the legates had not been aware how eager they all were to agree and to have done with it, never would they have hazarded holding the session on the following day.

That session, for the rest, was about to present almost the same spectacle. "While in the others," says Pallavicini, "one was astonished if, by chance, some prelates, very few in number, did not give their pure and simple adhesion to all the propositions agreed on in congregation-general; in this, on the contrary, *there were very few who had not something to reprehend.*" "The most notable acquiesced," adds the historian, even although he reports long observations made by the Cardinal of Lorraine and Cardinal Madrucci. In short, the decrees could not be fixed in the course of the sitting. The president stated that modifications would be made as much in conformity as possible with the wish of the greater number; these changes were to be equally valid as if they had been voted in public session. The hour was far advanced; they had been sitting ever since morning; the close was voted unanimously. Upon this a new burst of triumph from Pallavicini. "On seeing *this success* the council thought it could perceive the port towards which it felt itself borne onwards by a propitious gale, but not without the dread of some furious hurricane yet coming on and driving it again to a distance." As for the pope, "One cannot express the delight with which he was transported on hearing this happy news. He sent to say that it had overwhelmed both him and his court with infinite joy, and remarked that he viewed *this success* as the earnest of an approaching conclusion." Success, always success, as if four months of convulsions and of chaos were not, on the

contrary, the very rudest defeat to which the makers of infallible laws could be subjected.

Let us now cast a glance over the general mass of those that had been promulgated.

The doctrinal decree which we have examined elsewhere, is accompanied with twelve canons, with anathema to whosoever shall teach—

That marriage is not one of the seven sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ; that no divine law forbids polygamy; that the Church has not the right to diminish or to extend the number of matrimonial impediments established by the law of Moses; that the Church has erred in those she has established; that marriage may be dissolved on account of heresy, the defects or the voluntary absence of one of the spouses; that marriage celebrated, but not consummated, is not dissolved by one of the spouses entering a religious order; that the Church has erred in teaching that the tie is not dissolved by adultery; that she has erred in authorizing, in certain cases, the separation of the spouses without dissolving the marriage; that clergymen and the religious (monks and nuns) may marry if they do not find themselves capable of persevering with honour in celibacy; that the state of marriage is preferable to virginity, and that celibacy, on the contrary, is not superior to marriage; that the prohibition of weddings at certain seasons is a tyrannical superstition; that matrimonial causes are no concern of the ecclesiastical judges.

All these points might furnish matter for many observations. Several have been made already. Let us add a few more without dwelling long on the subject.

St. Paul, who has said so much about marriage and so much pressed its holiness, nowhere says that it was instituted by Jesus Christ.

Nothing better than to forbid polygamy as contrary to the spirit of Christianity. To affirm that it has been forbidden by a divine law, is to go beyond the truth.

A law proceeding from God, the law of Moses, has laid down certain impediments. Jesus Christ, in introducing modifications on other points relative to marriage, has said nothing of that. neither have his Apostles done so. The Church cannot therefore impose, as articles of faith, the modifications she has made in it.

The divine law speaks of marriage, but does not speak of monastic vows. On what shall we rest the recognition of such

a superiority in the latter of these engagements that the other may be broken by it?

What foundation is there, in fine, for teaching as an article of faith, and sanctioning with an anathema, the prohibition of weddings at certain times? After such a canon, there is no reason for all the Church's laws not being also points of faith. To place the latter among the canons, and to relegate that on clandestine marriages among the disciplinary articles, intimately associated though it be with doctrine, is a subversion of order, such as we shall find rarely exemplified even in the most ill-assorted civil laws.

Without recurring to the grand question of the indissolubility of marriage, still let us notice in what manner this dogma is taught here. "Anathema," it is said in the seventh canon, "to whosoever shall maintain that the Church errs in teaching that marriage cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the spouses." Why this roundabout statement? If the Church has not erred in teaching that adultery does not authorize divorce, why not have simply announced the thing, with anathema to whosoever shall deny it? This is what was done at first; but the Venetian ambassador having remonstrated that his republic had subjects belonging to the Greek Church, where this opinion is not held, the statement was purposely softened down. Hence this simple declaration that the Latin Church has not erred in teaching it. This was more prudent; but then what signifies the anathema? How anathematize an opinion, while you at the same time avoid declaring it to be false? A principle in discipline may be bad in the West and good in the East; but a matter of faith is necessarily everywhere true or everywhere false. Ever the same confusion between discipline and dogma, between the fallible and the infallible; ever the same influence of the things of the earth on that which is to be taught in the name of heaven. If the council abstained from declaring absolutely the indissolubility of marriage, it was not because Jesus Christ had taught the contrary, it was because the Venetians possessed the islands of Cyprus and Candia, and it did not suit them, for the moment, to disquiet the Greek merchants that resided there.

Let us pass on to the disciplinary articles.

We have spoken of the first,—that of clandestine marriages and public formalities.

The three next bore upon the impediments to marriage.

Some useful alleviations were applied to the boundless despotism that the Church had arrogated to herself in those matters.

The fifth ordained that matrimonial dispensations should be granted rarely and *gratuitously*.—We need not say how this last clause is observed.

The sixth, and the two following, treat of rape and concubinage.—The substance was good, but the civil authority very ill treated. The magistrates were reduced to the humble office of mere police agents, under the supreme direction of the bishops.

The ninth excommunicated every prince or lord who should have constrained one of his subjects to marry against his will.

The tenth, in fine, limited to Advent and to Lent the seasons during which no marriage could be celebrated.

The first of the articles, said to be of reformation, contains excellent counsels on the choosing of the bishops, parish priests, and all the other functionaries of the Church. The minority had succeeded, not without difficulty, in having these rules declared applicable to the election of the cardinals; it had even been added that the pope should choose them as much as possible from among all Roman Catholic nations. We have seen what has been the result.

II. The provincial councils shall meet every three years.—This has never been observed. The popes have never seen to its being observed. The isolation of the bishops was more favourable to the See of Rome than that union of which those colloquies might be the source. The diocesan councils, according to the same article, ought to meet every year; a rule which has been no better observed, the bishops having the same reason as the popes for not liking to have deliberative assemblies under them.

III. Every year, or at least every two years, the bishop shall make a general visitation of his diocese. The rules to be observed in these visitations.

IV. Additions to the decree of 1546 on preaching.—The council repeats that preaching is the *principal* duty of the bishops.¹

V. A bishop accused of a serious crime shall be judged by the pope.—This has not been admitted in France. The Gallican practice, founded on the ancient general practice, attributes to provincial councils the trial of bishops.

¹ See Book II.

VI. The bishops shall have power to absolve in secret from all censure incurred for secret crimes, excepting homicide.

VII. The bishop shall see to it, that previous to the administration of the sacraments, their meaning and virtue shall be explained to the people. The explanation shall be in conformity with a catechism drawn up by the council, and translated into all languages.—That catechism was not made at Trent, and, as matters stood, it was well known that it would not be made there. It is the *Roman Catechism*, or the *Catechism of Trent*, that which we have repeatedly quoted. We have seen that the council is made to say there a great deal that it had not said, and sometimes the contrary of what it had said.

VIII. Public sinners shall be subjected to public penances, always susceptible of being converted by the bishop into secret penances.—The exception has continued to be made the rule. There are no obligatory public penances.

IX. The bishop, as delegate of the pope, shall inspect the churches in his neighbourhood which shall not be found to be of any diocese.

X. In affairs connected with morals, the bishop's sentence shall take effect immediately, even in the case of an appeal to the pope.

XI. New applications of the right of inspection in bishops, always in their quality of delegates of the Holy See.

XII. That none shall be raised to any dignity to which the charge of souls is attached, before the age of five-and-twenty. That archdeacons, canons, as well as the priests of important parishes, shall, as far as possible, be doctors or licentiates in theology.

XIII. Divers measures to be taken for providing that parish priests shall everywhere have a fitting salary.—Ill observed. We have seen that the inferior clergy continued to have no share in the wealth of the Church.

XIV. The council reprovcs and interdicts the custom of paying any sum whatever for the acquisition of titles and taking of possession.—Although this article struck at the payment of annats,¹ the popes have never liked it to be understood in this sense.

XV. Divers measures concerning canons and their revenues.

XVI. Duties of chapters during vacancies in the episcopal see.

¹ Sum that has to be paid to the pope upon entering on a benefice. It was ordinarily a year's revenue.

XVII. That no one possess more than one benefice requiring residence.—Often violated or eluded, as we have seen, until public opinion, more powerful than the decree, made things better.

XVIII. Parish livings to be bestowed according to comparative merit. A jury, named by the bishop, shall subject the candidates to a public examination.—Well meant, but attended with great practical inconveniences. The most capable of shining at an examination will often prove the least capable of being a good parish priest. The rule has remained on the paper.

XIX. Against divers abuses in the collation of benefices.

XX. Ecclesiastical procedure. Forms, guarantees, appeals, &c. The pope shall not have it in his power to evoke a cause to himself, unless for very serious reasons, and by a rescript signed by his own hand.

XXI. We have said enough of this. It is the tardy explanation of the *proponentibus*. It would have been more natural to have made a separate decree of it, or at least to have placed it at the head, than to have made it the twenty-first article of a decree that treats of something quite different.

On the whole, however, we cannot but think that people were wrong in continuing to accuse the council of having made insignificant regulations only. But one thing was wanting; a sanction that could be reckoned on; and this is probably what was especially meant when they were said to be feeble and null. Moreover, as there was nothing in these reforms that might not have been equally well decreed by the pope, they were thought to be beneath the dignity of a council: what was wanted from it was principles, not details; a constitution, in fine, not simple laws. We have seen the efforts made by the Court of Rome constantly tending, on the contrary, to confine it to the condition of a legislative assembly, deliberating by favour of the prince. But if we willingly acknowledge all that was good and important in the decisions that Rome allowed it to take,—the number and the gravity of the points which it regulated sufficiently shew, on the other side, whether or not the Church of Rome had been wronged in being represented as inundated with abuses, and delivered over to the most complete arbitrary power.¹

¹ After the admissions of Roman Catholic historians this remark seems superfluous; but we must not be in too much haste in supposing a fact acquired in history. In the present struggle between Roman Catholicism and the Reformation, have we not witnessed the re-appearance of ideas and assertions which one might have believed to be buried three centuries ago? That frightful corruption, against which there had for so long a time been

And so the twenty-fourth and second last session was celebrated.

The second last, we say; but those who felt most eager to come to an end durst not hope that that end was so near. Besides the abundance of matters that had still to be treated, a thousand difficulties might emerge; and there was enough of these already.

Immediately after their protest against the decree on the princes, the ambassadors of Charles IX. had retired to Venice. They had been accused of having exceeded their commission; but they could soon shew a new letter in which the king gave them his full and entire approval, enjoining them not to return to Trent until they had received a promise that the obnoxious decree should be abandoned.

Although the pope had not approved of its being presented, he believed himself possessed of a still wider extent of rights than had been mentioned in that famous piece. On the 22d of October, by a proclamation solemnly posted at the gates of St. Peter's, he summoned the Queen of Navarre to appear before him as a heretic and supporter of heretics, under penalty of being declared to have escheated her dignities, estates, domains; having her marriage declared null, her children bastards, &c. The Cardinal of Lorraine had vainly tried to make the pope comprehend that this summons, particularly in the terms employed, was only a dangerous anachronism. He detested the queen; but felt also that the pope was about to compel Charles IX. to undertake her defence, and that this was not quite the way to put her down. Under this form, in fact, her cause was that of all crowned heads; heretic or not, the question was whether Rome meant to return to her ancient omnipotence over states and sovereigns.

This question was stated to the pope with a vigour which he nowise expected. The French ambassador at Rome, D'Oisel, had orders to say to him, "that at the first rumour of this strange news the king could not believe it; that after the reading of the proclamation, he still hesitated before he could figure

nothing but one universal cry, has been denied. Those immense disorders, so energetically denounced, at Trent, by all the independent and pious bishops to be found there, have been made out to be slight abuses in detail, wickedly exaggerated by the Protestants. In presence of such tactics no argument is superfluous. With people who would deny the existence of the sun, were it to suit their object in the smallest degree to do so, we must put ourselves in a condition to prove that the sun exists.

to himself such a forgetfulness of the royal majesty, of the liberties of the kingdom, of the universal reprobation now bestowed on this kind of procedure. And although the right of the pope had been as much acknowledged as it was little, why put it forth against the Queen of Navarre rather than against so many other princes in the same case? Could it be because she had no means of defence, and that hopes were entertained of tempting the king by offering him an opportunity of usurping the estates of his kinswoman? The king would take care not to sanction, by accepting the proffered advantage, a right which next day might be turned against himself. When, then, would the popes come at last to see that if Jesus Christ said, *My kingdom is not of this world*, it cannot pertain to his vicar either to take away or to bestow states?"

Pius IV. was in no condition to resist; he promised that the matter should go no farther. It had generally been thought monstrous, even in Italy, that he should have ventured to speak of declaring the illegitimacy of the children of a prince who had died in fighting for the Church. Notwithstanding this, as the summons had never been officially withdrawn, the enemies of Henry IV. did not fail to make use of it as an arm against him. It was said, that "as his mother had not obeyed, the threat was accomplished. He had ceased to be the son of Anthony of Bourbon; the throne of France did not belong to him." Thus were there prepared long before, and always at Rome, the storms that were to convulse the kingdom.

The future agent of those convulsions, Philip II., although the council often gave occasion to his having contentions with the pope, was, in reality, daily becoming more and more united with him. This was because the council, between them, was no more their greatest affair. In sending directions to his legates to have it closed as soon as possible, Pius IV. had added confidentially, that they need not pay too much attention to the reclamations of the Spaniards, as he was sure of their king. Here we see the court of Rome already offering to the bigotted ambition of Spain the bribe of having France to control, and perhaps to conquer.

It formed part of the king's policy, accordingly, that his union with the pope should remain concealed under the noisy reclamations of his ambassadors and his bishops. The latter having asked for his orders with respect to the closing of the council, he had given them only vague directions, and their opposition

had already somewhat slackened. It revived when the Cardinal of Lorraine, taking the lead in stating what was the wish of the majority, proposed to finish before Christmas, that is to say, in less than six weeks. "He and his French colleagues," he said, "ought to be on their way back to France before the end of December. It would be painful for him to leave the council while still sitting; it would be annoying to the council to close without any French bishops being present at the signing of the decrees." The emperor's ambassadors also began to say that the sooner they came to a close the better. Those of France were still at Venice, and although their personal feelings went quite the other way, they left the cardinal to act as he pleased. Finally, the Spaniards gave way. It was decided that the next session should be the last; some of them even proposed, in order to make more sure of this, that purgatory, indulgences, and the worship of saints should be omitted. The majority felt that such an omission would be very strange. They refused, but as we have seen them do before, they promised to abandon all the points on which the members should not be immediately agreed, or on which disagreement might be apprehended. Yet the man who should have ventured to say that the close would take place, not at Christmas, but at three weeks before Christmas, would have been treated as a dotard.

The pope's ill health admirably served the purposes of his ministers. In his private letters he often spoke of it; urging them to spare him the affliction of dying before the close of the council, with the prospect of the election of his successor by the assembly, or preceded at least by the most perilous contentions between it and the cardinals. The Roman party did not need his entreaties in order to make them enter fully into his fears, and prevent at any cost their being realized. The French and the Spaniards wanted nothing better, for the moment, than to escape the agitation of so serious a question. The emperor and his prelates, though quite enough disposed to regard the council, in point of theory, as charged with the election of the head of the Church, preferred also, for the moment, not having to explain their views upon it. All were agreed, in short, that it should be left, in the event contemplated, to the college of cardinals; but as no party felt sufficiently sure of the others, there was hardly a bishop to whom the death of the pope would not have now appeared either a calamity, or a subject of serious perplexity,

and who would not have been ready to sanction all that could be done to prevent their being overtaken by it.

Nine prelates, to whom care was taken not to add any divine by profession, were charged with the dogmatical questions. The only condition imposed on them was, that they should proceed with despatch. In a few days the decree was ready for being voted.

Although we, too, are anxious to conclude our labours, we cannot dispense with pointing out the course to be pursued in the discussion of the subjects that were now to be treated.

First of all, let us be careful to distinguish between theory and practice. Not that the Church of Rome does not here appear to us quite as responsible for abuses in practice, as for errors in theory; but it is prudent that, before proceeding farther, we should shut the outlet which we see daily taken advantage of in questions of this nature. The grossest superstitions are tolerated, encouraged, provoked; and when we have the misfortune to press these excesses, we are denounced as wanting in good faith. "The Council of Trent," is the instant reply, "has taught nothing of the kind. You maintain that the people adore the saints, and give all the attributes of the Deity to the Virgin Mary. Shew us a single article in which this adoration is ordained? You say that the worship of images and of relics is in many places a veritable idolatry. But the council teaches expressly that they are to be honoured only with a reference to those whose lives and persons they recall." This is Bossuet's favourite argumentation in all his pleadings in these matters.

Let us, for the nonce, accept this distinction. Should we be rigorously bound to it? No. In judging of a man who would maintain that we must keep to his writings and his theories? Writings and theories, in this respect, are to be adduced only if the man's conduct be conformed to them. From the moment they are found opposed, we are allowed to keep to facts. On these the final judgment must rest; in these the true spirit is to be found.

Be that as it may, let us confine ourselves, in the first place, to the council's declarations. Let us see what it teaches, and how much of that Scripture, history, and reason permit us to accept.

Purgatory, in itself, at a first glance, has nothing that shocks us. "Nothing that is unclean shall enter heaven," says an Apos-

tle. For souls therefore that are unclean, the Roman Church concludes, there is a place of purification and expiation.

Take care. For one passage from which you may try to infer that such a place exists, you will find twenty where the purification of the soul is represented to us as the immediate and direct result of grace manifested in Jesus Christ and accepted by faith.

For one passage from which you might believe you were authorized to intercalate the idea of purgatory, you will find twenty in which the passage from this life to another, from earth to heaven or to hell, is so close, so straight and direct, that never will you, with any shew of reason, succeed in interposing anything between them.

For the proof, were anything necessary, we should go to Roman Catholic preachers themselves. Is it not a very curious and withal a very significant fact, that when they follow the Scripture, in order to speak of the last judgment, they are led involuntarily to say nothing about purgatory? What, for example, says Massillon about it, in his sermon on the fewness of the elect? What say Bossuet, Flechier, Bortaloue, about it, when they take up the subject in that sense, and keep to the promises, threatenings, and figures of the holy books? Is it not always, just as in Protestant sermons, the good on the right hand, and the wicked on the left, the good seed and the tares, the wheat and the chaff, the sheep and the goats, the elect and the reprobate, to the one happiness, to the other misery? But mark what is still more significant. The Roman Catechism, in its chapter on the last judgment, one of the most complete and biblical in the whole book, says nothing about purgatory, does not even mention it. Elsewhere, no doubt, it speaks of it, and at great length too; but is not this careful development of the chief texts in the Bible in which the last judgment is spoken of, without a single word that leads to the mention of purgatory, tantamount to an admission beforehand of the little foundation that there exists for what is said about it afterwards?

In fine, for one passage where it might be maintained that, strictly speaking, the writer was not logically bound to mention purgatory, you will find a host where it cannot be admitted that he would have said nothing had he believed in it, or had any idea of it.

And this is no longer a question in theology or history; it is a matter of common sense and common honesty. Here is a doctrine of fact, purely of fact; a question, if ever there was

such, to be decided by an *ay* or a *no*. If there be a purgatory the sacred writers must have spoken of it, less often, if you will, but quite as plainly as of a heaven for the good, and a hell for the bad. But mark, not a word have they said about it, not a word at least that does not primarily mean something else, and which must not be strained hard in order to bring that meaning out of it. Could this be because it was a subject in which few were interested? Purgatory, on the contrary, must be a serious affair for all; if there be such a place, where is the man who can flatter himself that he will not go there? Yet this point, so interesting, so positive, so indispensable to be known, Jesus Christ and the sacred penmen must have passed hundreds of times on the right, on the left, above, below, without touching it, without allowing to drop from their mouths or pens that *ay*, or that *no*, which would have shed light on one whole portion of eternity! Ah! doubtless, there is many another *ay* and many another *no*, about which we fain would know somewhat, but which God has kept to himself, but then what right have men to impose theirs on us? The Church of Rome herself has never held herself authorized to teach new doctrines. Her infallibility, according to her own admission, is confined to the infallible determination of what has been taught. What value then can be attached to her testimony in favour of a doctrine of fact, when once we discover that that fact is nowhere to be found in the Scriptures, and when common sense proclaims that if it exist at all, it must have appeared there at almost every page?

The same principles apply to the worship of the Virgin. Here again we have a positive question, a fact which, if it ever entered into the designs of God at all, must have manifested itself more or less distinctly from the earliest days of Christianity. The greater the importance attached to it by the Roman Church, the more cogent will our argument be. The larger the space that the Virgin shall occupy in her faith, in her worship, the greater right shall we have to ask why she occupies no place in Scripture, none in the history of the first ages of the Church.

None in Scripture, we say. In the four Gospels, first of all, there is not a word to indicate that Jesus Christ accorded to his mother any share whatever in his work, neither during nor after his ministry on earth, neither in this world nor in the other, neither as acting of herself, nor as an intercessor with her son or with God.

“Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women.” “Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word!” And some days after, when she began to comprehend the future grandeur of her son, “All generations,” she said, “shall call me blessed.”

Yea, blessed indeed was she whom God had chosen to be the mother of the Saviour! Protestants have never said otherwise. But, from that to a worship, to any invocation whatever, the distance is great, it is infinite. This very word *blessed*, so evidently applicable to any one who has been the object of a great favour, finds its commentary elsewhere, and from the mouth too of the Saviour himself. “Blessed,” exclaimed a woman, “is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked!” What was his reply? “Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.” Here we see at once that the simple grace of being a believer is put above that of having given birth to the Messiah.

Is this unique privilege represented to us at least in such a manner as to lead to the belief, that she could avail herself of it as an intercessor in behalf of men? Why, on one occasion, she makes a request to her son. A request, this is saying too much; she does not even go so far as that. Jesus had so completely separated himself from her in all that bore “on his Father’s business,”¹ that she has no wish to seem to intermeddle with it. “They have no wine,” she said. “Woman,” replied Jesus, “what have I to do with thee?” He then performs the miracle; but he had made it a point to shew that it was not because she had asked him. On another occasion, when told that his mother and his brethren wanted to speak with him—“Who is my mother?” said he, “who are my brethren?” Then, stretching forth his hand toward his disciples, he added, “Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.” One does not see how he could better have expressed the idea, that in so far as he was the sent of God, to him the ties of blood were nothing. Had these words never been recorded, and were we permitted to put them into his mouth, we could not in truth have found any more clearly, more positively, expressive of our view of the subject.

So much for the four Gospels. In the book of Acts there is

¹ “How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?” Luke ii. 49.

nothing, absolutely nothing, that allows us to suppose that any power was owned in Mary, or any homage rendered to her. No mention is made even of the respect which the disciples could not have failed to entertain for the mother of their master. "All continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women, and *Mary the mother of Jesus*, and with his brethren." Such is all that appears. After that, and it occurs in the first chapter, her name is no more introduced.

In the Epistles, finally, even in those which must have been written a longer or shorter time after her death, mark this, in those even of that beloved disciple to whom Jesus when expiring said, "Behold thy mother!" nothing is said about her; she is not even mentioned. Words fail you when you would fully express how inconceivable, how unheard of it would be, that she whose worship was to fill so important a part, should not have had even a page, not a sentence, not a line, not a word, not even the shadow of an allusion, among so many letters, addressed to so many churches, full of so many lessons and instructions on all sorts of subjects. In the Apocalypse, the same omission; and this silence, whatever opinion one may profess with respect to the doctrinal authority of that book, is still more significant, in certain respects, than that of the Epistles. Posterior by five and twenty or thirty years to all the rest of the New Testament, the Apocalypse might have been subjected, and was in fact subjected to the influence of more than one new idea. If this idea were then in favour, had it even begun to be so, how is it that there is not here the slightest trace of it? And yet there was no doctrine, no usage, more of a nature to find a place in the Apocalypse. She whom Roman mysticism was afterwards to make the gate of heaven, the queen of angels, the star of the morning, &c.,¹—how shall we account for there not being the smallest place for her in that magnificent representation of the celestial magnificences?²

¹ *Janua cœli, Regina angelorum, Stella matutina, &c.*—See the litanies.

² Would the reader know how one of the historians of the Virgin tries to escape from the overwhelming significance of this silence? The following passage occurs in the *Mouth of Mary*, a work approved and recommended by several bishops:—"For the celebration of the noblest of creatures Scripture has but a few words, tradition but a few memorials, whether the evangelists and doctors wished to respect the thick veil with which the humble Virgin was enveloped, or that the human idiom cannot attain to such attitudes. Thus, the human idiom sufficed for speaking of God, and of the Son of God; but was inadequate to the task of speaking of the Virgin. Be it so. But, then, why do you say so much of her? If the sacred writers had so much respect for "the thick veil with which she was enveloped," why remove it? On a subject on which "Scripture has but a few words, and tradition but a few memorials," why those long histories, long romances rather, which you put into the hands of the people?"

Assuming this, although it could be proved that the worship of the Virgin dated from the commencement of the second, or even from the end of the first century, already it must be admitted as hopeless to attempt assigning to it an apostolic and divine origin.

But no. Down to the middle of the fifth century, not a trace do we find of the acts of homage rendered, or to be rendered to the mother of the Saviour. We admit that there were early testimonies of respect and admiration, amplifications more or less strong on her glory and her sanctity; but all these testimonies, all these amplifications, so much quoted at the present day, are precisely the strongest points we should have to adduce against the worship which some make bold to authorize by them.

Of all those declarations which Romanists go to collect among the Fathers, and which they take great care to isolate from all that might throw a shade over them,¹ how is it that we do not find one in which we find a practical conclusion? How happens it that none of those writers have added to those benedictions and those eulogiums, either that the Church offered worship to the Virgin, or that it was her duty to offer it to her? Wherefore, again, do the liturgies, the catechisms, the histories, the sermons of the times, make no mention of any ceremony, any practice in honour of her, of any recourse had to her on any occasion, or under any form whatever? Wherefore does Epiphanius, towards the close of the fourth century, attack the honours which some Arab women had paid to the Virgin? These, it is replied, were idolatrous honours. Not more idolatrous, as we could shew, than those enjoined or tolerated at the present day. But it is not even possible, with that writing before our eyes,² to say that Epiphanius meant to blame excess only. In that case, the best mode of attacking what these women did, would have been to shew what the Church did, what the Church authorized. But there is nothing of the sort. He condemns without restriction; he does not speak of any worship, of any commencement of worship; with the terms he employs, and the

¹ Tertullian (*De Carne Christi* vii.) comparing Mary to the sisters of Lazarus, thinks that she was inferior in devotedness and in faith. Origen, (on St. Luke, Homily xvii.,) Basil, (*Epistle* 317.) and others, still affirm that she was scandalized, shaken, by the death of her son. Others, in fine, and Chrysostom, in particular, are not afraid to interpret as a reprimand, the words, "What have I to do with thee?" There had been in her, they said, a feeling of pride. She wanted to make a parade of the supernatural power of her son. This is not our view; but it is clear that those who thought thus, and who wrote thus, had no belief in Mary's impeccability.

² *Heresies*, 79.

disdain which he expresses, we are not even permitted to suppose that those women had followed the impulsion of any known doctor, or that there was any party at that time ready to declare itself in their favour. Thirty years afterwards, when the disputes that preceded and followed the council of Ephesus were at the highest, when Nestorius was deposed for not having wished to give Mary the title of Mother of God, when Cyril and Proclus, his antagonists, using and abusing the victory which the council had given them, were celebrating the mysterious grandeurs which seemed to them to be involved in that title, well then, in these very sermons in which Mary is magnified as much, and more perhaps than ever was her Son, there is nothing, absolutely nothing, to indicate an established worship, or a worship to be established.

We need not go farther. The idea made its way; the worship was yet to come. What is certain and incontestable is, that at that epoch it had not yet come.

What shall we now say of the worship of the saints in general? Here we must pass over the same ground, and arrive very nearly at the same conclusions.

First, then, there is the same silence on the part of the sacred writers; the same absence of every trace that it could have appeared to them that the dead, saints or not, behoved to serve as intermediates, by any title whatever, between the living and God. Some imperceptible allusions never could counterbalance so complete an absence of all teaching, all invitation, all orders on the subject of the invocation of saints. We do not speak of lessons to the contrary; that would carry us into too wide a field. When the preacher says that the dead "have no part more for ever in anything done under the sun,"¹ that "they know not anything," where is the exception in favour of the saints?

Has all that is implied in a prayer addressed to a dead person been in fact well considered? That the saints have, at the present moment, access to the presence of God we willingly admit, albeit that at first what was said by Jesus Christ of one sole universal judgment at the end of the world, has generally been understood in its literal meaning.² The saints pray at present—

¹ Eccles. ix. 6.

² This opinion, so manifestly contrary to all idea of invocation and worship, is formally taught by several of the fathers. See Irenæus, *Against Heresies*, v. 25; Justin, *Dialogue with Typhon*; Lactantius, *Institutions*, c. vii. Note, moreover, that in remitting to the last judgment the entrance of the saints into heaven, neither these authors nor any other add that the Virgin gets there before them.

be it so; but do they hear you who pray to them, and who ask them to pray for you? Think well; what you attribute to them is nothing less than the greatest, the most incomprehensible, the most essentially divine of all God's attributes,—that of being everywhere, of seeing everything, of hearing everything. What! a man who but yesterday was like myself, who like me both saw and heard within a very narrow and impassable range, who could no more than myself seize at one and the same time more than one object, one idea, one word,¹—behold him now, like God, seizing at once millions and hundreds of millions of objects, ideas, words! The man who no more than myself could read what passes in the heart of a single fellow-creature, behold him reading what passes in all men's hearts at once! behold him in Europe, in America, in the lowest mines and on the mountain tops, by day, by night, everywhere and always! behold him instantaneously and simultaneously taking in all the words, all the sighs, every slightest emotion of the soul into which the idea of his intercession has entered! For, in fine, if he is to hear me whenever I shall address myself to him, he must be always at hand, always with me, always with everybody; you cannot suppose that there are places where, or moments when, he will not hear you. Thus no middle; either the saints have not the faculty of hearing you at all, or they have it in the same degree as God. God no doubt may have wished that it should be so; but the greater the privilege the more must we insist on seeing it established on declarations authentically proceeding from Him who alone can bestow it. "They see Him who sees all," says Gregory VIII., "of what then could they be ignorant?"² Idle antithesis, which would amount to saying that one cannot see God without becoming his equal. "If I see a man mounted on the top of a steeple," says Du Moulin, "do I on that account see all that he sees?"

You figure to yourself the peace of a soul that feels itself surrounded by so many friends, that cannot breathe a sigh without these divine messengers disputing in some sort the honour of bearing it to God. This is very nearly what the pagans said when asked to renounce those countless deities who also encompassed them from the cradle to the tomb, and besieged them with

¹ No man is great in the presence of his valet, it is said. Are there many saints whom those who lived on familiar terms with them could seriously invoke? On hearing of the canonization of St. Francis de Sales, "Ah," said an old bishop, who had known him well, "that is fine, but the fellow cheated furiously at piquet."—*Mémoires de Tallentant*.

² *Quid est quod nesciant qui scientem omnia sciunt?*

their constant protection. No doubt, looking to the outward side of things, the Christianity of the Apostles was singularly cold and bare compared with those poetic creeds, consecrated by so many exquisite works of art and by ages of antiquity, under which not a city, not a village, not a house, not a tree, but had its tutelary deity,—not a man, in fine, that could not, in every circumstance of life, invoke a god expressly placed at his service in that very exigency, so that the slightest volition on his part might have a divine volition at its command. And yet, in reality, which was best, those petty gods of every moment—supposing that there existed such—or one sole perfect God, great enough and good enough alone to do as much and more than they all? Which too, since we are compelled to touch this chord, is the grander, the more beautiful, the more really poetical also, the invocation of all those subaltern deities, or a direct and intimate communication with Him who has all power and who fills all space? Thus the same answer that was made to the pagans we may make to the partisans of the invocation of the saints. Duke George of Saxony, one of the greatest enemies of the Reformation, as he sat, in 1537, at the bedside of a dying son, exhorted him to leave the saints to themselves and to think only of Christ. The dying man's wife, a Lutheran at heart, gave a look of surprise. The duke noticed it. "For the dying," said he, "this is the best instruction to give." It is in fact, and we love to acknowledge it, what all truly pious priests say to the dying. When the danger is thought at a distance, you find for yourselves insignificant protectors; when it presses, if you have not forgotten Him who alone and of Himself can save you, to Him, to Him alone you feel urged to cry. But if this doctrine be the best for the dying, why should it not be so for all, and on all occasions? "In popish times," said Luther,¹ "people made pilgrimages to the saints; they would go to Rome, to Jerusalem, for the expiation of their sins. And now we still make pilgrimages, but it is into the regions of faith. We go not to Jerusalem, but straight to God. This is the true visiting of the promised land. What are the saints in comparison with Christ? Nothing more than the small dew-drops of the night on the head of the spouse and on the locks of his hair!" Luther was a poet; he had known enough of you, ye saints of both sexes; he had worn his knees before their images; and it was only on going, as he would say, "straight to God" that he beheld opening before his steps, like

¹ Table Talk.

a new and unknown world, the regions of true peace, the springs of life in Christ. This that we have told, moreover, applies to more people than one would think. There are Roman Catholics, and many too, and the most pious, who do not believe in the intercession of the saints; many, at least, who do not believe in it for themselves, and who never have recourse to it. Well, then, when these would go to God, is anything wanting to them? Have they a longer journey to make in order to perceive the sun than others who look only at the stars? And after their eyes have once been turned towards Him whom the Bible calls the "Sun of Righteousness," is there perceptibly less peace, less faith, less confidence in them than in others?

Shall we be told, then, that the direct way is not proscribed, that the invocation of saints is not enjoined as indispensable to salvation, that the Council of Trent, in fine, only recommends it as good and useful? No doubt, when the sun is set it is useful, it is good to have the stars; but as long as it is above the horizon, what need have we of them? Let us speak without a figure. It is, in the end, as a resource to the weak that the invocation of the saints is recommended. We have just spoken, in fact, only of certain choice souls who, without condemning it, do without it, and are none the worse. Would the others lose much? That is the question. That a man who has been in the habit of addressing God only through the saints, should experience at first no little embarrassment in addressing him alone, and directly, is possible enough; but is any embarrassment, any stupefaction felt by those who have been in the habit, on the contrary, of praying only to God? Are there things of which they dare not speak to him? If there be, they are things felt by them to be bad or unworthy of him, and, in that case, it were a pitiful service to render them, to give them beings to pray to, to whom they shall have less dread of opening their hearts. Next, what business have we to inquire whether this be the more or less easy, the more or less dangerous way? The grand point, and to this we must ever return, is that God has not pointed it out to us. Here we have not to do with a mystery which he might have meant to leave in the shade. The question of prayer is the very one on which the sacred books have gone most into practical details; and if they could have spoken of it two or three hundred times, under every form, and on all sorts of occasions, without enjoining or advising what the council declares to be useful and good,—by what right should any one

add ought to the command everywhere repeated, to address ourselves to God, to seek the intercession of Christ? Shall we be told that there is no formal prohibition against seeking that of others? What! if Jesus Christ be formally pointed out to us as our intercessor and our *advocate*, if he be represented to us as always ready to discharge that divine office for us,—does not this imply that we are prohibited from having recourse to any less holy and less powerful than he? Far be it from us, however, to admit that the prohibition is merely implied. “There is one God,” says St. Paul, “and one Mediator between God and man, to wit, Christ Jesus.”¹ Yes, say Roman controversialists, one sole mediator of *redemption*; but that does not exclude mediators of *intercession*. Where has this distinction been found? Not assuredly in the Bible, where *intercession* and *mediation* are constantly confounded. What is the subject in hand, in fact, at the very place from which the passage we have quoted has been taken? Why, prayer in general, and all sorts of prayers. “I desire, therefore,” says the Apostle, “that first of all, prayers, requests, supplications, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings, for . . .” &c. How maintain, after this, that the mediation of which he speaks two or three lines farther on can be understood of redemption only? Besides, with the doctrine of indulgences, redemption itself passes in part into the hands of the saints. This, Bellarmine admits.² Thus, even were the above distinction as well founded as it is groundless, the Church of Rome cannot take advantage of it.

“Let no man,” says he elsewhere,³ “beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of angels.” According to Bossuet, this refers only to angels viewed, according to the neo-platonic theory, as subaltern creators of the universe. That opinion may have given occasion for the prohibition, but the Apostle speaks in general terms. There must be no worship of angels, *under pretext of humility*. Now, the Roman Church does not go so far as to teach that God is inaccessible to men; it is from humility, then, that people pray to saints and angels, and thus enter fully into what the Apostle has interdicted.

Shall we once more cite the Apocalypse? This we might do. How happens it that the saints, who are represented to us as surrounding the throne of God, have nowise the air of having prayers to listen to? Let a Roman Catholic suppose himself

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

² De Indulgentiis, i. 24.

³ Coloss. ii. 18.

writing that book, and let him say if he could omit such a detail? A single passage has been adduced. "Then," it says, "the four living creatures, and the four-and-twenty elders, fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, *which are the prayers of saints.*" Such is what has been ventured upon as a set-off to the overwhelming silence of the Gospels, the Epistles, and the rest of the Apocalypse; such is what people fancy they may oppose to the direct teaching which, in that crowd of passages where it could not fail to have been, shines only by its absence. Were we not afraid of appearing to accept the challenge to discuss the question on this field, we should find in those very lines, wherewithal to refute what has been attempted to be deduced from them. First of all, throughout the whole chapter, we find the subject in hand to be songs of praise. Can the *prayers of saints*, mentioned in this passage, mean anything else? No, for they are presented under the form of *odours* or *perfumes* in golden vials, which is never said, and which cannot anywise be said, of any prayers whatever, coming from whomsoever you will, and comprehending all sorts of demands. Next, who present those *prayers*? *The four living creatures and the four-and-twenty elders.* Do you admit that there are in heaven four living creatures and four-and-twenty elders serving intermediately between the saints and God? It is a figure, will you say? Be it so. Under this figure, nevertheless, there is formally announced this fact,—the existence of an intermediate, it matters not who, between God and the saints. Now, what do you make of this detail? If the figures that follow have a dogmatic value, how refuse it to this? In fine, what is represented to us as thus coming to God, are *the prayers of the saints.* Their *prayers for us*? That is not said; and, moreover, in that which is cited of them a little farther on, the living are not in question at all. We see elsewhere the saints praying for the Church, for the salvation and the peace of men in general; but not a trace do we find of individual petitions, of prayers which they bear the appearance of having heard for the purpose of transmitting them. Such is the utmost, we repeat, that Romanists have been able to adduce in favour of the invocation of the saints.

Now, if the invocation of saints is neither enjoined nor sanctioned by Scripture, all the more may we say this of the abuses to which it has given rise. Thus far, in fact, according to our

engagement, we have combated only what the council teaches; but we did not interdict ourselves from following out what the Church has done or allowed to be done. Of all the points above noted, there is hardly one on which there has not been as wide a departure from the decisions of Trent as those decisions themselves are a departure from both the letter and the spirit of the Holy Scriptures.

In vain might you prop up a system with good proofs, it is always a serious defect not to be capable of being applied without being altered. We shall ask, then, in the first place, if the worship of saints is generally such as it is found necessary to represent it in order to elude our objections?

“You accord to them,” we have said, “the most divine of all attributes, that of being everywhere present.” This it has been found impossible to deny; but, says Bossuet, “Never has it been thought by any Roman Catholic, that the saints could know *of themselves* our wants, or even the desires by which we pray to them.” Never has any Roman Catholic, we admit, taught that the saints could of themselves possess this astounding power; but how many are there, who, in praying to them, make this distinction? How many are there who, on their knees before the image of a saint, say to themselves, have ever said to themselves, “He hears me not. If my prayer reaches him, it is through the intermediate agency of angels, or by a revelation from God, or by a vision of God!” For such are, in fact, the three means suggested by Bossuet. But of these the council says nothing; no more does the catechism. The universal presence of the saints is admitted by implication as a fact in every invitation to pray to them, in every prayer addressed to them; there is not one Romanist in a hundred, perhaps not one in a thousand, who, unless under the influence of scruples inspired in him from without, does not absolutely omit this reservation without which, according to Bossuet’s admission, the worship of the saints becomes an insult to God.

Moreover, between the invocation of the saints as intercessors only, and the invocation of those same saints as having power to grant answers, as omnipotent, in short, as gods,—if there be, as is maintained, an abyss in point of theory, there is not, in fact, more than a step. And as for that step, how many pious Roman Catholics are there in a condition to keep from taking it, and who, in fact, refrain from taking it? We have had occasion to make researches on this subject in a country where the worship

of the saints and of the virgin, although much diffused, still is much less so than in Italy or in Spain; and not only have we found no one who, in the spontaneous movements of his heart, has not always suffered himself to run at once into the invocation of them as omnipotent beings, but the very prayers in which they are called intercessors, do not in general prevent their viewing them as something very different. We have seen it proved that even in repeating to satiety, "Holy Virgin, *pray for us*," the idea of intercession is absorbed in that of a direct, absolute protection, to be obtained from the mother of Christ. At the very moment when the lips shall be opened to say *Pray for us*, the inward feeling is just the same as that which might be translated instantly after by the words, "The holy Virgin *bless you*—the holy Virgin *conduct you*—*if it please the holy Virgin*,"—and a hundred other forms of language in which the Virgin is openly substituted for God.

But, says Bossuet again,¹ in whatever terms the prayers addressed to the saints be conceived, the Church's intention, and that of the faithful, reduces them always into this form, "Pray for us." The Church's intention, that may be; the intention of the faithful, that we deny; and what avails the Church's abstract intention, when the faithful are almost inevitably led to intend quite otherwise. When a beggar, to whom you have given alms, and who thanks you, as is usual in so many countries, not by a "*God repay you*," but by "*May the Virgin repay you*," of what consequence is it that the Council of Trent, which he has never heard of all his life, has reduced his prayer beforehand to an intercessory request? The Virgin, or God—in his mind it is all one. He gives to the creature without any reserve what is due to the Creator only; and if this, as has been always said, constitutes idolatry, his prayer to the Virgin is evidently an act of idolatry. In this sense, we repeat, are there many prayers to saints of which we may not say as much?

Our best auxiliary here is one of the most zealous champions of Roman Catholicism, the man who has most contributed, in our days, to make it what it is, Chateaubriand. Without caring about what councils have forbidden or permitted, he does not discuss, he paints, and his pictures have hardly a feature in them that does not confirm our criticisms. "The sprightliest and the bravest race were *consecrated* to Geneviève, the daughter of simplicity and peace." "Those shepherdesses transformed by their vir-

¹ Exposition iv.

tues into beneficent *deities*." "There is nothing, even to the feeble advantage of difference of sex and of visible form, that *our deities* do not share with those of Greece." "The *deity* of a saint begins with his felicity in the regions of eternal light." "It was proper that the female saint of the woods *should work miracles*." "Those martyrs who deserved to rise to the rank of *the celestial powers*." "For the man of faith, nature is a perpetual marvel. Does he suffer? *He prays to his little image*, and is comforted. He prostrates himself; *he prays to the saint to restore to him a son, to save a wife*." "Never was there a people so surrounded with *friendly deities* as the Christian people." "Those men who have merited *to be adored*." Here we see Roman Catholicism, such as it is; here is what it cannot fail more and more to become, as long as its heads shall believe that they have only to shelter themselves behind the impotent and deceptive declarations of a council.

Do we see, in fact, that the Roman Church tries at least to struggle against that irresistible bent of the nations to adore that which, we are told, she gives them only to revere? Does she insist much with her members on that distinction which she so loudly proclaims, when she has to prepare a reply to adversaries? We know not; fain would we believe, even though we have strong reasons to doubt it, that there are no Roman Catholics to whom the subject has not been clearly explained, once at least. But precept is one thing, example another; to teach seldom and coldly a subtle distinction is one thing; very different is the resistless contagion of practices repeated every day. There are countries in which you may pass twenty years without seeing anything that does not lead right to the error of which the admission is forbidden. Were an ancient Roman to re-appear in the midst of Rome, what would he find changed there but the names of the gods, and the forms of the sacrifices? Could he doubt that the saints that give their names to the temples, that have their altars, their festivals, are not the deities of the country? That Pantheon which he had left consecrated to all the gods, he finds again consecrated to all the saints; those columns, those pedestals on which he had seen Jupiter, Romulus, Trajan, or some other deified emperor, he now sees supporting Peter or Paul, John or Mary.¹ Would you tell him, then, how that

¹ The very title *Divus*, ordinarily replaced in official documents by that of *Beatus*, has not, however, been expelled from them. We meet with it once or twice in the Acts of Trent. Would it have passed into the language, had not the idea which it involves first passed into men's minds?

temple of St. Peter is not a temple to St. Peter? Your explanation he will not find it easy to comprehend, however little this pagan may have remarked the foot of the saint to have been worn away by the perpetual kissing of the faithful; well, too, will it be, if he fails to recognise in the statue that of an ancient Jupiter! When he shall see the Virgin on the altar, and a whole people on their knees before her; when he shall hear her called—for he must needs understand Latin, and in this respect at least will have the advantage, which many Christians have not, of understanding what is said among them—when he shall hear her called by all those magnificent names that have been lavished upon her by the Church of Rome, how could he comprehend your maintaining, after all this, that you do not make her a goddess? How could he comprehend, most of all, that she is not a goddess in the view of the people? He will hear them chanting *Ora pro nobis*; but he, too, in his day, often addressed himself to the inferior deities, to ask their intercession with the princes of heaven, and those deities of the second or third order, did not thereby cease to be considered as deities. When the pious Æneas invokes his mother Venus, he very well knows that of herself she can do nothing, that she must go and petition Jupiter; is she the less, in his eyes and those of his people, a high deity? Does she cease on that account to have temples raised to her, to have sacrifices offered to her, to be treated habitually on the same footing with Jupiter? Direct adoration is nowise incompatible, in fact, with the idea of intercession; were this generally as well understood as it is little, the adoration would remain. And how many prayers to saints, besides, whether in the most widely diffused collections, or in the worship itself, where intercession is not mentioned! How many others in which it occurs only at the close, in two words, and as it were out of sight, at the end of long and fervent invocations! That famous *Sub tuum*, which you hear repeated morning and evening in all the schools of Roman Catholicity, what is there in it more or less than a prayer to (a) god. “We take refuge under thy guardianship, Holy Mother of God. Despise not our supplications, but from all perils ever deliver us, glorious and blessed Virgin.”¹ In such an atmosphere—we have seen it proved—there is not one—even to the Lord’s Prayer, that the perverted instinct of the faithful has not quietly transformed into a prayer

¹ *Sub tuum præsidium confugimus, sancta Dei genetrix. Nostras deprecationes ne despicias, sed a periculis cunctis libera nos semper, Virgo gloriosa et benedicta.*

to the Virgin. That prayer, according to the Catechism, may be recited before any image of the saint, provided the reciter have the sentiment that the saint repeats it to God. How many Romanists have any such sentiment? When Juliana of Liege saw the famous cut made in the moon, and concluded from it that God was distressed at having no festival, while all the saints had theirs—it was, setting aside the oddity of the form it took, a very great truth; but has the festival which people lost no time in establishing, the *Fête-Dieu*, of which Liege lately celebrated the six hundredth anniversary, remained at least a true festival to God? Not at all. There are countries, and those the most Roman Catholic, where it has nothing more than the name. In Italy, in Spain, in Provence, the *Fête-Dieu* is only a new festival to the Virgin.

Thus wherever the worship of the saints has been developed freely and without control, God's worship has been more and more effaced. "You might steal God from them without their noticing it," said some one in describing Italian Catholicism. Nothing more true. You have only to remove the name of God from some Latin prayers, where it still remains, and all would go on as if there were no void in religious worship, and without the bulk of the people suspecting any change. Were a new council to declare that God no longer exists, and that there is no other deity but the Virgin, it would only give the form of law to what already exists in fact, in the great majority of certain populations.

We have no thought that any such sacrilegious decree will ever be passed, but it must be admitted that with this exception, it would be impossible to accord more to the Virgin than has been accorded to her in our days, and that too in the centre of Europe, in France, in the face of indignant Protestantism and sneering infidelity. Instead of restraining the nations while in this dangerous downward course, the Church of Rome has done her best to urge them into it. Here, as in so many other things, all that she could not have destroyed without shutting against her certain sources of influence, she has thought it more simple, and, above all, more advantageous boldly to lay hold of for her own purposes, and has put herself at the head of all those natural impulses which she could not arrest. It will not be her fault if in this respect France shall ere long see nothing to blame in the superstitions of the remotest hamlets of Calabria. We wish we could quote at full length the famous *mandement* by which a

cardinal¹ has inaugurated this new era. At full length, we say, without omitting the few lines in which the author protests against all assimilation of the Virgin to God. What then is the amount of those lines, and how far do they undo our objections? We have not said that the Church of Rome teaches the deity of the Virgin; we have said that it stimulates people to believe in it, or, at the very least, not to pray, or to discharge any duty, or to live or to die, in fine, but as if they believed in it, and, in these terms, what could we cite that could better confirm our assertions? Wherein do a few details, wherein does a distinction so very refined in point of theory, so impossible in practice, anywise restrain the outburst of those tendencies which as a whole are so lauded? From the very opening lines behold the worship of the Virgin carried back, according to the author, to the first days of Christianity. "The Saviour," says he, "gave to religion, *from the cradle*, a companion whose gentleness was to temper his severity. This faithful companion was devotion to the holy Virgin." From the cradle! Did not your hand become withered when it had so impudently given the lie to the silence of Scripture! The author recurs to it; he is delighted with it; he seems to dread that the expression may still be wanting in preciseness, and that *from the cradle* may be thought to mean only *from the first ages*. "Religion and devotion to the Virgin," we are told, "came down *together* from the holy mountain, to advance *together* to the conquest of souls. Thenceforward *wherever* the standard of salvation has been unfurled, the ensigns of Mary have been seen displayed." What! the ensigns of Mary were displayed in those Churches to which the Apostles addressed so many and such long epistles, without saying a word about them? Cardinal de Bonald, you say this,—believe it you do not.

And how have they advanced together, the religion of Christ and devotion to the Virgin, to the conquest of the world? "United by the bond of a common origin, and of one same vocation, *these two sisters* joined hands." Here at once we have equality, if not between God and the Virgin, at least between the two worships; and the equality of the two worships implies, let people say what they will, in the view of the immense majority of the faithful, equality between the two beings to whom worship is addressed. Equality! Do they even keep to that? The *mandement* does not even contain a phrase which

¹ Archbishop of Lyons, November 1842.

does not come to this, "See how much more agreeable, more easy, more poetical, and more cheering is the worship of the Virgin than any other!" The author admits that in our "holy books, the Spirit of God *throws a hardly transparent veil over the celestial life of the Saviour's mother.*" This is an ingenious way of telling us that she is very little mentioned there at all. But when the author, some lines farther on, lays hold of the narrative of the marriage at Cana, and concludes from it that one may and ought to pray to the Virgin for the supply of our bodily as well as of our spiritual wants, shall we say that this too is ingenious? To quote this incident without quoting the words, which give it a totally different meaning,¹ is a piece of ingenuity such as we are not in the habit of calling by that name. And how many details, besides, on what we may ask of the Virgin to have alleviated! But as for spiritual wants they are hardly spoken of at all; while as for the temporal, Mary is announced from one end to another, as particularly ready to supply them! The more of those wants you shall have, the more easy will it be for you to be pious; the more you shall be afraid of trials and of death, the more, to judge by the fervour of your prayers to Mary, will you be able to believe yourself a finished Christian. The worship of the Virgin, in this point of view, is the hospital of the unbelieving.²

But let us leave this new source of danger, which would lead us back into the general discussion of the question. All that we have said we might support by quotations; all the results to which we point are admitted by the *mandement*, but with songs of triumph. "True Catholics," says he, "pray no longer, in some sort, to Jesus, except through Mary. For them there are no festivals without her; one might say that apart from her there is no more hope for them. Her name is found incessantly on their lips, and her image in all their hearts. The Church, far from opposing, applauds these bursts of filial piety. From his tempest-tossed bark Peter turns his looks constantly to the star of the sea. *It seems that God has given over his omnipotence to his mother.*" Yes, this is just what we never cease to repeat, *it seems*, to look at the Roman Catholic world, there is now no other deity but the Virgin. Is it only externally so? So it is alleged. Were there reason in this allegation, it would

¹ Woman, what have I to do with thee?

² We know that Scripture often calls *unbelieving*, not those who believe in nothing, but those who believe without having the strength to be Christians.

be a singular way of honouring that God, "strong and jealous," who will have "no other gods before him."¹ But mark again the archbishop's words, as he becomes, without suspecting it, the interpreter of the true sentiments of the people, "Could we," he says, "fail to direct our eyes towards that celebrated sanctuary, whence a tender mother watches lovingly over her family, *where sits a powerful queen, whose hand has raised a dyke to restrain the impetuosity of the billows?*" See, in spite of all fine distinctions, what it comes to at last. It is no longer God, as formerly in the Bible, that says to the waves, "Thus far shalt thou come and no farther," it is the Virgin.

Shall we now adduce some of the countless passages in which the popes have made themselves, with still more frankness and recklessness, the interpreters of the same sentiments? What shall we say, in particular, of those expressions that occur so often in their decrees, in which the saints are represented as punishing, avenging, fulminating? We shall not go back to John XXII., excommunicating Lewis of Bavaria, and saying, "May the wrath of God and his Apostles Peter and Paul kindle upon him, in this world and the next!" We shall not go to Leo X. excommunicating Luther; that piece, admirably composed in other respects, in which the pontiff conjures all the saints to rise against the heresiarch, is known to have been modelled after that in which Cicero, in his famous *De Signis*, invokes the wrath of the gods on the profaners of their altars. All the bulls that relate to the Council of Trent are closed with these words, "Whosoever shall have contravened this let him know that he will incur the indignation of God, *and of his Apostles Peter and Paul.*" Now, there are but two senses in which you can understand this formula, which is to this day in use; either Peter and Paul, in their indignation at the guilty person, will punish him at their own instance, and, in that case, you make them gods; or, powerless of themselves, they shall call upon God to punish them. A fine part truly to assign them. On one sole occasion in the Gospels do the Apostles think of speaking against the guilty. "Ye know not," says the Master severely, "what spirit ye are of." And, behold, we are to look upon them in heaven, making themselves accusers, and counselling revenge! But no; it is not thus that the matter is understood. One would blush at the thought of St. Paul, or St. Peter, or Mary, above all, approaching the throne of God for the purpose of pointing

¹ First Commandment.

out victims to be smitten by his wrath. In spite of themselves Romanists keep to the first alternative; compelled to choose betwixt making the saints informers and accusers, or gods, they cannot hesitate. Not that they plainly say to themselves, "these are gods, they have the power to punish;" but it is as gods that they are dreaded, it is as gods that people are taught to dread them.

So much for the formulas in which the divinity of the saints is tacitly assumed, and which, as they excite no suspicion, only serve the better to make it believed without people being aware of it. But if we would now have more direct declarations, the papal bulls will supply them abundantly. In these, for the most part, there are no restrictions; no prudent protests, which, as in the case of Cardinal de Bonald's *mandement*, if they do not seriously guard against any error, permit, at least, the author to plead afterwards that it was not his fault. Take, for example, a piece which we have already often cited, the encyclical letter of 1832. God is there invoked, but only at the close in a few frigid lines, as one would speak, in a letter, of some great useless personage,—too great, however, to be entirely set aside. But, at the commencement, "This letter is addressed to you on that auspicious day on which we solemnize the assumption of the Virgin into heaven,¹ in order that she, whom, in the midst of the greatest calamities, we have recognised as patroness and liberatrix, may be no less favourable at the moment in which we write, and that with her heavenly breath she may inspire," &c.² Give this letter to a man who knows nothing of Christianity: he will have read three-fourths of it before having a doubt that the Virgin was not the deity of Christians, and the pope her high priest. A year afterwards the pope, in referring to that piece, says that he wrote it "with assistance from above, and *particularly* under the auspices of the Virgin."³ In fine,

¹ It is known that the Roman divines are not agreed as to what is to be understood by this. Some will have it that the Virgin, like Jesus Christ, had a true ascension; others that she was resuscitated and ascended to heaven, but not corporeally, forty days after her death. In both cases it has been agreed that the word *assumption* should be used, indicating that she was taken up into heaven, not that of *ascension*, which would indicate that she had gone up thither of herself. The common people, of course, see no difference here, and the ascension of Mary on the 15th of August is a far grander festival than the ascension of Christ. Note, that the assumption has not yet been raised to be an article of faith: the Church advises people to believe it, but does not command them to do so. To institute a festival in commemoration of an event which Rome dares not affirm to have ever taken place, is still more whimsical than it would be frankly to decree its reality.

² Ut quam patronam ac sospitem persensimus—ipsa et scribentibus adstet propitia—mentemque nostram cælesti afflatu suo in ea inductat consilia.

³ Brief to the Archbishop of Toulouse.

that same year, in a brief to the Bishop of Rennes, we find, "After having implored the protection of the most holy virgin, mother, sovereign, guide, and mistress of all men."¹ After that, maintain if you can that you do not teach the people the divinity of the Virgin. Had the Council of Trent ordained its being taught, could you have said more? In 1849, the Roman bishops, assembled at Imola, wrote to Pius IX., felicitating him on the re-establishment of his authority; and the pope, in his reply, commends them for having taken care, above all, to acknowledge that that event had been due to the protection of the Virgin. One may, without being a Protestant, see something a little odd in this idea, for it is almost tantamount to admitting, that God might likely enough, but for the Virgin, have left the pope at Gaeta, and the republic at Rome; but of what consequence is one absurdity more or less? the essential matter is the consolidation of a worship from which they look for everything.

We have spoken hitherto only of the Virgin and the principal saints. Juvenal laughed in his sleeve at the mob of the Roman gods; is the mob of saints much more respectable in the eyes of a religion, we do not say enlightened, but only not quite blind? You ridicule the idea of Roman emperors becoming gods by a decree of the senate; can Rome warrant the sanctity of any one of the personages with whom she has peopled heaven? The pope, even in the opinion of those who think him otherwise infallible, is not so with regard to facts. He, like anybody else, may be seduced by outward shows of sanctity. We do not expect to have objected to us the miracles of which the pope insists on having proofs before proceeding to canonize. We are well aware that the process is always very long, and still more very dear; but as we know of no case in which, with patience and with money, the petitioners for canonization have not succeeded in their object, we have hardly, we confess, any more confidence in the impartiality of the tribunal than in its infallibility. Besides, there are many saints whose canonization has not even been surrounded with this vain guarantee.² The pope, in fine, it is further admitted, may be led into error in the matter of the miracles, as well as in his estimate of the virtues of the person to be canonized. Accordingly, this personage who

¹ *Quæ omnium mater est, domina, dux et magistra.*

² We know that the right of canonization, now reserved to the pope, once belonged to the bishops.

is offered to you as a protector in heaven, alas! may possibly be in the deepest pit of hell. The Church of Rome once made more than one saint of whom she does not boast, and whom she would be very well pleased to expunge from her catalogue. If she was mistaken with respect to these, who shall warrant her not being so as respects others also? Martyrdom itself is not a proof of sanctity. "Though I give my body to be burned," saith St. Paul, "and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." A man may thus go to the stake for the glory of God, and yet be no true saint.

It is, nevertheless, on the credit of their martyrdom alone, that a host of saints are held forth, in the Roman Church, to the veneration of the nations. Of that number there are many of whom absolutely nothing beyond this circumstance is known, which does not, however, prevent the fabricating, or the permission to fabricate, admirable histories of them; nay, there are some whose martyrdom is as little certainly known as anything else. One feels petrified with surprise and indignation on learning the manner in which a good number of those demigods are created at Rome, whose mortal remains are displayed on the altars of Roman Catholic Christendom. It is in the catacombs, in ancient Christian cemeteries, wherever, in short, there is a chance of finding any bones of the first centuries, that a provision of new saints is made from time to time. Formerly, no tombs were ransacked but such as bore certain inscriptions and emblems, but it is long since no such scrupulosity has been shewn.¹ The bones, accordingly, are taken up and committed to certain persons whose office it is to clean them; next the cardinal-vicar or the sacristan-bishop² of the pontifical chapel, puts them into a box which he seals. What are called *testimonial* letters are then drawn up, bearing that these bones are certainly relics, and that they may be exposed, in any church whatever, to the veneration of the faithful. If the body be entire, the signature of the cardinal is attached to them; if there be only fragments, that of the bishop. If the name of the defunct be unknown, which often happens, one is given to him. And thus on the old horizon of Rome there have lately arisen St. *Prudentissimus*, St. *Felicissimus*, and many others.

What can we add to these details? To worship known saints

¹ See a curious dissertation of Father Mabillon, intituled, *L'ltre d'Eusbe Romain a Theobald Fr. creais, sur le culte des saints inconnus*, 1697.

² The cardinal-vicar is the vicar of the pope, in so far as the pope is bishop of Rome. He discharges the functions of bishop in the city.

is, no doubt, a deplorable error, but at least one can understand it; to worship saints of whom we know not the life, the death, or so much as the name, beings of whom we possess nothing but bones, which possibly belonged to persons who were neither saints nor martyrs, nor even Christians, is not this the *ne plus ultra* of impudence among those who place them on the altar, and of imbecility on the part of those who pray to them?

For the rest, there are not many ancient relics having an authenticity so clearly proved as not to make it at least imprudent to make them objects of worship. To the uncertainties add the improbabilities;¹ to the improbabilities the evident impossibilities;² to the impossibilities the frauds, still innumerable, to judge by those that have been discovered;³ and see if the worship of relics, even supposing it to remain within the limits traced by the council, that is to say, without any alloy of superstition or adoration, be not one of those things that have done most to disfigure Christianity.

One word more on this worship and that of images. Let us observe first:—

1. That there is nothing said of it in history or in the first times of the Church, although it might have been very easy for the faithful of Judea to have images, and, still more, relics of Jesus Christ.

2. That if the old law, altogether material in so many respects, absolutely banished it, the greater reason have we to consider it as incompatible with the lofty spirituality of the new.⁴

Here, accordingly, the Church has been obliged to have recourse to a fraud which would be hardly credible were it less easily verified. Of the ten commandments of God there is not one more positive, more clear, more detailed, than the second. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any like-

¹ What likelihood is there that so many objects, originally of no value, should nevertheless have been preserved?

² Saints with several heads, several bodies, bits of the *true* cross, "as many as would load a large boat," says Calvin, &c.

³ At Geneva, for example, the famous skull of St. Peter is found to be a piece of pumice-stone. And the blood of St. Januarius? It is said that the clergy of Naples are now beginning to be sufficiently embarrassed by it, having no mind either to admit the farce or to continue it.

⁴ One is confounded to see how little certain persons disquiet themselves about setting themselves in opposition not only to the spirit but to the very words of the most formal scriptural declarations. "But the hour cometh, and now is," saith Jesus Christ, (John iv.,) "when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him." "At the present day," says Audin, (*Vie de Calvin*.) "one must see that prayer requires external excitations, that the ignorant soul, in order to fly to God, requires material signs, and that worship in truth is a mere abstraction."

ness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." Certainly this is embarrassing. Before such a law there is no way of saying, as with respect to the worship of the saints, "We do not adore them, we only pay them certain marks of homage." No, the commandment has anticipated all this. "Thou shalt not bow down before images;" it matters not with what feelings. "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them," neither in the way of veneration, consequently, nor of adoration. Observe, in fact, that this prohibition cannot be made to mean only forbidding an approach to images with such feelings as we ought to have towards God alone. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is said in the preceding commandment. Here, then, we have the formal interdiction of all adoration not having God for its object. It is clear, therefore, that what follows bears not upon the feeling but upon the act itself. Whatever notions you may have with respect to the image, whatever efforts you may make to avoid adoring it, from the moment that you bow down before it, from the moment you give it any worship whatever, the commandment is violated. The Jews never understood it otherwise.

What, then, do you suppose has the Church of Rome done with this commandment? She has expunged it! Another, the tenth, has been cut into two;¹ and so, in spite of the omission, all the Roman catechisms present us with ten commandments as the ten commandments of God.²

In the Vulgate, however, and when the commandments have to be quoted at length, Romanists have not gone so far as to suppress one of them; they think it enough to unite the second with the first, an arrangement which the Jews have never admitted, and which was admitted in the Church only on the credit of St. Augustine, without ever having been positively decreed.

¹ Not only cut into two, but reversed. For mark, it is not the first part of the tenth that the Church of Rome has made the ninth. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife" does not come before, but after, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house." The Roman Catechism, after having devoted a chapter to each of the preceding commandments, is honest enough to combine the two last into one, so impossible is it logically to separate them.

² Some years ago, if we recollect right, in the famous Lady Hewley case, an English judge, asking for a Socinian translation of the New Testament into English, and putting his finger on one or two passages, in which he said a mere tyro in Greek might detect a forced and wrong translation, made that a ground for denying the right of Socinian ministers to be considered ministers of Christ's Gospel. What, in the eye of law, must that body be which first falsifies that code which forms the basis of our laws, and is the *lex legum*, and then makes a fraudulent attempt to conceal the falsification?—TR.

In analyzing the Decalogue,¹ Chateaubriand follows the Hebrew text. Bossuet, warmly pressed by one of the ablest controversialists of his time,² replied that he was ready "to accommodate himself, if wished, to the arrangement followed by his adversaries;" and he continues to support the opinion of which we have shewn the improbability, to wit, that this commandment, as the mere complement of the first, forbids, not the honouring, but only the adoring of images.

Although the prohibition were capable of being thus interpreted, which we formally deny, it would still remain to be seen if this distinction be observed, and if it can be observed. All the dangers which we have noticed in the worship of saints you find also here. "We adore God before the image," said Innocent III., "and not the image before God." *We!* Here, no doubt, we have another instance of what we have seen called elsewhere as *the intention of the Church*, that invisible correction of all practical errors, of all individual idolatries. As if in God's sight there was anything but individuals! As if, with idolatrous thoughts and sentiments, one could not be an idolater, because the Church has not categorically prescribed his being so! It was in vain for the council to teach that if the Church honours images, it is not that she believes that they have any divinity, any virtue,³ but because the honour redounds to those whom they represent. Although to prostrate one's self before creatures would of itself be going infinitely too far, in the very temples of God, *before his face*, as the commandment says,—are there many people who know at least that they must keep to that, and who really address to the saints all the honours paid to their images? Are there in Italy, in Spain, wherever the worship of saints has been fully developed, and where nobody cares about Protestant objections, are there, we say, many to whom it is a matter of indifference whether it be to such or such a madonna, to such or such an image of the same saint that they address themselves? Will you find at Marseilles many mariners who would embark after having prayed, not to their ancient patroness, *Our Lady de la Garde*, but to *Our Lady* of some other place? Yet they very well know that there are not several Virgin Marys. If their homage be paid only to her, why this preference openly given to one above another of her statues? How does it happen that so many statues have their special attributes, and that it is so com-

¹ Génie du Christianisme.

² Non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas, vel virtus.

³ Noquier.

mon to ask something from a saint in one locality which would not be asked at all, or with much less confidence in another? On this point there is no way by which the Church of Rome can escape complicity. Though she may never have said, *ex professo*, that certain images had more virtue than others, no more has she ever had anything but encouragements for those special devotions whereby this idea is rooted in the popular belief. How shall a madonna, which you treat as if she were a queen, and which you suffer people to consider as the palladium of a city or a country, not appear a very different object in their eyes from that which stands neglected at the neighbouring street-crossing? How shall a statue to which you attribute the working of miracles be no more than another which has not the reputation of working any? It is not to the statue, say you, that you attribute them; it is not even to the saint whom it represents; it is to God acting in compliance with the prayer of the saint. Ay, such, no doubt, is the theory; the theory as modified and modernized at least, for your Romanists of pure blood have nothing to do with it, far from it; but is the practice, once more we ask, is the practice often in accordance with it? Are there many who make this long circuit within which you admit that there would be idolatry? All might make it, but the objection would still subsist. From the moment that one image shall pass for being more habitually than another, we do not say the cause, for it is maintained that this is not believed, but merely the occasion of certain favours, is it not clear that some part at least of the confidence felt in the original, will be bestowed on the image? "The man must be blind," says Bossuet,¹ "who does not perceive the difference between those who put their trust in idols and those who would make images assist them in raising their minds to heaven." But no more did the pagans ever admit that they worshipped statues. In Greece, at Rome, you would not have found one who, on being asked to give a theoretical exposition of his worship, would not make the gods the ultimate recipients of the honours paid to their statues. All that Roman Catholic doctors tell us to this effect, is, word for word, what was said in the third and fourth centuries, by the apologists of expiring paganism. The first author of the lines we have just quoted was not Bossuet—it was Julian the Apostate.

Shall we now speak of what the images ordinarily are, and of

¹ Exposition v.

the new perils with which art has surrounded the worship of them? What might we not have to say of those of the Virgin in particular? The council certainly did not decide that her worship ought to be that of beauty;¹ but Chateaubriand has said it,² and, as elsewhere, has in this said only what is actually the fact. Let painters be allowed to represent her according to their own ideas; but upon altars, if people will have her there, she ought at least to remain what she was here below. Instead of the simple Hebrew type, why that Greek cast of features and those renewed traits of Venus? Why that roseate tint, instead of the copper-colour paleness of the women of Nazareth? Why that virgin blooming with perpetual youth and beauty, although she had seen her son live till his thirty-third year, and may have outlived him, perhaps, many years? When a statue is erected to a great man, nobody dreams, if he has died advanced in life, of representing him young; at least it would only be in the case of wishing to recall some trait of his youth. Shall it be said that, in representing Mary as at the age of twenty, she is taken at the time when she was the mother of Christ? All well, if the only object were to recall that great event; but from the moment that she is to be prayed to, is it not an anachronism to present her to us as she was when nobody in the world dreamt as yet of praying to her, and when she herself suspected less than any one the post that was to be assigned to her? If ever she filled that post—which we persist in denying—it is clear it must have been at a much later period, after the death of her son, after her own death. Why, then, we repeat, why pray to her as a young and beautiful woman, if it was only in her old age or after her death that she began to be in a position to be prayed to? In heaven, it is true, souls are neither young nor old; but if this be the reason for your Virgin being always young, remember that this privilege is common to her with all the souls that have been released from the body's miseries. You generally represent the male saints as very old;³ but as for the female, nothing too fresh, too charming for them. Provided you can but lay hold of people, it matters little to you whether it be by the heart or the eyes, the pure or the impure.⁴ Come, now, tell us can-

¹ On the contrary, *Procarî vniustate imagines non pingantur nec orrentur*, says the decree.

² "Enchanting dogma which softens down the terror of a god, by interposing beauty between our nothingness and the divine majesty."

³ Except Saint John. Although he survived all the other Apostles, a whimsical usage has condemned him to remain under the figure of a youth.

⁴ Liguori, Sanchez, the *Compendium* and many other books, would supply us with revelations, were they required, of what is concealed under the worship of the saints.

didly, would you have been as much devoted to the Virgin, had you never seen her represented but as a woman of sixty, dressed as she ought to be, in a small town of Judea, the wife or the widow of a carpenter? Would you in that case have given her all those poetical surnames which you shower upon her in her litanies? Would all those poets who sing her praises, and many of whom, with that exception, are no more Roman Catholics than we are,—well for them, indeed, if they be not at heart perfect infidels,—would they ever think of singing her praises? Ah! Rome, Rome, here we see thee truly *all things to all men!* It remains to be seen whether after the manner of St. Paul or as “*the great prostitute*” of the prophets.

To come at last to indulgences, it is impossible for us to follow the same course, by attacking first the principle, then the form and the abuse. Here the abuse is inherent in the principle. There is no indulgence that is not necessarily, and in itself, an abuse.

To say that there is nothing about it in Scripture would be as if we should try to prove that it was day at noon, and night at midnight. This the Church of Rome knows as well as we.¹

Or rather, yes; there is something about it in Scripture, and a great deal too. From beginning to end the New Testament is just a long *indulgence*, sealed at every page with the blood of Jesus Christ; but that indulgence is unique and it is perfect; it belongs by faith to whosoever desires and asks for it, and, for an evangelical Christian, there is no stranger enigma than an indulgence of two days, of three days, of a hundred days, as says the Roman Church.

Indulgences, in their origin, were merely an accommodation of the ancient discipline to the less severe morals of the times that followed. The penances imposed by the Church were, in primitive times, measured by days, months, sometimes years. Hence the custom of granting to the faithful, on some occasions, means of abridging their duration. A three days' indulgence, for example, signified that all the faithful, subject at the time to certain penances, might, on fulfilling certain fixed conditions, prayers, alms, &c., abridge them by three days.

This arrangement was too much in accordance, on the one

¹ Would the reader know what Father Biner has ventured to say? The salutary dogma of indulgences, of purgatory, of the worship and the invocation of saints, images, and relics, were discussed *by following the Word of God to the Letter*. Assuredly few more impudent lines have been written from the beginning of the world.

hand, with the public relaxation of morals, and on the other, with the encroaching propensities of the Church, not to be carried ere long some steps farther. From the idea of a mere mitigation of temporal pains inflicted by the Church, it gradually passed into that of the abbreviation of men's sufferings in the life to come. This doctrine, and that of purgatory, after having mutually accredited each other, formed at last only one and the same system: a three days' indulgence then signified and have continued to signify, in the language of the Church, three days retrenched from those appointed to be spent in purgatory. As for the scandalous excesses which afterwards made the sale of indulgences so notorious, it would be superfluous to speak here in detail. It forms one of those points on which the Romanist historians resign themselves best to being agreed with us.

The council abolished what had been most flagrant in the human or, if you will, commercial abuse of indulgences; they continue to be paid for, but at least they are not made a market of. The form, accordingly, is a little better; the substance has not changed and could not change; it has, on the contrary, received a strikingly significant sanction. At Trent the doctrine of indulgences took its place definitively among the Roman dogmas.¹

Yet the council did not condescend to any explanation of the nature and the object of indulgences. We have seen, at the commencement of this history, on the occasion of the attempts made by Adrian VI. to give a satisfactory theory on the subject, that it is quite as difficult to explain the matter to Roman Catholics as to prove it to Protestants. On the one hand, we said, if the dispositions of the heart go for nothing in the effect which the indulgence is to produce, paradise is put up to the highest bidder; if they do go for something, they necessarily go for a great deal, and then it becomes impossible to say precisely what is given to you when you obtain an indulgence. The decree refers us to what the Church teaches. Where are we to find that? Surely it was for the council to say. Usage has led, although the decree says nothing about it, to indulgences being considered as applicable to the dead; one may gain them for the dead as well as for himself. Ever the same scandalous partiality of which we have spoken already in treating of the mass. If you have left relations and friends who are concerned about your being delivered from purgatory, delivered you will be; if

¹ See how ingeniously all this is arranged and attenuated by Bossuet, (*Exposition* viii.) "Such," says he in concluding, "is the holy and innocent doctrine of the Church."

you happen to have none, then though you might have been all but a saint, you must stay out your time.

Next, let us see. Either the pope has the power of bringing souls out of purgatory, or he has not. If he has not, the question is decided. If he has,¹ what cruelty then for him to leave there whole millions of souls whom he might by a word bring out of it! Without going so far, why this strange inequality in the distribution of a treasure which is deemed inexhaustible? Why will a *pater* and an *ave* in my parish church avail for only five or six days' indulgence, when they avail for forty days in another church, before another Madonna or another cross? Why is the performance of the same works paid, in such or such a congregation, with a plenary indulgence, and, in this or that other, with a mere indulgence for a time? Why—but we should never end with the contradictions with which this matter is beset. Yet let us give one, just one more. If plenary indulgence be not merely a lure, how comes it that masses continue to be said for the souls of those who received it when dying? Why that solemn *de profundis* repeated at Rome during the whole reign of a pope, on the anniversary of the death of his predecessor? This is what Luther said in his theses, and the objection is not the less embarrassing for being old. The only means of getting out of the difficulty would be to accept the consequences of the system. You have only to regard as well and duly entered into heaven all who left this world with that infallible passport, and to refuse, therefore, to say a mass for them. And why is this not done? We have no need to explain. Between a mere act of inconsistency added to so many others, and the drying up of the very best source of her revenues, could Rome ever hesitate?

But if there be ground to ask, on the one hand, why the pope and the bishops have not, at least, the charity to grant everywhere, and to all, as many indulgences as they have a right to dispense,—no less reason have we to be astonished at the low price they put upon them, and the incredible facilities offered to such as want to acquire them. See, for example, the statutes of the brotherhood, (*confrérie*.) well known under the name of the *most holy and immaculate heart of Mary*. By a brief of 1838, plenary indulgence is accorded to those who shall worthily confess on the day of their reception into the brotherhood; which is as much as saying to people, “Come in among us, and all

¹ Let us not forget that it was Alexander VI. who first officially arrogated to himself this power.

your previous sins will be wiped out." Plenary indulgence, moreover, to such as shall confess themselves, and communicate at certain epochs of the year, and these are ten in number. Further, indulgence of five hundred days to whosoever shall devoutly be present at the mass of Saturday, and shall pray for the conversion of sinners.¹ Though we should believe in indulgences, it strikes us that we could not but feel some scruples at seeing them lavished away in this manner. For a mass that shall have cost you half an hour, to be exempted from purgatory for near a year and a half! For one confession, to be exempted from it for altogether, although you may have deserved a thousand years of it! If not stopt by shame, these bold traffickers in salvation ought, at least, one would think, to dread lest their wares should suffer depreciation in consequence of being given away for so little. True, they do not cost them anything, and there is no limit to the purchases. Nobody well knowing to how many years of purgatory he may be condemned, can reasonably stop in adding to the amount of indulgences with which he is to appear at the bar of judgment. By placing himself on the most favourable conditions, and taking care to let no occasion be lost, a man of sixty might without difficulty have amassed them for above a million of years, over and above the plenary ones, each one of which ought to suffice, and with which one does not well see what the rest can signify. In St. Dominick's time an indulgence of one hundred years cost 15,000 disciplinary lashes, and Dominick once gave himself 150,000 of these in the course of a single Lent.² The road to heaven, it will be seen, has been marvellously widened since that time. Lainez said, the object of church discipline is to *facilitate* man's fulfilling of God's law.

It is commonly taught, in fine, that the indulgence has for its basis the merits of Jesus Christ and of the saints, applied by the Church to persons whose own merits would not suffice for their salvation

Now, as for those of Jesus Christ, we have already observed that the Church has nothing to do with administering them in fixed doses, since every one may, by faith, find there fully his justification and his salvation. The Church herself would not dare to proclaim them insufficient.

¹ The intention is laudable; but what is the prayer which the associated shall have, besides, to repeat daily for the conversion of sinners? The *Ave Maria*. Is it not to belie both letter and spirit to invite people to repeat certain words with an eye to an end which those words do not even mention?

² Hurter, *Institutions de l'Eglise*, VII.

As for those of the saints, the custom of applying them to others is not only an abuse, but it amounts to the subversion of the Christian economy.

There is not, in fact, in the whole Bible, any truth more clearly or more frequently taught than that of man's inability to win heaven. Common sense, besides, sufficiently teaches it. A workman, however earnestly he may set himself to his task, could never earn in one day the right to take rest for thirty years. Between eternity and the sixty or eighty years of this life, the disproportion is a hundred times, a thousand times greater. Fill up these sixty or eighty years with as many virtues as you will, not the less evident is it, that they never could make up the purchase-money of an eternal and infinite happiness. Assuming this, in vain for you to have had a little more of the virtues, a little more zeal than another: how could you contrive to let him have the benefit of them? You have not paid for the thousandth part of your own acquisition,—what could another borrow from you that is not owing to your creditor, as payment to account of the whole sum due? Two men have each an enormous sum to pay: one produces fifty crowns, the other five-and-twenty, and the debts of both are discharged. Would you say, therefore, that the first has paid more than was necessary, and that his overplus of five-and-twenty crowns will cover the debt of a third debtor? Although we should teach, in opposition to Scripture, that salvation is to be purchased by works, still it would have to be admitted that the very greatest of saints has never paid more than an imperceptible proportion of the price of it. And if one may say, strictly speaking, that God might have saved him for less, this nowise proves that he has done too much, paid too much, and that the surplusage of his efforts may be passed to another. Do we find this to be said by those saints, those martyrs, in the Apocalypse, who are represented as praying for the Church before the throne of God? What humility, on the contrary, in their sublimest songs of triumph. What fervour in their acknowledgments that they have been saved by the blood of him whom they call the Lamb. How little do they seem to say that their merits could save, or help to save, any creatures whatever! Yet such is the doctrine that Roman Catholics make bold to preach. "What affecting things," says Chateaubriand, "in this doctrine. My virtue, poor paltry mortal as I am, becomes the common property of all Christians; and in like manner, as I have been tainted with

Adam's sin, my righteousness has been put to the account of others." It would be difficult to imagine anything more radically antichristian. Let us listen rather to Innocent III., the wisest and the most evangelical of the popes, every time that he does not speak as a pope. "Nobody is justified in the sight of God," said he, "by the merit of his works, but by the gift of grace. Before the purity of the Creator, all the purity of the creature is impurity." Did Luther say anything else? And having said that, did he not say everything?

And now let us return, no more to digress from them, to the last deliberations of the council.

Two decrees of reformation accompanied the dogmatical decrees that we have been analyzing.

In the first, relative to the religious orders, we perceive in many an article a collision with the civil power. In the fifth, for example, magistrates and princes are enjoined, under pain of excommunication, to aid bishops in confining within the cloister, nuns who should attempt to be free. Now, governments the most disposed, by being Roman Catholic, to act in this spirit, have never admitted that the Church had the right to require it at their hands.

The council fixed sixteen years as the minimum age required for the validity of vows. This was a compromise between the custom that prevailed of pronouncing them much earlier, and the term of eighteen, twenty, and even thirty years, generally asked by the princes; but this regulation, so inadequate in itself, has never been seriously observed. Girls destined to the cloister, continued to enter as children, and their liberty was, in point of fact, engaged long before they took the vows. Another enjoined, it is true, that before admitting them to the solemn profession, the bishop should ascertain that they came to it with their full consent; but what was there to fear from those wills so fashioned and compressed? The council had no need to excommunicate whosoever should *force* a girl to embrace the religious life; the field remained, and will ever remain, open to indirect compulsion, to skilful circumventions. It was said, in fine, that the renunciations and donations of the novices in favour of their convents, should not be valid till after their vows. A very wise regulation, but no more had that any effect, but to redouble the eagerness of the monasteries to retain those whose patrimony they coveted. In a state of things which was faulty at the base, all

corrections in detail do as much harm as good, and only serve, in short, to legalize abuses. Several prelates made some very judicious remarks on this subject, but the council was too much pressed for time to pause to consider them.

Still more did the decree of general reformation give signs of the precipitation with which it had been prepared. Of the twenty articles of which it was composed, few were not either too vague to have serious results, or too much mixed up with civil matters not to raise invincible opposition on the part of the princes.

Among the articles which were too vague, but to which it would hardly have been possible to give more precision, without making a profound breach on the constitution of the Church, we would adduce that which forbids bishops to enrich their relations and friends with church property, recommending to them at the same time, the greatest simplicity in their dress, furniture, table, and general habits; that in which all hereditary, or appearance of hereditary succession to benefices, is proscribed; that, in fine, which prescribes that dispensations should be granted, only after mature consideration and knowledge of the case; and, moreover, without any retribution. Many a time does this last clause occur, yet we cannot but repeat that it has never been observed, and at Rome less than anywhere else.

As for the articles in which the council encroached on the civil authority, there were some of all sorts.

In the third, side by side with some wise advices on the danger and impropriety of lavishing excommunications, the bishop is allowed to retain the power of excommunicating, in certain cases, for civil and criminal affairs.

In the eighth, he is authorized to change, when it shall appear necessary to him, the destination of hospital property.

In the ninth, he is made sole judge of the legitimacy of patronages, that is to say, of the virtues on the ground of which the feudal lords should as patrons appoint to certain cures and benefices.

In the tenth, the pope's legates and nuncios are assumed to have in all countries a jurisdiction independent of that of the sovereigns and bishops.

In the nineteenth, in fine, duelling is proscribed,¹ but to can-

¹ This detestable custom, says the decree, introduced by the devil, its author. *Detestabilis usus, fabricante diabolo introductus.* As detestable and diabolical as you please; but it is

onical penalties is added that of the confiscation of goods, a penalty purely civil, and totally beyond the competence of the assembly.

All these articles are of the number of those which prevented the council, after its close, from being accepted without restriction in any state in Europe.¹ In France, as we have said already, it has never been officially received, either with or without restrictions, notwithstanding the reiterated solicitations of the bishops, addressed to Charles IX., Henry III., Henry IV., and Lewis XIII. Those of our day insist that the solicitations of their predecessors were equivalent to the regular reception of the council by the whole body of the French clergy. They reasonably may do so; but those very solicitations, and still more the terms in which they are conceived, prove at the same time, with the clearest evidence, that the clergy who made them did not consider the council as received in France, inasmuch as it had not been received by the French government. "The Council of Trent has been received by all kings, and there remains only this kingdom that. . . . In such sort that for your kingdom there remains a mark and reproach put upon it by other kingdoms for the crime of schism."² "Other kingdoms have received it, and this kingdom which, above all others, has the title of Most Christian, has yet to receive it."³ "The whole earth has received this council. Shall we make ourselves the enemies of Judah and Benjamin? Shall we, like the infidels, hinder the rebuilding of the temple?"⁴ The States-general, in 1614, were addressed in the same language. Fifty years after the council, therefore, the king not having received it, the bishops did not consider it as received. This question, for the rest, is a much more serious one among Roman Catholics, than when viewed in relation to the attacks made against them. We would here merely point to it in passing, and remark how much the French clergy, on this, as on so many other things, have changed their opinions since the sixteenth century.

All these decrees, with the exception of that on indulgences, curious to see the council attribute to the devil a custom, which every one knows was introduced, or certainly at least adopted, in the Middle Age, by the Church herself. What is duelling but a degenerate continuance of the famous *Judgment of God*?

¹ See *Histoire de la réception du Concile de Trente*, by the Abbé Mignot, 1756.

² The Archbishop of Bourges to Henry III., in the name of the General Assembly of the Clergy, 1582.

³ The Bishop of Mons to Henry IV., in the name of the Assembly of 1596.

⁴ The Archbishop of Vienne, in the name of the Assembly of 1605.—See the work last cited, and the *Notes sur le Concile de Trente*, by Rapicod, 1706.

which they did not well know how to arrange, and which they spoke of omitting, were drawn up and voted with extraordinary rapidity. Hardly was there here and there a detail, a word upon which there was not immediate unanimity; but this very unanimity called forth, on the part of some prelates, an objection which was destined not to disappear with the opposition given by those who then formally stated it. Those prelates openly said that these last doctrinal articles appeared to them superficial, insufficient, little worthy of a council. One has seen, and we could have demonstrated the thing still more clearly, how much ground there was for this reproach. All difficulties are evaded. Of all the questions which a Roman Catholic might ask himself on these points, all so interesting to him, and so closely connected with what is most usual in his faith and in his worship, there is hardly one of which he finds the solution there. Hardly will he find what is most elementary in a child's catechism. After so many anathemas on disciplinary, and even on civil matters, there is none on the worship of saints, none on that of images, *none on purgatory*.

This arose from the desire to come to a close having daily gained ground, so as to ferment "marvellously" in all men's hearts.¹ The emperor's ambassadors, in particular, were constantly pressing the legates. If matters were not hastened, they said, their master would recall them; it was not until after the close that it was known that the emperor had not really had any such intention. The Portuguese ambassador held nearly the same language. Those of Venice and other states joined their urgent calls, and the Count di Luna, even while expressing his desire to wait for a letter from the king of Spain, did not seem indisposed to their proceeding notwithstanding. The legates wrote in consequence, that "harvest time had arrived," when of a sudden, on the 27th of November, in the evening, the count came to them, and expressed quite different sentiments. As for him, he said, he had more reasons than any one to return to his country at the soonest possible, death having there decimated his family, and thrown his affairs into disorder; but the interest of the council and of the Church had more weight with him than any other consideration. Would it not be very sad that a work pursued during eighteen years should not have an honourable end? If it were not really possible to do all that the wants of Christendom might have exacted, ought not the council at

¹ Pallavicini, l. xxiv. All the details that follow are from him.

least to proceed with dignity to the little that it was still about to do? "Wherefore expose themselves, in their eagerness to pluck the apple some days too soon, to the risk of having only harsh fruit, that never can have the sweet and healthy fragrance that perfect ripeness alone can give?"

In spite of these representations the legates persisted; they even openly announced their intention not to wait for the day that had been fixed (9th December) for the celebration of the last session. On the 29th of November the count called around him all the prelates of his nation, and, to his great surprise, found only two or three who were resolved to join him in opposing the council's being brought to a close. On the day following he held another meeting, but with no better success. Hardly had they left the house when a courier arrived from Rome; the pope had had a relapse; he may by that time have died. In vain did the count protest anew that his master did not dream of troubling the next election, by holding that it belonged to the council: the majority could never feel at their ease till the assembly should be dissolved.

Everything concurred towards the hastening of the close; but it might bring back all the old difficulties attending the opening. On the 2d of December, although the legates had decided to hold the session on the morrow, there was a host of things on which the members had not come to any common understanding.

First of all, the pope was not presumed to have any cognizance of the decrees that were to be made, or of those of the other sessions. Under what form was the official communication to be made? Was the council to make a formal request for the pope's approbation? That would be to own the council's inferiority; to which the Spaniards and the French would never consent. Were they to send the decrees to him as definitively passed? That would be to teach the superiority of the council. The Roman party had at first the idea of taking the course of separating without having regulated that point. The decrees were to be sent to Rome; the confirmation was to be given without any farther explanation. But all other difficulties were so evidently in the course of being smoothed away that it was thought one might venture to remove this too. The conferences were calm and brief. The most rebellious were given to understand that the papal confirmation did not necessarily imply the superiority of the pope; that it was merely the act by which, as head of the executive power in the Church, he

made himself responsible for the execution of her decrees. As they wanted nothing better than to be persuaded, they were persuaded, and in the end there was but one prelate, the Archbishop of Grenada, who persisted in not asking for the pope's confirmation.

At the same time there vanished, as if by enchantment, the difficulty which had very nearly prevented the council from being resumed. It will be remembered with what warmth the French and the Germans had repelled the idea that the assembly of 1562 was the sequel of those of 1545 and 1551. We have seen that a decision on this point had been avoided, and the event proved how much wisdom there had been in leaving it to be decided by time and the force of circumstances. Time had brought everybody to desire a speedy conclusion; now that presupposes one whole, which the decrees of those last two years evidently were not. To vote for the close was therefore of necessity to vote the acceptance of all the anterior decrees. It was proposed, accordingly, in that sitting of the 2d of December, that there should be read at the last session all that had been published under Paul III., and under Julius III., and not a voice was raised against this solemn declaration of the unity of the three councils.

In fine, by way of acknowledgment for so much ready compliance, the Roman party consented to remove from the decree on the princes, all the special proscriptions, as well as all the anathemas with which it had been proposed that they should be supported. The council was only to renew, in general terms, the ancient canons relative to the Church's immunities, and the princes were to be respectfully craved to observe them, and to cause them to be observed.

On Friday, 3d December 1563, after the ordinary ceremonies and a triumphal sermon preached by Jerome Raggazoni, a Venetian, and Bishop of Nazianzum, the Council proceeded to the reading of the decrees which had not been definitively agreed upon until pretty far on in the night. The legates took the freedom to add an article, no mention of which had been made in the preparatory meetings, and which, at any other time, would not have passed without raising a storm. It bore, that "whatever expressions and whatever clauses might have been put into the decrees, the council meant that it should not be, and that it could not be interpreted, in any case, to the prejudice of the

authority of the Holy See."¹ This was the old *salva semper* more positive and more general than ever. *The authority of the Holy See* not having been defined, either *de jure* or *de facto*, the pope remained, as he had ever been, sole judge of his own rights, and widest latitude was left to him, as was abundantly seen from the sequel, in the interpretation and application of the decrees. Although this article, in fine, did not plainly contain the doctrine of the pope's superiority, it was clear that ultramontaniam would have no difficulty in giving it that meaning. The authority of the Holy See is represented in it as in such sort beyond the sphere of every kind of discussion, that no council could ever entertain the thought of circumscribing it by any limits.

As four or five hours at least were required for reading the old decrees, it had been decided that the session should last two days.

Next day, then, very early, the members held a general congregation for deciding on the decree upon indulgences. The ultra-Romanists had made fresh efforts to have it thrown aside, but this was opposed by a pretty large majority. Singular destiny of the question that had once on a time made so much noise, and that had turned men's minds most warmly towards reformation and a council." It was at the close of eighteen years, an hour or two before it met for the last time, that the assembly, with great difficulty, found a few moments to devote to what had, in 1517, evoked the first thunderbolts that were launched at the head of Luther!

This accomplished, the session was resumed. The decree just finished was read, then a second on fasting, the distinction of meats, and the observance of festivals.² On those points the council confined itself to recommending, in a general way, the observance of the laws of the Church. As it was known that the bishops were but little agreed on the question whether laws of this kind are of divine or of ecclesiastical right,³ and up to

¹ *Omnia et singula, sub quibuscumque clausulis et verbis . . . ita decreta fuisse, ut in his salva semper auctoritas Sedis Apostolicæ et sit et esse intelligatur.*

² "That pastors should do their utmost to make people obey these commandments, especially those that concern the mortification of the flesh, such as the distinction of meats, fasts," &c.—*The Council.*

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to (such) ordinances?"—*St. Paul.*

³ St. Paul, nevertheless, has said (Colossians ii.) that these laws are the "commandments and doctrines of men;" but St. Paul had no voice in the council if they in the least dreaded any opposition on his part.

what point they are either, it had been so contrived that the council had not to pronounce either way.

Three other articles followed. One, that the definitive composition of the Index and the Catechism,¹ previously decreed, should be remitted to the pope. A second, to declare that questions of precedence, whatever solution might have been given to them at Trent, were to be considered as precisely where they were before the council had met. The third, recommending to the princes and bishops the prompt and rigorous observance of the decrees.

In fine, they proceeded to read those that had been passed under Paul III. and under Julius III., but with the studious omission of anything that could intimate whether this was meant as a confirmation of them, or only as a declaration, by recalling them, of the identity of the council. It was of great consequence that this point should remain undecided. To declare that they were thus confirmed was to give a triumph to those who had previously attacked them as not being definitive decrees; to declare that they were recalled, but without confirming them, inasmuch as they had all their authority already, would have been to put many persons in the dilemma of either having to admit that they had done wrong in protesting before or of renewing their protests. Hence the precaution taken to speak only of a reading.² Ever, down to the last moment, compromises, subterfuges, questions eluded, principles dissembled under forms, because there was either want of the courage or want of the will to agitate what lay essentially at the bottom of them.

There remained the final voting, that on the petition to the pope for confirmation. Although it might have been hoped, in the last preparatory assembly, that there would be but a single opposing voice, great was the anguish of anxiety; the ground they stood upon was felt to be so radically false that it was not easy for one to stumble without making many others do the same. It was perceived that it would require no great effort for people to ask themselves what sort of infallibility that could be that went in search of a confirmation of its decrees from another infallibility. We have said already how the matter stood; either the council's decisions had been hitherto null, although the assembly had all along spoken and acted as if they thought

¹ The Index appeared in March 1564, and the Catechism in September 1566.

² *Vult sanctæ synodus ut illa nunc recitentur et legantur.*

them valid, or they had their force, their full force already, for there are no degrees in infallibility. What in that case would the papal confirmation signify?

These objections, which they were fortunate enough to contrive that no one should bring forward, were about to become more salient than ever by the manner in which the papal sanction was bestowed.

Pius IV. felt disposed to grant it immediately; but however inadequate the reforms that had been ordered might be, there was enough in them to frighten his court, and nothing had more shocked it, in particular, than to see the cardinals expressly comprised in some of the most severe decrees. Accordingly, long before the last session the parties chiefly interested had taken their measures. When the legates arrived at Rome with the petition for confirmation, the pope was already circumvented, troubled, dismayed. As for personal sacrifices, he had resigned himself to them all the more readily, as he remained after the dissolution of the assembly sole master of his own conduct, so as either to carry the reforms into effect or to say no more about them; but he made efforts in vain to close his ears to those declamations and those lamentations that now came upon him from all quarters. To the vexation of making so many discontented there were added his own scruples, those at least which artful advisers had contrived to suggest to him with respect to his duties and his position as pope. Was he free in point of conscience to abandon any portion whatever of what his predecessors had considered as the rights of the Holy See? Very great doctors had said—No; and as there was not a single abuse, however crying, that might not have been shewn to be connected more or less remotely with the papal prerogatives, there was not a kitchen scullion belonging to the pope, as De Lansac the ambassador would say, that was not ready to throw himself on the rights of Peter, were it even in opposing the pope himself. Is it much otherwise at the present day? Ask Pius IX. He is better acquainted than any one with that inextricable maze of interests, usages, abuses, prerogatives, real or factitious wants, with which the pontifical throne has ever been beset. From the pope down to the lowest sacristan, everybody at Rome feels as if he were in one of those ancient houses which are wanting neither in beauty without nor in comfort within, but of which not a bit of wall can be taken down and repaired without your being led to rebuild the whole from top to bottom.

These difficulties were removed. Let us see how.

First, we find that the Cardinal da Mula, in a commission of inquiry on the subject, voted for the confirmation, but with the following remarks:—

That people had much reason to congratulate themselves on seeing they had come to the end of so many fatigues, disquietudes, and expenses; and to avoid the risk of falling into them again, only perhaps to extricate themselves in a far worse condition the next time;

That to refuse confirmation might lead some to dispense with it, and to obey the council, as having no need of it; others to consider all the decrees as null; and then to have recourse to national councils;

That by taking a middle course, as was recommended by many, that is to say, by selecting the decrees on the faith for immediate approval, and reserving the rest to be determined upon afterwards, the difficulty would not be effectually removed, and all sorts of dangers would be amassed for the future;

That if, according to other counsels, they were to be approved in the lump, but with certain modifications in detail, this would be to expose the pontifical authority to the most delicate contestations;

That, accordingly, there was no room to hesitate between some disagreeable things, the bearing of which it would be easy to attenuate, and the storms of all kinds which so unlooked for a refusal would infallibly draw down upon the Holy See.

Da Mula was followed by Hugh Buoncompagno, bishop of Bestice, not a cardinal till afterwards, but already one of the pope's oracles, who summed up the state of matters with even more frankness.

First, he asked why the decrees of Trent, even when confirmed by the pope, should have more authority than so many others, of which the pope has remained supreme arbiter. The validity of laws, according to him, and not only their practical validity, but their meaning, necessarily depends on the man who governs. There is nothing to prevent opposing use to laws, the necessity of the moment to the general necessities contemplated in the decree. Will it be said that the adversaries of the Holy See will have, in this new code, an arsenal always open? But nothing more easy than to shut it against them. When the rule of St. Francis, full of ambiguities, threatened to raise a war among its interpreters, what did Nicolas III. do? He forbade

the interpretation of it by any one but himself or his delegates. This might be wisely done as respects the decrees of Trent. Confirm them; but ordain at the same time that no one shall have the right, or ought even to entertain the thought of interpreting them.

This idea pleased Pius IV. Yet it was a thing quite unheard of even in the annals of papal despotism. To forbid writing glosses on ancient and more or less obscure laws, is still done; but to publish simultaneously with the code, a prohibition against studying its meaning, is the last possible step that can be taken in the subjugation of the conscience and of thought.

That very step, which we should deem to be fabulous, were there not the solemn bull there¹ to attest it, was actually taken. "In virtue of the apostolic authority, we prohibit all, whether ecclesiastics, of any rank whatsoever, or laymen, whatever be the authority with which they are invested, the former under pain of interdiction, the latter under pain of excommunication; we prohibit all, in a word, whosoever they may be, to make upon these decrees of the council any *commentaries, glosses, annotations, scholia, or interpretations whatsoever.*"²

After this, reproach Roman Catholicism, forsooth, for having deprived you of the right to interpret the Bible! That which it has itself put in the place of the Bible, its decrees, its council by predilection, what it had spent eighteen years in elaborating, calculating, weighing,—even that it does not yet believe itself sufficiently sure of, to admit of its being abandoned to the conscience and the reason of the faithful. It publishes this code, but with a prohibition which, if strictly observed, would be equivalent to an interdict against reading it; for it is clear that you cannot open it any more than the Bible, without the risk of interpreting some one or other passage differently from the pope, and consequently, being excommunicated. Truly Rousseau was an excellent Roman Catholic, when he said, "The man who thinks is a depraved animal."

¹ 26th January 1564.

² ". . . Ullus commentarius, glossas, annotationes, scholia, ullumve omnino interpretationis genus super ipsius concilii decretis quocunque modo edere." The pope then evokes to himself all the difficulties that may emerge. A permanent commission, known under the name of the *Congregation of the Council*, was instituted to this effect. It still subsists; M. d'Andrea, formerly nuncio in Switzerland, is a member of it. Its decisions have been several times collected and published. Some of them are very curious, whether as an amplification of the Tridentine dogmas, or as an abatement of the decrees that are unfavourable to the pope.

See, then, ye children and apologists of Rome, the yoke under which you are placed. True, many hardly suspect it, in those countries, at least, in which the Roman Church has not the government in her hands. She leaves those in tranquillity who, without having broken with her, would break with her evidently on the first attempt she might make to enslave them. She takes care not to lay upon those who only half belong to her, anything in the way of believing or doing beyond what the faith and devotedness of each will bear. As for those whom she believes to be entirely hers, who eulogize and who defend her, on them she lavishes all sorts of encouragements, facilities, and flatteries. Say a word, write a sentence which has the appearance of an apology, and although that sentence, that word, should bear only upon something quite unessential, such as the beauty of a cathedral, or the majesty of a high mass, or the poetry of steeple bells, forthwith you are pronounced a man *of faith*, whose numbers, if we are to believe certain books, are daily on the increase. Alas! it must be admitted, their numbers are increasing; fortunately we can have a near view of them, and after having had such a view, we are soon reassured. Ask these alleged men of faith if they believe in the authority of the Church; put the case before them of their being called upon, not to speak, but to submit and to obey, and you will find how little they differ from those who tell you that they do not believe in that authority. Ask them what they think of the pope's infallibility? Some will, without hesitation, deny it, and you will shew them that it is nevertheless a dogma, not only at Rome and among Jesuit professors, but with almost the universal body of Roman Catholic bishops of all countries; you will tell them that if the Council of Trent did not venture to teach it in set terms, it formally assumed it by submitting its decrees to Pius IV.¹ Others will maintain that they admit it; and, as in the

¹ No more let us forget the form under which the approbation was granted. The more the pains that had been taken, till then, to evade the question of the respective authority of councils and of popes, with the more assurance did Pius IV. decide it in his own favour. "After mature deliberation," says he in his bull, "having seen that all the decrees are Catholic, useful and salutary to the Christian people, we confirm them, ordaining that they shall be received and observed." Thus the decrees that he confirms he recognises as not only *useful and salutary*, but *Catholic*; he has tried them, then, tried them as sovereign judge, in point of faith as well as in point of discipline. He pronounces, but it is after *mature deliberation*. He accords. We are entitled, therefore, to suppose the case of his having possibly refused, and to ask ourselves what, in that event, would have become of the authority of the council. If there be no difficulty here for those who frankly admit the omnipotence of the pope, and his superiority over councils, there is enough certainly to perplex those who deny it. Everywhere, and under all forms, you come upon this grand problem which would be enough to subvert the Church of Rome altogether, but for the immense interest that all her members have in letting it sleep.

case of the Church's authority, you will only have to enter into some details, in order to prove that they do not admit it. Will they try to make a distinction between infallibility in doctrine and infallibility in discipline? Still you can prove to them not only, as we have done,¹ that this distinction has never been admitted at Rome, but that there is a host of decrees presenting such a medley of discipline and dogma, that we defy you to effect any such sifting of the one class from the other. And why speak we of popes and papal bulls! The council itself, that infallible summary of Roman doctrine, you have a hundred means of proving to those people, is, at bottom, just as little an object of their belief. And here you may boldly extend your sifting of men's creeds beyond the circle of persons decidedly superior in point of education and talent. To all whom you could induce to reason and to account a little to themselves for what they believe, you might shew, even in the council, things which they do not believe, which they never will believe; you might thus wrest from them the admission, direct or indirect, it matters not, that they are not Roman Catholics; and these professed believers might, in their turn, reckon with their fingers, how many of the condemnations and anathemas, denounced by these same decrees of Trent, and under which they have long believed you to be overwhelmed, they themselves have hitherto been, still are, and all their lives must be obnoxious to.

Roman Catholicism, we are told, is one and invariable. This we have denied. The quarrels that agitated the council, the intrigues to which it was necessary to have recourse, in order to have so many important questions put out of the way or decided, the proofs we have had of the novelty and of the human origin of so many articles of faith, all this might still authorize us in coming to a close, to deny, as we have done so often in the course of this history, both that unity and that invariability. But here let us admit, both that Roman Catholicism is *one*, and that Roman Catholicism is *invariable*. Viewing the subject in the light we have already indicated, its adversaries will only be all the stronger as such. If Roman Catholicism be one, there is but one way of being a Roman Catholic,—it is to have an equal faith in all that it teaches; it is to be ready to say yea, and amen, not only to the four or five chief doctrines that

¹ See Book I.

characterize, in the gross, the Romish creed, but to all the secondary doctrines that Rome has deduced from these, and to all the developments that she has given to them. Thanks to infallibility, all is of a piece; it is a gigantic arch from which you cannot remove a stone, not even the smallest, without bringing the whole to the ground. Reduced to regular shape in virtue of the same authority, all the Church's doctrines have an equal right to your absolute submission. You cannot doubt one, without thereby doubting the authority which enjoins your believing it; you cannot reject one, without at the same time subverting the whole edifice of infallibility; for if the Church could err on a single point, however minute, there is no reason to believe that she may not have erred on others. Deny that minute point, and you are no longer a Roman Catholic, seeing you thereby abandon, in fact, the principle, without which your Church is nothing more than any one of the fractions of the Reformation.

It would, then, could we but compel people to be consistent, it would at the present day be an easy thing to shake and subvert Roman Catholicism. Among all the objections scattered throughout this volume, if there be one, a single one that is well founded, it is in reality as if they all were so. Let the Tridentine Fathers have been mistaken once or a hundred times, it matters little which, in either case they were fallible. Let a Roman Catholic admit that we are right on one point, or a hundred points, it matters little which, he has admitted his disbelief in the infallibility of his Church. He has examined, he has made his choice,—he is a Protestant, for he has admitted the fundamental point of Protestantism. If he stops there, if he continues to believe himself, or to call himself a child of the Church of Rome, it is because he dares not, or knows not, or does not wish to follow out consequences to their legitimate end.

But if we reckon up all who, from timidity, dare not, or who from ignorance know not, or who from indifference desire not to do this, alas! shall we not find they form nearly the whole? Let us not therefore indulge any illusion as to the results of our efforts. Twenty years ago the ruin of Roman Catholicism was spoken of as quite a simple thing, inevitable, close at hand; people would readily have fixed the very year. No doubt it will fall. We should consider that we insulted both the Bible and reason were we to find ourselves thinking for a moment that

victory will not remain with them. It will fall,—but when? If it has little faith in the Gospel, seeing it tramples it under foot in so many things,¹ little faith even in many of its own doctrines, as we have superabundantly proved, it has faith in itself, in its unity, true or false, in its powerful organization, in its empire over the masses, and all this goes a very great way. No doubt we have often enough shewn how those men, whom it assembled together three centuries ago, for the purpose of fixing and giving consistency to its faith, despaired of their work. And yet, had we related in detail the close of their last assembly, we should have had to represent them as united, in high spirits, grasping each other by the hand, embracing each other with tears of surprise and joy. From the midst of those groping efforts, those quarrels, those critical conjunctures of every kind, there came forth at last something which, right or wrong, might be presented to the world as unity. No more was wanted. The man whom they had dreaded most, the old head of the opposition, the Cardinal of Lorraine, himself drew up and chanted the acclamations with which the sitting was closed. From the top of her new plastered citadel, Rome again ventured to look her foes in the face, and the last words of the council were, “Anathema! anathema!”

But, thanks be to God, that citadel which was raised at Trent, is formidable to him only who looks at it from a distance and from below; it is from at hand, and from above, that we have tried to see it ourselves, and to show it to others. Hard by the mountain of Trent there towers the triple mountain of Scripture, history, and reason. Thither we have sought to conduct our readers. We ascended—the other grew less; and we had not reached the top, when our eye plunged right among the ramparts with which Rome has covered hers. Our readers will remember all that we then perceived of incoherence in the plan, of vice in the details, of fragility in the foundations of the loftiest towers. It was not without effort and vexation, they may be assured, that we viewed so often and so pertinaciously the earth rather than the heavens; it cost us not a little to have to bend to the rugged exigencies of polemics, those doctrines of peace, of love, of life, which God has called us to publish, in a very different strain, from the pulpit. But, we can call him to witness, never has the hatred of error been converted under our pen, never, above all, in

¹ “I would give my two hands to be able to believe in Jesus Christ, as firmly as the pope does not believe in him.”—Luther, *Table Talk*.

our heart, into hatred of those who profess it; and if we have succeeded in inspiring others with our sentiments, as we hope we have succeeded in justifying our ideas, it will not be with the cry of the Tridentine Fathers, "Anathema! anathema!" but with the prayer, that God will enlighten, touch, pardon, and bless, that our readers will shut this book.