



G. Cooke sc.

FATHER PARSONS.

The English Priest

*The Library
St. Joseph's Priory.*

HISTORY
OF
THE JESUITS:

FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THEIR SOCIETY TO ITS SUPPRESSION
BY POPE CLEMENT XIV.;


THEIR MISSIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD;
THEIR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND LITERATURE; WITH THEIR REVIVAL
AND PRESENT STATE.

BY

ANDREW STEINMETZ,

AUTHOR OF "THE NOVITIATE," "THE JESUIT IN THE FAMILY."

WOOD ENGRAVINGS BY GEORGE MEASOM.



IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,
PUBLISHER IN ORDINARY TO HER MAJESTY.

1848.

BX

3706

.58


1848

v. 2

LONDON :

BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.



✓

CONTENTS TO VOL. II.

	PAGE
Book VI. or RODERICUS	1
Book VII. or BOBADILLA	320

BOOK VI. OR, RODERICUS.

THE Jesuits have reason to lament, and Catholics in general, have cause to feel surprise at, the uncanonical death-bed of "Saint Ignatius." The disinterested reader may lament the circumstance : Ignatius and Luther. but, having attentively observed the career of the founder, he will perhaps consider its termination as perfectly consistent as it was natural. His ambition had made his religion a lever ; and when in that mortal cold bleak agony, ambition was palsied and dead within him, its lever became an object of disgust—as invariably to human nature become all the objects and instruments of passion in satiety, or in the moments when the icy hand of Death grips the heart that can struggle no more. It is indeed probable that the last moments of Ignatius were frightful to behold—frightful from his self-generated terrors—for, be it observed, I impute no atrocious crimes to the man, although I do believe that the results of his spiritual ambition entailed incalculable disasters on the human race and Christianity, as will be evident in the sequel. To me it would have been a matter of surprise, had Ignatius

died like a simple child of the Church. Fortunately for the cause of truth and the upright judgment of history, circumstances hindered the invention of an edifying death-bed, by his disciples. Strangers knew all—a physician was present. But here I am wrong : one of them, writing at the end of the seventeenth century, *has* contradicted all previous biographers, and actually asserts that Ignatius died “with the sacraments” !¹ Had his disciples been permitted to *think* of the thing, no doubt we should have had a glorious scene on paper, painted by the first biographer for all succeeding generations of the tribe. But this has been providentially forbidden, and we are permitted to know that Ignatius died in such a manner, that, had he lived in the sacramental era of Jesuit-domination in France, the founder would have been by the law denied Christian burial. Comparing the accounts given by their respective disciples, Luther’s death is far more respectable than that of “Saint Ignatius,” and so consonant with the man’s character through life, that we think it as truly described as that of Ignatius, for the same reason precisely. The dominant thought of the Reformer accompanied him to the end—the thought of his mighty enterprise animated the last word he uttered.² His death was consistent with his *cause* : that of Ignatius was not ; and *there* is the mighty difference. No unqualified admirer of Luther am I—nor unqualified disparager of Loyola ; but the

¹ Francisco Garcia, Vida de San Ignacio de Loyola. He says : “And finally, full of merits, having received the blessing of the sovereign pontiff and the sacraments, invoking the name of Jesus, he gave up his blessed spirit with great peace and tranquillity to him who created him for so much good to the world—y finalmente, lleno de merecimientos, aviendo recibido la benedicion del Sumo Pontifice, y los Sacramentos, invocando el nombre de Jesus, diò su bendito espiritu con gran paz y sosiego al que para tanto bien del mundo le crio.”—*Flos Sanct. tercera parte*, p. 518, edit. Madrid, 1675.

² See Hazlitt’s “Life of Luther,” p. 350, *et seq.*

latter is forced upon us as a saint, whilst all admit the former to have been only a man; and I confess that I like the man better than the saint. Both achieved "great things" by very natural means, as we have seen; but the latter pretended to an equality with Jesus Christ—*Quando el eterno Padre me pusò con su Hijo*—"When the eternal Father put me beside his Son"—and, therefore, I consider him an ambitious impostor—like Mohammed and every other, past, present, and to come, for we may be sure that the race is not exhausted utterly. In Luther's writings and actions there is much to disgust us: in Loyola's impostures there is much likewise to disgust us: the errors of both emanated directly from that "religious" *system of Rome*, whence they emerged to their respective achievements.¹ Antipodes in mind—antagonists in natural

¹ For instance, both of them talked of incarnate devils incessantly tormenting them. In Hazlitt's "Life of Luther" there are very copious extracts from Luther's Tischreden or Table-talk on the subject—all highly characteristic of the age, as well as the superstitious cast of mind which the reformer never threw off—so difficult it is to get rid of early associations. The reader remembers that the Catholics represented Luther as the son of an incubus or devil. The reformer himself believed the thing possible, nay even states a case which he vouches for! It is one of the least immodest and disgusting among Hazlitt's extracts: "I myself," says Luther, "saw and touched at Dessau a child of this sort, which had no human parents, but had proceeded from the devil. He was twelve years old, and, in outward form, exactly resembled ordinary children. He did nothing but eat, consuming as much every day as four hearty labourers or threshers could if any one touched him, he yelled out like a mad creature" It is positively horrifying to hear the reformer say: "I said to the princes of Anhalt, with whom I was at the time, 'If I had the ordering of things here I would have that child thrown into the Moldau at the risk of being held its murderer.' But the Elector of Saxony and the princes were not of my opinion in the matter Children like that are, in my opinion, a mere mass of flesh and bone, without any soul. The devil is quite capable of producing such things," &c. P. 318. The whole chapter is dreadfully disgusting and humiliating: but Mr. Hazlitt deserves praise for the honourable integrity with which he has perfected Michelet's garbled performance. Still some of the devil-matter should have been left out as too disgusting and immodest. A sentence to that effect would have answered all the purpose of conscientious fidelity.

character—diametrically opposed in natural disposition or organisation, both lived according to the internal or external impulses to which they were subjected; and frankly, the free-living of Luther, as represented by his associates, and by no means criminal or excessive, was as consistent and necessary in Luther, as were the “mortification” and “self-abnegation” and “chastity” of Loyola, as represented by his disciples.¹ Ignatius could not certainly have succeeded by any other plan in the given circumstances; and habit made the thing very easy, as any one may find on trial—with *such* views as imperatively required that the founder should not be as “other men.” Protestants have amused or deceived themselves and their readers, by comparing the “regenerated” spirits of Luther and Loyola. In so doing, they debase Luther, and pay a compliment to the clever inventions of the Jesuits. To my mind, at least,

¹ According to the Jesuit Bouhours, writing in the age of Louis XIV., the physicians who dissected Ignatius thought him of a “phlegmatic temperament,” although naturally of the most ardent complexion: t. ii. p. 228. This he attributes to the efforts which Ignatius made to restrain his passions: but such a result would appear in *conduct*, not in the *organs* laid open by dissection, which are modified by *disease*, and not by rational, virtuous restraint. In fact, it is excessive indulgence or excitement which totally alters their natural condition. Were it not so, morality would be man’s exterminating angel. Thank God we are now-a-days being enlightened on these subjects of such vital importance to society and religion. But Bouhours garbles the fact to which he alludes. Maffei, an earlier Jesuit, gives a diagnosis of the saint’s disease, showing it to have been simply an induration of the liver, with “three stones found in the *vena Porta*, according to Realdus Columbus in his book of Anatomy.” Ign. Vita. p. 158. He meant either gall-stones in the gall-bladder, or solid masses in the ducts of the liver, both morbid concretions from the ingredients of the bile. The *vena Porta* enters the liver at a furrow of its inferior surface, just where the bile-duct issues, and it ramifies with the duct throughout the substance of the organ. Hence originated the old anatomist’s mistake: but the diseased liver is manifest; and when we consider how many desperate afflictions result from disease in this organ, we should excuse many of the saint’s extravagancies. Anxious, racking thoughts will derange the liver; and this derangement once begun, entails derangement in every other organ,—blood and brain evince the disaster, and constant misery is the result—gloom and fanaticism.

Loyola was perfectly innocent of all the distinctive spirituality ascribed to him in his "Spiritual Exercises" and Constitutions ; or, at the most, that spirituality has come down to us, filtered and clarified by his clever followers, who extracted from Loyola's crude notions of spirituality a curious essence, just as modern chymists have extracted *quinine* from the bark *cinchona*, which they introduced into Europe, and made so lucrative at first.¹ The determined will of the Jesuits was the true legacy of Ignatius—like that of the Saracens bequeathed by Mohammed. On the contrary, Luther was essentially a theorist : his German mind and feelings made him such ; and the essential characteristics of that theory prevail to the present hour—most prominently vigorous where men enjoy the greatest freedom, press forward most intently in the march of human destiny, ever mindful of God and their fellow-men—whilst duty is the watchword of the great and the little. We have not derived all the advantages which Providence offered to mankind at the dawn of the Protestant movement. We have not been blessed as we might have been, because since then we have modified everything : instead of pressing forward, we have been urged back to the things of Rome—every step in which direction is an approach to mental darkness and sentimental blindness. When there shall be absolutely nothing in our religious and moral institutions to suggest its Roman origin, then shall the hand of Providence be no longer shortened, and its blessings will be commensurate with our corporeal health and vigour, mental refinement, and moral

¹ The introduction of this medicinal bark to Europe took place in 1640. Under the name of *Pulvis Jesuiticus* the Jesuits vended it, and derived a large revenue from the trade. It is said that the Jesuits were the first to discover its efficacy in fevers. Quinine is a purified form of the drug.

rectitude—the three perfections destined for man. But this must be the result of enlightenment. By persecution, by intolerance, you cannot effect it. If a poor hypochondriac will have it that his head is made of lead, would you persecute and kill him for his idea? Persecution on account of religion is pretty much as reasonable and as Christian-like. Enlighten public opinion, nourish the love of country, and human nature, with the power of God, will do the rest.

Their founder died thus uncanonically—without consolation—without absolution—it is even doubtful whether the messenger was in time to get the pope's indulgence or passport, by proxy : for we are expressly told that the Son of Obedience had “put off the matter to the following day ;”¹ and as Ignatius expired one hour after sunrise, according to Maffeus, or two hours after, according to Bartoli, the time, even with Bartoli's provident enlargement, was doubtless much too early for a papal interview : the very old pope, who was, from his usual regimen, probably a heavy sleeper, was not likely to be stirring at that early hour of the drowsy morn. But the Jesuits were resolved to make up for the disaster. Rome, we are told, rang with the rumour—“The Saint is dead.” The body was exposed—devotees rushed in crowds, kissing his feet and hands ; applying their rosaries to his body, so as to make them miraculous—and begging for locks of his hair or shreds of his garments imbued with the same quintessence.² They gave out that “when he expired, his glorious soul appeared to a holy lady called Margarita Gillo, in Bologna, who was a great benefactress of the Company, and that he said to her : ‘Margarita, I am

How Ignatius was glorified.

¹ “Re in proximam lucem dilatâ.”—*Maff.* p. 158.

² Ibid. Bouhours wisely garbles the event.

going to Heaven, behold I commend the Company to your care ;' and he appeared to another devotee who wished to approach the saint, but the saint would not let him ;" and to many other persons he appeared with his breast open, and displaying "his heart, whereon were engraved, in letters of gold, the sweet name of JESUS"!¹ By all these proceedings the Jesuits motivated or encouraged a cruel, reckless mockery of the most sacred event venerated by Christians. They overshot the mark, however. The apotheosis of Ignatius was overdone. The pope resolved to put an extinguisher on the conflagration—and there was enough to provoke any man who felt the least solicitude for the honour of religion. They gave out that Bobadilla, who was ill, no sooner entered the room where the corpse lay, than he was cured—which turns out to be contradicted by the fact that he was for some time after an invalid at Tivoli, as the thoughtless biographers and historians depose ! They said that a girl diseased with "King's Evil" was cured by being touched with a shred of the saint's garments—though other biographers tell us that the Brothers would *not* permit any to be taken ! "The flowers and roses which were on his body gave health to many diseased ; and when his body was translated, there was heard in his sepulchre, for the space of two days, celestial music—a harmony of sweet voices ; and within were seen lights, as it were resplendent stars. The devils published his death and great glory—God

¹ "Luego que espirò San Ignacio se apericiò su alma gloriosa à una santa señora llamada Margarita Gillo, que estava en Bolonia, y eva muy benefactora de la Compañia, à la qual dixo : *Margarita yo me voy al Cielo, mirad que os encomendo la Compañia.* Tambien se apericiò a Juan Pascual su devoto, y queriendose llegar al Santo, se lo estorbò Hase aparecido muchas uezes, trayendo el pecho abierto, y en el corazon esculpido con letras de oro el dulce nombre de Jesus," &c.—*Garcia, ubi suprà*, f. 518.

thus forcing them to magnify him whom they abhorred!" Nor was this all. "A demoniac woman being exorcised at Trepana, in Sicily, God forced the devil to say that his enemy Ignatius was dead, and was in Heaven between the other founders of religious Orders, St. Dominic and St. Francis."¹ This was the grand point

¹ Garcia, *ubi supra*. He also tells us that Ignatius raised at least a dozen dead men to life—*por lo menos doze*—one in Manreza, two at Munich, another at Barcelona, &c. ; some after death, and others during his lifetime. See the disgusting narratives in this Jesuit's "Life of the Founder." Even Bouhours gives some vile instances. And yet Ribadeneyra, in his *first* edition of the "Life of Ignatius," gave no miracles—nay, the last chapter enters into a long, windy, and most absurd disquisition, on the subject of miracles in general, tending to their decided disparagement—finishing off as it does with these words: "But miracles may be performed by saints, by guilty men, by wicked sinners—*ma i miracoli possono ben esser fatti cosi da Santi, come da rei, e da malvagi peccatori.*" P. 589. His introduction to the subject at once conveys the certainty that no mention was as yet made of the invented miracles—let alone the fact that there were *none* performed, which is, of course, *the fact*. He says: "But who doubts that there will be some men who will wonder, will be astounded, and will ask why, these things being true (as they are without doubt), still Ignatius performed no miracles, nor has God wished to display and exhibit the holiness of this His servant, with signs and supernatural attestations, as He has done usually with many other saints? To such men I answer with the apostle: 'Who knows the secrets of God? or who is made his adviser?'" P. 565. Thereupon he launches into a boisterous ocean of frothy boasting about the Company and its achievements—and the mendacious miracles of Ignatius's *sons* all over the world, concluding thus: "These things I hold for the greatest and most stupendous miracles." P. 582. Now this same Ribadeneyra was an inseparable companion of Ignatius, an eye-witness of all his actions: his first edition was published in 1572, *fifteen* years elapsed—no miracles appeared in the edition of 1587—nor in the Italian edition of 1586, which I quote, although the chapter is impudently entitled "*Of the miracles which God operated by his means,*" referring the title to the Institute, &c. But when the Jesuits began to think it necessary to have a saint to compete with Benedict, Dominic, Francis, &c., then they induced this unscrupulous Jesuit to *publish* miracles in 1612, which he did in what he titled, "Another shorter life, with many and new miracles;" and he got rid of the incongruity by saying that the miracles had not been *examined and approved when he previously wrote!* Truly, he would have at least mentioned this fact, *en passant*, in his elaborate disparagement of miracles in general. After this, miracles fell thick as hops, as you will find in all Jesuit-histories. The credulous Alban Butler gives a note on this Jesuitical "transaction," and his remarks are all that the most gullable devotee can desire on the subject. "Saints' Lives," July 31. See Rasiel de Selva, *Hist. de l'admirable Dom Inigo*, for some sensible remarks on the subject, ii. p. 200.

at which the Jesuits were aiming—the exaltation of their founder to an equality with the other grand founders after death ; which was, after all, somewhat *less* than the founder's own ambition—for we remember that *he* declared how the Eternal Father had placed him beside His Son ! And now let us listen to Pope Paul IV., reading these unreasonable Jesuits a lesson.

It does not appear that the brethren made great lamentation for their holy Father Ignatius. They rather complied with the founder's advice on all occasions when a Jesuit migrated. "For what can be more glorious, or more profitable," would he say, "than to have in the blessed Jerusalem many freemen endowed with the right of corporation, and there to retain the greater part of our body?"¹ This authenticated sentiment is exactly what the witty Father Andrew Boulanger expressed so pleasantly in an allegory of Ignatius applying for a province in Heaven.² "You should rather rejoice," said Ignatius, "to find that the colleges and houses which are being built in Heaven, are filling with a multitude of veterans—*gauderent potius collegia atque domos, quæ ædificabantur in cælo, emeritorum multitudine frequentari.*"³ There was no time for the Company to think of lamentation amidst the strife and confusion of her ambitious members, struggling to decide who should seize the helm of the gallant bark of the Company, which, like the Flying Dutchman, was almost on every ocean, and almost in every port—and all "at the same time," like the Apostle of the Indies, according to the Jesuits,

Expansion
of the So-
ciety at the
death of
Ignatius.

¹ "Quid enim sive ad decus, sive ad fructum optabilius quam in beatâ Jerusalem municipes plurimos, et quam maximam sui partem habere?"—*Sacch.* lib. i. 34.

² Ante, p. 176.

³ *Sacchin.* lib. i. 34.

and decidedly so in point of fact. It was something great and prospective—that monarchy left behind by Ignatius, with all its provinces, and wealth, and colleges, which, however, as he said, left him in the lurch at last—cold, desolate, despairing. No monarch ever left an achieved kingdom in so flourishing a condition as Ignatius Loyola, the Emperor of the Jesuits. There were twelve provinces, with at least one hundred colleges. There were nine provinces in Europe,—Italy, Sicily, Germany, France, Spain, and Portugal; and three in Asia, Africa, and America, or in Brazil, India, and Ethiopia. Thus, in less than sixteen years every part of the world was penetrated by the Jesuits. The historian tells us that their number did not much exceed one thousand;¹ but allowing the most moderate average of fifteen Jesuits to each college, we shall have 1500 Jesuits engaged in tuition, and the training of youth. Then allowing an average of 400 pupils to each college—there were more than 2000 in one of them subsequently—we shall have 40,000 youths under the care of the Jesuits.² The scheme was new—tuition was “gratuitous,” or parents thought it cost them nothing because they were not “obliged” to pay—all were readily admitted—and the colleges of the Jesuits were filled—for the Jesuits were “in fashion.” To the number of Jesuits engaged in tuition we must add the important item of the missionaries dispersed all over the world, running from city to city in Europe, or wandering in the wilds of Africa, Asia, and America. At the death of Loyola, in 1556, there could not be less than

¹ Sacchin. lib. i. ; Bartoli, Dell’ Ital. lib. iii.

² Sacchinus says there were more than a thousand pupils instructed at the College of Coimbra, in 1560. Lib. iv. 65.

two thousand Jesuits in the Company, with novices, scholastics, and lay-brothers of all trades and avocations, carpenters, bricklayers, shoemakers, tailors, bakers, cooks, and *printers*. Who was to govern this motley tribe of humanity? That was the question. Only five of the original Ten companions were alive. There were under forty professed members in the Society, according to the historians: but there scarcely could have been so many, seeing that there were only nine two years before the founder's death, according to the Ethiopian letter which I have given. We are expressly told that Ignatius had the strongest objections to permit many to be raised to that dignity which constituted the *Power* of the Company¹—having the privilege of voting in the congregation and the election of a general. Whatever might be their number, it appears that the five veterans of the foundation at once made it evident that only one of *their* chosen band should fill the vacant throne. Bobadilla aspired to the dignity, but he was ill at Tivoli,² and in the absence of the redoubtable firebrand, Lainez was chosen vicar-general. We shall soon see the consequences.

Paul IV., the Pope of Rome, had treated Ignatius very kindly; he had even expressed a wish to unite his Society with that of the Theatines, which Paul had founded. This was no small compliment for a pope to pay Ignatius; but the deep old general declined the honour,—he could never think of such a thing—it would have been throwing all the products of a life's labour into the Gulph of Genoa, where an ancient pope had drowned some cardinals tied up in a sack. Ignatius had no notion of being “tied

The pope
denounces
Loyola's
system.

¹ Sacchinus calls them “the bones and sinews of the Company—*ossa ac nervi hujus Ordinis*.” Lib. i. 20.

² Bartoli, l. iii.; Sacchin. l. i.

up ;” he had hold of a helm, and he had sturdy rowers, and an universe of oceans was before him for circumnavigation. And he was right in his calculation. Had he not prophesied *eternity* to the Company of Jesus, and is not that most strikingly boasted of in the glorious image of the first century of the Company of Jesus ? It is, decidedly.¹ And who ever hears a word about the *Theatines* or their founder Caraffa ? Echo says, Who ? and no more. But who has not heard of the Jesuits and Loyola ? And the universe sends a history from every point of the compass. Ignatius knew what he was about, and declined the honour most handsomely ; nor was “the greater glory of God” forgotten. Whether the general’s refusal was ascribed to the right motive by the pope, or that he was simply annoyed by it, as the Jesuits believed, whatever was the cause, one fact is certain, that the pope was heard to say, at the death of Ignatius, that the general had ruled the Society too despotically—*nimio imperio Societatem rexisset*.² We remember the proceedings of the Jesuits at the death of Ignatius ; unquestionably they were not likely to make the pope more favourable to the members than he was, to judge from that expression, to the head of the Company. Lainez, the vicar-general, thought proper to go and pay his respects to the holy father, in that capacity. According to the Jesuits, Paul, as I have stated, had wished to make a cardinal of Lainez. We remember what happened on that occasion. The Jesuit stuck to his Company, which, to him, with all the prospects before him, was worth in honour, power, and estimation all the cardinal-hats in existence. As matters now turned out, Lainez being at the head of affairs, with the

¹ See *Imago*, p. 52.

² Sacchin. lib. i. 31.

contingent generalate at his fingers' ends, the deep old pope saw the thing clearly, and was resolved to strike home at once. He began with a few common-places and the proofs of his regard for the Company. Then suddenly changing his tone and attitude, he exclaimed : "But know that you must adopt no form of life, you must take no steps but those prescribed to you by this Holy See ; otherwise, you will suffer for it, and a stop will be put to the thing at once ; nor will the edicts [Bulls, &c.] of our predecessors be of the least avail to you. Because, whenever we issue any, our intention is not thereby to hamper our successors, by depriving them of the right to examine, to confirm, or destroy what preceding pontiffs have established. This being the case, you must adopt, from this Holy See, your manner of life, and must not be governed by the dictates of the *person* whom God has called away, and who has governed you till now ; nor must you depend on any support but God alone. Thus working, you will build—*super firmam petram*—on a firm rock, and not on *sand* ; and, if you have commenced well, you must, in like manner, go on well, lest it be also said of you : "*Hic homo cæpit ædificare, et non potuit consummare*,—this man began to build and he could not finish." Beware of doing otherwise in the least point, and you will find in us a good father. Tell my children, your subjects, to console themselves." "And with these last words," says Lainez, giving the account, "with these last words he gave me the blessing," which was tantamount to showing him the door.¹ We can easily imagine the

¹ Bartoli gives the affair as he says from a document left by Lainez. Sacchinus leaves out the disparagement of Saint Ignatius, and adds a qualification not in the document. He says : "After other things of the sort, at length, shaking off

scope of this thunderbolt. It must have been long preparing. Its effects will be soon visible. But what a disenchantment for *Saint* Ignatius to be called *the person*—*la persona che Dio ha chiamato a se*; and the decided disapprobation of Loyola's principles, and the allusion to *sand*! We have here much light thrown upon the Jesuit-method at that early period, and it should not leave us in the dark. A pope finds fault with Loyola's principles or dictates; then, surely, the University of France, the Archbishop Silicio, the monks of Salamanca, old Melchior Cano, were not altogether without justification in denouncing Ignatius and his system. Justice requires this fact to be remembered. Sacchinus acted consistently in garbling the pope's address, even as Lainez reported it; Bartoli imprudently let out the thing, and Pallavicino, his brother-Jesuit, would have blamed him as he blamed good Pope Adrian VI., for admitting all that the heretics denounced in the Church. On the other hand, observe the threat of *suppression*, and see how the final suppression of the Society is justified in advance, by explaining the true nature of papal Bulls and apostolic Breves. Bartoli enters into a long discussion against these papal sentiments; but he leaves the matter just where he found it, actually twisting the pope's menace into an exhortation, "for Lainez and the whole Company to keep in the same path, and never to leave it,—or to regain it, should they ever wander"! ¹ This conclusion he founds on the words "*if* you have well begun"; but he forgets that the dictates—*dettati*—of the *person* Ignatius were

his frown—*fronte explicata*—he bade them to be of good cheer." This is an invention: at all events, the pope had not done with them yet.

¹ Dell' Ital. l. iii. f. 356.

no longer to govern them, and, consequently, the “good beginning,” if uttered at all, had reference to a period preceding the “despotic government” and present “dictates” of Loyola.

The Jesuits were not the only nettle in the side of Paul IV. It is possible that the fierce old pope hated them for their Spanish origin ; and that circumstances conspired to make him suspicious of the essentially Spanish Company. Nothing could exceed the pope’s abhorrence of the Spaniards : he hated them from his inmost soul, says Panvinus, the papal historian ; according to others,—heaping upon them the bitterest invectives, calling them schismatics, heretics, accursed of God, seed of Jews and Moors, dregs of the world—nothing was too vile to represent his enemies, whether in his sober moments, or when charged with the thick black volcanic wine of Naples, which he swallowed largely. He even hated and disgraced all who did not hate them enough,—Cardinal Commendone among the rest ; and now he had resolved on *war*, determined to avenge himself and all belonging to him, on the execrable Spaniards—without the least chance of succeeding.¹ Charles V. had just abdicated in favour of Philip II. A comet had frightened him ;—precisely the same comet which is now flaming athwart the firmament. It blazed over the death of Ignatius Loyola—the abdication of Charles V.—and has now come to summon *Louis Philippe* to drop the diadem from his wrinkled brow. Curious coincidence : but ten thousand comets would not have frightened the intriguer into abdication without the yells of exasperated Frenchmen,

¹ Panv. Paul IV. ; Gratiani, Vie de Commend. p. 105 ; Navagero ; Ranke, p. 74.

who eat fire and drink blood in their fury.¹ And the same comet waved its torch over Smithfield, whose fires were burning Protestantism out of England. Spain and England were now united. Mary had married Philip II.—bigotry united to bigotry, begetting the monster “religious” Persecution. In vain a Spanish Friar, Alphonso di Castro, denounced the thing as contrary to the spirit and letter of the Gospel: his *words* had no blessing from Heaven: for he was Philip’s confessor, and his words were only a decoy to conciliate the people to the Spaniard whom they hated intensely. Hooper, Saunders, Taylor, Rogers, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer—the heads of Protestantism,—fed with their bodies the flames of the holocaust which Catholicism, once more restored, offered to the God of Christians! A few

¹ At its appearance in 1556 this comet is said to have seemed half the size of the moon. Its beams were short and flickering, with a motion like that of the flame of a conflagration, or of a torch waved by the wind. It was then that Charles is said to have exclaimed: “His ergo indicis me mea fata vocant—Then by this sign Fate summons me away.” Several comets appeared during this century—in 1506—in 1531—the present in 1556—and another in 1558, which last was, of course, to predict the death of Charles V. Besides the catastrophes of kings, comets are supposed to influence the seasons. Historians tell us that for three years before the appearance of the one in 1531, there was a perpetual derangement in the seasons, or rather, that summer almost lasted throughout the whole year; so that in five years there were not two successive days of frost. The trees put forth flowers immediately after their fruits were gathered—corn would not yield increase—and from the absence of winter, there was such a quantity of vermin preying on the germ, that the harvest did not give a return sufficient for the sowing of the following year. An universal famine was the consequence; next came a disease called *trousse-galant*—then a furious pestilence. The three calamities swept off a fourth of the French population. A bright comet, called the star of Bethlehem, appeared in 1573, and menaced Charles IX. for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, as Beza and other Reformers publicly declared. Charles, who had languished dreadfully since the wholesale murder, died in effect a few months after, in 1574. Another comet appeared in 1577—the largest ever seen—and it seemed to predict the murder of Henry III., which happened so long after, in 1589. Whatever may be the physical effects and moral influences of comets, the present one, in the absence of all other explanations,

short years, in this century of mutation, had sufficed to make and unmake three different forms of Christianity in England—to “establish” three universal churches. An embassy had been sent to Rome : the pope’s supremacy in England was acknowledged : absolution was duly pronounced ; and an English ambassador thereupon took up his abode in the papal city. Persecution followed and ratified Catholic ascendancy in England.¹ Glorious prospects were these—such a fool is humanity when drunk with selfishness. But Spanish power in Italy was not adequately compensated by papal power of England : pope Paul IV. began the war with Philip in Spain and England, by publishing the famous Bull *In cænâ Domini*, which swallows down all kings and countries as though they were a mess of pottage. It excommunicates all the occupiers of the pope’s possessions on land and sea—it excommunicates all of them, however eminent by dignity, even imperial ; and all their advisers, abettors, and adherents. Vigorously the old pope buckled to the contest. He would crush his enemies. All men, without exception, were invited, urged to hold up his arms whilst Amalek was shivered into nought. The King of France, the ambitious lords of the land, his accommodating wife and unscrupulous mistress—all with different motives—were solicited by Paul’s messenger, his nephew Carlo Caraffa. Even the Protestant leader, Margrave Albert of Brandenburg—even the Grand Turk Solyman I.—the hopeless infidels who had so long battered the Christians—even these were solicited to fight the battle of the pope, Father of the Faithful,

must account for the thunderbolt-like shattering of the Orleans dynasty—and this excessively mild and flowery winter. Heaven grant that nothing more is in reserve !

¹ See Lingard, vi. ; Burnet, ii. ; Hallam, i. ; Dodd (Tierney’s), ii.

St. Peter's successor, and Christ's Vicar on earth.¹ How did it end? All his undertakings completely failed; and left him the will for the deed. His allies were beaten: the Spaniards ravaged his domains—marched against Rome, once more menaced with destruction—and then the old man consented to peace.

It was during the consternation produced by this imminent siege, that the Jesuits showed the pope what they could do in a time of trouble. The priesthood and monkhood of Rome were summoned to throw up defences. Sixty Jesuits sallied forth with mattocks, pitchforks and spades, marching in a triple column led by Salmeron, whilst the affrighted Romans groaned and wailed around them, fancying that the day of judgment was come; and that this triple troop of Jesuits, with mattocks, spades, and pitchforks, was going to dig them an universal grave or pitfall—*ad quandam quasi Supremi Judicii instantes speciem cohorrescentibus*. Vicar-General Lainez graced the works with his presence.²

To the Jesuits, by profession “indifferent to all things,” the crash of arms—the hubbub of human passions—were an angel's whisper to be stirring—and they bestirred themselves accordingly. The year 1556 closed with a magnificent display at the Roman College. It opened with theological, proceeded with philosophical disputations, and concluded with three orations in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, interspersed with poems in the same. Theses on ethics and the usual subtleties of theology were proposed and defended, and *printed* at the press of the Roman College. “Sweet to the men of Rome, amidst the din of arms, were these voices of wisdom,” exclaims the historian: “whilst confusion

¹ Botta, iii. ; Rabutin, Mem. ; Bromato, Vita di Paolo, iv. ; Ranke ; Panvinus.

² Sacchin. lib. i. 37.

filled the city with uproar, there was a quiet little nook for the Muses—among the Jesuits.¹” A tragedy was performed by the scholars, with all the concomitants of former exhibitions ; for “though Ignatius was dead, his spirit animated all spirits ; and the master considered those amusements of the stage useful to form the body and to develop the mind. Amongst the scholars were Italians, Portuguese, Spaniards, Frenchmen, Greeks, Illyrians, Belgians, Scotchmen, and Hungarians. United from so many different quarters, these youths followed the same rule of life and routine of training. Sometimes they spoke the language of their country, sometimes Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. On Sundays and festivals, they visited the hospitals, the prisons, and the sick of Rome. They begged alms for the House of the Professed. During the holidays at Easter and in autumn, their zeal spread over a larger field. They made excursions into the Terra Sabina and the ancient Latium, evangelising, hearing confessions, and catechising²—thus fructifying their pleasures as well as their studies, and practising for a more glorious manifestation. As yet, we are told, there were no public funds, no endowments for the support of these establishments. All was maintained by CHARITY :—but she would have been blind indeed if she had not seen where to fling her superfluities, whilst the Jesuits were offering such enormous interest, such splendid equivalents for her “paltry gold.” Benedict Palmio, the ardent and eloquent Jesuit, was winning immense applause and creating vast sensation : in Latin or Italian, a renowned orator, equally fluent in both, he preached in the

¹ “Haud injucundæ vulgo accidebant inter arma sapientiæ voces : nec pauci mirabantur, cùm turbæ ubique Urbem miscerent, apud Patres quieti Musarum locum esse.”—*Id.* lib. i. 39.

² Cretineau, i. 341.

pontifical chapel and “wonderfully held captive the ears of the most distinguished princes.”¹ Emmanuel Sa, Polancus, Avillaneda and Tolieto, the renowned of old, were at that time the Company’s teachers : Possevinus, Bellarmine, and Aquaviva, future luminaries, were amongst her scholars on the benches.

Then, despite her troubles, in the face of her enemies, the Society was advancing. She had fought her way cleverly and valiantly to renown. What she possessed she had earned : it is impossible to deny her exertions. Think of the items. Sworn champions of the Catholic faith, the Jesuits were its determined supporters—the terror of Protestantism : their very life they exposed in opposition to “heresy.”

Wherever a “heretic” lurked, some “nimble-witted Jesuit” was ready and eager “to bestow a few words on him.” There was something inspiring in the very thing itself. Excitement begat effort, and effort begat success. Another item :—The

schools of the Jesuits were bidding defiance to all competitors, without exception. Franciscans, Dominicans, Benedictines were freezing in dim eclipse, whilst the orb of Jesuitism rose to its meridian, or approached its perihelion, intercepting every ray of favour and renown. A third item :—The

fame of its “apostle” Xavier, the Jesuit-Thaumaturg of India, was a vast deposit in the bank of the Company’s “merits :” he died in the midst of his glory, but he left Jesuits behind, to transmit to Europe “Curious and Edifying Letters” concerning

¹ “Cujus et ardor animi et eloquentia magnos et plausus et motus excitabat in sacello pontificio clarissimorum principum aures mirifice tenuit : haud minus in eâ linguâ quam in vernaculâ oratoris adeptus nomen.”—*Sacchin. lib. i. 39.*

the wonderful missions. Was that nothing to the purpose? And, lastly:—Already the Company had “martyrs of the Faith.” Antonio Criminal
in India,—Correa and De Souza amongst the Martyrs.
savages of Brazil. Hundreds were eager to brave the same fate—generous, noble hearts, self-devoted children of Obedience, to which they refused neither soul nor body. They died in striving to humanise the savage. You will say, perhaps, they misled them. But that was not always the fault of these valiant men, and true heroes. Their hearts impelled them to the work, which they did as was prescribed to them—responsible to Obedience, as their superiors were responsible to the all-seeing God of Truth and Righteousness. You must, for a moment at least, forget the creed of these men in the unequalled heroism they displayed. Not that they were cast into an uncongenial element. Far from it. The missionaries dearly loved life
in the wilderness; preferred, in a very short Enjoyments
of the
missioners.
time, the savage to the man of Europe. One of these Jesuit-missioners had lived thirty years in the midst of the forests. He returned, and soon fell into a profound melancholy, for ever regretting his beloved savages. “My friend,” said he to Raynal, “you know not what it is to be the king—almost even the God of a number of men, who owe you the small portion of happiness they enjoy; and who are ever assiduous in assuring you of their gratitude. After they have been ranging through immense forests, they return overcome with fatigue, and fainting. If they have only killed one piece of game, for whom do you suppose it to be intended? It is for the FATHER; for it is thus they call us; and indeed they are really our children. Their

dissensions are suspended at our appearance. A sovereign does not rest in greater safety in the midst of his guards, than we do, surrounded by our savages. It is amongst them that I will go and end my days.”¹ Not that it cost these men no effort : far from it : but what has ever been achieved without effort ? Yet there was joy in their sorrow—ease in their hardships—pride in their minds—and a most pardonable vanity in their hearts. These adventurous spirits themselves selected the field of their exploits : all who were sent *had expressed the wish to the general*.² Meanwhile the men at home—the writing, the stirring Jesuits—made the most of the distant missionary for the entertainment of the curious and the edifiable. If the blood of the missionaries did not fertilise distant lands into Christian fruit, their *fame* swept over land and sea, to fan, as a mighty breeze, their Company’s renown.³

¹ Hist. &c. of the East and West Indies, iv. 418.

² “Qui missionem Indicam cupiunt, debent generalem admonere.” — *Sacchin.* lib. ii. 92.

³ “By the true and painfull endeavours of Thomas Gage, now Preacher of the Word of God at Acres in the County of Kent, Anno Dom. 1648,” we have presented before us another view which may be taken of the missionaries in general, though not of the Jesuits in particular. This most amusing old traveller thus unfolds his experience : “True it is, I have knowne some that have written their names [he had resided among the monks,] in the list of *Indian Missionaries*, men of sober life and Conversation, moved only with a blind zeale of encreasing the Popish Religion : yet I dare say and confidently print this truth without wronging the Church of Rome, that of thirty or forty which in such occasions are commonly transported to the India’s, the three parts of them are Fryers of leud lives, weary of their retired Cloister lives, who have beene punished often by their Superiours for their wilfull backsliding from that obedience which they formerly vowed ; or for the breach of their poverty in closely retaining money by them to Card and Dice, of which sort I could here namely insert a long and tedious catalogue ; or lastly such, who have been imprisoned for violating their vow of chastity with &c., &c., either by secret flight from their Cloisters, or by publike Apostatizing from their Order, and cloathing themselves in Laymens Apparell, to run about the safer with their wicked, &c. Of which sort it was my chance to bee acquainted with one Fryer John Navarro a Franciscan in the city of

And now she stands forth, a fascinating maiden to the world presented, with her retinue of a thousand warriors—men of intellect, polished manners, grace, and comeliness—each eager, at her bidding, to achieve some high feat of arms, as gallant knight, to win his lady's special praise and favour. Such was the Company in her seventeenth year—her marriageable age. Two suitors appeared,—both with high pretensions to her favour—the Pope of Rome, and the King of Spain. There was a difference between them, however. The former was tottering on his throne, but pretending quite the contrary, and had menaced the Company: the latter was certainly the richest king in Europe, and was therefore the most powerful; and he was full of big, Spanish designs—the conquest of England will succeed to many—and he was just on the point of figuring in revolutions which would shake the thrones of Europe.

The Company compared to a maiden and her suitors.

A general was to be elected—a successor to Loyola.

Guatemala, who after he had in secular apparell enjoyed &c. &c. for the space of a year, fearing at last he might be discovered, listed himself in a Mission to Guatemala, the year 1632, there hoping to enjoy with more liberty and lesse feare of punishment &c., &c. Liberty, in a word, under the cloak of Piety and Conversion of Soules, it is, that drawes so many Fryers (and commonly the younger sort) to those remote American parts; where after they have learned some Indian language, they are licenced with a Popish Charge to live alone out of the sight of a watching Prior or Superior, out of the bounds and compasse of Cloister walls, and authorized to keep house by themselves, and to finger as many Spanish Patacones, as their wits device shall teach them to squeeze out of the newly-converted Indians wealth. This liberty they could never enjoy in Spain, and this liberty is the Midwife of so many foul falls of wicked Fryers in those parts." Then follows an account of the adventures of the aforesaid Fryer John Navarro, strikingly illustrative of the *Quo semel est imbuta recens servabit odorem testa diu*, or that though a northern winter might untinge an Ethiop's skin a shade or two, the tropical suns have just the contrary effect on a monk's "old Adam." See The English-American, his Travail by Sea and Land; or A New Survey of the West Indies, chap. iii. Lond. 1648. I omitted to state, after Gage, that *John Navarro* was a Doctor of Divinity and celebrated preacher in his "mission." The &c.'s in Gage's text above are unfit for transcription.

Lainez, the vicar-general, had, for reasons not stated, put off, from the very first, the assembly of the general congregation which was to elect a general.

The Company betwixt the pope and the King of Spain.

It seems that he wished to pave the way to his own permanent exaltation. The war between the pope and the King of Spain intervened. The King of Spain forbade the Jesuits in his dominions, even the Jesuit-duke Borgia, to proceed to Rome for the election. Philip would have the general congregation take place in Spain, hoping to transfer permanently the centre of the Order from Rome to one of his own cities.¹ Brilliant idea, and teeming with prophecy—a forward glance into the coming history of the Jesuits. To whatever extent the Jesuits might contemplate this Spanish scheme, circumstances intervened to render it abortive in form, although, virtually, they would never belie the origin of their Company—ever eager to advance the interests of Spain, to serve her king among the many who *fee'd* their services. But a most extraordinary intestine commotion supervened, menacing the very life of the Company.

Hitherto the Company has appeared strong by union. It was a bundle of sticks, not to be broken, undivided ; and to those who give the Jesuits credit for nothing but spiritual and divine motives in all that they perform or undertake, it will be somewhat startling to hear that, according to their own statement, the worst passions of human nature raised a tempest in the Company herself, such as was not surpassed in rancour by any storm roused by her most implacable enemies. Bobadilla—the man of the Interim—who had braved Charles V. to the face, sounded the trumpet of revolt. Lainez and

¹ Cretineau, i. 363.

the generalate were the bones of contention. Ignatius had left his kingdom, like Alexander, "to the worthiest." That was a matter of opinion, and Bobadilla thought himself worthiest of all. As a preliminary to what is to follow, we must remember that in the curious Ethiopian letter, before quoted, Ignatius certainly dismissed both Lainez and Bobadilla without laudation. Pasquier Brouet he praised most highly; and if the *Saint's* opinion had been at all cared for, in reality, the "angel of the Society" was, perhaps, the heaven-destined general of the Jesuits. The inference is that Lainez had a "party" in the Company—had been "stirring" in spite of his "illness," and vast "humility," commonly called "solid," and pointedly ascribed by the historians to their second general—in his triumph over revolt. The Jesuits have never spared their enemies, publicly or privately; and they lash Bobadilla as one of their greatest antagonists. Bartoli dissects this member most unmercifully. Had Bobadilla triumphed in the contest—and he was foiled by superior management only—Lainez would have been "picked to pieces," and the successful rebel would have merited the awarded amount of his rival's laudation. It is evident that Bobadilla had large claims on the Company's gratitude and respect. He felt that he had won her applause and renown; he had carried out to the fullest extent her measures and her schemes. Bishoprics he had visited; monasteries he had reformed; in the court of Ferdinand, in that of Charles V., he had figured as confessor; all Germany, Inspruck, Vienna, Spire, Cologne, Worms, Nuremberg, had heard him preaching, had seen him working in the cause of Catholicism; and he had *scars* to attest his prowess in the strife, having been

mobbed by the “heretics.” Was it not quite natural for this Jesuit to think himself superior to Lainez, who, after all, had been only a skilful speechifier, and rum-mager of old tomes at the Council of Trent. At least, there is no doubt that Bobadilla took this view of his rival’s merits, which, by the way, he had slurred on a former occasion in a manner most striking and characteristic. Ignatius had assembled the fathers to consult on a case of some importance. The secretary made a sign to Lainez to begin the proceedings ; but Bobadilla stopped him at once, saying that his years and his works entitled *him* to the lead. All was silence, whilst the veteran went through his achievements, summing up as follows. “In fine, excepting St. Paul’s *catená hác circumdatus sum* — excepting imprisonment only, I can show that I have endured every kind of suffering for the aggrandisement of the Company, and in the service of the Church.”¹ It is thus evident that Bobadilla perfectly understood the duties of a Jesuit ; and it must be admitted that he deserved his “reward” for having performed them so gallantly. Action was this Jesuit’s “one thing needful.” According to Bartoli, he termed all religious rules and observances mere childish superstitions, bonds and fetters, which did nothing but restrain and check the spirit. His constant cry was *charity*, which he said was the form and measure of holiness in every state : in possession of charity, no other law was necessary ; charity alone was all the law in perfection. You will scarcely believe that Bobadilla was a man of the “Spiritual Exercises” and the Constitutions. In

¹ “Che trattone il *Catená hác circumdatus sum* di S. Paulo, potea mostrare ogni altro genere di patimenti sofferti in accrescimento della Compagnia, e in servizio della Chiesa.”—*Bartoli, Dell’ Ital.* lib. iii. f. 365.

effect, he had attempted to introduce his law of charity at the college at Naples, where he was superintendant ; but he failed, apparently from the opposite system being enforced *at the same time* by Oviedo, a hot-headed bigot, whom we shall find anon in Ethiopia. Confusion ensued—the young Jesuits were disgusted, and returned to the world. Ignatius, of course, cashiered Bobadilla, and Oviedo remained. These facts seem to prove that Bobadilla had all along thought himself called upon to resist many points of the Institute ; and that, on the present occasion, his ambition, and his objection to Lainez, only gave point and animus to his vigorous resistance. In justice to the rebel, on whom the foulest imputations are heaped by Bartoli and Sacchinus, this foregone conclusion of the Jesuit must be remembered. Moreover, it appears that his object was merely to *share* in the government of the Company ; he objected to the supreme authority being vested in one only.¹

He had been ill at Tivoli, the Company's rural retreat. On his return, finding that Lainez had put off the General Congregation "to heaven knows when—*fino a Dio sa quando*," says Bartoli, he felt excessively indignant at not having been invited to share the dignity and administration of affairs : he maintained that the Company should be governed by the survivors of the ten founders named in the papal Bull. Four of the professed immediately joined Bobadilla—among the rest, no other than the "angel of the Society," *Pasquier Brouet*. Simon Rodriguez also was among them. These striking accessions to the revolt are hard matters for Jesuit explanation. The first they attribute to simplicity, and the latter to rancour from his late condemnation

¹ "Summam potestatem penes unum hominem esse."—*Sacchin.* lib. i. 74.

by Ignatius. It is curious how the Jesuits expose themselves by appealing to the paltriest motives in their own great men, when they think it expedient to denounce their proceedings. What value, then, have their vituperations and imputations in the case of their enemies ? To the other two rebels similar motives are ascribed. Another member of great standing, Pontius Gogordanus, went further than Bobadilla and his associates. He presented to the pope a memorial, in which he distinctly charged Lainez and other Jesuits with the determination of proceeding to Spain for the election, and with the intention of modelling the Institute as they pleased, after removing it to a distance from papal authority. Great was the pope's indignation at this announcement. Lainez was ordered to deliver up the Constitutions and other documents relating to the Institute, within three days, with the names of all the members, who were forbidden to leave the city. Bobadilla followed up the stroke vigorously. The vicar-general was soon the general object of suspicion and blame, and the Institute itself was roughly handled by the sons of Obedience. Lainez met the storm with the last resource of the Jesuit. This "most humble" man called a council of his party : frequent meetings took place ; he made it clear that the thing was not to be neglected, lest the Company should suffer damage—*ne quid Societas detrimenti capiat*—says Sacchinus, after the manner of Titus Livius, when he talks of a dictator ; and it was resolved to make an impression, to create a sensation. Public prayers were announced. Public flagellations were self-inflicted three times a-day. Lainez in the House of the Professed, Natalis in the College, presided over the verberation.¹

¹ Sacchin. lib. i. 78. "*Quomodo turbis occursum*—how the mob was met," is the marginal title of the section.

But this was not the main method of success. Lainez got possession of all the papers written by the rebels. These men wrote all they thought ; but Lainez held his tongue, and committed nothing to writing. Bobadilla and Pontius were either too honest or too imprudent to cope with the crafty vicar and his spies. Their papers were abstracted even from their rooms, and carried to their enemy. “But it so happened, by the Divine counsel,” says Sacchinus, though he relates the dishonest means by which the *end* was effected—*divino tamen consilio fiebat!* Bobadilla soon found himself almost deserted. A cardinal was appointed by the pope to decide the question. Both parties were to be heard. Bobadilla set to writing again, and again were his papers abstracted and carried to Lainez.¹ Meanwhile the greatest moderation appeared on the vicar’s countenance : no man could possibly seem more humble and resigned. He won over the cardinal :—nor were rebels, however justified or justifiable, ever countenanced at Rome, except they were Catholics resisting their heretic king. Lainez even made the rebels ridiculous. On one of them he imposed a penance. And what was it ? Why, to say one Our Father and one Hail Mary ! It was Gogordanus, the only one who had stood firm in the enterprise ; for Bobadilla took fright at last, withdrew his case, and was despatched to reform a monastery at Fuligno.² Deserted by his Pylades, Gogordanus stood firm to himself, and taxed Lainez with oppression in having penanced him for writing to the pope. “What was the penance ?” asked the cardinal. “An Our Father and a Hail Mary” ! He was forbidden to say another word ; and when the cardinal

¹ “Quæ item capita ad Vicarium perlata sunt.”—*Id.* lib. i. 85. ² *Id.* lib. i. 86.

related the whole affair to the pope, Paul was filled with wonder, and made a sign of the cross, as at something strange and prodigious.¹ He reserved sentence ; but gave permission to the Jesuits to leave the city, and even gave them money to expedite the deliverance. Lainez sent Gogordanus to Assisium ; he reluctantly obeyed, though he would there be near his friend Bobadilla. We are, however, assured, that both of them set to work right vigorously in reforming or stimulating the monks of St. Francis.² Reform was the cry of the Company against “other men ;” but “*ut sunt, aut non sint*—as we are, or not at all,” was her motto for herself, and The Greater Glory of God. Thus did the cool dexterity, the keen-eyed tact of Vicar-General Lainez “put down” this remarkable revolt. First, he frightened the masses of his subjects with the terrors of his religion ; secondly, he refrained himself from committing himself by recrimination—above all, he avoided “black and white,” penned not a word, lest it should be turned against him ; thirdly, he avoided all *violence*—he permitted the rebels to give the only example of that invariable disparagement to every “party ;” fourthly, he made them ridiculous ; fifthly, he won off as many as he could, then he frightened the ringleader, and yet, not without the certainty of impunity—nay, with the immediate appointment of him to a congenial “mission.”

¹ “Quod vulgò solemus in rebus maximè ab opinione abhorrentibus.”—*Sacchin.* lib. i. 86.

² “Uterque tamen egregiè operam posuit.” &c.—*Id.* lib. i. 88. Assisum or Assisi is the famous city of St. Francis, founder of the Franciscans, whose *Sagro Convento* at this place is the master-piece of the Order. It has three churches built one on the top of the other ; Divine office is performed in the middle one ; St. Francis is buried in the lowest, which is never used ; the highest is seldom frequented. These churches and the cloister are decorated with fine paintings by Cimabue, Giotto, Peter Cavallino, Giotto, Barrocci, and others.

A better specimen of clever management was never given. Certainly it was suggested by the circumstances in which the vicar-general was placed, his uncertain position with the pope, and his limited authority ; but we must also remember, that it is not always the consciousness of peril and weakness which makes men cautious, collected, and inventive to achieve deliverance. Bobadilla, in his manifesto, had stated that it was difficult to relate how many blunders, absurdities, fooleries, and childish indiscretions Lainez and his assistants had in so short a time exhibited ;¹ but Lainez seems to have resolved to prove that his first step towards reformation in his conduct would be the management and subjugation of the arch-rebel himself and his assistants. Bobadilla ventured to attack the Constitutions of Ignatius, which, Bartoli sarcastically says, he had never read, nor understood, even had he read them, because he read them only to turn them into ridicule,²—a strange accusation for a Jesuit to bring against one of his founders ;—but Lainez resolved to show the rebel how he could imitate Ignatius in his astuteness, as well as uphold him in his Constitutions. This victory achieved by Lainez exhibits the character of the Jesuit as strikingly as any “ great ” occasion of his life—unless it be the moment when he gave out that “ God had revealed the “ Spiritual Exercises ” to our holy father—yea, that it was signified to some one by the Virgin Godbearer, through the Archangel Gabriel, that she was the patroness of the “ Exercises,” their foundress, their assistant, and that she had taught Ignatius thus to conceive them.”³

¹ Bartoli, *ubi supra*, f. 368.

² Ibid.

³ “ Fidâ traditione inde usque à P. Jacobo Lainio acceptum haberi, Deum hæc ‘ Exercitia ’ sancto patri nostro revelâsse : imò per Gabrielem Archangelum non nemini fuisse à Deiparâ Virgine significatum, se patronam eorum,

Thus subsided, for a time, the intestine commotions of the Jesuits. And the hostilities had ceased between the King of Spain and the Pope of Rome. The pope accepted gladly the proffered peace when he found himself at the conqueror's mercy, and dismissed the execrated foe with his pardon and blessing. On the very same night Tiber overflowed his banks, and deluged the holy city. Up to the highest steps of the Jesuits' church the angry waters foamed and floated the College. Immense damage was done to the city by the uxorious river ; but he seems to have only unsettled the Jesuits, as though he came, as in times of old, to pay a visit of inspection, after their late domestic convulsions—

“ Audiet cives acuisse ferrum,
Quo graves Persæ melius perirent,
Audiet pugnas, vitio parentum
Rara juvenus.”

A rare, choice calamity was this to be converted into a Divine judgment by fanatics : and so it was, and ever will be. The “heretics” cried Judgment, and over Germany it was told as a fact that many thousand Romans had been engulfed by the exterminating angel of a river—among the rest seven cardinals—and that the pope himself had escaped with difficulty.¹ Meanwhile, the embargo being taken off the Jesuits of Spain, they come to the General Congregation. *Quem vocet divûm populus ruentis Imperî rebus ?*—whom of the professed Gods will they invoke to guide the helm in the storm, raging and still impending ? To the holy conclave twenty electors—only twenty electors out of more than a

fundatricem, atque adjutricem fuisse, docuisseque Ignatium, ut ea sic conciperet ; quo nomine se huic operi dedisse initium.”—*Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu.* f. 1.

¹ Sacchin. lib. i. 90. *Hæreticorum mendacia guttura, &c.*

thousand men—proceed to elect a general for the Company of Jesus. Holy obedience in the vulgar herd—the *ignobile vulgus* of the Company put their necks into the yoke,—why should we complain? If the Evil One may do as he likes with his own, why should we interfere by force or argument between a Jesuit and his soul? But see, in the midst of the assembled electors, a cardinal enters, unexpectedly, in the name of the sovereign pontiff! Not exactly like Cromwell into parliament, he comes :—but still in a significant attitude, saying to the startled Jesuits assembled :

“Paul IV. does not pretend to influence a choice which should be made only according to the Institute. The pope desires to be considered the Protector of the Order—not in a general sense, as he is of all the Faithful and all religious Orders—but in a sense altogether special and particular.”¹

The pope’s jealousy of Philip II. was not dispelled. Borgia had not left Spain : this Jesuit, by reason of ill health, we are told, and from “political motives,” could not abandon Spain.² He remained with the hated Philip. Reformed or not reformed, the pope would have the Company entirely to himself, admitting least of all, such a rival in his fond possession. Now, what if Borgia be elected general? In that event the pope would have confirmation strong for his suspicion. Pacheco, the cardinal, further announced that he was charged by Paul IV. to act as secretary, and teller of the ballot to the electing Congregation. The Jesuits were taken aback : but they soon trimmed sail to the wind—ever yielding to the storm when they cannot control it. There was

¹ Cretineau, i. 365.

² “Pour des raisons de santé, et des motifs politiques.”—*Id.* ib. 372.

no doubt of the vicar's election to the generalate ; and he had a large majority. Lainez took thirteen votes out of the twenty,—Nadal, Loyola's coadjutor and assistant, when lately disabled—took four,—Lannoy and Brouet, the angel of the Company, had only one each ; and Borgia, the duke-Jesuit, had a single vote. Lainez was proclaimed general with immense applause and gratulation. *Te Deum laudamus* was sung, three sermons were delivered, one on the Trinity, a second by way of thanksgiving, and a third on the Virgin Mary. So great was the spiritual excitement on the occasion, that many said they had never been before so abundantly and solidly enlivened by celestial delights.¹

The ghost of Reform came suddenly upon them in the midst of their celestial banquet. Paul IV. insisted that the choral offices of the monks should be performed in the Society of Jesus. This is one of the most important exemptions of the Jesuits. It gave them seven or eight hours daily for—work. To have boxed them up in cloisters, and to have made them sing “the praises of God,” whilst they might promote the glory of the Society, by their numerous avocations—the composition of books in particular—in a word, to have made *monks* of them, was neither the notion of Loyola, nor contemplated by the Constitutions, nor in the least relished by the Jesuits in general. But this was not all. General Lainez received the next blow from St. Peter's Vicar. The pope required that the generalate should be only for a determinate period, as for example, the space of three years. This would at once make the Order a democracy—aristocratical more or less—but still its high monarchical elements would evaporate—fear and

¹ “Cælesti dulcedine usque eo affluenter ac solide recreatos.”—*Sacch.* l. ii. 31.

anxiety would hamper the triennial monarch, and open the way for further democratical influence. It would be impossible for the general to adopt schemes of any magnitude, requiring time for maturity and complete achievement: the work of the Jesuits was by its very nature progressive—a sort of new creation, in veritable geological days, unto the glory and rest of the Sabbath.

The Jesuits, in a respectful memorial, protested against these innovations. Lainez and Salmeron went to present it to the pope. Paul IV. received them freezingly. In the presence of the Cardinal of Naples, his nephew, the pope let fall upon them the weight of his displeasure. The two Jesuits attempted to explain the motives of their persistence—"You are rebels!" exclaimed his enraged Holiness; "opiniators verging on heresy—and I very much fear to see some sectarian issuing from your Society. For the rest, we are well resolved no longer to tolerate such a disorder."

Lainez replied:

"I have never sought nor desired to be general; and as for what concerns myself personally, I am not only not repugnant to resign at the end of three years, even this very day would I esteem it a favour if your Holiness would free me from this burthen, for which I have neither inclination nor fitness. Nevertheless, you know that the fathers, in proceeding to the election, have intended to elect a general in perpetuity, according to the Constitutions. Cardinal Pacheco announced to us that your Holiness desired two things: 1. That the general should fix his residence at Rome; 2. That he be appointed for life. The fathers were of the same opinion. The election being made in that manner, we are come to your Holiness, who has approved and confirmed

it. But I shall not hesitate an instant—I shall obey willingly, as I have said.”

“I do not wish you to resign,” rejoined the pope,—“it would be to shun labour ; moreover, at the end of three years I shall be able to prolong the term.”

How to deal with a furious old man! Lainez appealed to the bowels of his mercy.

“We teach,” said he, “we preach against the heretics : on that account they hate us, and call us papists. Wherefore your Holiness ought to protect us, to show us the bowels of a father, and believe that God would be to us propitious.”

All in vain ! Paul IV. was inexorable. He ordered the choir to be instantly established, and that this article should be *appended to the Constitutions* as the expression of his sovereign will.¹

The Jesuits obeyed, for it was absolutely necessary. The pope's death, within the year, freed them from this ostensible obedience ; they threw up the hateful choir ; and tore off the spiteful article superadded to their Constitutions. The pope's successor, the “dexterous, prudent, good-humoured” Pius IV. was not likely to look with more displeasure on this trivial disobedience to a mandate of his enemy Paul IV., than he had probably felt at the display of popular hatred when Paul's statue was torn down from its pedestal, broken in pieces, and the head with the triple crown dragged through the streets.²

All circumstances favoured the Jesuits. The pope had died miserably,³ unpopular, detested by his subjects,

¹ Cretineau, *ubi supra* ; Sacchinus, lib. ii. ; Bartoli, lib. iv.

² See Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, p. 80.

³ “At last, when laid low by an illness sufficient to cause the death even of a

as evidenced by the violent demonstrations which followed his demise. His Inquisition was pillaged and set on fire : an attempt was made to burn the Dominican convent Della Minerva. All his monu-^{Reaction.}ments were to be destroyed, as the Romans resolved in the capitol :—they had suffered so much under him, and his infamous nephews the Caraffas—for “he had been an ill-doer to the city and the whole earth.”¹ So did, and so spake the masses, stirred through the length and breadth of their stormy sea as it rolled with the turning tide. From the tempest the Society emerged, as the moon what time her horns are full, rejoicing. “She was restored to her normal state, stronger than before the death of Loyola. She was more united—because she had just tested her unity.”²

And not only that : she triumphantly stood on the pinnacle of a splendid reaction. A year before, she was at the mercy of a capricious old man, wielding the bolts of the Vatican. There had been a dread hour when all seemed lost—the gulf yawning beneath her. On the brink she stood unterrified. A strong man in her van battled with destruction. He bridged the chasm : she crossed ; and sang the song of thanksgiving to the master-mind which had planned, and effected her deliverance. The reaction was one of the most wonderful recorded in history :—in the conclave for the election of a successor to Paul IV., Lainez, the general of the Jesuits, was proposed, and would have been *Pope of Rome* but for a prescriptive formality ! Custom

younger man, he called the cardinals once more together, commended his soul to their prayers, and the Holy See and the Inquisition to their care : he strove to collect his energies once more, and to raise himself up : his strength failed him : he fell back, and died.” (Aug. 18, 1559).—*Ranke, Hist. of the Popes*, p. 79.

¹ Id. p. 80 ; Panvin. Paul IV.

² Cretineau, i. 371.

required that the pope should be chosen from the college of cardinals.¹

Lainez was a Spaniard : the most exalted members of the Society, with the Jesuit-duke Borgia at their head, were Spaniards ; the Society was a Spaniard's—in Spain she was best established ;—and the interests of Spain were then paramount ;—Italy had suffered—Rome had been threatened by the indignation of Spain's powerful king : he had designed to take the Society under his special superintendence : he was sure of its devotedness to his interests ; and now, how splendid the prospect if, by one great stroke, both the Society and the tiara should become his vassals ! A mere formality (but in the city of inexorable formalities) defeated the splendid design,—and “ the partisans of Lainez gave their votes to Cardinal Medici, who took the name of Pius IV.”²

Simple facts as the Jesuit-historians record them :
 but how significant when transfixed and ento-
 mologically examined, by cool reflection, with
 memory at her side opening the archives of
 antecedent and contemporaneous events.

The Jesuits
in the field
of blood.

Bloody executions within two years avenged Pius IV. and the Jesuits for what both Medici and the Jesuits had endured from the late pope and his nephews, the Caraffas ; and his relatives, Count Allifani and Cardini. They were condemned to death : it is not necessary to state the crimes of which they were accused, since the next infallible pope, St. Pius V. made restitution to their memory and their family, his appointed judges

¹ Cretineau, i. 385 ; Sacchinus and Bartoli.

² This Jesuit-fact is, however, somewhat suspicious. It is scarcely probable that the cardinals would elect any one who did not belong to their body. See Quesnel, ii. 10.

declaring "that Pius IV. had been led into error by the Procurator-General," who was duly put to death as a scape-goat.¹

Jesuit-fathers attended the condemned in their preparation for death. Silver crucifixes were kissed, the *De profundis* was gloomily muttered; the *Te Deum* too, at the suggestion of one of the Jesuits, alternated the lament of death. The Cardinal Caraffa was resigned, for he had made his confession, and was absolved, and had recited the office of the Virgin. And the grim tormentors approached ready to strangle the anointed of the Church. The cardinal shrunk in horror from the sight, and turning away he exclaimed with unspeakable energy: "O Pope Pius! O King Philip! I did not expect this from you!" He rolled on the ground, a strangled corpse.²

The bodies were exposed to public view: the effect did not correspond to the expectation. The Romans had detested the late pope's nephews—they would themselves have torn them to pieces without remorse: but the revenge of another hand only found (as usual) indignant pity in their breast: they bewailed the victims—the feeling was contagious—a tumult was imminent. The Jesuits were sent forth to restore tranquillity in Rome; and they succeeded.³

¹ His name was Pallentiere, the "Attorney-General" of the prosecution. Pius V. declared the sentence unjust; and Pallavicini, the Catholic historian, asserts that the cardinal's guilt was not made out, to judge from the documents which he had examined.

² Cretineau gives a long description of these executions, actually with the view of "showing off" the Jesuits in the cells of the condemned! But the fact is that the cardinal was *denied* his usual confessor. "He was not allowed his usual confessor: he had much to say, as may be imagined, to the confessor *sent* him, and the shrift was somewhat protracted. 'Finish, will you, Monsignore,' cried the officer of police, 'we have other business in hand.'"—*Ranke, Hist. of the Popes*, p. 83.

³ Cretineau, p. 389; Thuan. lib. 23; Ciacon. Vita Pontif. Paul IV.

If the conduct of these Jesuits in the field of blood was edifying, it compensated in some measure for that of another Jesuit, in the confessional, a few months before these dreadful scenes horrified and disgusted the hearts of Rome. There was at Grenada, in Spain, a repentant lady, who went to confess to a Jesuit, whose name is not mentioned by the Company's historian. This lady accused herself, in confession, of a certain sin which requires an accomplice. The Jesuit insisted upon having the name of the party revealed to him : the lady refused : the Jesuit withheld absolution, until, overcome by his importunities and menaces, she revealed the name of her accomplice. The Jesuit immediately imparted the crime, and named the criminal to the Archbishop of Grenada, who, according to the Jesuits, had advised his indiscretion. Immense scandal ensued. The whole affair transpired : the Jesuits were denounced by the public voice as not only betrayers of confession, but also as intriguers, making every effort to get at the secrets of those who did not confess to them, through the instrumentality of their penitents. Certainly it was unfair, unjust to denounce the whole body for the fault of one member : but, instead of respecting the sacred principle which aroused popular, nay, even royal, indignation, instead of denouncing the conduct of their member, they permitted, if they did not command, one of their best preachers to defend his conduct. He did so publicly. Sacchinus gives us his argument : it is proper to know the Society's doctrine on the subject. John Raminus, the preacher, admitted that "It is never lawful to break the sacred seal of confession, though the destruction of the universe might ensue : but, there may be occasions when a priest may lawfully insist upon

being informed by his penitent of a criminal accomplice, or a heretic, or any delinquent tainted with some pestilential vice, if there be no other remedy at hand : that he may in confession exact permission to use that knowledge in the case of a fraternal admonition, or may exact it out of confession, for the purpose of a judicial accusation. Should the penitent refuse, he ought not to be absolved—just as no thief ought to be absolved, if he refuse to make restitution.”¹ It is impossible to point out all the abuses to which this doctrine invites a prying Jesuit. Accordingly, three ecclesiastics denounced it as “new, pernicious, impious, or rather monstrous,”—whose tendency was to alienate the people from the practice of confession. Nevertheless, the Jesuits found supporters : disputes ran high : the archbishop put a stop to the litigation by undertaking to decide on the matter, enjoining silence to both parties. But so strong was public opinion set against the Jesuits, on account of the transaction, that Borgia declared there had never before been such a storm raised against the Company. Throughout Spain and Belgium—even at the court of Philip II.—the infamous transaction excited merited indignation. The Jesuit-confessor may have erred through indiscretion : but Raminus seemed to speak, or did speak, the doctrine, and declared the practice, of the Company. It is thus that the Jesuits have almost invariably, publicly or in secret, accumulated execration on their heads, by never admitting an error, and by defending to the uttermost their sinning brothers.²

Fortunate coincidences often give an outlet from

¹ Sacchin. lib. ii. 130. *Hispania Amatoria*, ii. lib. vi. p. 79 ; *Hist. des Religieux de la Comp.* i. 234.

² *Id. ib.* 131. Also *Hispania Amatoria*, ii. lib. vi. p. 97 ; *Hist. des Religieux de la Comp.* i. 234.

difficulties—like the sun-lit dawn after a night of tempest. Frequently have the Jesuits experienced this alleviation of their toil and trouble. At the height of the execration which has just been traced to its origin, Charles V. died, appointing by will one of their body, Francis Borgia, a co-executor of his royal behests. Charles had never liked the Jesuits. Policy rather than esteem, seems to have motivated his acquiescence in their establishment throughout his dominions. Borgia paid him a visit in his retreat at St. Juste's. They spent their time very agreeably together : it was a congenial amalgamation of ascetic feelings, brought more closely in contact from the similitude of their abnegations. There was even, perhaps, some little danger of Borgia's acquiescing in the ex-royal wish, that the Jesuit should leave his Society and take up his abode with penitent royalty. Charles "had his doubts" about the Company : he expressed them to his beloved visitor : but the Jesuit was forewarned of the temptation,¹ and left the royal monk in his solitude, after receiving "a small sum," by way of alms from one poor man to another, as the king expressed the sentimental charity.² This had occurred the year before, whilst Melchior Cano was denouncing the Jesuits, public report declaring Charles to be hostile to the Company. It was on this account that Borgia visited

¹ Cretineau, i. 375.

² Borgia knew how to win over the royal ascetic. Charles complained to the Jesuit that he could not sleep with his hair-shirt on his back, in order to macerate himself the more. The apostolical Jesuit replied : "Señor, the nights which your majesty passed in arms are the cause that you cannot sleep in hair-cloth—but, thanks be to God that you have more merit in having passed them thus in defence of your faith, than many monks have who number theirs wrapped up in hair-cloth." The "small sum" given to the Jesuit was two hundred ducats, and Charles said it was the best favour he had ever granted in his life—*la mayor merced que avia hecho en su vida.*—*De Vera*, Epitome, p. 253, *et seq.*

Charles ; and the result of his kind reception and the correspondence which ensued, was greatly beneficial to the Company as soon as the interview, friendship or "patronage," was given to the winds of popular rumour by the calculating Jesuits, who always knew the value of "great names" among the vulgar in mind or condition.¹ As a Jesuit, Borgia was unable to undertake the executorship so honourable to the Company : such secular offices were expressly forbidden by the Constitutions ; but Lainez and six of the most influential Jesuits decided to supersede the "dictates" of Ignatius for the sake of policy, though they stubbornly refused to do so for the sake of the pope, who so wisely advised them not "to build on sand." And they got the "reward" of expediency. "The Company, meanwhile, made no small advancement—*nec leve interim Societas incrementum accepit*"—says Sacchinus. Borgia performed his duty as executor with honour and integrity. It was, however, an easy matter : for Charles V. had left nothing either to the Jesuits, nor the monks, not even to the Church, nor for Purgatorial prayers to be said for him, which last omission brought his orthodoxy into doubt among the Inquisitors and the Jesuits, it is said, who quarrelled with the ex-king's memory, since he had not given them a chance for fighting over legacies.²

Certainly the Jesuits did not spare a friend of the deceased monarch, Constantine Ponce, a Spanish bishop, and a learned doctor of the Church, but suspected of heresy and Lutheranism. He had been preacher to

¹ "Dietu facile non est quantum hæc Caroli humanitas vulgo cognita et sermonibus celebrata, rebus Societatis attulerit."—*Sacchin.* lib. i. 115.

² *Hist. de l'Inquisit.* Liv. ii. p. 235, *et seq.* ; *Anecd. Inquisit. Hispan.* p. 503 ; *Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus*, i. p. 237.

Charles in Germany, and had accompanied Philip II. to England when he married Queen Mary. Constantine Ponce applied for admission into the Company of Jesus. He had been one of her many enemies in Spain. The wily Jesuits suspected some design upon their secrets. They deliberated on the application: consulted the Inquisitor Carpius: Ponce was arrested and cast into the prisons of the dread tribunal, where he died, but was subsequently burnt in effigy;¹ undoubtedly a severe return for his advance to the Company. True, they might have rancorous recollections of his former hostility, and they might even have grounds for doubting his orthodoxy, but perhaps a milder method should have been adopted by the Companions of Jesus to revenge an injury and to reclaim a heretic.

Although as yet not officially connected with the Inquisition, the Jesuits might be considered its jackalls, as is evident from the last fact, and their confessional maxims, as recorded by themselves. In 1555, a year before his death, Ignatius, with the opinion of a majority of the Fathers, had accepted the direction of the Inquisition at Lisbon, offered to the Society by King John of Portugal, with the advice of his brother Louis and the Cardinal Henry. The death of Louis, and the illness of the Cardinal, prevented the accomplishment; but the Jesuits Henriquez and Serrano filled the appointment of Deputies to

¹ Sacchin. lib. ii. 128; Thuan. lib. xxiii. Ann. 1559. In the barbarities he suffered in the prison, though he had not yet tasted the tortures, Constantine often exclaimed: "O my God, were there no Scythians in the world, no cannibals more fierce and cruel than Scythians, into whose hands thou couldst carry me, so that I might but escape the claws of these wretches!"—*Chandler, Hist. of Persecut.* p. 186.

the General Council of the Inquisition in Portugal.¹ And it was in consequence of the urgent advice—*gravibus literis*—of the Jesuits in India that the Inquisition was established at Goa, with all its horrors, against our “false brothers of the Circumcision congregated in India from all parts of the world, pretending to be Christians, but fostering Judaism and other impieties privately, and sowing them by stealth. Therefore, if in any place, these Fathers thought the tribunal of the holy Inquisition most necessary, both on account of the existing license and the multitudes of all nations and superstitions there united.”² And it was established. The Jesuits did not get the appointment; for, from time immemorial, it was the almost exclusive patrimony of the Dominicans, whose cruel method of making converts to the faith, the Jesuits copied, when their milk of kindness was soured by disappointment in proselytising the heretic and the savage. None surpassed the Jesuits in the arts of persuasion whilst these could prevail; but, also, none exceeded them in terrible rancour when the destruction was next in expediency to the conversion or conciliation of their victims. And the flaming banner of Goa’s Inquisition flapped and expanded to the breeze, wide spreading the motto: “*Mercy and Justice!*” and unto a merciful good God it said: “*Arise, O Lord, and judge thy Cause,*” a cross in the middle, and a bald-headed monk of St. Dominic, with sword and olive-

¹ Franco (Soc. Jesu) Synops. Ann. Soc. Jesu in Lusit. p. 45. I must here remark that Orlandinus (lib. xv. n. 100) positively says that Ignatius *declined* the offer, or “received it unwillingly.” He does more: he pretends to give all the saint’s motives for so doing. In the face of this invention, another Jesuit, Franco, published the founder’s letter to Miron, on the subject, in which he shows even anxiety to obtain the appointment for the Company. Synops. *ubi suprâ*. This curious fact proves how little faith we can place in the Jesuit-exposition of Jesuit-motives, nay even of Jesuit-“facts.”

² Sacchinus, lib. i. 151.

branch in his hand, and a blood-hound mouthing a fire-brand, inflaming the world at his feet.¹ The views of the Jesuit-fathers were fully carried out ; the Pagans, the Jews, the Christians, whom they could not convert, were handed over to tortures too horrible to detail, and then unto the death by fire, when their souls went up to God, perhaps in their regenerated charity exclaiming: “Father, forgive them ; they know not what they do.” The Inquisition was thus one of the blessings given to India by the Jesuits,—one of the religious ceremonies of the ancient faith.²

The musket had been long the cross of salvation to the Gentiles of India. Torrez, the Jesuit, procured royal letters enjoining the viceroys and the governors of India to lend their powers to the Jesuits for the purpose of converting the infidels, and to punish their opponents. This excellent scheme abridged their labours wonderfully. All they had to do was to ferret out the places where the Indians congregated to sacrifice to Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva. Then a detachment of soldiers, headed by some Jesuits, completed the success of the apostolate. Sacchinus, the Jesuit-historian, describes one of these evangelising forays. It happened in the island of Cyorano, close by Goa, where, says he, “by a wonderful afflation, an immense number rushed to Christianity—*miro quodam afflatu ingens numerus ad Christiana sacra conflavit (!)*” Not far from the church of the Blessed Virgin about forty heathens were lurking in a grove of palms. They had been informed against as having indulged in certain

The Indian
“mission”
in 1559.

¹ See Chandler, p. 276, for an engraving of the banner.

² For details see Chandler ; Geddes ; Dillon, Relation ; Buchanan, Christ. Research, p. 149, *et seq.* ; Moreri, vi.

rites publicly, contrary to the royal edicts. To these men Fathers Almeida and Correa were sent, together with a certain Juan Fernandez, a lawyer, and the lord of the grove of palms. This lawyer circumvented the pagans completely, we are told ; consequently, he must have had not a few muskets and men to shoulder them. He ordered some of them to be seized, whilst the rest took refuge in the bush. They were frightened, and one of them, the oldest of the troop, cried out, "What's the use of binding us? let us be made Christians." "Nothing more *was* needed," continues the chuckling Jesuit. "Then a cry arose throughout the village that all wished to be made Christians. Almeida and his companion ran up ; and, whereas, previously the conversion of only seven or eight of the guilty men was hoped for, the *Divine Spirit in wonderful modes scattering celestial fire*, all of them, some rushing from one side, others from another, to the number of three hundred in a short time, shouted and declared that they would be made Christians ! When Consalvez mentioned the joyful affair to the viceroy, he said "it was the festival of the day when the Precursor of our Lord was beheaded ;"¹ and, we may add, with less guilt in the king who caused the murder, than in those who advised and practised "religious" murder and violence to please the wrinkled lady of Rome. There were no Brahmins among these captives of the faith ; "but the fathers, suspecting that they would escape beyond the reach of Portuguese power, placed sentinels and guards round about, by whom thirty were intercepted and added to the catechumens. In fine, by constant accessions, the number

¹ "Isque diem baptismi, quo sanctus Domini Præcursor obtruncatus est dixit."—*Sacch.* lib. iii. 129.

gradually increased so much, that on an appointed day, when the viceroy visited the island, five hundred postulants of baptism presented themselves. They marched in a long train, with the Christian banner, and drums, and various sounding instruments of the nation. When they came to the viceroy, their salute was kindly returned, and all entered the church of the Virgin, the viceroy bringing up the rear. There they were baptised, and then, as the day was far spent, they were treated to a generous repast, and, lastly, with an appropriate exhortation. On the following day, they learnt how to make the sign of the cross.”¹ Such is a specimen of the Indian “mission” in 1559 ; about five hundred and thirty pagans, at one fell swoop, by the terror of the musket *and* “the Divine Spirit in wonderful modes scattering celestial fire,” were flung into the Jordan of Rome, then feasted, and lectured, and taught the sign of the cross, and thereby became sterling Jesuit-Christians of the Indian mission. In fact, it was nothing but a downright fox-hunting, boar-hunting, bear-baiting apostolate, when the Jesuits got tired of preaching to no purpose, with no results to boast of in the annual letters which, with other proceeds, were the bills of exchange and assets of the missions for the bank of devoteeism, and passed to the credit of the modern “apostles.” In the viceroy Constantine the Jesuits found ready patronage and support in their system of conversion. The Brahmins in India were like the Romish priests of Ireland to the people. By their authority and exhortations the superstitions of the people resisted the arguments of the Jesuits in their public disputation. What did the viceroy to make his Jesuits triumph in spite of their

¹ Sacch. lib. iii. 129.

discomfiture? Why, he ordered forty of the chief Brahmins to sell all they had and to leave Goa with their families, to make themselves comfortable where they could find a resting-place secure from tyrannical viceroys and apostolical Jesuits.¹ “Deprived of this defence, and terrified by this example,” says the unscrupulous Jesuit Sacchinus, “the pagans of less note gave readier ears and minds to the word of God”! They actually banished the shepherds so as to rob the flock more easily! Now, how could these Jesuits complain when Elizabeth soon after banished the priests of Rome when she found that they “stirred” her people to rebellion? Or, had she been a fanatic, and finding that arguments would not do with the people in the presence of the priests, and proceeded to banish the latter, so as to entrap the former,—I ask, what moral difference would there have been in the matter? In truth, had England copied this Jesuit and Portuguese example in Ireland, in the time of Elizabeth, had every priest been sent forth, and the coast guarded against their return, we should long ere this have beheld that country as flourishing, as free, as happy, as honest, and honourable as any on the face of the earth. We have to thank the “roaring bellows of sedition and incendiary Pharisees” for the present degradation of Ireland. The method did not succeed in India except in producing hypocritical pagans, because there was so much in their rites and ceremonies which it was impossible to wear

¹ “Prorex cùm videret Brachmanum quorumdam auctoritate et suasionibus superstitionem tenuiorum stare, neque admodum multum disputationibus profici, quas priore anno institutas docui,—quadraginta eorum præcipuos, divenditis rebus una cum familiis aliàs sibi quærere sedes jussit. Quo et munimento exuti, et exemplo territi inferioris notæ mortales, procliviores aures, animosque Dei verbo dedêre.”—*Sacchin.* lib. iv. 245.

out without many years of advance to civilisation ; but in Ireland, it was only the false hopes and incendiary harangues of the priesthood that kept the Irishman a savage for the sake of “his” religion—the beggarly trade of his *Brahmins*.

Following up this advantage gained by the expulsion of their priests, Antonio Quadrio, the Provincial of India, sent forth his Jesuits into the villages. Goa is an island about two leagues in length, and one in breadth : it contains thirty-one villages, with a population of two thousand souls. There were now but few pagans after this year’s conversion—as it were the stray bunches after the vintage—and it was hoped that in the following year there would be a complete gleaning of the grapes, says Sacchinus—*absolutam racemationem*. The method of the vintage was as follows :—Quadrio sent out his missionaries by twos ; they explained the gospel to the neophytes briefly, and discoursed on the sum of the Christian law copiously ; then in the afternoon they perambulated the villages, made a gathering of “the boys”—*cogerent pueros*, with the sound of a bell, and gave them each a green bough to carry in their hands. These were marched to the church singing the rudiments of the faith—*fidei concinentes initia*. Lastly, they inquired into the wants of the pagans, and either gave assistance, or reported the case at head-quarters. The result was that crowds of the pagans assembled, either for the sake of the sight, or enticed (*pellekti*) by their neophyte friends and acquaintances, and easily imbibed a love of baptism from that religious display of prayer and song, and the charity and exhortations of the brethren. It was sweet, continues the historian, to see the congratulations with

A new invention to convert the Indians.

which the brethren returning home were received ; for all eagerly waited for their return, that they might see how large a troop each would bring to the house of the catechumens to be baptised ; and might hear what particular and special proof of mercy the celestial Father had on that day vouchsafed to the apostles. Each led his troop, and joyfully to joyful listeners his glorious deeds related—*et præclara lætis læti narrabant*. This method of propagating the faith, says Sacchinus, seemed the most adapted to change the superstition of all India into religion, and was now, for the first time, invented—*et nunc primum inventa*. Six hundred were the first batch of Christians. Five days after, on the birth-festival of *John the Baptist*, it was impossible to baptise all the converts—five hundred and seventy received the rite—but more than two hundred had to be postponed ! It is pleasant to behold how many candidates a name of so little importance produced, observes the Jesuit—*tantumque candidatorum quàm levi momento nomen dederit*. But was it the *name* of John the Baptist ? Was it not rather the suggestion of poor persecuted humanity, crying out “*Quid opus est his vinculis ? efficiamur Christiani*—‘ what need of these bonds ? let us be made Christians,” since nothing but our receiving your rite, which we know nothing of, and care less for, is the only guarantee of rest and peace, and comfort. Besides, you promise to make us comfortable, to attend to our wants. We can understand that, at least : when our Brahmins get the upper hand again, and come back with their families, we ’ll shout again for Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, and beat our drums and cymbals, and other sounding instruments for *them*, after the manner of our nation, just as we beat them now for you, great Christian Brahmins !”

In the face of these facts, in spite of our knowledge of the most peculiarly social paganism of the Hindoos, we are expected to believe that the historian really believed his pen, when it wrote these words: "The eagerness with which the Indians flew to the faith seemed not without a miracle"¹—verily, the miracle was that Christian men should be so blinded by their rage for exhibiting boastful catalogues of "conversions," as to abuse the sacred rite of Christianity with such unscrupulous recklessness, thus making the poor pagans as despicable hypocrites as they were before miserable victims of Portuguese tyranny and Jesuit persecution. Who can believe that such apostles really carried out the ideas of social organisation for the savage, which, in a former page, I heartily translated? Beautiful was that theory; but the men adapted to carry it into practice honestly, and in the Christian spirit of Christ, were not the Jesuits. Anon we shall see more than enough of these "apostles." The arms of Portugal flashed "faith" into the helpless hordes of India. It was the object of her viceroys to make the Hindoos totally dependent on their Portuguese masters. The rite of baptism was the infallible means to that end. It made them Pariahs, outcasts from their respective ranks, and compelled them to crowd the Christian temples, and cry *Credo Pater*! I believe, father,—so that their hungry stomachs might be filled. Thus were numbers actually demoralised, for they lost *self-respect*; and became, in their turn, decoys to others as unfortunate as themselves. Conversion was the expediency of the Portuguese, and the rage of the Jesuits, their faithful humble servants.

¹ "Alacritas quoque quâ Indi advolabant ad fidem, haud videbatur carere miraculo."—*Sacchin.* iv. 259.

“Numbers” declared success for both respectively ; and so we read that in the year 1559, by the authority of the viceroy, and his desire for the spread of Christianity, no less than three thousand three hundred and thirty-three pagans were baptised in the church of St. Paul at Goa!¹ You perceive that the Jesuit balance-sheet of conversion is as carefully “cast up,” as the sum of our national revenue with its imposing pence and farthings. The fact is, that the very gorgeous display of these multitudinous baptisms—enough to tire a legion of hundred-handed Titans, and drain a river—was just the thing to captivate the Hindoos, so passionately fond of festivities, which their Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, and other thousand gods most liberally vouchsafe to them, and which they found ready for them in the cities of the Christians, different in very few points from their own outrageous “mysteries.” For the sake of “pomp and feast and revelry” they would submit to have their foreheads washed by a Jesuit, instead of dipping them in “Ganges, or Hydaspes, Indian streams.” The fact was *proved* in the year 1561.

“This year, the College at Goa did not receive the increase of Christians it hoped for,” says Sacchinus, adding,—“and here is the cause: the archbishop who arrived at the end of the preceding year, just came when the produce of that most lucky harvest was unusually abundant, when immense troops of Indians were daily added to the congregation of the faithful. Whereupon, being prejudiced by the reports of certain persons

¹ “Secundum Deum Constantini maximè Proregis auctoritate, &c. In Goano S. Pauli templo ter mille et ducenti triginta tres baptizati, præterque hos in privatis tectis valetudine non permissi exire, circiter centum”—making the 3333—a curious and striking lot of triplets for the gaping devotee to convert into a mystery.

more intent on money than the gain of souls, saying that the Indians were compelled to receive baptism, he ordered that all who were to be baptised should receive the rite in their respective parishes ; and that if the rite was to be celebrated with greater ceremony than usual, he reserved the case to himself. This arrangement, established with a pious design, by the most excellent bishop, did not succeed as was intended," adds the chuckling Jesuit ; "for," he continues, "as the Hindoos were, one by one, or certainly only a few together, almost in darkness, and in corners, *sprinkled with the sacred water*"—to translate the bombastical expression—"whilst that splendour of Goan magnificence—of the number of the candidates—of the new garments and decorations—of Portugal's nobility—the presence and eyes of the viceroy—and other attendant display—when all this was no more—*then* the estimation and desire of so great a mystery began to fall off and freeze amongst the uncivilised people who, in every part of the world, but there most especially, *are led by the eyes—oculis ducitur.*"¹ Here is an admission ! Can anything more be required to desolate the heart with the conviction that the Jesuit-christianity of India was altogether but a vile, deceitful, lying phantasm, which it "out-Herods Herod" to think of ? Yes, there *is* one thing more—and that is, the awfully debauched life of the Portuguese themselves in India—the "true believers" of that Christianity which these sight-loving, miserable pagans were

¹ "Quæ res pio consilio ab Antistite optimo instituta, &c.—Etenim cum singuli, aut certè pauci, prope in tenebris, et in angulis sacrâ tingerentur aquâ ; ille autem splendor ex Goanâ magnificentiâ, ex numero candidatorum, ex novo vestitu, cultuque, ex nobilitate Lusitanâ, ac Proregis ipsius præsentîâ et oculis, cæteroque apparatu abesset ; cæpit tanti mysterii opinio et cupiditas rudem apud populum, qui ubique terrarum, sed ibi maximè, oculis ducitur, cadere et frigere."—*Sacchin.* lib. v. 246.

tempted to embrace with their lips and their foreheads, by an appeal to their wretched vanity, in the midst of gorgeous display, rank, and decoration ! The prohibition was taken off, and the Jesuits “went ahead” as usual.

From India, across that ocean which the Portuguese knew so well, let us advance into Abyssinia, to see how the first bishop of the Jesuits, Andres Oviedo, has managed his apostolate. Doubtless we remember the occasion of this promising mission—resulting, if we are to believe the Jesuits, from an express invitation of Asnaf, the Abyssinian king—the descendant of the famous Prester John.¹ The king of Portugal and Father Ignatius wrote letters to the king of Abyssinia. These letters went through the hands of the Indian viceroy, who sent them to Asnaf by “three other persons, that they might sound the Emperor’s inclinations before the patriarch’s arrival,”² a precaution scarcely necessary if Asnaf was really a party to the visitation.

The Jesuits
in Abys-
sinia.

Only two of the Jesuits (how cautiously they move) entered the country : but suspicion was there before them : king Asnaf, the descendant of king Solomon (as

¹ This time-honoured name is a curious specimen of learned absurdity, in seeking to explain a difficulty before verifying its existence. “Prester John” is consecrated to the royal skull of Ethiopia : but it was the name of a Nestorian priest, *John* by name. He was the Mohammed of the twelfth century ; and his kingdom was in *Asia*, near China. According to Du Cange, William of Tripoli, and other writers, a Nestorian priest, about the middle of the twelfth century, assembled troops of his sect, and pretending to be of the race of the Magi, usurped the dominions of his king, Choriem-Ran, after his death. He vanquished seventy-two kings in upper Asia, and extended his empire to the Indies and Tartary. Meanwhile, Scaliger, and other geniuses, have grubbed out the etymology of the name in the Persian and Arabic ; and Cretineau records the intelligence that “*Prester John* is *Ethiopian* for *great and precious*” ! Just like *Gherkin* from *Jeremiah King* : naturally derived thus—Jerry king, Jer king, Gherkin. See for the above explanation of Prester John, *Mem. sur l’Ethiop.* in *Lettres Edif.* t. i. p. 636.

² A brief account . . . *Hist. of Ethiopia.* 1679.

the race royal of Ethiopia claimed to be deemed) suspected some sinister design in this expedition ; and even if he had applied for a Roman patriarch, there was surely no need of sending one in the shape of thirteen Jesuits. Asnaf argued very naturally that these Jesuits were but the forerunners of an European invasion. If he had not the head of Solomon, he had the eyes of an observer, and could look around at his neighbours in their exemplary misfortunes. It was, in fact, the common opinion round about that "he would become the tributary of the conquerors, and that the Catholic religion sanctioned all manner of spoliations ;"¹ so averse were the nobles to their admission that some of them openly affirmed that they would sooner "submit to the Turkish than the Roman yoke."²

Asnaf gave them an audience: one of them explained the doctrines of the Roman faith. Asnaf heard the Jesuits patiently, but dismissed them with a letter to the King of Portugal, which was as much as to say that "he had his doubts about the matter, and begged to decline their services."

The spokesman was Rodriguez : his special mission had been "to study the situation of the country," say the Jesuits themselves.³ He returned to his eleven companions at Goa, for further orders—an unfortunate precaution, for the king was given to understand that "a great number more were waiting at Goa to be transported into his kingdom."⁴ He was frightened at the idea of this Jesuit invasion,—although in sending forth thirteen Jesuits, Father Ignatius, it is said, only intended to represent Christ and the twelve apostles.⁵

¹ Cretineau, i. 486.

² Hist. of Ethiop., before quoted.

³ Cretineau, i. 485.

⁴ Prof. Lee's Brief Acc. in Gobat's Journ.

⁵ Ibid.

Rodriguez, the pioneer and explorer, decamped; not so Oviedo the militant bishop. The sturdy Jesuit resolved "not to yield his footing so easily." He challenged discussion with the schismatic monks: the king joined in the controversy, and "very much foiled the bishop," for "he knew more than his doctors."¹

Then the Jesuit-bishop came down with an excommunication of the whole church of Abyssinia!² Asnaf had threatened to put Oviedo to death, but contented himself with banishing him for ever from his presence.³ An enemy, two months after, appeared on the frontier: Claudius went forth to give him battle: fortune was against him: the Turk prevailed: the king was slain; and left his throne to Adamas his brother, a sworn foe of the Roman Catholics, "upon whose account," he said, "his brother had not only lost his life, but the whole empire of Ethiopia had been reduced nearly to ruin."⁴

Severe measures against the Roman Catholics ensued. Oviedo stood before the king. Adamas forbade him to preach Catholicism. The Jesuit replied: "'Tis better to obey God than men." At this bold reply, the king brandished his scimitar to cut off the Jesuit's head: but the Queen threw herself at his feet, the Jesuit stood unterrified, and the king withheld the blow.⁵ This is a fine Jesuit-picture; but another account says that Adamas only tore the gown from the Jesuit's back, which makes no picture at all.⁶

A persecution of the Catholics followed: "divers were imprisoned, tortured, and put to death." Oviedo and his companions were banished to a cold and desolate

¹ Cretineau, *Brief Acc.*, and *Lettres Edif.* t. i. p. 630.

² *Brief Acc.* in Gobat.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Cretineau, i. 486.

⁶ *Hist of Ethiop.*, before quoted.

mountain, for the space of eight months. A miracle set them free. "A princess of the blood royal, whom curiosity, or rather Providence, had led to the cavern of the banished Jesuits, beheld their persons surrounded by a miraculous light, and obtained from Adamas the recal of the holy missionaries." They set to work again ; made new conversions ; and the persecution was redoubled ; and "the miracle of Daniel" in the den of lions, "was renewed," say the Jesuits. "Five Abyssinians who had abjured error, were exposed to famished lions : the ferocity of the lions was changed into tameness." Adamas changed not, however ; and his cruelty eventuated a splendid miracle, unsurpassed either in the Bible or the legends of the saints. "He condemned Oviedo, his companions and disciples, to a more distant and horrible exile than the first. They were on the point of perishing from hunger and thirst,—when God, touched by Oviedo's prayer, caused to appear to their eye, a *river*, which, opening asunder after quenching their thirst, presented to them a *multitude of fishes*, enough to feed them."¹

The tyrant's severity was an admirable excuse for rebellion ; and accordingly a leader was soon found, who, with "thirty Portuguese" entered into a conspiracy against the king, "not without the concurrent instigation of the Jesuits who led the Portugal faction."²

Adamas tried to temporise with the Portuguese, and even invited the Jesuits into his camp : but the evil was done : battles ensued : Adamas was worsted ; and died soon after.³

Respecting his successor the accounts before me are very conflicting : some making him a persecutor, others

¹ Lett. Edif. i. 631.

² Hist. of Ethiop. 13.

³ Ibid. ; and Lett. Edif. i. 631.

“eminent in glory and virtue,” and a great admirer of “the morals and holy life of the Jesuits.” Nevertheless Oviedo was by no means comfortable, nor was his cause triumphant—for the pope recalled him from the mission, with orders to proceed to China or Japan, which, however, he did not, or did not live to obey. In great privation at Fremona, a town in the kingdom of Tigra, he had not even paper to write a letter to the pope, or to the King of Portugal (as another account states), and was forced to tear out the fly-leaves of his breviary or an old commentary,¹ sticking them together for the purpose. One account states that he expressed the wish to leave Ethiopia, “charging the miscarriage of his whole enterprise on the want of aids from Portugal :”—others assert that he stated the difficulties of his mission, but still affirmed his desire to remain on the ungrateful soil in spite of his tribulations. He was ready for martyrdom. “Yet” (by another account quoting his letter) “he must be permitted to inform his Holiness that, with the assistance of five or six hundred Portuguese soldiers, he could at any time reduce the empire of Abyssinia to the obedience of the pontificate ; and, when he considered that it was a country surrounded by territories abounding with the finest gold, and promising a rich harvest of souls to the Church, he trusted his Holiness would give the matter further consideration.”² In effect what was wanting? Only Portuguese muskets and a viceroy. “All who have any

¹ Acosta says “non plus digitali magnitudine, e vetusto (ut videtur) aliquo commentario excerpta.”—*Rer. in Or.* 31.

² See, for the conflicting accounts of this mission, Cretineau, i. ; Prof. Lee’s Brief Acc. in Gobat ; Hist. of Ethiop., as before ; Lettres Edif. et Cur. ; Ludolf. Hist. Ethiop. ; La Croze ; Geddes ; Tellez ; Acost., *Rer. in Orient.* p. 31 ; Voyage aux Indes, iii. ; Lobo, *Voy. d’ Ethiop.* ; Sacchin. i. iii. iv.

experience of Ethiopia," says the Jesuit Tellez, "know that without arms in hand to defend and authorise the Catholic preachers we shall never have the desired success among those schismatics."¹ With these sentiments, Oviedo could not bring his mind "to see the Holy Church of Rome lose the most glorious enterprise under heaven—and this only for want of 500 or 600 Portuguese soldiers."² But the fact is, the promises of the Jesuits were mistrusted even in Portugal; and whether the Court had no reliance on the word of the Jesuits, or was unable to lend them assistance, it was resolved to command a retreat to all the Portuguese in Ethiopia, who were rather numerous there, and as infamously debauched as elsewhere.³ Some make Oviedo leave the country—others settle him for fifteen or sixteen years at Fremona, dying a saint, with miracles after death as numerous as those which he performed in life, according to the Jesuits. Such was the first expedition of the Jesuits into Ethiopia; and such was its termination after all the efforts of Ignatius, all the expenses of the King of Portugal. It was attended with great suffering and persecution to the people—

A.D. 1577.

disgrace to religion—and good to none—not even to the Jesuits, whatever interpretation they might give to the word.

If the political designs of Portugal on Abyssinia

¹ "Esta sempre foy a pratica dos que tem experiencia de Ethiopia, que semas armas na mam, que defendam et authorizem a os Pregadores Catholicos nam poderam nunca ter o successo desejado entre aquelles schismaticos."—P. 184.

² "Ver perder a Santa Igreja de Roma a mays gloriosa Empreza, que ha debayxo dos ceos, et isto so por falta de quinhentos, o seycentos Soldados Portuguezes."—*Tellez*, p. 195.

³ "Mas como nosso Senhor (a o que parece) queria com elle castigar as liberdades et solturas de que alguns Portuguezes uzavam em Ethiopia, assim tambem quiz, que elle nam passasse sem açoute."—*Id.* p. 178.

failed by the precipitation of the Jesuits, and the promptitude of the native sovereigns, the eastern coast of Africa presented fewer obstacles to the religio-political advance of the Jesuits. Not content with their sovereignty in Arabia, Persia, the two Peninsulas of India, the Moluccas, Ceylon, the Isles of Sunda, and a settlement at Macao—which last ensured them the commerce of China and Japan—the Portuguese invaded the opposite coast of Africa ;—and in the beginning of the sixteenth century established an empire extending from Sofala to Melinda, from the Tropic of Capricorn to the Equator. Mosambique was its centre, well fortified and garrisoned, commanding the ocean and the African continent. Gold, ivory, and slaves, were its attractions.

The Jesuits
amongst the
Caffres.

Under the shelter of this absorbing power three Jesuits were dispatched into the country between Sofala and Mosambique, in the year 1560 ;—their leader was Gonsalvo Silveria, a Portuguese. Accordingly, we are assured that in a few days—*intra paucos dies*, the native king, his wife, sister, children, relatives, nobles—in a word, almost the entire population,—with great joy and gratulation became Christians, or rather, (to translate the original), the Jesuits “cleansed them in the sacred fount—*sacro fonte lustrarunt* ;” and a church was dedicated to the Virgin Mary.¹

Andrew Fernandez boldly advanced among the horrid savages of Caffre-land. Threats and contumely dismayed him not :—inflamed with the zeal of a scriptural enthusiast, or strong in the terror by his country's arms inspired, he presented himself in the midst of a festivity celebrated by the savages, demolished with his

¹ Acost. Rer. in Orient. p. 32.

own hands the whole apparatus of the pagan rites, and trampled them under foot with impunity. The King of the Caffres was present,—the Jesuit humbled him, covered him with confusion, in the presence of his subjects.¹ Still, the king had been baptised : his presence at these pagan rites explains the depth of his conversion.

Meanwhile Gonsalvez left Mosambique, with six Portuguese for his escort, proceeding to Quiloa on the coast, by sea. A dreadful storm arose : all was over with them, as they thought : but the Jesuit “ raised his hands and eyes to heaven in supplication : ”—the winds ceased, and the waves were still.²

Through the lands colonised by the Portuguese, Gonsalvez advanced, reforming and baptising the slaves of the Portuguese, and was received everywhere with great demonstrations of respect by the native kings, who were vastly edified by the Jesuit’s disinterestedness. Thinking all the Portuguese alike, one of these kings offered him “ as many women, as much gold, land, and as many cows as he pleased.” The Jesuit replied that “ he only wanted the king himself.” Then the king ejaculated to the interpreter a moral universally useful : “ Indeed,” said he, “ since he will receive none of these things, which are so vastly coveted by others, he must be immensely different from other mortals.” The king dismissed him with the kindest expressions of friendship,—the Jesuit devising a method to convert the sable king, constitutionally fond of the “ fair sex,” if the term

¹ This is called by Acosta, *Andree ingens facinus*, Andrew’s mighty exploit. It seems that the king *licet baptizatum*, though baptised, was a bit of a rogue ; and the bold Jesuit compelled him to acknowledge that he had *no power over the rains of heaven* (so useful to the crops), as was pretended by the Caffre kings—a sort of Vatican prerogative to cajole the people and make them submissive. This humiliating confession of the king would at once cast him far below the wonder-workers of Jesuitism.

² Acost. ib. 32. b.

may, by courtesy, be applied to the ladies of Africa. It succeeded to admiration. Gonsalvez said mass next morning in an open spot, exposing on the altar a picture of the Virgin Mary, which he had brought from India. Some of the "courtiers" passing by, fancied they saw a real woman of great beauty. They reported accordingly to the king, who instantly sent to the Jesuit, telling him he had heard that he had a wife; that he wished him exceedingly to bring her to him. Gonsalvez covered the picture with a costly robe, and took it to the king. Before he exposed it to view, in order the more to sharpen the king's desire—*desiderium quò magis exacuat*, Gonsalvez told him that it "was the image of God's mother, in whose power and dominion were all the kings and emperors of the whole world." Then he uncovered the image. It received the king's veneration. He asked the Jesuit again and again to give it him: the Jesuit consented, and placed it in the king's chamber, fitting up the room as an oratory or chapel—*veluti sacellum quoddam precandi causâ peristromatis exornat*. Whilst the king slept that night "the Queen of Heaven appeared standing by his side, exactly as represented in the picture, surrounded with a divine light, shining with a sweet splendour, with a most venerable and joyful aspect." On the following day the king sent for Gonsalvez and told him that he was "wonderfully concerned that he could not understand the words of the Queen of Heaven, which she spoke to him every night." Gonsalvez was ready with his elucidation: he told the savage "that her language was divine, and not to be understood except by those who submitted to the laws of that Queen's son, who was God and the Redeemer of the whole human race." In conclusion, the king and three hundred of his "nobles" were solemnly baptised with

great pomp and ceremony,—the king being very consistently named Sebastian, after the King of Portugal, and his mother received the name of Mary, after the Queen of Heaven.¹ If you remember “the trumpeters in the nave,” placed by the preacher of Navarre, you may easily guess the secret of this *reflecting* and speaking picture, managed by the Jesuits.

Subsequent success tallied with this splendid beginning ; it seemed likely that the whole population would become Christians, when some powerful and clever Mahometans, in high favour with the king, made serious representations to his majesty respecting the Jesuit expedition, assuring him that he was endangering his life and kingdom, that Gonsalvez was an emissary of the viceroy of India and the chiefs of Sofala sent to explore his condition, to excite the minds of his people to rebellion, and ready with an army to follow up the movement with a hostile invasion. We can only record such imputations, having no means of verification ; but it is remarkable that savages, as well as civilised men, came to the same opinion respecting the Jesuits. True or false, the representations were deemed probable by the king ; Gonsalvez was doomed to destruction. He was killed, and his body was thrown into the river, “lest the corpse of such an evil-doer, if left on the ground, should kill them with its poison ;” for he was believed “to have brought with him various poisons and medicaments to work on the minds of the people and kill the king.” Fifty Christians whom Gonsalvez had baptised on his last day, shared the same fate. The Portuguese interfered, and threatened the king with the vengeance of war. This threat had due effect. The king expressed regret, threw the blame upon his advisers,

¹ Acosta, *ibid.* p. 35, *et seq.*

whom, with barbaric recklessness, he put to death without delay, to propitiate the Juggernauts of Portugal. When the intelligence of these transactions reached India, more Jesuits were despatched to the country, at the urgent request of the viceroy—*vehementer optante Prorege*, in order “to promote the beginnings which promised altogether happy progress.”¹

In Brazil, the Company of Jesus had produced a miracle-worker, such as the world had never seen before—whose like we shall never see again. The Jesuit Anchieta far excelled even Xavier in powers miraculous. The Jesuits call him the Apostle of Brazil, and the Thaumaturg of the age.² The wonders related of this man, by the Jesuits, surpass in absurdity all that can possibly be imagined. Let the Jesuits describe him: “His praises may be comprised in one word if we call him the *Innocent Adam*. It was only just for God to create an Adam for the mortals of the New World—*mortalibus Novi Orbis novum à Deo creari Adamum par erat*. I know not which to call his terrestrial Paradise—the Canary Islands, where he was born, or the Company which he entered; for, in the former, he breathed the breath of life; in the latter, the breath of grace. He shared the four endowments which Adam received in his state of innocence; namely, dominion over the animal creation, a right will, an enlightened understanding, an immortal body. His dominion over the animal creation was proved six hundred times by fishes, birds, wild beasts, serpents, all which he would call in the Brazilian language: they obeyed and followed him, by the privilege of Adam: ‘Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and

¹ Acost. p. 59.

² Bib. Script. Soc. Jesu, Joseph Anchieta.

over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.' Wherever he wished, fishes were found, and suffered themselves to be caught ; hence he was called by the ignorant savages the father who gives us the fishes we want. And it sometimes happened that the people of a village being reduced to want by being hindered from fishing in stormy weather, he led them all to the beach and asked them what sort of fish they desired. By way of a joke, they would ask for a sort not found at that season of the year ; and he would produce such a shoal of the fishes, that they caught with their nets, nay even with their hands, as many as they liked. He would call birds to praise God, and they flew to him and perched on his finger and chirped. A flock of crows had gathered round about some fishes laid out on the shore by the fishermen ; at his command they moved off and waited for a promised part of the prey. Once on a voyage, when ill, and the sun's meridian rays were too hot to bear, he commanded a bird to go and call her companions to make him a shade—a parasol. And she went and gathered a flock and returned, and they shaded the ship with their wings, to the length of three miles, until he dismissed them, and they flew off with a joyful croaking. Often, whilst he was praying or preaching, little birds would perch on his head and his arms ; so great was their beauty, that they seemed things of Heaven rather than of earth."¹ The savage beasts of the forest—the ferocious jaguar he tamed ; two of them followed him as guards when he went to the woods at night to say his prayers, and when he returned he rewarded their fidelity with some fruit—*fructibus*—which enhanced the miracle ; seeing that

¹ Bib. Script. Soc. Jesu, Joseph Anchiet.

their carnivorous stomach accommodated itself to an herbivorous digestion,—their intestines were elongated, as a matter of course. He even used the beasts of the country to instruct the savages, and impress them with their barbarity : thus, the death of a large monkey, killed by a Brazilian, furnished him with matter for a sermon and occasion for a miracle. “ The noise that this animal made in falling,” says Jouvenci, “ having brought to the spot all the other monkeys of the neighbourhood, Anchieta spoke to them in his language, commanded them to go and invite the little ones, the father, the mother, in fine all the relatives and friends of the defunct, to assist at his funeral and celebrate his obsequies. All these animals assembled immediately, making great lamentations, some striking their breasts with their paws, others rolling on the ground before the corpse, others tearing their beard and sprawling in the dust,—all moaning and pulling frightful faces. After these preludes, many monkeys approached, and lifted the defunct, and carried him on their shoulders, whilst the rest followed the funeral, leaping from tree to tree. There were some,” says the *historian*, “ which, imitating the ferocity of the barbarians, seemed to reproach them with it, by glaring on them with furious and threatening looks. Thus the funeral advanced to a village four miles off. Then Anchieta, dreading lest the savages would set upon these charitable animals, commanded them to return into the woods, and they obeyed. Thereupon the Jesuit, turning to the Brazilians who were already running to give chase to the monkeys, exclaimed : ‘ See how these beasts bewail the death of one of their kind, whilst you rejoice at the death of your fellow-creatures, and sometimes devour them alive.’ ” Whether Father

Jouvenci perceived the absurdity of this missionary Arabian Entertainment, or really wished to give us an idea of the natural and most excusable incredulity of these savages, he adds that this adventure of the wonderful Anchieta only made them laugh.¹ Nieremberg says that Anchieta stopped a tempest which was impending, in order that the Indians might enjoy a comedy which he had composed for them. It lasted three hours in the representation, and the tempest frowned pregnant with its cataract ; “but the prayer of God’s servant held them fast” until the people departed, and then the tempest burst with whirlwinds, floods, and dreadful thunders.² Savage bulls he forced to the yoke by the sign of the cross ; and sometimes, merely to amuse the Indians who happened to be with him, he would, for mere sport, *ad oblectamentum*, command the monkeys of the woods to gambol and to dance, and they did so, until he dismissed them. “Our Adam handled serpents without injury—*serpentes Adamus noster inoffensus tractabat*. So completely did he rule over vipers, that when he trod on one with his naked feet, and tried to make it bite him, it licked his foot respectfully, nor did it dare *to lie in ambush for his heel*.”³ We almost fancy that these marvels were invented expressly to ridicule all that Christians read with awe and adoration. Nor is the budget exhausted, by very many items. All nature was subject unto him : he spoke, and all obeyed him. Tempests he stilled, desperate diseases he cured, showers he suspended in the air, language he gave to a dumb infant, life and vigour to a dying father, limbs to the maimed. He cured leprosy with water, consumption

¹ Juvenci Hist. lib. xxiii. p. 766, apud Quesnel, i. 160.

² Varones Ilustres, ii. 519.

³ Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu, *ubi suprà*.

with the touch of his sleeve, head-ache with the shreds of his garments, and the sound of his voice dispelled anguish of mind and put to flight temptations. The elements themselves respected him as their master—*ipsa elementa observabant ut dominum*. Often when a shower came on during a journey, whilst his companions were wet to the skin—*permadentibus*—he appeared quite dry—*siccus apparuit*. The sea respected him as well as the showers. When in prayer kneeling on the beach, the flowing tide would pass beside him, leaving a vacant space where he was enclosed within a double wall of the heaped up billows—*velut in geminum parietem undis exaggeratis*—and leaving him a dry path to the shore in the midst of the waters. “But what need of many instances,” exclaims the Jesuit, “since he ruled nature not as a master but as a tyrant—*sed quid multis opus est, cum non tam dominatu, quam tyrannide naturam tenuit*, and sometimes forced her to produce what she did not possess—*cogeret interdum quod non habebat exhibere*. In a great scarcity of oil he produced some from an empty cask, and though dry within, it afforded for two years as much oil as was wanted for two colleges, for the use of the church, the table, and the poor.” He changed water into wine, to revive some one on a journey; and to humour the longing of a sick man, he changed a fish into an oyster—*piscem in pernam mutavit*.¹ A pagan, who falsely thought himself a Christian, had died. Joseph called back his soul, and led it back to his body, baptised him, and sent him back to Heaven—*alius Gentilis, qui se Christianum falsò crediderat, obierat; ejus animam Josephus revocavit, reduxitque ad corpus, baptismo tinxit, ac cælo remisit*. He knew what happened in his absence,

¹ Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu, *ubi suprâ*.

secrets, and things about to happen ; and he foretold them as distinctly as though his mind was the mirror of the Divine Wisdom to which all things are present—*quam si Divinæ Sapientiæ, cui præsentia sunt omnia, speculum esset ejus intellectus*. Inspirations, revelations, the peculiar endowments of beatified bodies he enjoyed, “for we know on good authority that whilst in prayer his body was often raised from the ground, surrounded with the most brilliant light, with heavenly music sounding the while.” They say he once forgot his breviary, leaving it behind, twenty-four miles off ; an *angel* brought it to him !¹ In the twinkling of an eye he performed long journeys—*momento temporis longa itinera decurrisse* ; yea, was in two places at one and the same time ; and when you liked he would make himself invisible, sometimes vanishing, then returning to astonish and stupify the spectators. It is scarcely credible that God created a man of such wonders for one world only—*virum hunc tantæ admirabilitatis vix credibile sit a Deo fuisse uni mundo conditum*.² Surely there was enough in all these wonders and portents to make a *saint* for the glory on earth of the Company of Jesus ; but though the Jesuits expected that result,³ they were disappointed, and Joseph Anchieta remains the silly, stupid thing of their biographies, though he may have been, for all we know to the contrary, a laborious missionary, and author of a few books, rendered curiosities by the “solid falsehoods” of his brethren respecting their author.⁴

¹ Tableaux, p. 231.

² Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu, *ubi suprâ*.

³ “Et spes est illum propediem ab sancta Matre Ecclesiâ utro mundo ad venerationem, imitationemque (!) propositum iri,” &c.—*Ibid*.

⁴ Among the rest, he wrote a *Drama* for the extirpation of the vices of Brazil—*Drama ad extirpanda Brasilicæ vitia*. *Ibid*. One would suppose that his miraculous powers ought to have given them “a twist,” as St. Patrick served

These angels of disturbance and inventors of fables—with the best possible intentions, if we are to believe themselves—were not less active in Europe than in India, Abyssinia, Caffreland, and Brazil. In 1560, the Jesuits penetrated into Switzerland: the Valteline, in the land of the Grisons, became the scene of contention. The invading force consisted of three priests and three other Jesuits not in orders. They insinuated themselves into the good graces of a certain Antonius Quadrius, a simple old gentleman of the Valteline, belonging to one of the first families of the country. How it happened, who can tell?—but the old gentleman gave the Jesuits all his wealth to build a college—*re suâ familiari collegio extruendo donatâ*. The Jesuits took possession; but it appears they were too precipitate. A mandate of the Canton fell upon their dreams like a nightmare. They were ordered to leave the country forthwith. The messenger added that “he was a Catholic, and on that account he was unwilling to proceed to force: he rather would give them a friendly hint, to return to their people, and not to wait for compulsion.” But it would never do to resign so easily a boon so promising: the Jesuits held out, and their patron, the old gentleman, protested against the mandate. There was a gathering of the people—men and women: the nobility joined in the fray. The old gentleman’s relatives were naturally excited. He had no children, and they were his heirs at law. They tried persuasion with the Jesuit-principal, Tarquinius Raynaldus. They begged that he would not rob them of all

The Jesuits
in Switzer-
land.

the frogs and toads of Erin, and “banished them for ever.” Besides his life in the *Bibliotheca*, and Neiremberg’s amongst his *Varones Illustres*, Illustrious Men of the Company, there are two lives of Anchieta by the Jesuits Beretarius and Roterigius, all horribly ridiculous.

their inheritance, contrary to the rights and customs of men. The Jesuit's reply was handsome, whether it be the composition of Sacchinus or Raynaldus. "It is only a few days since I have become acquainted with Quadrius [the old gentleman aforesaid]: religious men who have given up their own patrimony do not come into this valley in quest of another. We are here by command of those whom we have taken as the rulers of our life, in the place of Christ the Lord: we are ready, should occasion require, to give our life and blood for the salvation of souls, not only to the family of Quadrius, but all the world. But if Quadrius will listen to me, I will see that he bequeaths to you a great part of the inheritance. For, although it were better for him to consecrate the work to God, as he had resolved, still, in order to preserve peace with all men, I shall suggest what you demand. A few religious men will not be suffered to want sustenance, by the bounty of the other citizens, and the providence of the heavenly Father."¹ This fine address was really all they could desire: and so they went their way, rejoicing; but the Jesuits at once began to teach a multitude of boys, whom they divided into three classes; and vast was the daily conflux of accessions to the benches. They had sent Quadrius to appeal: they were working away joyously, when down came a final decree from the authorities abolishing the college. Resistance was vain: the determination to dislodge them was evident. The Jesuits yielded to the storm for the present, and took their departure, treasuring the remembrance of what they left behind—"drawing at each remove a lengthened chain." In the following year, the agitation was vigorously

¹ Sacchin. lib. iv. 59.

renewed. Sacchinus puts all the motives and expedients to the account of the *people*: but their source is too evident to be thus mistaken: they are as follows:—that Quadrius was a man of great authority, and would be respected by the princes of Germany, and the Emperor himself: that recommendations from all the princes of Christendom would prevail: that the consent and agitation of all the people of the Valteline would gain the day: that nothing was certainly *impregnable to money—pecuniæ certe nihil inexpugnabile esse*. The relatives of Quadrius could be won over by the hope of getting a great part of the inheritance—the Governor of the Valteline, being a Catholic, would undertake the business, and bring it to a happy issue.¹ Letters of recommendation were forthwith obtained from the King of France, the Emperor of Germany, the King of Bohemia, the Marquis of Piscaria, the Governor of Milan, the Duke of Bavaria, the Catholic Cantons, and other authorities, addressed to the Grisons in favour of the scheme. Is not this determined manœuvre worthy of admiration? Is it easy to get rid of the Jesuits when they have once had a footing? Nor was this all. They chose two of the citizens—sharp and sturdy men—*acres ac strenuos viros*—as their commissioners. These went about among the neighbouring people, praying and conjuring the Catholics to favour the common cause; and others they filled with promises—*cæteros implent promissis*. Their old patron was stimulated almost to frenzy: he was ready to resign all he had—even the shirt on his back—nay, he would even give up himself, with apostolical charity—*apostolicâ caritate superimpendere seipsum*. Meanwhile, the “heretics” were no less active

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. 96.

on the other side, agitating with equal determination, perfectly convinced that there was not a greater pestilence against the Gospel than the Jesuits—*nullam esse Evangelio suo capitaliorem pestem quam Jesuitas*. In the midst of this fermentation, the cause was tried before the authorities. The Jesuit-commissioners delivered a speech, carefully prepared—*accuratè præparatâ oratione*—which you will find in Sacchinus, much too long and elaborate for translation, but duly eloquent and diffuse on the good qualities and pious intentions of the founder of the college which had been taken from the Jesuits, imputing the worst motives to his heirs at law, ascribing the banishment of the Jesuits to their avarice—the whole concluding with the following glorious peroration :—“ Therefore, most excellent gentlemen, preserve far and wide the reputation of your firmness and gravity, with our safety and dignity. The most Christian King of France begs this of you,” (saying this, they exhibited the letters) : “ the Emperor Ferdinand begs it : Maximilian, the King of Bohemia, Albert, Duke of Bavaria, the Republic of the Swiss, the Governor of Milan, our whole country, suppliant at your feet, our children, our grandchildren, our whole posterity, all join in the petition. If they could come hither, you might see the boys, the mothers of families, the whole population of the valley and all the vicinity, prostrate at your feet, uplifting their hands in supplication. For, most kind gentlemen, we have experienced the powers of this right Institution : we know the learning and talent of these men. They were only a few months among us, and already our boys are different to what they were : they are much more modest than before, more quiet at home and out of doors, more respectful to their elders,

more obliging to their relatives, and far more desirous of praise and learning. Confiding in the justice of our cause, in the wisdom of Quadrius, in the glory of his deed, and in your justice and kindness, we deem all the annoyances, or expenses which we have incurred in the matter, rightly placed, in order that the memory of so great a benefit, first conferred by Quadrius, and by you, who will restore it, shall live for ever in our mind, and that of our posterity.” The address was delivered with vehemence and with tears, says Sacchinus.¹

This glorious speech might have been a prize-essay of some pupil among the Jesuits. You will find other specimens in Jouvenci's Orations, on a variety of topics or common-places.² But the speech shows its origin—and what the Jesuits say of themselves and their miraculous transformations amongst “the boys” and the mothers of families. As such it would have been a pity not to give an extract. The address of the Jesuit-commissioners overshot the mark, and was heard with apathy. The relatives of the old gentleman were skilful lawyers and spoke for themselves, and were heard with immense applause and success. They said that their relative was extremely old and without children: they were consequently the lawful heirs to his property: that it was unjust to permit his wealth to pass into the hands of adventurers, who, under the pretence of instructing youth, were only seeking to enrich themselves with the spoils of individuals, and to alter in their favour the maxims and fundamental laws of nations—that the great age of their relative had weakened his mind, and that these Jesuits had taken

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. 101.

² Juvencii Orationes. See also Stradæ *Eloquentia Bipartita*, which is rather more sensible than the former.

advantage of his imbecility to induce him to give them his money, thus robbing his relatives and his country, and pampering a set of vagabond and turbulent monks with the wealth of the Valteline.¹ This appears to have been the general opinion of the audience ; for a decree was passed banishing forthwith the Jesuits from the country of the Grisons, as the enemies of the Gospel. The old gentleman's donation was cancelled ; and the administration of his affairs was given over to his relatives, though he was undisturbed in the possession and use of his property during life, but all was to descend to his relatives after his death. The Jesuits say there was immense lamentation at this decree, and that the fathers had not got five miles from the city before a severe earthquake shook the country, "so that the vulgar feared lest the earth should open and hell should swallow down all the people on account of the crime of those who had expelled the fathers."² I *expected* to read of some such portent at the end of the affair ; and would have been much surprised had I not found it recorded. In truth, it is hard to maintain the requisite impartiality of the historian when we have to do with such desperate partymen, such unreasonable and reckless inventors as the Jesuits. There is, however, an unintentional equivocation in the words "*scelus ejectorum patrum*:"—which may be interpreted into—"the crime of *the ejected fathers*" which crime may have had as much to do with the "earthquake" as anything else *below*. Disturbances and menacings among the Jesuit-party were left in fermentation : but it was thought useless to

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. 102.

² "Vix ab ponte quinque millia passuum recesserant, cum tam gravi motu illa omnis ora concussa est, ut vulgus timerent, ne dehiscente terrâ ob scelus ejectorum patrum (sic interpretabantur) omnes Tartarus absorberet."—*Sacchin. lib. v. 106.*

make any further efforts to regain the college. Still Sacchinus assures us that the old gentleman, Quadrius, again ratified the grant before his death, which followed close upon the edict—apparently to justify the stubborn pertinacity of the Jesuits in still clinging to the property: for Raynaldi again went to the city, and managed to make an impression on one of the heirs—but all to no further purpose, although the Jesuit tells of various calamities falling upon the “peculators of the sacred money.”¹ Whatever view we take of this expedition into the Valteline, it is impossible to make it reflect credit on the Company. An imbecile old man—the disturbances that ensued—the evident hand or toil of the Jesuits throughout the agitation—their subsequent hankering after the money,—all must declare that grasping spirit of possession which the Jesuits soon began to display—and the sort of victims they selected.

Whilst the Jesuits were thus expelled from Switzerland for the reasons above stated—the inhabitants of Monte Pulciano in the Duchy of Tuscany were endeavouring to get rid of them as the corrupters of their wives and daughters. It certainly does appear, from their own version of the affair, that the accusations were not without foundation. Sacchinus treats them as popular rumours: but the very facts which he does admit lead us to infer the contrary:—at all events, as in the Swiss affair, the Jesuits invariably appeal to popular demonstrations in their favour: they should, therefore, be the last to shield the guilt of their men by depreciating the credit of the popular voice. The facts

¹ Ib. 106. As an instance of Jesuit-mystery, take the following phrase, whose meaning is, that Father Tarquinius made a religious impression on one of the heirs: “Cùm Pater Tarquinius pontem abiisset, *unum heredum religio subiit*”—*religion went into the mind of one of the heirs!*

are as follows. One of the Jesuits was accused of having offered violence to a respectable lady, who, trying to escape from his brutal passion, was, by the savage, fiercely pursued. One of their lay-brothers had also committed himself in a manner unbecoming a religious man, or any man, though Sacchinus says he was imprudent and too simple, and only asked a woman whither she was going. In addition to this, a Jesuit had been seen leaving the college, and entering a disreputable house, where he remained all night. The Jesuits—mighty men of disguises as they were—easily get rid of this, by stating that some rogue had disguised himself as a father, in order to increase the bad odour of the Jesuits—a method of exculpation, or rather a recrimination, which requires us to believe a double or a triple crime in another man rather than the simple one in a Jesuit.¹ Certain it is, as Sacchinus admits, that the Jesuits were extremely familiar and diffuse with the ladies of Monte Pulciano, and confessed almost all the women and girls of the city.² It is even said that the very walls of the Company's church breathed and begat devotion—*ipsos templi Societatis parietes spirare et ingenerare in adeuntium animis pietatem*. Accordingly the number of the women who frequently went to confession and the sacrament, was immense, and their devotion remarkable. This sacred tribunal was always the shoal of frail ministers; and must ever be the bitter source of never-ending temptation to the most virtuous. The close contact of beauty, the warm

¹ However he reasserts the fact subsequently, and says that he saw a document in which the man is stated to have confessed the disguise on his death-bed!—Sacchin. lib. vii. c. 25.

² “Sed feminarum ad confessionem et sanctam Eucharistiam crebrò accedentium numerus et pietas erat insignis.”—*Id.* lib. v. 107.

breathings of the sanguine, the soft accents of blushing modesty, must naturally ruffle, and stir, and agitate the feelings of the confessor ; but when to this gentle attraction of human sympathy is superadded by the fair penitent, the more or less protracted list of her temptations, her troublesome thoughts, her frailties, how horrible must be the intensity of that struggle with the clinging suggestions of nature in the confessor, who finds that his penitent is inclined to be as frail as himself ! Against the Jesuits of Monte Pulciano suspicion succeeded to suspicion : the people shunned them, and one of the principal citizens felt himself called upon to protect the honour of his family. This gentleman had two sisters, very amiable both of them : they were the spiritual daughters of Father Gombar, Jesuit, and rector of the college at Monte Pulciano. They were accustomed to enjoy long conversations, on pious matters, with the Jesuit, apparently contrary to the stringent rules and regulations on the subject of female intercourse, which I have already laid before the reader. Rules and regulations are good things, but they are nothing if not observed. Public rumours frightened Gombar, and he bethought him of the rules and regulations, and, of course, offended his spiritual daughters, though very much given to piety—*plurimum deditæ pietati*. But he had not the strength to do more than half his duty, for he only threw off or cut short one sister, and retained the other, who was a matron, and had a son in the Company. The dismissed lady imparted a bad suspicion to her brother, actuated by jealousy, according to the insinuation of Sacchinus : but can we be even sure of the alleged cause of jealousy ? It is so easy to invent the obvious crimination,—though it is impossible

to say what a jealous or slighted woman will *not* do for revenge. Be that as it may ; the result was a fact which spoke at least a strong conviction of the Jesuit's guilt or indiscretions. The brother of the ladies forbade both of them to confess to the fathers, and even to visit the rector. A great sensation ensued : all the noble ladies of Monte Pulciano were scared from the church of the Jesuits. A good-natured Capuchin monk, with brotherly sympathy, lent assistance to the Jesuit's reputation, and gave him a stave from the pulpit ; but, whatever was the intention of the monk, his sermon became a trumpet to the scandal, and everybody " took the thing in hand," determined to " sift it to the bottom."

A number of love-letters, either written to, or by Gombar, was found. It was also discovered that he had inveigled a large sum of money from a lady, which the grand vicar of the place compelled him to restore. Sacchinus says that the vicar treated him in a most honourable manner—when he proved that he had made restitution—*probatâ satisfactione* : but it was a very bad case altogether, and Gombar, the Jesuit rector, took to flight, and nobody knew what had become of him, until it was made known to the offended world of Monte Pulciano that General Lainez had expelled him from the Company, saying, " He should have done anything rather than permit himself to appear guilty by such a flight, and cause the name of the Society and of so honest and holy a lady to be contaminated. If he had not the courage to die, he might have avoided the danger of death by hiding himself at home. Why did he not fly to Perusia, or to Rome, if he fled at all ?" The penalty was expulsion ;—though Gombar begged to the last to be set to any work, *even* to the tuition of

youth all the days of his life !—*ac nominatim ad pueros totam vitam docendos paratum*¹—hence we may see the estimation in which this department of the Company's functions was held by the members—the offer pointing to it either as an humiliation, or a labour of Hercules. But this wise precaution did not serve the purpose of General Lainez. The expulsion of a guilty or imprudent member was not permitted by Providence to restore the credit of the whole body at Monte Pulciano. The Jesuits who remained, or were sent to retrieve the Company's honour, were visited with the public and private inflictions of general detestation. Their church and their schools were utterly deserted. The city revoked the stipend of the public teacher. The college itself was taken from them by the parties who had originally given them the use of the building. They were reduced to the greatest necessity—actually starved out—as far as the Monte Pulcians were concerned. They suffered so much that the Jesuit Natalis facetiously said it was not a college but a house of probation. Lainez put a stop to the sufferings, bodily and mental, of his men, by dissolving the college in 1563, after seven years' duration.² Thus were the Jesuits quietly expelled from Monte Pulciano—by a most effectual method, it must be admitted, since neither great alms nor small alms—the tithes of the Jesuits—enabled them to proselytise the

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. 110. For the Italian reader, Bartoli is unusually concise on this affair at Monte Pulciano. He coolly says, "It would be fastidious to relate the particulars." Actually the name of Gombar is not even mentioned in the whole chapter ; and all that we have just read from the learned and often mysterious Latin of Sacchinus is wisely "left out," like the part of Hamlet, "by particular desire," from the tragi-comedy. And there is reason for the Jesuits to be ashamed of the transaction occurring in their best days, and before the *Monita Secreta*, or Secret Instructions were given to the public.—See *Bartoli, Dell'Ital.* lib. iv. c. 12.

² Sacch. vii. 20.

heretics, to lead the women captive, to train “the boys,” *gratis*.

This affair at Monte Pulciano opens an inquiry into the domestic arrangements of the Jesuits, the result of which was their immense influence with the people—as exhibited on more than one public occasion. I allude to their confraternities and sodalities. Sufficiently striking and impressive were their bands of self-scourging laymen, who congregated at their houses every Friday to bare their backs and inflict the propitious castigation; or who on festivals were led forth through the streets in procession, in the same predicament. It appears that Xavier invented the method among the people of Japan; and in the historical romances of the Jesuits, we read that besides arresting temptations of the flesh in the ardent islanders, the whips actually cured diseases by contact, and by the same process, alleviated the pains of child-birth.¹

We remember the efficacy of processional flagellation in Portugal, when the good name of the Company was to be restored. The question is, how could such means produce the result which is stated? Simply by appealing to the superstitious associations of the people, who considered corporeal austerities the guarantees of holiness. Hence the method failed when the Jesuits tried it in Germany for the conversion of the heretics. These public and private “antidotes of chaste religion,” as the Jesuit calls them, availed little or nothing against what he also terms “the venom of the impious.”²

In other places they established what they called sodalities—clubs or réunions, cliques and conventicles, where

¹ Orland. x. 133, *et seq.*

² Id. iv. 19, 20.

the secrets of families were collected, and pious frauds concocted. These began in Sicily in 1555, the year before the death of the Founder. The institution was called the Council or Office of Charity—The Council or Office of Charity. a captivating name for the multitude. The duties of the members consisted in distributing the collections made for the poor, in espousing the cause of widows and wards engaged in law-suits; and they had to see to the proper administrations of the churches, convents, chapels and hospitals: the administration of wills and bequests was no less a special duty of the brethren.¹ A more cheering prospectus could never be devised—except such a one as would announce an infallible method for preventing the abuses likely to result. These sodalities were generally filled with persons devoted to the Jesuits, in whose houses the assemblies took place. For a time results were satisfactory: but soon it became evident that the guardians against fraud had become victimisers in their turn; and the sodalities were abolished.² Abuses. The Company always fruitful in inventions adapted to promote their designs, supplied their place with other confraternities which they devised, destined to enjoy a longer duration. These were called the Congregations of the Holy Virgin. On Sundays and Festivals the members assembled with the Jesuits to recite The Congregations of the Virgin Mary. the Office of the Virgin—a set form of extravagant adulation in which the Song of Solomon, the Prophets, and other books of the Bible are made to do strange service to Mary. A Jesuit presided, heard their confessions, said mass to them, and administered the sacrament. These sodalities were very comprehensive. Their

¹ Orland, lib. xv. 17.² Hist. des Religieux, &c., i. 144.

organisation seems to have been modelled on that of the castes of India. They were divided into classes. The first was the sodality of the nobles and the highest ranks; the second comprised the merchants and simple citizens; the third consisted of workmen and servants. To make the castes more distinct—and in deference to the gradations of human vanity—each class had its particular assembly and chapel.¹ The whole sodality was governed by one of the Jesuits, a prefect elected by the congregation, two assistants and a council. There was a secretary, with twelve consultors, whose office it was to watch over those members who were committed to their care by the Jesuit father-president, or by the prefect, and to report on their conduct accordingly.² The greatest deference and obedience were inculcated by rule towards the father of the sodality, and other officials.³ No member was to leave the town of the sodality without apprising the father and prefect of the same; and letters patent were given to him to insure his admission into another branch of the sodality, wherever he might be travelling. Peace, concord, and brotherly love were to reign throughout the members of the association; and in order to promote their advance in “true and Christian virtues” frequent assemblies of the members were to take place, and there would be frequent intercourse with those who could assist them in their progress. As each member, even in his absence, shared “the merits of the sodality” it would be only fair for him to give information respecting himself and his concerns to the

Their organ-
isation.

Government.

Ways and
means.

¹ Hist. des Religieux, &c. i. 145.

² Leges et Statuta, &c., Congreg. B. V. Mar. part i. § viii. ³ Ib. part i. § 1.

prefect, commending himself to the prayers of the sodality :—always striving to show himself a true son of the sodality by his moral integrity, and endeavouring to edify all and entice them to the practice of virtue and piety.¹ It was the duty of the prefect to watch carefully over all the members, and their conduct. Any notable fault was to be by him reported to the father of the sodality, for admonition and emendation. Penances were enjoined for certain faults, or according to the devotion of postulants ; and an official was appointed by the father to enjoin and direct the inflictions. The rules were plainly written on a board, or printed, and the greatest diligence was enjoined to promote their observance. There was a book in which were inscribed the names of those who frequented or were remiss in frequenting the assemblies.² When a member became scandalous, he was summoned before the whole congregation, the charges were made against him, and his name was erased from the list of the sodality : but the father always had the power of summary dismissal “in matters of moment—in *rebus gravibus*.”³ Strict secrecy was enjoined to the secretary of the association : “when it shall be necessary to observe secrecy, he must strive not to divulge nor hint at the resolutions or undertakings of the sodality, and he must not show any papers to any one without the express command of the father and prefect of the sodality.”⁴ He must have a book in which he will enter the names of the members, their entrance, country, and other particulars, according to

¹ *Leges et Stat.*, &c., part i. § i. 12.

² *Ib.* § v. 5.

³ *Ib.* § v. 11.

⁴ “*Ubi autem oportebit servare secretum, studeat ita, ut neque loquatur, neque indicet, quæ fuerint constituta, vel agenda sint, neque vero scripta ulla cuiquam, sine expresso patris mandato, ac præfecti sodalitatis, ostendat.*”—*Ib.* § vii. 1.

the custom of each sodality. He will also make account of those who die, or marry, or be dismissed from the sodality : but he is not to state the cause of dismissal.¹ Such are the peculiar rules or statutes of this sub-Jesuit-Order. It must be allowed that it had something like an organisation, and was worthy of the Jesuits. Of course we cannot see what most of these regulations could have to do with piety and the advance in Christian perfection : but we *can* see how the sodalities multiplied the Jesuits, *ad infinitum*, wherever they existed ; and we *can*

An explanation.

now account for the demonstrations of their “ friends ” whenever they got into difficulties.

What the “ resolutions and undertakings ” of the congregations might be, it is little to the purpose to inquire ; but the certainty of Jesuit-leverage by means of these sodalities, must be evident at a glance. By these they could always tune the popular voice, command the assistance of the middle ranks, and influence the great, or their wives and children, which, in the long-run, answers the purpose equally as well. To entice devotees

Enticements to join the fraternities.

to enter these sodalities numerous graces and indulgences were proclaimed by the Jesuits.

On the day of his entrance the member gained “ a plenary indulgence ”—that is, a total remission of the penalties due to his sins, absolved in confession, according to Catholic doctrine. At the day of his death the same is awarded, besides other days consecrated to the festivals of Christ and the Virgin Mary. Nor was this all. All who “ in a state of grace ” followed the corpse of a sodalis to the grave, gained an indulgence of a year,—that is, they satisfied by that act just as if they underwent the ancient canonical penances for the space

¹ *Leges et Statuta*, part i. § vii. 2.

of a year. Innumerable other indulgences blessed the sodalis, and enticed the devotee to enter the congregation of the blessed. So indulgent were the Jesuits that they procured an indulgence for all the world on condition that they should on certain days visit the churches of the Company, on all days when Catholics *must* go to mass—a plenary indulgence in return for a *Miserere*, a *Pater Noster*, or an *Ave Maria*, rehearsed in behalf of the pope! ¹ Does not all this prove that the Jesuits knew the secret of influence, and set to work accordingly? Was not this a right good means “to bring water to their mill,” as the French would say? Meanwhile the women were not neglected; there was something specially for them, under the name of retreats. These were houses contiguous to their own residences, and built expressly for the purpose, to which ladies might retire from the tumult of the world and the dissipations of fashionable life, for a few days, in order to spend the time “with God,” and their father-confessor, the whole to conclude with communion on some grand festival. In these curious and interesting coteries of devout ladies under Jesuit-influence, the same distinctions were observed as to rank, as in the great sodalities. They classified the ladies; so that there was no fear of the shop-keeper’s wife coming into contact with the magistrate’s lady, nor of the servant-maid’s falling in with her mistress. The object of these pious inventions—which they even attempted to introduce subsequently into regiments of soldiers—is pretty evident. At Louvain, where these congregations began, it was perceived that the object of the Jesuits was thereby to entice the faithful to their churches, from

Houses of
retreat for
the women.

¹ Leges et Statuta, &c., part v. § i. *et seq.*

their respective parishes. With regard to the retreats for women, we may observe that it was a very bold and presumptuous undertaking. It is written that those who seek the danger shall perish in it; and we all know that *this* is one of the greatest dangers to which the sons of Adam can expose their thoughtless frailty. The Jesuits should have been the last men to meddle with the thing. Their rules and regulations were clamorous against female conversation. They infringed, and scandal ensued. Strange and disgraceful reports got afloat—nor was it the least remarkable fact, that “some of these pious women were whipped once a-week by their father-confessors”—and the fact is admitted by Orlandinus—*nec falsa narrabantur*.¹ Clamours actually rose against the Jesuits; but they were strong in their sodalities; and they went on as usual in conscious triumph; so glorious indeed was the result of their operations, that on the Christmas following, one single Jesuit gave the sacrament to more than two thousand communicants!² Such a thing had never before been heard of, says Orlandinus.

The women gave them trouble in Venice as well. The Jesuits could not dispense with their influence in society; they strove to insure it, and suffered accordingly. There was in the city of the Doge a convent of female penitents, who passed for saints according to the representations of their father-confessor; but it subsequently turned out to be quite the contrary. Their priest was convicted of grave misdemeanors, and suffered the penalty of death. It appears, too, that the fair penitents were condemned

The Jesuits
and the ladies
of Venice.

¹ Lib. xiii. 29.

² Ibid.

to strict seclusion. There were more than a hundred women thus shut up together, which, it seems, proved a hard matter in the given circumstances. They resolved to starve themselves to death, if not permitted to leave their convent.

An unfortunate Jesuit, Father Palmio, undertook to reduce the fair rebels. Palmio had the gift of persuasion, we are expressly told, and succeeded in quelling this female insurrection.

This success proved a sorry boon to the Jesuits. Their method was incomprehensible, and therefore liable to "misrepresentation." Now the fact was evident, that they were the confessors or directors of most of the women in the republic. It was therefore concluded that by this "subterraneous medium" they got at the secrets of the state. The senate took the matter in hand, and one of the members declared that "the Jesuits meddled with an infinity of civil matters, even those of the republic ; that they made use of the most respectable and holy things to seduce women ; that not content with very long conversations with them in the confessional, they enticed them to their residences for the same purpose ; that it was the ladies of the highest rank who were the particular object of the advanced Jesuits. The abuse was to be remedied without delay, either by expelling them from the country, or by appointing some person of authority and merit, such as the Patriarch of Venice, to watch over their conduct."

The senators remonstrate.

Such were the charges and the remedies proposed. The patriarch was their sworn enemy, and he had called them *Chiappini*, a very contemptuous cognomen in Italy, to be modestly translated

The patriarch and the Jesuits.

into "bird-catchers" periphrastically ; but a word which a patriarch ought to have "ignored."

The idea of supervision was too galling to be endured. A friend of the Jesuits defended them in the senate, and an appeal was made to the doge Priuli. At the same time the pope, Pius IV., himself wrote to the senate and the doge, guaranteeing the good morals and doctrines of the Society. This, of course, was conclusive, and the patriarch hid his diminished head. Nevertheless, the doge sent for Palmio, and thus addressed the Jesuit : "If you have calumniators, bear them with patience ; it is the property of virtue to have to fight. The Society has amongst us hot defenders ; but I am required to draw your attention to one or two points ; they are the only ones which have been entertained in the heap of fictions debited by your enemies. In the first place, we see with pain that you, who are the best confessor in existence, avoid the duty ; and, to the great regret of the whole city, you impose that function, with regard to several battalions of women, on young men scarcely twenty-five or twenty-six years of age !" Palmio affirmed the contrary : the confessors were more than thirty-two years of age ; and, Constitutions in hand, he pointed to the precautions, the curious details of watchfulness enforced in the Society to preclude all suspicion in so delicate a function. There the matter rested.¹

This is a specimen of Jesuit-escapes from trouble, according to the statement of the Jesuits themselves. Their misdemeanors were, of course, still certain in the estimation of many ; but, for this time, they triumphed

¹ The whole is an *ex-parte* statement of the Jesuit Palmio in a letter, whence Cretineau extracted the facts as above. Tome i. p. 390, *et seq.*

and went on confiding, reckless in their machinations. A less fortunate hour will surprise them anon in the same Venice. Still, they were doomed to feel the effects of Gombar's guilt or indiscretions at Monte Pulciano. The Venetian senators being apprised of that affair, forbade their wives to confess to the Jesuits, which was probably as painful a prohibition to the ladies of Venice as it was to the Jesuits.¹

At Rome, the affairs of the Society had received great development. Freed from the haunting ghost of Paul IV., the Jesuits had breathed freely once more, and at the exaltation of the old man's enemy, Pius IV., to the chair of St. Peter, they made every effort to win his good graces. It was at first uncertain what they had to expect on their own account, although, inasmuch as the pope's enemy, Paul IV., had treated them with considerable rigour, it was probable enough that they would be befriended, were it only to cast a slur on Caraffa, whom the Romans disgraced so horribly at his death. But the Jesuits had shirked the papal mandate respecting the public choir. This was disobedience to the Holy See. And the third year of the term prescribed to the generalate of Lainez was approaching. The general bethought him of the doom right anxiously; but there was little reason to fear, as events declared, that success was to attend him, and when all would be certain, he would make a show, like Father Ignatius, of resigning the generalate,—a delicate piece of superfluous magnanimity. As a cardinal, Pius IV. had shown no favour to the Company, he had had "nothing to do" with the Jesuits. Lainez began his operations round about the papal throne by inducing

Lainez resolves to sound the new pope.

¹ Antiquit. Venet. apud Quesnel, Hist. des Rel. ii. 4.

four cardinals to recommend to his Holiness the whole Society in general and himself in particular—*et nominatim Lainium*. Lainez then presented himself in person, and after the solemn kiss of the holy toe—*post osculum solenne pedis*—he proceeded to deposit the Company in the pontifical lap, protesting that all were ready, without tergiversation, without a word about travelling expenses, at once to be sent

His protestations to the pope.

by his Holiness to any part of the world, to barbarians or heretics ; in a word, that his Holiness might use them *as his own commodity*—*tamque suâ re uti posset*—and he hoped to be useful in very many respects—*sicubi speraret usui fore quam multis nominibus*.¹ It must have been evident to the Jesuit that his point was gained by the matter and manner of this exordium. I say it must have been so evident to him ; for, according to his historian, he at once proceeded to ask a favour from his lord and master. The words ascribed to him constitute Jesuit-matter, and they are worth recording. Lainez hoped that his Holiness would patronise the Society, and particularly the Roman College. He said

Throws in a hint.

“ there was now in that college an immense number of young Jesuits, about a hundred and sixty, all of them most select, almost all of them endowed with genius, excellent dispositions, gathered together from all the nations of Christendom ; and now being trained most learnedly and piously, and were ardently progressing, in order to be despatched all over the world to preserve, to restore, to infuse, to propagate the Christian religion ; that the Roman College was the source whence the colleges of all Italy and Sicily had arisen and were supplied ; thence had colonies been

¹ Sacchin. lib. iv. 1, *et seq.*

sent into France, Belgium, and Germany, with constant accessions, to be ramparts against the assaults of the heretics ; thence went forth colonies bearing the light of the faith even into India and the uttermost bounds of the East, to nations unknown from time immemorial ; thence, in fine, had Spain and Portugal received subsidies. But the house is too small. We are packed together, dreadfully inconvenienced, in want of every thing. Health suffers, sickness blasts our fairest hopes, our brightest geniuses wither and die. We have neither food nor clothing. May your Holiness cast a kind look on this your progeny, your faithful and ready *cohort*—*fidam ac promptam cohortem* ; and let us feel a particle of that paternal care which is over all. It is a deed worthy of the piety of the Roman bishop, the guardian of all nations, presiding over the Queen-city of the earth, the sole oracle of the world, the eternal palace of religion and piety, to preserve and perpetuate this refuge and rampart of all nations [the Roman College], and thus, by one deed, to bestow a meritorious favour on all the nations of the universe.”¹

Glorifies the
pope and
Rome.

After this speech it will surely be ridiculous to talk of Jesuit-modesty :—and we may be permitted to think that men who could thus boast of their “spiritual” deeds were scarcely actuated by spiritual motives. I allude to the leaders, the enterprisers of the Company—the “men in authority”—the Jesuit-*princes* : for undoubtedly there were amongst the body some hearty, honest, truly conscientious men, who laboured as God seemed to direct them, by the lips of their superiors. The latter I shall gladly cheer as I find them ; and the former shall portray themselves as above—to my mind they are

¹ Sacchin. lib. iv. 1, *et seq.*

despicable throughout. The drift of the foregoing address, or its equivalent—not likely to be less to the purpose from the lips of Lainez—was nothing less than the covetous usurpation of a building which he thought admirably suited for a “refuge and rampart of all nations,” and more calculated to keep his “fairest hopes” from being blasted, and his “brightest geniuses” from withering and death. In truth it was a desperately keen device of this wily Jesuit. There was at Rome a large convent of nuns, which had been founded by the Marchioness de’ *Ursini*, the niece of the late *Pope Paul IV.* This convent was very extensive, and with its agreeable and commodious situation had for a long time tempted the cupidity of the Jesuits. Now, as they knew that the present pope was the mortal enemy of the Caraffas, whom he then kept in prison, and whose trial was proceeding, the Jesuits took advantage of the pope’s temper to solicit the grant of this convent, with the design of making it the Roman College. The preceding interview, address, and its disgusting sentiments, were the beginnings of the perpetration. The skilful mixture of presumption, falsehood, and flattery, produced the effect which Lainez had promised himself.

A remark on popes, by a Catholic. “Popes,” says Quesnel, “like other men, have always been open to the most extravagant flattery. It is one effect of the corruption of their nature, and of self-love, which is always alive in them. Pius IV. who soon sent the whole family of his predecessor to execution, was so intoxicated with the fulsome laudation Lainez bestowed upon him, that without any formality of justice, he expelled the nuns from the convent, which he gave to the exulting Jesuits.”¹ Their

¹ Quesnel, ii. Sacchin. lib. iv. 5.

historian has the heart to be somewhat merry on the pitiful subject :—he actually says that the Marchioness de' Orsini, its foundress, was by degrees conciliated to the transfer of the convent, and so far approved the pope's action, that “she confessed herself deeply obliged to the most Holy Father for giving her so many sons in lieu of a few daughters!”¹ I am no advocate nor admirer of the system which delivers up a number of women to the horrors of seclusion, or the temptations of luxurious sloth, to become bearded and hideous from physical causes—pining, corrupted, withering, raving in a harem infinitely more disgusting to think of than any which Turks can devise :—but this is not the question. It is a question of right and possession superseded by covetousness and tyranny. Be it so : let the Jesuits exult :—but let them beware : retribution will come betimes : they shall be done to as they have done by others : Providence will chronicle their spoliations, to be accounted for hereafter—in *this* world, be it understood—a crushing but merited retribution. Not content with flinging them this stolen property, the pope added a revenue of 600 ducats for the support of his “faithful and ready cohort,” whose commander he was just declared, thus putting their bandit-possession on a footing for operations. Was there no voice raised against their spoliations, ten times worse than any which Henry VIII. ever perpetrated ? Worse, because perpetrated by the very men who held themselves up as the patterns of morality—the guardians of the Christian faith—the oracles of religion. Was there no

The pope enhances his kindness.

The spoliations of the Jesuits denounced.

¹ “ Ut magnam se gratiam Beatissimo Patri habere profiteretur, quòd paucarum loco filiarum filios sibi tam multos tradidisset.”—*Sacchin.* lib. iv. 5.

voice raised against these spoliations? There was—and in Rome. Their claim to the college of Coimbra was disputed. One Gomius Abreus showed himself “a very troublesome adversary” to the Jesuit, as they call him—*adversarius erat permolestus*. “It was a law-suit of great moment,” says Sacchinus, “and on its issue depended that noble safeguard, not only of Portugal, but especially of the Indies.” Abreus advanced against the Jesuits—held consultations with the judges, publicly and in private, denouncing the Jesuits as robbers of benefices and spoliators of the clergy, and commenced an action against them, with no small chance of success if the case was to be tried before a just tribunal. And the Jesuits evidently were of the same opinion: for their historian says: “So far had Gomius proceeded, that in so serious a loss which *was imminent*, the Company was less anxious about their wealth than their reputation;”¹—and well they might be—for their factitious reputation or “credit,” would soon be the basis of ulterior speculation. The most unprincipled rogue on ’Change will, in a predicament, postpone his “*purse*” to his “*reputation*”—the infamous *Iago* tells you this, as well as the “Company of Jesus.” What followed? Interviews, a speech, and a supplication, doubtless from General Lainez to the fatuous pontiff. And the most Holy Father took the thing in hand—reserved the case to himself. Abreus insisted. What availed it?

The pope
decides in
their favour.

Nothing. The pope gave his cohort the verdict. He did more: he remitted them the *fees* of the “Apostolic diploma,” or letters patent, which confirmed their “right” to the property.


¹ “Eo rem adduxerat, ut in tam gravi quæ imminebat jactura, minor Societati rei quam famæ cura esset.”—*Sacchin. lib. iv. 6.*

“By this benefaction,” says Sacchinus, “he gave us more than a *thousand ducats*, which we would otherwise have had to pay,”¹ A thousand ducats—about £500, for a verdict in the papal chancery! English law must certainly be cheap in our estimation, since at the very oracle of heaven the “costs” are so ruinous. But let that pass,—and compute or conceive, if you can, the immense revenues that the sovereign pontiff lost by the Reformation—when so many “cases” and “appeals” were decided without “apostolical diplomas”—and their thousand ducats. Was it not perfectly natural that the popes should go mad on the subject of abstract orthodoxy—all that was requisite to maintain the formalities whence they derived their enormous revenues—and was it not also quite natural that the pope should foster the Jesuits who *seemed* so likely—and who certainly flattered themselves with the notion—to reduce all the world to papal subjection. Accordingly, possessed with this irrational, mad idea, the pope thought he could not do too much for his faithful and ready cohort; and when Lainez went to thank his holiness for all his benefactions, the pontiff exclaimed: “There’s no need of thanks—I’ll shed my very blood to foster the Company!”² What could be more glorious for the Jesuits? And they “prospered” accordingly.

How the
Reformation
hurt the
pope.

The pope’s
devotedness
to his band.

¹ “Quo corollario plus mille aureorum nummum, quod in id impendendum alioqui fuisset, donavit.”—*Sacchin.* lib. iv. 6.

² “Haud opus gratiis esse: Societati se usque ad sanguinem fauturum.”—*Sacchin.* lib. iv. 7.  Early in the next year the pope increased the revenue of the same college of Coimbra, by the donation of six farms and the township of Mont-Agrasso. All these were so many spoliations from the Archbishop of Evora, whose revenues were thus diminished in behalf of the cohort. He also gave them the revenues of another parish, which were abstracted from a dignitary or official of the Cathedral. The Jesuit says that the latter

Honours and appointments fell upon them like the debauching shower of gold wherein Jupiter descended to beget Perseus, who with the head of the Gorgon Medusa turned all his enemies into stone, if not otherwise defeated—a fit emblem of the Jesuit. Jesuits were appointed to examine the candidates for orders. Jesuits were made inspectors of churches, and directors of nuns. Lainez was in his glory—with more work than he could possibly perform, and yet he undertook to convert a poor Calvinist whom they had caught in Rome and condemned to be burnt. He intended to cajole him out of his faith—*blandè mulcere*: but when he went to the prison and saw a multitude of cardinals, bishops, nobles, and the pope's relatives, sitting around to witness the discussion, the vain boaster of Trent thought it a fine occasion for display, and “felt compelled to proceed in a manner more glorious to Catholic truth, though less adapted to the proud mind of the heretic.”¹ From his Collections of the Fathers, the Jesuit of Trent flung a volley at the heretic. All to no purpose. The man told him he did not care a straw for the fathers—in which he was quite right—and that he “stood by Calvin alone, whom he preferred to all the fathers.”²

He stood firm in spite of impending fire. A decided failure for the Jesuit. Had he been truly anxious to rid the man of what was thought “heresy,” he would

“consented” to the transfer: but he does not state the same respecting the Archbishop of Evora—*Hæc omnia Pontifex separavit à reditu Eborensis Archiepiscopi*—and there he leaves the spoliation.—*Franc. Synops. ad Ann. 1561, 14.*

¹ “*Inire coactus est pugnae viam gloriosiore Catholice veritati, sed superbo heretici ingenio minus idoneam.*”—*Sacchin. lib. iv. 12.*

² “*Exclamat uno se stare Calvino. Quidquid contra objiceret, hoc tenebat saxum, aliter sentire Calvinum . . . Calvinum malle: instar omnium habere Calvinum.*”—*Ib.*

not have yielded to the impulse of vanity which suggested a grand display—a glorious confutation of the Calvinist. *Haud nihil tamen profectum*—“but it was not altogether a failure ;” says his his-
Lainez fails to convert him.
 torian, “for the audience (bishops, cardinals, nobles, and the pope’s relatives) admired the wisdom of the Catholic doctor, and detested the blind stubbornness of the heretic.”¹ Verily he had his reward, this “Catholic doctor”—and when the soul of this poor heretic took flight, sped to our merciful good God for judgment—whilst the hard hearts, the cruel men of Rome were howling and exulting around *their* judgment, his body roasting in the flames—at that dreadful moment, oh, say, ye men of orthodoxy—did his God send his suppliant soul to Hell? And yet you call his constancy “the blind stubbornness of a heretic !” In the midst of these events truly so disgusting, but so glorious for the Jesuits, their historian, with the usual modesty, coolly observes : “I know not how it was, but really, at Rome especially, and far and wide over the north, this opinion increased, namely, that there was no other more available remedy for the reformation of morals and the restoration of religion, than to employ, to the utmost extent, the men of the Company.”²

Firm, established in papal favour at Rome, the Company of Jesus flapped her spreading wings over all Europe besides. The sons of Calvin in Savoy shuddered as

¹ “Qui disputationi interfuerant, non sapientiam magis Catholici Doctoris admirati, quam cæcam detestati heretici pertinaciam, læti, &c., recessère.”—*Ut antea*.

² “Ac nescio quo pacto Romæ hoc potissimum anno, latèque per Septentrionis oras, hæc opinio percubuit, ad corrigendos mores, restituendamque religionem, haud aliud præsentius esse remedium quàm hominum Societatis quam plurimum operâ uti.”—*Sacchin. lib. iv. 7.*

the sound boomed athwart their mountains. "Coming! Coming!" it seemed to mutter, "Coming!" and she came. A young man—a mere novice—Antonius Possevinus was her angel. He had been a student at Padua, destined for the priesthood, with a benefice *in commendam*. The Jesuit Palmio, so powerful with the nuns at Venice, *mesmerised* him into the Company; for we can apply no other term to the method as described by the Jesuit, Sacchinus.¹ He was admitted by Lainez in 1559, in the month of September. At the end of the month he began his novitiate. In the beginning of November he was sent to resume his studies at the Roman College.² Thus the important two years of probation, as appointed by the Constitutions, were dispensed with by the general. A single month was sufficient to ensure such an accession to the Company, and he took the vows accordingly. He was in his twenty-seventh year, and not in orders. He had "private business" to transact in Savoy: Lainez invested him with a commission to Emmanuel Philibert, the Duke of Savoy, and Prince of Piedmont. He left Rome with the dress and title of a beneficiary *in commendam*—*dis-simulatâ Societate*—pretending not to be a Jesuit, says Sacchinus, in order the more freely to transact his private business. On his departure, Lainez summed up all his instructions to the emissary in these words: "In

¹ Sacchinus states that he was meditating to join the company. "With these thoughts in his mind," continues the Jesuit, "with which Palmio was *not* acquainted, the Father held forth the host to Possevinus, [at the Sacrament], and said, in a whisper, 'O Lord, give to this man thy Spirit!' . . . Suddenly Possevinus was excited, and scarcely able to contain himself . . . falling on his knees before the Father, he cried out, 'Father, be my witness in the presence of God—I vow and promise to the Divine Majesty, knowingly and willingly, to enter the Company, and never to accept any benefice or dignity.'"—*Sacchin.* lib. iii. 43.

² Biblio. Scrip. Soc. Jesu. Ant. Poss.

your actions and deliberations think you see *me* before you.”¹ This was in 1560. It proved an eventful—a bitter year for the Calvinists of Savoy. And dread prognostics seemed to predict the monstrous births of the pregnant future. Lights in the skies, troops of horsemen in the clouds, mysterious sounds of invisible chariots, earthquakes, a comet, a conflagration in the firmament, a shower of blood, were among the supernatural terrors which agitated poor humanity in those days of “religious” warfare.² Where was the God of Christians? Where was his Christ?

Emmanuel Philibert gave Possevinus an audience. We have the Jesuit’s speech in Sacchinus. It is a portrait. He began with telling the duke that as God had given him the country, so ought he to give the souls in the country to God. Eternal happiness in Heaven, and a steady reign on earth, would be the result. Those who had fallen off from the Roman Church, that is from God, —*hoc est à Deo*, were also continually unsteady in their allegiance to human potentates. What was to be done? eagerly asked Philibert, according to the Jesuits. Look to the monks, replied Possevin—see how miserably they have gone astray—unworthy of their holy families, unworthy of the holy garb whereby they are concealed and recommended; hurrying the people down a precipice with their corrupt morals and doctrine. Write to the generals of orders, and the cardinals who are their

A Jesuit-model of craft, effrontery and falsehood.

¹ “Cui discedenti, post alia, hoc instar omnium præcepti dedit. In rebus agendis consiliisque capiendis, præsentem adesse sibi ipsum existimaret.”—*Sacchin.* iv. 61.

² “Calamitates tam quæ huic Sub-Alpinæ regioni incubuerunt, quam quæ Galliam nostram postea per tot annos ad religionis causam divexarant, multa tunc cœli signa præsagierunt: nam et Clarasci et Travillæ ignis in aëre,” &c. &c.—*Thuan.* xxvii. Ann. 1560.

patrons, and ask for proper leaders of the multitude unto good action and right feeling. Proper and zealous priests are required. King Philip is convinced of this, and has acted on the conviction. The consequence is, that Spain is in a fine condition, because the clergy are not diseased with ignorance—*inscitiâ non labore*t, says the classic Sacchinus. “Your advice is good,” replied Emmanuel, with a sigh, “but in the midst of such darkness, and so barren an age, whence can I get the proper supply of virtuous and learned priests?” That was the point of the nail which the Jesuit wanted to see, and he clinched it at once. “The Emperor Ferdinand,” said Possevin, “has two methods for producing such proper men. First, he sends from Germany youths of good hope to the *German college at Rome* to be educated, where they have the best masters in morals and learning, from whose training they come forth imbued with hatred against the heretics—*concepto in hæreses odio*—and having thoroughly seen the majesty and holiness of the Roman Church, and being, moreover, armed with learning, defended by innocence of life, when they return to their country they are a great safeguard. Secondly, knowing the virtue of the Company of Jesus—under whose training the German youths are educated—the emperor confesses that he can find no aid more seasonable in these most wretched times, than to get as many men as he can of this family into his dominions. Accordingly he is constantly founding colleges for them. By these colleges the young are religiously educated, and the Catholics are made steadfast in the faith; nor is the poison of the heretics only prevented from spreading, but many of them are converted from error, so that this result alone, or for the most part, preserves Germany

from utter ruin." Then he alluded to King John III., Xavier, Rodriguez, and the mighty results of the Jesuit-proceedings in Portugal, all in the same strain as above. "I think your highness has heard of the college at Coimbra," continued Possevin. "More than a thousand pupils are there educated with equal ardour in learning and piety ; for the seeds of piety are sown together with learning. They have appointed times to confess their sins ; they all attend mass together every day ; they often go to communion. Noble youths frequent the hospitals, and perform with alacrity all the functions and services of the lowest domestics for the sick. Far from those youths are impious and lustful actions and expressions. Far from them are disturbance and quarrels. Seeing these things and others—of which, next to God, the fathers of the Society are the authors—the people of Portugal call them by no other name than that of Apostles."¹ It is difficult to say whether falsehood or effrontery most predominates in these assertions. The result, however, was, that Philibert wrote to Lainez for men to take the charge of two colleges. Meanwhile, Possevinus scoured the country, insinuated himself amongst the unsuspecting Calvinists, and when he had satisfied himself on all the points suggested by his villainous zeal, he sent in his report to the Duke of Savoy : the result will soon be apparent.²

Calvinism was extensively prevalent in Savoy. Its chief strongholds were the valleys of Mont-Cenis, Luzerne, Angrogne, Perouse, and Fressinières. The Jesuits in Savoy. As long as this country belonged to France after its conquest, the people enjoyed religious toleration ; but after its restoration to the duke, and the

¹ Sacchin. lib. iv. 62, *et seq.*

² Id. lib. iv. 66.

visit of the Jesuit Possevinus, the fiend of religious persecution was let loose upon the wretched Calvinists. A great number perished by fire and torture ; many were condemned to the galleys ; and those who were spared seemed to owe their pardon to a dread in the mind of its ruler, lest the country should become a desert. But long before the fangs of persecution were blunted, dreadful deeds were perpetrated by its cruel ministers. Philibert fell ill, and the bloody executions languished ; but no sooner had he recovered, than, urged by the pope, advising the trial of arms, since tortures had failed with the heretics, he promptly raised an army, resolved on war.¹ The Calvinists held a consultation, and it was determined not to take arms against their prince, however unjust the war might be : they would retire to their mountains with all they could transport of their goods and chattels. Some retired to the Grisons, others took refuge among the Swiss, and some clung to their huts, resolving to defend their lives, but not before declaring by manifesto that war was forced upon them by despair, and that they would lay down their arms if the Duke of Savoy would permit them to live in peace. But that was not the maxim of kings in those days. It seemed that some infernal Fury had sent them to scourge mankind. The reply to the manifesto was an army of two thousand men, under the Count of the Trinity and the Jesuit Possevin. The fortune of war favoured both sides alternately : then followed negotiations towards reconciliation, and demands for indemnities and war expenses far beyond the means of the miserable children of the mountains. Poor as virtue can possibly be, the mountaineers in

Atrocities.

¹ Quesnel, ii. 14. Sarpi, v. 51.

their dilemma borrowed money to pay their oppressors, and were forced to sell their flocks to meet their engagements, with ruinous interest. They paid, and still were persecuted. They were disarmed: more money was demanded. Their ministers were banished: their houses were searched and pillaged: their wives and daughters were outraged; and, by way of a bonfire to celebrate the achievements of orthodoxy, their village was set on fire.¹ In the midst of these horrors, the intriguing, crafty, mendacious Possevinus—if Sacchinus The Jesuit i' the midst. has not belied him in the speech—was seen rushing from place to place, posting preachers of the true faith everywhere, searching for the books of the heretics and handing them to be burnt by the pope's inquisitor, whom he had by his side, scattering pious tracts, and recommending the catechism of the Jesuit Canisius² to the persecuted, pillaged, maltreated men of the mountains, and their outraged wives and daughters. It is very ridiculous, but, at the same time, bitterly humiliating. And Sacchinus tells us that, in reward for all the dexterity of Possevin in bringing about these very sad proceedings, which he calls "an immense good of the Catholic religion," some "principal men—*principes viri*"—thought of getting the pope to make Possevinus a bishop.³

But this Jesuit-expedition into Savoy, clever as Sacchinus represents the scheme, was a total failure;—and after entailing misery on the Calvinists, it was followed by one of those *beautiful* retributions recorded in history, which compels The expedition is a failure, however. us to believe in a superintending Providence. Beautiful in the abstract, however painful in the concrete,

¹ Quesnel, ii. p. 15, *et seq.*² Sacchin. iv. 71.³ Ibid.

as all the woes of humanity must be, whether in the calamities of Catholics or Protestants, fellow-citizens or strangers, private foes or public enemies—the tyrants of earth. No sooner had the Count of the Trinity retired from the scene of the war, than the people made alliance with the Valdenses or Vaudois, their neighbours, who promised them assistance. Emboldened by support, and goaded by the memory of the past,

Retribution. they resolved on revenge. They sacked the

churches of the Catholics, overturned their altars, and broke their images. War blazed forth on all sides, and various were its fortunes : but the Valdenses gained a signal victory over the Count of the Trinity, and their victory suggested a better line of policy to Emmanuel Philibert, notwithstanding his “head of iron” —*Tête de Fer*, as was his surname. In spite of the pope’s gold and exhortations for the continuance of the war and utter extermination of the poor heretics, Philibert, who was not so stupid as the Jesuit represents him, proposed an accommodation—when he saw that his troops had been often routed, and, in the last battle, completely defeated by the heretics, who nevertheless, and notwithstanding their vantage-ground, were inclined to peace with their sovereign—and of this he was per-

Toleration forced. suaded. Complete toleration ensued—their pastors returned—restorations and restitu-

tions were made to the heretics—the prisons gave up their confessors of the faith, and the galleys surrendered their martyrs. Was it not glorious ? And why did Christian charity, human kindness, refuse these blessings which the hideous sword of war so lavishly bestowed ? I have answered and shall answer the question in every page of this history :—but a reflection of Quesnel is

much to the purpose. “ With all deference to the popes of these times, and our Christian princes, but really it was not very necessary to sacrifice to their pious fury, as they did in those days, so many thousands of men, only to be subsequently compelled to accept *such accommodations* as these sons of the mountains achieved. And such has been invariably the issue of ‘ religious ’ wars, which the inordinate zeal of popes, the imbecility of kings, the fanaticism of the people have occasioned, and into which the interests of the true God in no wise entered.”¹ In utter contradiction of the numerous conversions so mendaciously boasted of by Sacchinus as resulting from the terrors of warfare and the roguery of the Jesuit Possevinus²—in testimony of the futility of persecution, the Cardinal de Lorraine, one of the religious spitfires of those days, found the heretics swarming in Savoy : in the very court of the duke many openly professed their heresy ; and although it was only a month since the duke had published an edict commanding all the sectarians to leave his dominions within eight days, he now prohibited its execution—and even pardoned many who had been condemned by the Inquisition, stopped and rescinded all proceedings in hand, and permitted all who had fled from persecution to return to the arms of toleration. Nor was it difficult for the duke to convince the cardinal that the interest of the Catholics themselves required him to adopt that line of conduct.³ This

The usual
issue of
“ religious ”
wars.

Emmanuel
Philibert.

¹ Hist. ii. 18.

² Lib. iv. 71, whose title is, “ *Multi hereticorum sectam ejurant*,”—“ Many of the heretics abjure their sect.”

³ Sarpi, l. viii. 6. The events which I have described, and the representations of the Jesuits, are calculated to give an incorrect character to Emmanuel Philibert. The characteristic facts of his career are as follows :—In the armies of Charles V. he acquired great military renown ; and he continued to serve his

treaty—so favourable to the Protestants, and honourable to the sensible duke, profiting by experience—utterly disappointed the Jesuits, and the pope, who denounced it in full consistory. The disappointment was natural. The Jesuits counted on solid foundations, establishments, colleges, all the peculiar *things* of the Company—*res Societatis Jesu*, as likely to result from an expedition suggested, promoted, and belaboured by their Father Possevin, whom Pope Pius IV. had sent express to the Court of Savoy. In effect, the duke, as I have stated, had written to the general, begging a large consignment of the apostles according to the samples described by Possevin, as truly miraculous in touching for mental ignorance and moral depravity—to say nothing of orthodox allegiance. Two colleges were ready to make them comfortable. You doubtless expect to hear that the Jesuit Lainez gladly seized the opportunity. But then, I must state that the duke, whose head had sense as well as iron in it, wisely

Aut Cæsar
aut nullus.

son, Philip II., for whom he won the battle of St. Quentin, so disastrous to the French, in 1557. He had accompanied Philip, in 1553, to England, where he received the Garter. After the declaration of peace, in 1559, he married the daughter of the King of France, by which alliance he recovered all the dominions which his father had lost, and subsequently enlarged them by his valour and prudence. He fixed his residence at Turin, and applied himself to restore order in every branch of the administration, and may be considered as the real founder of the House of Savoy. He died in 1580, leaving only one legitimate son, but six natural children ; for his mistresses were numberless, notwithstanding his “piety,” which is commended by his biographer. He was surnamed *Tête de Fer*, Ironhead ; and was succeeded by his son, Charles Emmanuel, surnamed *the Great*, of course on account of his military operations, for it is impossible to discover any other claim in him to the title. All Philibert’s natural children had glorious fortunes in church and state, and seem to have deserved the oblivion of their stain—if royal blood be not the hyssop to sprinkle and cleanse all such defilement. Pope Clement VII. is said to have appealed to the birth of the Redeemer, when people talked of his illegitimacy ! See Guichenon, *Hist. de Savoye* ; and Bruslé de Montplainchamp, *Vie d’Emmanuel Philibert* ; and all the Biographical Dictionaries.

resolved to have some control over establishments which, by the late treaty, would be likely to infringe on the rights of his heretic subjects. The colleges were not to be endowed: but the stipends were to be paid to the Jesuits, just as to the other masters of the people. Lainez threw up the thing at once—as not adapted to the Company—the operations of his men would be hampered by these “half-and-half” colleges—*quod in mutilis hisce dimidiatisque collegiis fieri non sit.*¹ So, after giving occasion to vast annoyance, great suffering, confusion, bloodshed, torture, rape and rapine among the poor Savoyards,—the Jesuits decamped, Possevin was not made a bishop, no colleges were founded, the *res Societatis* was at a discount—and all was quiet as before. Thanks, however, to the Jesuit-expedition for teaching Philibert a lesson, by which he profited for the good of his subjects. Would to Heaven that it were my pen’s sweet office to state the same result of all Jesuit-visitations. Nothing is so pleasant as to see good coming out of evil—particularly when the parturition promised a monster.

A more disastrous consequence to themselves attended a scheme of the Jesuits in India, during the same year, 1560. The southern coast of India, inhabited by the Paravas, or the pearl fishermen, had long been the scene of rapine and extortion by the Portuguese against the natives. King John of Portugal had received complaints on the subject, during Xavier’s apostolate. The Portuguese oppressed the pearl fishers in every possible way. They insisted upon having all the pearls sold to themselves only, and on the most disadvantageous terms for the

The Jesuits—amongst their own “converts” in India.

¹ Sacchin. lib. iv. 74. Quesnel, ii. 19.

natives. The “converts” were treated as the very worst of men—expelled from their houses by their friends, relatives, and parents, for thus losing caste; and the Portuguese aggravated their calamities by rapine, cruelty, and extortion.¹ The Jesuits had retained possession of the residences founded by Xavier. The Viceroy Constantine planned a scheme to transport the inhabitants of the pearl coast to an island opposite to Jafnapatam, in the island of Ceylon. The alleged motive was to protect them from certain pirates who annoyed and plundered them,—at least, so say the Jesuits: but as they add that Xavier himself had suggested the enterprise, this apparent anxiety to exhibit *a* motive for the transaction, does not prevent us from believing that it was not *the* object of the scheme. But Jafnapatam did not belong to Portugal. It was still a free kingdom. It was therefore necessary to invade and conquer the country before the pearl fishers could be transported. The Jesuits lent themselves to the scheme, and its preliminary wickedness. They had at their college a child of eight years, who they say had been a fugitive, expelled from his paternal kingdom by the king of Jafnapatam. This boy was to be re-established in his kingdom by the expedition—with Jesuits for his regents and prime ministers, or the Portuguese for his masters, undoubtedly. “The expedition,” says Sacchinus, “was altogether of great importance for the Christian name, of great importance for increasing the wealth of Portugal. Therefore Constantine equips a strong fleet for the purpose; and in the meantime he commands the fathers of the Company, to whose care the neophytes of the Paravas were committed, to *prepare* them for the

¹ Maff. Indic. f. 249.

transportation.”¹ It seems to me that the true motive is now declared—the expedition was of great importance for increasing the wealth of Portugal—*magni ad Lusitanas quoque augendas opes momenti expeditio erat*. In effect, the kingdom of Jafnapatam, which was the real object of the Portuguese viceroy, is, or was, one of the richest countries in the world,—abounding in most delicious fruits and aromatic gums, precious stones of all kinds—rubies, hyacinths, sapphires, emeralds, pearls, and the purest gold : in fine, all that the imagination of man pictures for his desires, has there been placed, with a profusion worthy of the Creator alone. Accordingly, it is the Ophir of Solomon,—in the interpretations of certain commentators ;² nay, men of that class have even affirmed it likely to be the Paradise of Adam—which might serve to account for the existence of Jews or something like them, amongst the pagans of India, as was duly discovered by the Jesuits, according to one of their “Curious and Edifying Letters.”³ To the Portuguese viceroy, however, Jafnapatam was Eden,—and no flaming angel withheld his entrance :—it was Ophir,—and he might

¹ “Interim Patres Societatis, quorum Commorinenses neophyti curæ commissi erant præparare eos ad trajectionem jubet.”—*Sacchin.* lib. iv. 260, 261.

² Bochart, Quesnel, &c.

³ Ceylon is almost joined to India by the island of Manaar, here destined for the Paravas, and their new fishing operations for their masters, the Portuguese. There is a ridge of sandbanks connecting that island to another, and called *Adam's bridge*, and there is a mountain in the island, called *Adam's Peak*, where he was said to have been created, and under which he is said to be buried. All these absurdities are attributed to the natives ; but it is evident that they originated with their “Christian” invaders. As early as 1520, the Portuguese had gained a footing in the island, and had fortified themselves in Colombo. The Dutch expelled them finally in 1656. The French gained a settlement subsequently ; but it now belongs to Great Britain. It is 270 miles long, by 145 broad, with an area of 24,664 square miles, with a population of only 1,127,000—not fifty inhabitants to the square mile. Talk of a surplus population in Europe with such a field open for a truly Christian and industrious colony.

reach it with his ships. First, however, he sent some barques to transport the Paravas. The pirates came down upon them on a sudden, in the midst of the embarkation. They put to sea: the enemy attacked and sunk their barques—few escaped by swimming—and among them was the Jesuit Henriquez. His brother-Jesuit Mesquita was captured by the barbarians, and retained as a hostage. Meanwhile the viceroy sailed with all his fleet against Jafnapatam, and stormed the royal city. The king had fled to the mountains: the viceroy had it all his own way: the “conquest” was made; a tribute was imposed, and he returned, with disease in his fleet, to Goa, to attend to other matters of “great importance.”¹ The young fugitive king was forgotten, if he was ever thought of; and a guard was placed over the few pearl fishers who escaped by swimming, in the island of Manaar: but few as they were they were useful to fish the waters of Jafnapatam in order “to increase the wealth of Portugal,” which seems to have been the true object of their removal: for is it not absurd to suppose that the Portuguese would transport a tribe in order to enable them to live in peace? Besides, why not more effectually defend them by a strong garrison? But, in the face of the alleged motive, we may ask, How these Paravas were really more protected from the pirates at Manaar than on their original coast? In truth, their masters wanted their services elsewhere: the season was advancing: that fishery promised to be more lucrative: the resolution was taken; and the Jesuits lent their assistance, as in duty bound, to *their* masters. They disgustingly deceived the poor fishermen, with their usual “Ad

¹ Sacchin. lib. iv. 269.

majozem," but were most sincere in "lending a hand" to increase the wealth of Portugal, and thus promote—*res Societatis*—the wealth or thing—for the word means anything and everything—of the Company. And yet, how quietly the Jesuit narrates the transaction—as if no reader would know enough of the Portuguese in India, to see through the thing—as if all would bend in admiration of the Company's *motto*, totally oblivious of their *aim*.

The various occupations of the Jesuits in any given year, month, day, at any hour of their career, if represented in miniature by their artist, Tollenarius, would be the most curious sight imaginable—a veritable "phantasmagoria of fun"—to themselves and the thoughtless or careless: but "no joke" to the victims. A case of spoliation of nuns, cajoling a rich old gentleman, frightening the Venetian senators and husbands, under punishment at Monte Pulciano, stirring up persecution in Savoy, apostles, after the manner of Judas, amongst the wretched Paravas, and a thousand other avocations pursued at the same time in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. And now we must accompany a Jesuit-expedition into Ireland and Scotland.

Panorama of
Jesuit occu-
pations.

Mary died in 1558, "to the inestimable damage of religion," says Sacchinus, on the same day that Cardinal Pole breathed his last, "which clearly showed that God was angry with Britain,"¹ says the same oracular Jesuit, alluding to the *exitialia dogmata*, the "pernicious doctrines" which were about to reascend after violent depression, like a pole hurled into the depths of the sea, to remount with

Queen Mary
—opinion
touching her
death.

¹ "Quo eodem die, ut planè videretur Britanniae Deus iratus," &c.—ii. 134.

the force of the reacting waters. Consequently, the death of Mary and the cardinal seemed, to the party depressed, a certain sign that God was becoming *pleased* with Britain ;—and it is curious to note the different opinions on the subject, the various interpretations of an event by which nothing at all was shown, except that they *were dead*, or, in the beautiful words of the ancient sufferer, “Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down : he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not.” Elizabeth mounted the throne of Bri-

Elizabeth is
civil to the
pope.

tain. To the Protestant sovereigns of Europe she declared her attachment to the reformed

faith, and her wish to cement an union amongst all its professors. To the Pope of Rome, by the “ambassador” Carne, she protested that she had determined to offer no violence to the consciences of her subjects, whatever might be their religious creed.¹ Paul IV.

Paul IV.’s
brutal reply
to the queen.

received the announcement with contempt.

He raved at the queen as though she had been a Spaniard, or he was “in his cups.”

He said “she was a bastard, and therefore had no right to the crown.” He added that he could not revoke the Bulls of his predecessors, who had invalidated Henry’s marriage with Anne Boleyn, the queen’s mother. This was little to the purpose : for he told the Jesuits what he thought of his predecessors’ Bulls and mandates. He said the queen was “very bold and insolent in daring to mount the throne without asking *his* consent : this audacity alone made her unworthy of favour :—but, however, if she would renounce her pretensions, and submit the decision to him and the Holy See, he

¹ Lingard, vi. Camden, i. 28.

would try to give her proofs of his affection ; but he could not permit any attack on the authority of Christ's vicar, who alone is authorised to regulate the rights of those who pretend to regal crowns.¹ According to the Jesuit Pallavicino, he also said, that Mary Queen of Scots claimed the crown as the nearest legitimate descendant of Henry VII.² There is nothing to wonder at in this insolent resistance to the voice of a nation. The "Church of Rome" had not as yet been "taught to forget" her unreasonable, inconsistent prerogatives. Three hundred years of *Protestant* inculcation have been required to teach her the lesson, which she has learnt at last, that all her prerogatives were founded on the superstitions of the people, and that in the present stage of this eventful planet's progress, her very existence depends on her strict neutrality in the politics of men. So delightfully has she imbibed so expedient and necessary a lesson, that she has even enthusiastically fraternised with the Republicans of France, consigning royalty, with its "rights," to the tombs of its ancestors, to which, as far as "the Church" is concerned, it may take its departure as soon as possible, the voice of the people being the voice of God, whose very *existence* was proved, in the estimation of the famous Parisian preacher, Lacordaire, *by the late Revolution!*³ A more

How the
Roman
Church has
learnt "to
forget" her
old self.

¹ Quesnel, Leti, i. 315 ; Camden, Rapin, &c. Lingard ascribes these sentiments to the suggestion of the French ambassador, vi. 253. ² Lingard, ib.

³ "In the cathedral of Notre Dame, the Abbé Lacordaire commenced his series of sermons. An immense crowd was present. The rev. gentleman first read the archbishop's letter. On the demand of the government, the archbishop gave orders to have the 'Domine, salvum fac POPULUM' henceforward sung in all the churches. The abbé, addressing the archbishop, said, 'Monseigneur, the country, by my voice, thanks you for the courageous example which you have given ; it thanks you for having known how to conciliate the *immutability*

stinging sarcasm could never have been uttered against prostrate royalty : but it rebounds on “the Church :” *History* snatches and pins it on the back of “the Church,” as a moral, an axiom, a principle for universal edification.

The pope’s insulting notification to Elizabeth produced such an effect as would have followed the same conduct

Effects of
the pope’s
insult on the
queen.

at the present day in the Church of France.

Setting aside the queen’s natural resentment on the occasion, it became evident at once to

the queen’s ministers and supporters that it was only by strengthening her “party” that she could hope for security on the throne ; and they resolved, by all means in their power, to promote Protestantism and suppress Catholicism. It was the selfish suggestion

What the
queen should
have done.

of party—a line of policy at all times, and even now as much as possible, prevalent in all “parties,” whether “religious,” political,

social, and literary. The better part to be chosen by

of the Church and the sanctity of oaths with the changes which *God* effects in the world by the hands of men.’ The preacher, as if to give proofs of this immutability, wished to continue the development of the doctrine which he had set forth so eloquently for several years. He appeared to desire to entrench himself behind divine tradition, and to preserve it from the invasion of *history* ; but the fire burst out, and the Dominican of the people, arriving at the proofs of the existence of God, cried out, ‘Prove to you God ! Were I to attempt to do so, you would have a right to call me parricide and sacrilegious. If I dared to undertake to demonstrate to you God, the gates of this cathedral would open of themselves, and show you this PEOPLE, *superb in its anger, carrying God to his altar* in the midst of respect and adoration.’ The whole auditory were so much moved, that they testified loud applause, which the sanctity of the place could not restrain. The *Débats*, alluding to the scene, says, ‘It is well : let the Church take its place like us all. Let it show itself, the people will recognise it. Let it not have any dread of the Revolution, in order that the Revolution may not be afraid of *it*. God has delivered the world to discussion : *Tradidit mundum disputationi*. Let the Church use its arms, the Word and charity, instruction and action. Let it aid itself, God will aid it.’—*Daily News*, March 1, 1848.

Elizabeth and her "party" would have been to conciliate her Catholic people by keeping her original resolution, and following it up with perfect equality to the complete exclusion of "religious" tests and declarations: but, of what avail would so *Christian*, and, therefore, most expedient, a resolve have been, whilst the pope had his monks, and his priests, and his Jesuits, to "stir" the people to dissatisfaction and rebellion? What a blessed thing for humanity, had there been either no pope, priests, monks, and Jesuits at all, or that these leaders of the multitude had merged their selfishness in the divine cause of human happiness, peace, and prosperity. Elizabeth was angered: her party was anxious: the pope and *his* party were equally angered and anxious—and we shall soon see the consequence. Meanwhile Pius IV. had succeeded to the papal throne, and sent a nuncio to Elizabeth, requesting her to send her bishops to the Council of Trent. Her reply was, that she had been treated just as if she was not a Christian: that she did not think the Council a free and holy assembly, but only a conventicle gathered at the solicitation of certain princes, for their particular interests: and, lastly, she was convinced that the intention of the Court of Rome, in sending the nuncio, was less to invite the English bishops than to inspire the Catholics of her kingdom with still more aversion than they already exhibited towards the Protestants.¹ The whole reign of Elizabeth proved that her sagacity was not at fault in this last surmise. Pius IV., perceiving by this reply the error of his predecessor's conduct towards Elizabeth, did not at once acknowledge the queen, as

But it would have been useless.

The queen's reply to Pope Pius IV.

¹ Quesnel, Leti, &c.

he ought to have done for the welfare and peace and happiness of his Catholic children, but resolved to send into Ireland one of his “roaring bellows of sedition,”—“incendiary pharisees”—to spring a mine, destined ere long to explode, with fearful damage to the wretched people, who, without the priests to blight their generous hearts, would have been the admirers of a queen who knew so well how to reward and promote gallant loyalty, when once convinced of its existence in her subjects. Long had the Jesuits panted for a settlement in

Designs of
Ignatius on
England.

Britain. Ignatius and his troop had thought much of the matter, and it was even said they made proposals to Cardinal Pole on the subject ; but *they were declined*. Their proposal was similar to the spoliation of the nuns at Rome ; for they coveted the monasteries of the Benedictines, to convert them into colleges, promising, in return, to promote *the restoration of Church property*—on the principle of setting a thief to catch a thief.¹ Perhaps the cardinal saw through the

¹ “One remarkable thing of him was, his not listening to the proposition the Jesuits made him, of bringing them into England . . . They suggested to Pole, that whereas the Queen [Mary] was restoring the goods of the Church that were in her hands, it was but to little purpose to raise up the old foundations ; for the Benedictine order was become rather a clog than a help to the Church. They therefore desired that those houses might be assigned to them, for maintaining schools and seminaries, which they should set on quickly : and they did not doubt, but, by their dealing with the consciences of those who were dying, they should soon recover the greatest part of the goods of the Church. The Jesuits were out of measure offended with him for not entertaining their proposition ; which I gather from an Italian manuscript which my most worthy friend Mr. Crawford found at Venice, when he was chaplain there to Sir Thomas Higgins, his majesty’s envoy to that republic : but how it came that this motion was laid aside I am not able to judge.”—*Burnet*, Reform. ii. 509. Bartoli states the offer by Ignatius to Pole, of the German College for the education of English youth : but says no more respecting the application to the cardinal. By his account Philip II., the husband of Queen Mary, was solicited on the subject by the Jesuit Araos, a particular favourite of the king, by Borgia and Leonora Mascareynos, a “tender mother” of the Company. “But it is true,” says

“cohort,” though he is said to have complimented its founder, and answered his letters, as well as those of Lainez.

Glad of the present opportunity, as on a former occasion, the Jesuits at once offered a man for the Irish expedition. He was an Irishman—David Woulfe by name. The pope, says the Jesuit-historian, wished to make a bishop of him, and despatch him with the title and display of an apostolic nuncio : but to credit this proud anecdote, we must give the pope credit for extreme imprudence, or exceeding ignorance of Ireland’s position at that time, respecting the Catholic cause. He would never have been admitted. Lainez thought a more inconspicuous method more applicable to “religious humility,” and “the freedom of action—*ut liberius ipse agere posset*,”—less calculated to offend the heretics, and hinder him from doing his work covertly and quietly—*quo tectius ac quietius ageret*—and the pope yielded to the Jesuit, according to Sacchinus. Invested with his powers of apostolic nuncio, without the attendant paraphernalia, this Woulfe departed, carrying with him a great quantity of expiatory chaplets and such like Roman amulets for Ireland.¹ Passing through France, he was arrested and imprisoned at Nantes, being suspected for a Lutheran.

A Jesuit sent to Ireland.

His cargo of Roman wares.

Bartoli, “for various reasons, *on which it is useless to enlarge at all*, the result did not correspond with the desire.” This *Che non relieva punto il fermarvisi intorno* is somewhat remarkable in so very diffuse a writer as the Jesuit Bartoli. I should state that Ribadeneyra was sent by Philip II. to console and assist Mary in her dropsy—*a consolare ed assistere in suo nome alla Reina Maria, inferma dell’ idropisia*.—*Dell’ Inghil.* f. 72. But even his presence in England availed nothing, adds Bartoli. After all, it *does* seem that Cardinal Pole was no patron of the Jesuits.

¹ “Bonoque piacularium sertorum, aliarumque his similium rerum numero instructus.”—*Sacchin.* iv. 46.

He was probably *disguised*, and went along swaggering : otherwise it is difficult to account for such an error, supposing he said and did nothing to excite suspicion. After four days' confinement, he reached St. Malo, embarked his luggage for Bordeaux, but preferred to walk to that place, which, says Sacchinus, was a Divine instinct,—*divinus instinctus*,—because the vessel foundered on her passage ; but this depends, perhaps, upon what he did in his journey, and, in the uncertainty, the instinct might just as well have been from Beelzebub. But surely the large collection of expiatory chaplets, Agnus Deis, and miraculous medals, *ought* to have saved the ship from foundering. After spending five months on the journey, he reached Cork ; and his description of the state of Catholic matters, in 1561, is both curious in itself and curiously worded. He states that he was engaged, amidst the snares of the

His bad
account of
the Irish
Catholics.

heretics, in consoling and inspiring confidence to the Catholics, and in regulating the affairs of the Irish Church ; that he was received with wonderful joy by the Catholics of Cork, where he spent a few days. With the greatest secrecy he got the Catholics informed of his presence and its object, and describes that he saw, throughout the space of sixty miles from Cork, crowds of men and women, with naked feet, and covered with a shirt only, coming to confess their sins and beg absolution for their incestuous marriages, more than a thousand of which he ratified by apostolic authority, in the space of a few months. He further states, that the Irish were very much entangled in this vice : but free from *heresy*, which corresponds with another Catholic's remark, that “they sin like devils, but believe like saints,” as I have elsewhere

quoted. He goes on to say :—" That *all* the priests and monks everywhere kept mistresses."¹ " The people," says he, " wonder that I don't charge them anything, and receive no presents ;" which His good example. seems a sort of reflection on the old inveterate " begging box " of Ireland, and the wages of the sanctuary.

" Man's food in Earth's bosom is rotting—
But Charity's dole is allotting—
To whom ? At God's door, the pampered once more
To plunder the Pauper is plotting."²

The Jesuit David, however, would do nothing of the kind, as he assures us, " although," he adds, " I lost all my baggage by the wreck of the French vessel from St. Malo, and I am desperately pinched—*vehementer inopiâ conflictari*." It was then he probably felt the loss of his chaplets, Agnus Deis and miraculous medals : for he *might* have sold these for the good of the apostolic treasury, and supplied his pinching want without scruple, after posting the amount to the pope's credit with *Res Societatis* at the top of the folio. David says that " he eschewed all their convivialities—declined their invitations,—*ne locum gratiæ aperiret*, lest he should put himself under any obligation," if that be the meaning of the strange expression. " I find it by no means easy to beg," he continues, " for here you can scarcely find bread in any house during the day, because the people seldom eat dinner, and at their supper eat new bread, which, for the most part, they do not bake before

¹ " Nudis pedibus, uno tantum indusio tectos, peccata confessuros, et absolutionem super incestis matrimoniis rogaturos. Plus mille conjugum paria non multis mensibus ex injustis nuptiis, auctoritate Apostolicâ legitimis ab se juncta. Hoc maximè implicatum vitio populum : cæterum ab hæresi purum esse : Clericos cænobitasque passim omnes cum mulierculis suis."—*Sacchin.* lib. v. 148.

² *Lay of Lazarus*, in " Facts and Figures from Italy," p. 17.

evening. Some of the priests, taking offence at my abstinence, make a jest of my poverty: but continuing my practice of abstinence, I abound in the fruits of holy

He is ridiculed by the priests for his abstinence.

poverty, and I joyfully endure their mockery, accounting it an increase of my gains." So far David Woulfe, Jesuit, and Apostolic Nuncio

in Ireland. His account of himself is very flattering: but by no means so to the priests and monks, and people of Ireland—excepting their orthodoxy. Meanwhile, however, temptation overpowered him: the man who went to reform, added himself to the number of the fallen. "Happy would he have been," exclaims Sacchinus, at the conclusion of his letter, "Happy, if he had continued such good beginnings! For, at length, from being left to himself, and without a check, he

He falls at last, and is expelled the Company.

became gradually remiss, more useful to others than to himself, and the man behaved in such a manner that it was necessary to expel him

from the Company.¹ Such was the second Irish expedition of the Jesuits. It scarcely corresponded with the pope's expectations. About three years after, three more Jesuits were dispatched to Ireland with an archbishop to erect colleges, and academies, having been invested with papal power to transfer ecclesiastical revenues to the purpose. Into England also a Jesuit was sent at

¹ "Felicem si talibus exordiis convenientia attexuisset. Nam demum per solitudinem et impunitatem, remissâ paulatim curâ sui, utilior multis quam sibi, itâ se homo gessit, ut segregandus ab Societate fuerit."—Lib. v. 149. This Jesuit has been confounded by Cretineau with a *Father David*, mentioned by Sacchinus, lib. viii. 98; and Dr. Oliver, in his excessively partial and meagre "Collections," says just nothing of David Woulfe, except that "he had been chaplain to James Maurice *Desmond* de Geraldinis, as I find from that nobleman's letter, dated, &c. The earl expresses himself most grateful to the Society for having admitted him to a participation of its prayers and good works at the request and recommendation of the Rev. Father William Good"—which is a curious application of the Company's merits.—*Collect.* p. 270.

the same time—an Englishman, Thomas Chinge by name —“for the good of his health,” says Sacchinus, “and for the consolation and aid of the Catholics. He is said to have made some “conversions” among the nobility, and the year after “changed his earthly country for the celestial.”¹ In 1562, Pius IV. sent the Jesuit Nicholas Gaudan to Mary Queen of Scots to console and exhort—to no purpose, as events declared.

A Jesuit in
England.

It is admitted by all parties that excessive abuses prevailed in the Scottish Church before the Reformation was introduced into Scotland; and Dr. Lingard expressly says that of all European Churches that of Scotland was amongst those which were best “prepared to receive the seed of the *new gospel*,” as he slyly calls the Reformation. The highest dignities of the Church were, with few exceptions, lavished on the illegitimate or the younger sons of the most powerful families.² Merely as such they certainly had as good a right to these dignities as to any other—provided they were competent by nature and by grace. But whatever might have been their other qualifications, they failed in the essential characteristics of honest and competent churchmen. Ignorant and immoral themselves, they cared little for the instruction or moral conduct of their inferiors.³ As everywhere else the clergy were proud. They consulted their ease. They neglected their duties without scruple: but exacted their “dues” with rigour. And the people lashed them accordingly with their tongues,⁴—which they will always do—until a rod is put into their hands, and they are taught how to use it. The new preachers appeared. They preached to willing ears respecting those doctrines

The Reformation in
Scotland.

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 93.

² Lingard, vi. 269.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

which promoted existing abuses ; and if to suit the times, to season their discourses, they bitterly inveighed against the vices of the churchmen, they only took a natural and infallible course to the favour of the neglected, despised, and oppressed people. In order to be felt, things must be made tangible ; and so when Possevinus would recommend his Company to Philibert, he inveighed, as we have read, against the vices of the monks in Savoy. In the matter of the Scottish clergy, as elsewhere, the obvious course to be followed by the churchmen was *reform*:—an awful, day-of-judgment-contemplation, doubtless : but that was the necessity upon them. What was done ? The usual thing. A “convocation” enacted “canons”—to regulate the morals of the clergy—to enforce the duty of public instruction—to repress abuses in the collection of clerical dues.¹ It was too late, as usual : and besides, the enactments of “convocations” are not the things to produce the results so desirable. Meanwhile, the preachers were not neglected. Old statutes were revived against them as teachers of heretical doctrines, and new penalties were superadded to show how the churchmen thought they could “put down” the spirit of transition.² It was a mistake as well as a crime ; and they suffered the penalty for both. Earls, barons, gentlemen, honest burgesses, and craftsmen, plighted hearts and hands in the congregation—and finally John Knox fell as a

John Knox. thunderbolt on “the Church” of Scotland. This terrible reformer was the son of obscure parents : Haddington and Gifford in East Lothian dispute the honour of his birth : the University of St. Andrews made him a Master of Arts. In his thirtieth

¹ Lingard, vi. 269.

² Ibid.

year he renounced the religion of Rome : and seven years afterwards, in 1542, he declared himself a Protestant. The heart of a Scot—firm, tenacious, immovable from its purpose—qualified him for his appointed work : the enthusiasm of a Scot—which is infinitely more thoughtful, more calculating, more to the purpose than that of any other nation—made him terrible in his denunciations of what he abominated ; and the philosophy of Aristotle, scholastic theology, civil and canon law, built in his mind that rampart of controversy, so indispensable at a time when, to confute a heretic, was only second in glory and merit to roasting him on the spits of the Inquisition. This man was condemned as a heretic for denouncing the prevalent corruptions of the churchmen : he was degraded from the priesthood—for he had been ordained—and was compelled to fly from the presence of the fierce, cruel, and vengeful Cardinal Beaton, who, it is said, employed assassins, thus to “get rid” of a determined opponent. Persecution envenomed his heart—nerved his enthusiasm—and of his mind made a deadly dart to transfix his constituted foes—who were the foes of his cause—and thus a sacred impulse, “with solemn protestation,” urged him “to attempt the extremity.” Events checked his efforts for a time. A party of Reformers, led by Norman Leslie, a personal enemy of the Cardinal, murdered Beaton in 1546, to the utter consternation of the catholic cause, which the relentless Cardinal had laboured to promote by imprisoning, banishing, hanging and drowning the heretics. Open war followed the murder. The conspirators were besieged in St. Andrew’s : French troops aided the besiegers : the place was surrendered, and amongst the prisoners was Knox. Nineteen months’

close imprisonment was his fate—he was then liberated with his health greatly impaired by the rigour he endured—biting his lips and biding his time. He came forth to “attempt the extremity.” Indefatigably he proclaimed his peculiar doctrines—intemperate in words—obstinate in mind—austere, stern, vehement—a hero fashioned by persecution and the requirements of the age, and his country. Against the exaltation of women to the government of men he bitterly inveighed. The key-note of his trumpet was undoubtedly given by the specimens he found in power—the Queen-dowager Mary of Guise, in Scotland—and Queen Mary in England. All his doctrines were more or less tinged with Calvinism. All sacrifices for sin he deemed blasphemous; all idolatry, superstition—all that was not authorised by Scripture he denounced—he was altogether opposed to episcopacy or the government of bishops. If in strictness, in austerity, Scotland’s Protestants exceed those of England, John Knox lays claim to the initiative—the solid foundation. In 1556 he went to Geneva to minister to the English congregation who appointed him their preacher.¹ In 1559 he returned to Scotland, where he remained to his death in 1572. Intrepidity, independence, elevation of mind, indefatigable activity and constancy which no disappointments could shake, eminently qualified him for the post which he occupied: and whilst he was a terror to every opponent—an uncompromising inflicter of castigation on all without exception of rank or sex, when he thought they deserved it—still,

¹ Dr. Lingard is somewhat merry on this fact, which he describes as follows: “Preferring the duty of watching over the infant church to the glory of martyrdom, he hastened back to Geneva, whence by letters he supplied the neophytes with ghostly counsel, resolving their doubts, chastising their timidity, and inflaming their zeal,” vi. 270.

in private life, he was loved and revered by his friends and domestics. Persecution and tyranny had roused him to his enterprise : throughout his life he inflicted vengeance on the principles of their supporters—and unhesitatingly directed the indignation of his followers against the oppressors of the “brethren,” whom they were “bound to defend from persecution and tyranny, be it against princes or emperors, to the uttermost of their power.”¹

At the height of this agitation the Jesuit Nicholas Gaudan wormed his way into Scotland. It was a hazardous undertaking. The Catholic religion was proscribed : its public worship was prohibited. Puritans, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians were beginning those terrible contests amongst each other, whose remembrance gives maxims to the wise and a pang to the Christian. Human passions made religion their pretence or excuse—like Rome’s infernal Inquisition—and men slaughtered each other with swords consecrated by a text perverted. Was it not in prophetic vision that it was said : “Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth ? I tell you nay ; but rather division.” Sad and gloomy was that foreknowledge to Him who piteously said : “Come to me all ye who labour and are heavily burthened.” *He* foresaw how the passions of men would abuse His coming—and turn his peace into cruel division, and call it “orthodoxy”—with fire burning and sword unsheathed.

The Jesuit
Gaudan sent
to Queen
Mary.

The Jesuit Gaudan entered Scotland disguised as a

¹ See M’Crie’s *Life of Knox*. Review of the same in *British Critic* of 1813 ; *Edinburgh Review*, xx. 1 ; *Quarterly Review*, ix. 418 ; Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland* ; Bayle, *Dict.* ; and *Penny Cyclopædia*, xiii. ; *Ling.* vi. 270.

hawker.¹ It was a clever device—since it admitted him to the homes of Scotland without reserve—into places where he might observe without being noticed—sound the nation's heart throughout the land of contention—find numberless opportunities to blow the “fire” and spread the “division” so mournfully predicted—these things might he do—and yet seem an honest pedlar withal. But how many falsehoods must not that disguise have compelled him to tell, for the sake of his mission?

Access to the Queen of Scots was most difficult to the Jesuit. Who could envy the lot of Mary? A widow in her eighteenth year,—torn from the gorgeous gaiety of the French court, where she was educated—with a dread presentiment on her mind, she had reached the throne of her ancestors, and saw herself surrounded by advisers in whom she could not confide,—whilst without, throughout the length and breadth of the land, the Scottish Reformer's trumpet roused congenial hearts and minds unto deeds and desires which neither by nature, nor by grace, could she be induced to relish or approve. The Jesuit managed to notify his arrival and mission. The queen contrived a secret interview. She dismissed her attendants and her guards to the “congregation of their brawler,” says Sacchinus, and admitted the Jesuit by a postern.² Gaudan met the Queen thrice. His steps were traced by the enemies of his cause: he was pursued: a price was set on his head: death impends—but his orders were stringent—he may not depart until his end is gained. He was to impart to the Queen the pope's advice in her predicament—as if her doom was not pronounced by

¹ Cretineau, i. p. 463.

² “Per posticum admisso, cum ea suum fratrem reliquosque custodes de industriâ summovisset ad concionem rabulæ ipsorum dimissos.”—*Lib.* vi. 107.

the character of Mary Stuart. What was the pope's advice? We are not told, excepting that she protested to the pope her determination to defend the holy faith to the utmost of her power, and was ready to endure for it every calamity.¹ But this was an act of faith that every Catholic should fervently make, without any advice. Whatever was the pope's advice, however, we are told that "the queen's *voluptuous* imprudences will not permit her to follow it in the hour of *revolutions*."²

The Jesuit left Scotland and her queen to their troubles, bearing away with him several youths of Scotland's best families to be educated in Flanders—"hostages whom he delivers to the Church, subsequently to return to their country, as Apostles of the Faith."³

An anecdote curiously illustrative of Jesuitism is told respecting this expedition. Gaudan's disguise as a hawker brought a French pedlar into trouble. They seized him for the disguised nuncio, and gave him a severe whipping, though he protested that he was no nuncio, and they would have dispatched him had he not been recognised by some acquaintance. "And then," observes Sacchinus, "he was dismissed, richer for the strokes he had received,—wares indeed not a little more useful than those which he carried *si uti novisset*,—if he had only known how to use them"—which is a rare consolation, and applicable to all the calamities which the Jesuits have directly or indirectly brought on humanity, themselves included.

Proscribed in Scotland, the Jesuits had the misfortune

¹ Sacchin. lib. vi. 108.

² "Des conseils que ses voluptueuses imprudences ne lui permettent pas de suivre à l'heure des révolutions."—*Cretineau*, i. 463.

³ Ibid.

to be under the displeasure of Philip II. in the Catholic dominions of Spain : but here the mandate was that they should not *leave* the country. An express order was sent to the Spanish Company enjoining them to keep *the laws of the land* ; forbidding them *to export money* to other kingdoms, and prohibiting them from leaving Spain, either for the purpose of giving or receiving instruction. It was also intimated to them that they had given offence at court in many ways ; and an official visitation of their houses was ordered by the king.¹ The facts on which this royal displeasure was based, are not stated by Sacchinus. We are therefore left to imagine in what ways the Company of Jesus infringed the laws of Spain, and condescended to export money from the Spanish dominions. The historian of the Jesuits dismisses the subject with a few words only, and strives to impute motives or suspicions as the causes of the calamity—among the rest, the sudden and secret departure of Borgia from Spain, the frequent remittances of money to Rome—*ex pecuniis sæpe Romam translatis*, and the king's displeasure with Lainez on account of his intimacy with his majesty's enemy, the Cardinal Ferrara, whom he accompanied into France.² This peculiar Jesuit-method of dismissing grave charges is by no means satisfactory : particularly when we find that, even in the most frivolous cases, their historians enter into tedious details, when they believe they can confute an accusation, or extenuate the fault of a member.

Whilst the court of Madrid was striving to repress the cupidity and pious avarice of the Jesuits, the latter were making determined efforts to achieve an establishment in France—a legal establishment—for there were

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. 36.

² Ibid. 37.

Jesuits in France at all times. The *Province of France* existed by fact, if not by legal fiction. We remember the first attempt, and its disgraceful consequences, on both sides of the battle. This was the *tenth*. Nine times had the indefatigable Jesuits scaled the walls, and were repulsed ; but defeat to the will of Ignatius within them, only redoubled their resolve to achieve victory at last. They had patrons at the court of France ; they were befriended by the Guises—that restless family of ambitious leaders, now more powerful and active than ever. Francis II., the husband of Mary Queen of Scots, was sleeping with his fathers, neither too good nor too bad for this world ; and Charles IX., his younger brother, had succeeded, with Catherine de' Medici as queen-regent of the kingdom : both are destined to become famous for the general massacre of the French Protestants—a religious ceremonial dedicated to St. Bartholomew. Times of trouble were at hand : the fearful “religious” wars were about to break out ; and the “lights and ramparts of the Gallican Church, the cardinals de Lorraine and Tournon,” gladly patronised the foxes to whose tails they could append flaming firebrands to “set all on fire,” as they listed. And so the Jesuits said that the cardinals thus addressed them when they craved their co-operation, “Oh how fortunate is mankind to whom the Divine Majesty has vouchsafed to give such men in these times ! Would that by His mercy every province in this kingdom might receive so great a good ! Ye who have it, keep it. Embrace this sodality of Jesus Christ—walk in their footsteps—cling to their advice. In your name, and in duty bound, we will strive so that France may not be deprived, in any way, of so great a

Tenth attempt to enter France “by law.”

gift of God.”¹ This was the opinion which the Jesuits wished mankind to entertain—the *fama Societatis*—the good name of the Company—their “credit ;” but, on the present occasion, in spite of all I have said respecting their unflinching pertinacity, perseverance, and resolution to *get* into France legally—in spite of these noble energies, I must unfortunately declare that the *res Societatis*—the purse of the Company, was a stirring motive for the present penetration. William Du Prat, we remember, left them a legacy of 120,000 livres.² The executors of the bishop’s will, seeing that the Jesuits could not make use of the donation, since their Order was not legally acknowledged in France, proposed to rescind the bequest. The grant specified the building and maintenance of a college ;³ so, as this was impossible without legal admission in France, the money, though inactive itself, was actually stirring desires in a variety of hearts. The benevolent bishop had given all his property to the poor, the monks, and the Jesuits : the latter had not forgotten their share, and the former were not, as usual, satisfied with theirs ; and coveted *la part du diable*—the Jesuit-slice as well,—the poor, the monks, the mendicant friars, even the directors of the hospitals, begged that the money might be distributed to the poor, alleging that it would be much more usefully employed than by the Jesuits ; an opinion which the latter by no means entertained. The chance

¹ “ O vos beatos, quos divina Majestas temporibus his horum virorum dono dignata est ! Utinam ejus misericordiâ fieret ut singulæ hujus regni provinciæ tanto potirentur bono ! Tenete vos, quibus concessum est. Amplexamini Sodalitatem hanc Jesu Christi, et vestigiis ejus ac monitis inhærete. Nos ex vestro nomine, et pro officio nostro dabimus operam, ut Gallia tanto Dei munere nequaquam privetur.”—*Sacchin.* lib. v. 195.

² “ Or 150,000, with nine or ten thousand livres revenue besides, an immense sum in those days.”—*Coudrette*, i. 156.

³ *Coudrette*, iv. 91.

or the danger of losing the bequest goaded the fathers to redoubled efforts for legal admission into France. On the occasions of their former disappointment, one of the motives against their admission was their abuse of their excessive "privileges," which trenched on the "liberties of the Gallican Church." The objection still remained. The parliament was inexorable. In vain the Jesuits induced their friends the Cardinals de Bourbon, Lorraine, and Tournon—even the queen-regent, to write in their favour: the parliament cared no more for these soft impeachments, than it had cared for those of Francis II. Desolated by the hideous fact, the Jesuits compromised the matter, and consented to sacrifice somewhat of their "privileges," which, as it chanced, happened to be nicely balanced by just 35,000 livres. They kicked the beam, and the money came down; but it was a hard struggle on both sides, and the presence of General Lainez was required. The fiend of controversy beckoned him to France, as well as Mammon.

In 1561, when the quarrels of "religion" began to run high, the colloquy or conference of Poissy was opened, like all the other diets on religious matters, without offering anything palatable or digestible to the barking stomachs, into which they would force hard stones, *on both sides*. Conciliation was the object of this conference. It met with great opposition from Rome: Pius IV., in his papal pride, thought it an infringement on his authority, and sent Lainez to put a stop to it,¹ or, to make bad worse, as the Jesuit's violent orthodoxy was sure to do. The Cardinal de Ferrara was also sent by his Holiness to watch over the

Lainez in
France.

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. 193; Quesnel, ii. 33; Vie de Coligny, 235; Browning, p. 28; Maimbourg, Hist. du Calvinisme, livre iii.

interests of the Holy See ;—since Catherine held to the resolution, alleging her desire to show some favour to the Calvinists and to reconcile the “ parties,” which was simply impossible. Catholic bishops and Protestant ministers were assembled. The king and his court, the princes of the blood, and the great officers of state, were there—nor was the queen-regent absent. Five cardinals, forty bishops, a vast number of doctors, were arrayed against a microscopical knot of *twelve* reformers. But Theodore Beza, and Peter Martyr, were each a host, and they failed not on that occasion. Lainez would put in a word—a very elaborate speech, the original of which, we are told, is still preserved in the archives of the Gesa at Rome. He began with saying that, “ all his constant reading had convinced him how very dangerous it was to treat, or even to listen, to the heretics. For,” said he, “ as it is written in Ecclesiasticus, ‘ Who will pity the charmer wounded by his serpent, and all who go nigh unto the beast ? ’ Those who desert the Church are called wolves in sheep’s clothing and foxes, by Scripture, so that we may know we should be greatly on our guard against them on account of their hypocrisy and deceit, which are the characteristics of the heretics of all ages.”¹ He boldly turned to the queen, and told her that “ she must understand that neither she, nor any human prince, had a right to treat of matters of the faith Every man to his trade,” said the Jesuit—“ *fabrilia fabri tractent*. This is the trade of the priests—*sacerdotum est hoc negotium*.”² Peter Martyr had said that “ the mass being an image and representation of the bloody sacrifice on the cross, Christ himself could not be pre-

The confer-
ence at
Poissy.

¹ Sacchin, lib. v. 201.

² Id. lib. v. 203.

sent, because the image of a thing must cease to be where the thing itself is present :” which is a fair specimen of the controversial acumen displayed in the discussion. Lainez was a match for him. “Suppose,” said he, “a king has won a glorious victory over the enemy ; and suppose he wishes to celebrate the event by a yearly commemoration. Three methods present themselves for the purpose. He may simply order the narrative of the exploit to be repeated. Secondly, he may have the war represented by actors. Thirdly, he may enact a part himself—may perform in person the part he took in the war. This is what takes place in the most divine and unbloody sacrifice of the mass.”¹ “Without examining whether this comparison be apposite,” observes Quesnel, “it evidently smells very much of the *colleges*, on which, it seemed, that the fancy of the general and his brethren was running, full to overflowing.” The conference was agitated beyond endurance by an exclamation of Beza. Concerning the Lord’s Supper, he cried out : “As far as the highest heaven is distant from the lowest earth, so far is the body of Christ distant from the bread and wine of the Eucharist.”²

Controversial
acumen of
Lainez.

¹ Beza bantered Lainez for this comparison, remarking that the Jesuit had made a comedy of the Sacrament, and a comedian of Jesus Christ. “Que ce Pere avait fait de ce Sacrement une comédie, et Jesus Christ un comédien.”—*Du Pin*, Hist. du Concile, i. 489.

² Melchior Adam. Vitæ German. Theol. 644 ; Bayle, i. 689 ; De la Place, Comment. lib. vi. Ann. 1561. By this authority, we learn that Beza wrote to the queen next day, assuring her that “by reason of the outcry that arose, his conclusion was not understood as he wished and had proposed.” After a long and tedious explanation, he says : “Here are the words which I pronounced, and which have given offence to the bishops. ‘If any one thereupon asks us if we make Jesus Christ absent from the Lord’s Supper, we answer no. But if we look at the distance of places (as we must do when there is a question as to his corporeal presence, and his humanity distinctly considered), we say that his body is as far from the bread and wine, as the highest heaven is

The Parliament had referred the Jesuits to the conference, on the subject of their admission. Cardinal de Tournon, their friend, presided at the sittings. To him Lainez, covered with his controversial glory, applied in behalf of his Company—presenting their bulls, statutes, and privileges—and protesting that the Jesuits would submit to every restriction and proviso deemed necessary by the Bishop of Paris, in their admission. These conditions were nevertheless very onerous—if complied with,—which was decidedly not the intention of the Jesuits. They were to take some other name than that of Jesus or Jesuits. The diocesan bishop was to have an entire jurisdiction, superintendence, and a right of correction over the said Society and their college—all malefactors and bad livers (these are the very terms of the act) he might expel, even from the Company:—the Jesuits were to undertake nothing, either in spiritual or temporal matters, to the prejudice of the bishops, curés, chapters, parishes, universities, and other religious orders—but all were held to observe the common law, without possessing any jurisdiction whatever—and, finally, the Jesuits were to renounce, previously and expressly, all the privileges granted them by their bulls, and must promise for the future neither to solicit nor obtain any others contrary

The Jesuits
admitted on
hard con-
ditions.

from the earth, considering that, as for ourselves, we are on the earth, and the sacraments also ; and as for Him, his flesh is in heaven so glorified, that his glory, as St. Augustine says, has not deprived him of a true body, but only of the infirmities of the latter.’” He then goes on affirming the “spiritual presence” of Christ in *la sainte cène*. In this old chronicler, La Place, there is a full account of the affair ; as also in the Jesuit Fleury (not the Church-historian), *Histoire du Cardinal de Tournon*. As Browning observes, this Jesuit appears unable to restrain his indignation in describing this conference. He is lavish with abuse and calumnious insinuation, p. 367. The Jesuit Maimbourg is, as usual with him, more temperate and sensible, *Hist. du Calvinisme*, livre iii.

to “these presents”—in which case the present approbation and admission would be null and void.¹ Sacchinus is struck dumb on this transaction. He ignores the whole of it—giving merely the result in these words :—“Lainez reached Paris to complete the joy of the brethren and his hosts, being the glad messenger of the Company’s admissions at the Conference of Poissy.”² Doubtless their joy was not diminished by the knowledge of the hard conditions. Lainez would easily grant a dispensation to his “most sweet children”—*dulcissimos filios*—as Sacchinus calls them :—he who had swallowed the pope’s camel of a mandate touching the choir, would certainly not strain at the gnat of a bishop. To the glorious Jesuits who feared no man, the restrictions, supervisions, and jurisdictions, were mere cobwebs which hold together until they are *broken*,—which is an easy matter to anything, flies only excepted.

Certainly the reader is surprised at this silence of the Jesuit-historian on this transaction—so elaborate and diffuse on the most trifling occurrences in the Indies and other lands unknown. One would think that the determination with which the Jesuits urged their admission into France—the grand occasion—the pregnant hopes of the fact—should have merited some little minuteness of detail :—but you have read all that Sacchinus says on the subject. The fact is, the circumstances were by no means honourable to the Company ; and secondly, it was impossible to tell Indian or Arabian tales to the French, on that subject. This

A remark.

¹ Quesnel, ii. 38 ; Felib. Hist. de Paris, livre xxi. ; Pasquier, Plaid. Mercure Jesuit, p. 321 ; Hist. Partic. des Jesuites ; Coudrette, i. 74, *et seq.*

² Sacchin. lib. v. 198.

is another warning to put us on our guard against the "facts" of the Jesuit-historians, when they are interested in the circumstances.

Nothing could exceed the glorification which General Lainez received for his achievements at the conference of Poissy. The pope was lavish with his
Triumph
and bon-mot
of Lainez.
 holy laudation: he compared Lainez to the ancient saints, because, said his Holiness, he had maintained the cause of God without caring either for the king or the princes, and had resisted the queen to her face.¹ In effect, he had deeply wounded the lady by his severe animadversion and bitter advice: he had brought tears to the eyes of humiliated royalty. Two days afterwards, the Prince de Condé observed to Lainez: "Do you know, *mon père*, that the queen is very much incensed against you, and that she shed tears?" Lainez smiled and replied: "I know Catherine de' Medici of old. She's a great actress: but, Prince, fear nothing—she won't deceive *me*."² Admirable words—brave words for a long-headed Jesuit—but scarcely to be called the pious aspirations of an ancient saint, by favour of his Holiness.

Troubles balanced this apparent glorification of General Lainez. His vicar at Rome, Salmeron, was accused at
Charges
against
Salmeron.
 Naples, where he had been working—the foulest charges were confidently uttered against him: priest, nobles, gentry, talked the scandal over, and children sang his infamy in the streets of Naples. Extorting money for absolution from a rich lady was

¹ "Gli piacque molto il zelo del Gesuita; diceva, potersi comparare a gli antichi Santi, avendo senza rispetto del Re e Prencipi sostenuta la causa di Dio, e rinfacciata la Regina in propria presenza."—*Sarpi*, ii. 113.

² Cretineau, i. 421.

the least of the charges—the greatest being, of course, *heresy*—for they even said that he had turned Lutheran! Whatever foundation there may have been for these charges—and there was probably very little—the pope, who seemed inclined to canonise Lainez, defended Salmeron, and the “infamy” was at rest.¹ The pontifical murder of Pope Paul IV.’s nephews followed apace, and in the midst of that “legal” iniquity a Jesuit figured as the minister of consolation to the unfortunate convict. I have described the scene elsewhere, as a tail-piece to the death of Paul IV.

The inexhaustible activity of the Jesuits had tempted them to try another field for their labours. The pope was anxious to compensate in “other worlds”
The Jesuits in Egypt. for the kingdoms which he had lost in Europe.

Egypt took his fancy in 1561. Two Jesuits were despatched to the Cophts, with the view of
The Cophts. reducing *their* church to that of Rome. The

Cophts are the descendants of the ancient Egyptians; but the race can boast little of the blood that flowed in the veins of the Pharaohs. Greeks, Abyssinians, and Nubians, in the earliest days of Christianity, grafted their pedigree and their religion on the children of the Nile, the worshippers of dogs, cats, onions, crocodiles, and an extraordinary fine bull, as sacred to the Egyptians as the cow is to the Hindoos. The Christianity of the Cophts is, and was at the time in question, very similar to that of Rome—only it did not acknowledge the pope of Rome:—it had its own patriarch and hierarchy; and was very comfortable on all points of faith—never giving a thought to Rome—nor would Rome have thought of this stray Christianity, had not so many of

¹ Sacchin, lib. v. 156.

her own Christians strayed from her pale, and diminished the map of her dominions. By a list of the Cophtic peculiarities in the matter of religion, you will perceive that there was very little necessity for a "mission"—except the last named consideration. They held the real presence ;—only they gave the sacrament, as of old, under both forms—but only to the men. Women received only the "body," moistened with the "blood," and it was carried to them out of the sanctuary, which they were not allowed to enter. They practised confession. They differed respecting the succession of the Holy Ghost, like the Greek Christians ; and admitted but one will, one nature, one operation, in Christ. They baptised by immersion, and practised circumcision ; marriage, confirmation, extreme unction, were not recognised as sacraments. They were not forbidden to marry after a divorce and during the life-time of the wife put away. Their patriarchs traced their line of succession up to the apostle St. *Mark*.¹

The pope sent presents with the Jesuits, to the patriarch. They were both very civilly received. The Jesuits set to work with argument ; and after a very short discussion coolly required the Cophtic patriarch to write a letter to the pope in testimony of his "obedience." This was positively refused, to the horror of the Jesuit, who was thoroughly deceived in all his expectations : in fact, it turned out that both the pope and the Jesuits had been tricked by an impostor, pretending to be an envoy from the patriarch to the pope, offering an union of the churches ! Thus the expedition failed : the Jesuits remained, making fruitless efforts towards the point at issue : but apparently to very little purpose ; and they returned

The expedi-
tion fails.

¹ Sacchin. lib. vi. 122, and others.

ingloriously—one of them being compelled to disguise himself as a merchant, and to keep his handkerchief to his face, pretending to blow his nose, in order to get safely on board a ship sailing for Europe. A dreadful storm at sea completed his horror and disgust at the expedition ; but Sacchinus consoles his memory by comparing the Jesuit to St. Paul in the same predicament.¹

A very unpleasant disappointment for the pope and the Jesuits it was : but they could console themselves with publishing to the world their success in India. Imagine the sum total of conversions for the preceding year : “In the space of one year,” says Sacchinus, “ten thousand men were baptised—*anni spatio ad decem hominum millia sacro baptismate expiarunt !*”² The Jesuits also pretend that the water of baptism, when swallowed with faith, cured various diseases—such is the piety of the people, he adds ; and then quietly tells us of a case of fever brought on two neophytes by the craft and envy of the *devil*, but cured by holy water. “Give holy water,” said the missionary, “and when they had done so, in the same moment the fever left both of them.”³ But terror still

Jesuit-con-
versions in
India.

¹ “Mercatoris sumpto habitu, cùm insuper ad obtegendam faciem, emungendæ naris applicito sudariolo necessitatem simularet, in navim . . . imponitur.”—*Sacchin. lib. vi. 149.*

² *Sacchin. lib. vi. 172.*

³ “Aquam inquit sacratam potum dare ; quod cùm fecissent eodem momento febris utrumque deseruit.”—*Sacchin. lib. vi. 174.* I was told by a Jesuit, in the novitiate at Hodder, the following curious fact, illustrative of the superstitions still prevalent in *England*. One of the fathers, on the mission in *Lancashire*, was applied to by a peasant for some holy water. The father happened to be out of the usual supply ; so he proceeded to bless some there and then, in the presence of the peasant. During the rehearsal of the prayers appointed in the ritual, the peasant exclaimed, twice or thrice, “Make it strong, Meg is *fearful ill*—make it strong !” When the holy water was given to the man, the Jesuit asked him what he wanted it for, and he replied, “to give it to the *cow* !” His cow was “fearful ill.” This is no Protestant “concoction,” observe, but a veritable fact related to me by a Jesuit in the English novitiate. Truly, this land is still

continued the grand precursor to the Jesuit-baptism. In the expedition of the Portuguese governor Henriquez against the Celebes, the Jesuit Magallianez baptised one thousand five hundred natives in a fortnight. Thus it was that—to quote the words of Sacchinus—“the salutary ray of the Christian religion penetrated into the kingdom of the Celebes.”¹ The modern missionaries

A modern method. cannot propagate the faith by gunpowder ; but they are not less inventive in devising the expedients of craft, so as to be able to contribute their thousand and ten thousand “converts” to the Annals of the Propagation. To read their trumpery letters, one must believe that all India ought to have been made Christian within the last ten years. But only fancy the cool “religious” roguery of the following resolution, penned only *five* years ago by one Dr. Besy, “Vicar-Apostolic of Xan-tong,” in China : “We have amongst our resolutions taken that of opening schools in all the villages, and of selecting in each locality a certain number of pious widows, somewhat acquainted with medicine, who, *under the pretext of administering remedies* to the dying infants of the pagans, will be able to confer on them *baptism*.”² What do you think of that for the nineteenth century ? We denounce the tricks of “trade,” but those of “religion” deserve approbation !³

benighted, and a few thousand pounds of Foreign Mission funds might be usefully spent in bettering the minds and bodies of the ignorant poor at *home*, where we can insure *duty* without requiring the usual clap-trap of missionary letters, Annals of the Propagation, &c.

¹ Sacchin. lib. vii. 122.

² Annals of the Propagation, &c., v. 328. Each of these dying infants, so numerous in *China*, will be one of the thousands “converted.”

³ This bishop shows himself scarcely honest by the following addition to his method borrowed from the Brazilian Jesuits. He says, “As to the *expenses* occasioned by this good work, I have willingly charged myself with them ; I have engaged to cover all the costs, like those poor people who have not a penny to pay their debts, and who generously offer to their friends lands and money,

In Japan the success of the Jesuits continued to surpass their expectations, if that was possible. As these new apostles always went in the rear of the Portuguese fleets, the kings of the country, desirous of promoting commerce in their dominions, and therefore anxious to attract the Europeans, vied with each other in receiving baptism, and permitted their subjects to do as they pleased in the matter. The king of Omura not only permitted the Jesuits to preach, but even gave to "the Church," that is, to the Jesuits, a maritime city, by name Vocoxiura ; and to entice the Portuguese into his kingdom, he promised them that not only their merchandise, but even that of the Japanese who should trade with them, would be exempt from all imposts for the space of six years.¹

Progress in
Japan.

It was precisely the same tune, with a few more flourishing variations, in the theme of the Brazilian mission. One Jesuit began his march by baptising one hundred and twenty idolaters in a single village ; in another, five hundred and forty-nine ; in a third, four hundred and over ; in a fourth, two hundred and forty—all these in a single year "with magnificent pomp and display, as usual, he generated to the Church by the vital waters," says the Jesuit Sacchinus.² This professional Baptist's name is Louis Grana : it were a pity to consign it to oblivion. One thousand three hundred and nine Christians made in one year by one Jesuit ! But his companion, Father

Infinite con-
versions in
Brazil.

although they are clothed in rags." And then follows the horse behind the cart. "After God my hope is in you, members of the Association. Let not my hope be disappointed ! Be my security, and your alms will people heaven with new legions of angels." I suppress the remark which this word "legions" suggests.

¹ Sacchin. lib. vii. 133 ; Quesnel, ii. 61.

² "Celebritate apparatuque, ut solebat, magnifico, vitalibus aquis Ecclesiæ genuit."—*Sacchin.* lib. vi. 197.

Antonio Rodriguez, utterly left him behind in his evangelical expeditions. On one single occasion—*unâ lustratione*—he baptised eleven hundred and fifty Christians—*Mille centum quinquaginta duæ animæ ad ecclesiam appositæ eâ lustratione sunt*. At another place he baptised one hundred and eight Indians; at a third, eight hundred and seventeen; in a fourth, one thousand and ninety. On his return, at one time, he baptised one hundred and seventy; then one hundred and thirty-eight; then one hundred and fifty-three; then two hundred and two; and, finally, three hundred and twelve; making in all (errors excepted) five thousand five hundred and thirty-nine Christians in one year.¹ The idea is frightful. But the Jesuits must have belied themselves. It is, may I not say, impossible for men of common respectful deference to the religious sentiment, thus to trample under foot the sacred rite which they believed to have made themselves brothers of Christ and heirs of salvation. Heavens! was it but to send glorious accounts of the missions that these Jesuits actually did this wickedness? Nay, let us rather believe that they were infatuated with the idea of “conversion,” and in their blindness of mind and heart, considered mere baptism its exponent and its guarantee. For, alas! what was the hideous consequence?—the consequence that makes us, even at this distance of time, gnash the teeth in unavailing indignation, or wring the hands in the bitter memory of the past, asking, Why was light given to the wretched, and life to them who were in bitterness of heart? Sacchinus tells us that consequence—in *his* infatuation he *does* tell all—

Christian
virtue in
Brazil.

¹ Sacchin. lib. vi. 197, *et seq.*

and here it is in its horrible monstrosity :—the title of the section is "The virtue of a Man of Brazil—a convert Chieftain." "By this man's persuasion and example, the Christians and Brazilian catechumens dared to join the Europeans, and fought against their own countrymen, which, before that day, had scarcely ever occurred. So that not only acquaintances fought against acquaintances, friends against friends, but even children against their parents, brothers against brothers—all ties were broken. *Thus may you recognise the salutary division which the Prince of Peace confessed He was bringing to the earth.* A piteous sight, truly, unless the defence of the holy faith made the former as worthy of praise as the barbarous cruelty of the latter was worthy of hatred, rather than commiseration."¹ Need I add a single reflection on these dreadful facts, and as dreadful a sentiment? What a disappointment—what a falling off, was that! When the Jesuits arrived in Brazil, they found the savages maltreated, persecuted by the Europeans. The "men of God" came with the men of the devil, hand in hand, apparently heart in heart.

Reflections.

They strove to conciliate the savage. He mistrusted them. What good could possibly come with such infernal evil as that of Portugal? Yet the Jesuits, by dint of perseverance, contrived to fascinate the simple people, lived with them, seemed to take their part, seemed resolved to do so for ever. Thus they befriended

¹ "Hujus et suasu et exemplo ausi sunt Christiani et catechumeni Brasili, quod antè eam diem nunquam ferè evenerat, consociati Europæis, ferre contra suos arma. Itaque non solùm noti prius amicique inter se, sed etiam filiorum quidam contra parentes, fratresque adversus fratres (ut agnosceres salubre dissidium quod Princeps Pacis profitebatur se terris inferre) alii contra alios variis conjunctos necessitudinibus dimicarunt, miserando sane spectaculo, nisi quam hos sanctæ fidei propugnatio laude, tam illos barbara crudelitas odio faceret, quam miseratione digniores."—*Sacchin.* lib. vi. 203.

the savages : thus the Jesuits at first were, in some sort, a blessing to the persecuted, oppressed, deceived Indians. And what was the result ? The Indians flocked around them, listened to them, submitted to their ceremonial aspersion—in a word, joined those who seemed to be their friends. And then, again, what was the result ? They were induced to become the enemies of their country : to take a part in its subjection to the stranger, in its utter ruin. Their Christian teachers sowed division amongst them, and thus made them an easier conquest to their enemies. They separated fathers from their children, sons from their parents, friends from friends—all who had been united by any tie whatever—and they put arms into the hands of those whom they thus depraved, to slaughter their own kindred, and thus to display their “virtue” ! A thing that had never happened before, or scarcely ever, as the Jesuits admit—*quod ante eam diem nunquam ferè evenerat*. So the savages were better men, infinitely more moral before they became “Christians,” or, rather, before they were fooled, deceived, decoyed by the Jesuits into the service of the Portuguese, under pretence of making them “heirs to salvation.” Jesuit-Christians and despicable traitors—nay, rather, miserably-fooled children of nature—perverted, debased by those who should have enlightened them unto righteousness, and cursed with the name of “Christian,” which they thought they honoured by the foulest infamy that clings to the name of man. And how they were punished by the very men for whom they turned traitors ! Very soon afterwards, in 1564, pestilence and famine reduced the poor Indians to the last extremity. The Portuguese seized the opportunity, took advantage of their wretched condition, laid

hands on some as their own property, bought others from those who had no right to sell them : the rest took flight, in a panic, back to their woods once more, leaving the Jesuits to devise plans for “converting” and “reducing” them again.¹

From the Conference of Poissy Lainez had proceeded to the Council of Trent, which resumed its sittings in 1562. Doubtless he was well remembered at his reappearance ; and he was not to be forgotten or be made inconspicuous, after achieving such deeds as imperatively gave renown amongst the men of orthodoxy—not without stirring envy, however. Already were the achievements of the Jesuits in all their “missions” blazed to the world by oral tradition, at least ; and if there were afloat on that matter some “solid falsehoods,” as Pallavicino should call them—still they made the Company famous—and the end justified the means :—all would be made to promote the exaltation of the Church and the downfall of the heretics. A dispute arose as to the place that the general should occupy in the Christian council. Lainez evidently thought himself entitled to a place above the generals of the monastic orders—for to the master of the ceremonies he announced himself as general of a *clerical* order, well knowing that etiquette placed the clergy above the monks. The result gave mortal offence to the monkish generals, and they protested against his exaltation. Lainez bowed to the pride of the monks with the prouder pride of the Jesuit, and proceeded to the rear. *Hæc minima nostra Societas*, this our least Company—did not insist on the privilege. *Esse quam videri*—to *be* the first rather than to *seem* so—is all that

Lainez at
the Council
of Trent.

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 198.

is necessary for the present. Thus, doubtless, argued the Jesuit to himself, biting his nether lip. His friends supported him, the cardinals backed his idea : but the monkish generals were in a ferment—declaring that they would instantly vacate their seats altogether should Lainez be placed above them. Lainez was requested to absent himself for a day or two, until the matter could be adjusted ;—and then he was assigned an *extraordinary* place among the *bishops*.¹ Already had the seeds of jealousy or envy been sown in the hearts of the monks against the Jesuits :—this flattering gale of favour to the Society did not blight the crop now vigorously rising with the promise of luxuriant poison. A pulpit was assigned the general of the Company of Jesus—conspicuous to all—that the prelates and doctors might lose nothing of his harangues ; for, according to the Jesuits, there was a *mira cupido*, a devouring desire—“ to hear the man himself.” His high forehead, brilliant eyes, sweet look, and smiling lips, were his captivating exordium, if we may believe the Jesuits, though Father Ignatius positively slurred his personal appearance—*no tenga persona*. His placid countenance, they continue, his pale complexion, delicate appearance, and remarkably aquiline nose, lent to his person an air of suffering which his multitudinous labours of every description, his

¹ Pallav. p. 42, t. iii. ; Sacchin. l. vi. 77, *et seq.* See also Sarpi and Courayer's note, p. 269, t. ii. ; Ital. ed. p. 287, t. ii. French trans. Some say that Lainez himself retired indignantly, by way of mortifying the council by his absence for some days. It must be remembered he was the *Pope's* legate.—See *Quesnel*, ii. 69, and his authorities. Of course the Jesuits make Lainez the very pattern of Christian humility on this occasion ; but surely all the altercation would have been obviated by his going at once to the *last* place, without telling his papal rank, as *General of Clercs*, had he been an humble man. Not that I blame the *Jesuit* ; it is only the conduct pursued by a *companion of Jesus* that seems as extraordinary as the place assigned to the *Jesuit*.

watchings, his journeys, could attest.¹ On the other hand, the presence of the Jesuit at the Council of Trent was precisely the same as elsewhere—the cause of strife or unrest, if we may believe an enemy's account. The Jesuits—for Salmeron and others were with Lainez—opposed every opinion that seemed likely to gain a majority. They could not be silenced: they encroached on the time allotted for each speaker; and boldly insisted on their “privilege” as pontifical legates. Nevertheless, the Jesuits call them the oracles of the Council of Trent:—“so that this most august assembly of holy dignitaries, which, with the most insatiate ears, drank in the golden stream of eloquence rushing from his eloquent lips like a torrent, could not believe it was a mortal who addressed them from his pulpit, but a *Seer descended from heaven, pouring forth oracles from his tripod*, speaking mysteries, pronouncing decrees . . . O Lainez, how vast and unparalleled was thy reputation throughout the universe!” Thus boast the Jesuits in their famous *Imago*.² Certain it is that Lainez and Salmeron took a conspicuous part in every discussion—not without broaching what were deemed heretical opinions concerning grace and free will; and Lainez was

Suspicion
of heresy.

accused of *Pelagianism*—one of the bugbears which from time to time, the proud, luxurious, and useless Church singled out to set people by the ears, and uphold authority. It is not worth the while to explain the nature of Pelagianism, or any other *ism*, excepting *Jesuitism*—

¹ Cretineau, i. 269.

² Ut augustissima illa sacrorum Procerum corona, quæ aureum eloquentiæ flumen, quod ex facundo ore, velut è torrente, fundebatur, avidissimis auribus imbibebat, putaret non hominem aliquem è pulpito verba proferre, sed Vatem cœlo delapsum e tripode oracula fundere, mysteria eloqui, decreta pronuntiare . . . O eximiam illam et inauditam de te, Laini, orbis universi existimationem! —*Imago*, p. 139, et 438.

which deserves the deepest inquiry in every department. It blazed forth intensely on the occasion, that celebrated occasion, when the power of the Papal power. pope and of the bishops was discussed. Who had been more hampered, harassed, tormented, than the Jesuits—by the bishops? It was therefore a question peculiarly their own. Now we remember on how many occasions the papal Bulls and privileges exhibited by the Jesuits in their own defence, were positively slighted and made nothing of, by various bishops—in France particularly—and even in Spain, where it was certainly a curious demonstration. But it was a vital necessity for the pope to have his unlimited authority declared in a council of all Christendom—as represented—at a time when so many thousands and millions had utterly cast away the authority of Rome. All doctrine, all discipline, depended upon the decision. The monarchy—the absolutism of Christendom was to be ratified or annulled. See you not herein that antagonism to the democratic opinions beginning to be prevalent? A time when, as always, the misdeeds of governors do not escape punishment, merely by their shrewdness, and craft, and power: but, on the contrary, only until the governed are enlightened to a knowledge of their rights, and the God of justice decrees a stunning retribution.

At the time in question there were three dominant “religious” sections in the Roman Church—the monks—the Jesuits—the bishops. The monks were essentially democratic in their institutions. Their generals, the rectors of convents, their provincials, were appointed by election. Thus each province, each convent had, so to speak, a set of interests peculiar to itself: in wealth and comfort overflowing—where the Lutherans made no

incursion—these monks slept their lives away without caring much for aught but the continuance of their blessings. On the other hand, the Jesuits were strictly, essentially, monarchical. The masses amongst them had no voice whatever—except to denounce what they could “spy” amiss in a brother as debased as themselves. Every house, every province, however distant, was under the eye of the general, elected by an aristocracy, and aided, if necessary, by the same. The general was as absolute in his Company as the pope *wished* to be in his Church. Now, the men who proposed to practise obedience to such authority among themselves were just the teachers required to enable the pope to enjoy that high eminence, by their inculcations, over the nations:—and the Jesuits certainly, on every occasion, strove to propagate the theory of pontifical absoluteness. It is this reasoning which may induce us to think that the wily Paul III. had a larger hand in the Institute of Ignatius than the Jesuits will admit. I suspect that “the finger of God” which they say he discovered in the affair, was only his *own*, seen through the microscope of conceit. The bishops, lastly, were so many popes in their sees,—differing more or less in their powers and “privileges”—but, very little obnoxious to papal revision, and not vitally dependent on papal existence. Hence the pope could not depend upon them: they were even anxious to achieve more freedom than they enjoyed, in an age when all were striving to be free—to the detriment of the papal autocrat—and of the Jesuits whom he caressed, defended, and supported, in order to be himself supported in return.¹

The three
dominant
sections in
the Church.

¹ The reader will find some very apposite matter on this subject in *Botta*, *Storia d'Italia*, ii. 25, *et seq.*

Lainez dashed into the battle with desperate energy—as though his very salvation was at stake.¹ There was a fixed, determined purpose in the opinion which he was resolved to deliver. He spoke *last*, as usual with the man who is determined to measure his argument with that of every opponent—and to triumph in debate by demolishing all that is arrayed against him—having dissected all, and vigorously created the new portent of whelming confutation or defence. The question was, whether the power of bishops was immediately from God. The French bishops, as a matter of course, with their high *Gallican* notions, held the proposition as almost an article of faith :—but Lainez knew that *he* need not try to deprecate *their* indignation. The Spanish bishops, also,—even King Philip II. upheld the independent doctrine :—but the king had averted his royal countenance from the Company, and there *seemed* no probability of his turning it again. The *universal* monarchy was the Jesuit's fortified port, his embattled rampart : there he planted his spear and flung defiance to all the world beside. “I expect neither a red hat from the pope, nor a green one from Philip”—was his significant exordium, and then he advanced, affirming boldly the paramount authority of the pope over all bishops—deducing the authority of bishops from the pope, and not directly from heaven, as was contended.² The effect of these opinions, and many others touching the immunities of the popedom, was a sensation. According to the Jesuit, the Court of Rome had a right to reform all the churches of Chris-

Lainez fights
for papal
prerogative.

¹ Sarpi, viii. 15.

² Cretineau, i. 274. “Lainius inde exorsus : nec à Pontifice se rubrum, nec viridem à Philippo galerum expectare.”—*Sacchin.* lib. vi. 85.

tendom—but none had a right to reform the pope's particular church at Rome, simply because "the disciple is not above the master, nor the slave above his lord." Hence it was evident that the Court of Rome was not to be obnoxious to the reforming energies of the Christian council. He said that those who pretended that the Church ought to be reduced to the same footing on which she stood at the time of the apostles, did not distinguish the difference of times, and what was befitting according to their mutation—alluding of course to the wealth of the Church, which he called God's providence and bounty, and termed it impertinent to say that God gave her riches without permitting her to use them—as if it is incontestably evident that God *did* give her the riches she enjoyed. The Jesuit flung Right Divine over every corner of the pope's prerogatives: tithes, annates, from the people—similar dues from the clergy, all were appointed by Right Divine—which was quite true if he equivocated, meaning the Divine right of Mammon, whose blessings to the popedom turned curses to Christendom.¹ Of this Jesuit's speech on this glorious occasion, the Cardinal de Lorraine said: "It is the finest shot fired in favour of the popes;" and the legates in full council exclaimed: "The Holy See owes much to *one* man for all he has done in *one* day."² This was a bold stroke of the Jesuit—even if he was only the exponent of the pope's party in the council. He exposed himself to the aggravated enmity of the bishops, and consequently endangered the extension of the Society: but the pope was his friend, and indebted to him on that occasion, as well as on many others, and we shall soon

¹ Sarpi, viii. 15. Quesnel enters largely into the whole discussion, ii. 71, *et seq.*

² Cretineau, i. 274.

see that the Jesuits were made, by papal privilege, independent of bishops in their rights and pride. Great was the Jesuit's glory—an enviable lot in the midst of the congregation where vanity, pride, selfishness, sycophancy, and bigotry swayed the destinies of faith, raised the phantoms of hope, and always pointed to the golden objects of their charity. Lainez had all he could desire. No honour was denied him by the pope's party. Others must stand to speak : he, in his conspicuous pulpit, might sit on his tripod, *divinoque afflante spiritu*¹—and under the inspirations aforesaid, deliver his oracles. He was the arbiter of the council's time—spoke as long as he liked—was listened to with applause ; whilst his antagonists, however concise, were always too prolix for his “ party ”—the legates.² Vain was the indignation of the Spanish and French bishops, who were convinced of the collusion whereof the Jesuit was the mouthpiece. His insolence and presumption cut deep into their pride and vanity. Lainez resolved to keep the wound open, and printed his speech, which he distributed. It was one of the copies, doubtless, which, reaching the Cardinal de Lorraine, suggested his exclamation so boastfully recorded by the Jesuits,—for the cardinal was absent from that session. In a subsequent address, when the episcopal party was strengthened by the arrival of the cardinal in debate, Lainez moderated his opinions on papal authority ; but in the Roman College of the Company, public theses were maintained that year, at the opening of the classes, and papal authority was the all-absorbing proposition : his absolute dominion over all

Honours
awarded to
Lainez.

Doings and
sayings at
the Roman
College.

¹ A phrase applied by Sacchinus to Lainez, vi. 82.

² Sarpi, ut antea.

—councils included—his infallibility in matters of faith and morality—every prerogative was mooted, and, as a matter of course, triumphantly established on the Scriptures, on the fathers, and —on *reason*—these being the three everlasting highways of controversial freebooters.¹ The secret of this papal exaltation was the simple fact that the cry for reform in the Roman Court was universal in Catholic Christendom, and the abuses—the pecuniary abuses which the Jesuits defended—were amongst the most prominent. Pius IV. was as Pius IV. and reform. intractable in the matter as any of his predecessors. To the reformation of abuses in the universal Church he was happy to consent : but as for those of his Roman department and his Roman Court—these were his own affair. Deformities there might be in that queen of all Churches—but she pleased him notwithstanding—like the mistress of the ancient Roman, with her nose so unsightly, and yet, for some reason or other, most dear to her lord. Pius IV. was of opinion that if they wished so ardently for reform, they had only to begin with the courts of the other Christian princes, which, he thought, required it quite as much as his own, and the opinion is worth knowing to the reader of this history—but as for himself, as his authority was superior to that of the council, and as inferiors had no right to reform their superiors, he would, if he thought proper, labour to reform whatever he found amiss in his Church and his court. Thus the successor of a poor fisherman raised himself to an equality with the kings of the earth, in pomp and magnificence, and pretended to justify by their example that luxury and extravagance which his title as Peter's successor, and

¹ Quesnel, ii. 84.

Christ's vicar on earth, should alone have induced him to condemn.¹

The Jesuits—the self-appointed reformers of sinners—the evangelising Jesuits—the apostles in Portugal—the thaumaturgs in the East and in the West—the last hope of the sinking Church—the pure, the *honest* Jesuits lent their tough consciences to the pope—for a consideration. What Pius IV. said at Rome was repeated in Germany, to the Emperor Ferdinand, one of the princes who desired and ardently demanded the reform of the Roman Court. Representations were being expedited, ringing that awful peal to the holy city. The Jesuit Canisius was sent to expostulate with the Emperor. We have the Jesuit-speech in Sacchinus. After an appropriate exordium he proceeds to observe :—

“It does not become your majesty to deal severely with the vicar of Christ, a pope most devoted to you. You may offend him, and check his inclination to proceed with the reform. As he has promised to apply himself to the business, you must not mistrust the promises of the Supreme Bishop and of such a man : but you ought rather to cheer and assist him in his endeavours. Besides, can there be a doubt that this book [of representations] will fall into the hands of learned men, and will create new altercations and disturbances, and will rather aggravate than alleviate the matter in the council, which is, in *other respects*, sufficiently afflicted—*satis alioqui afflictam*. According as the dispositions and desires of each party are constituted, these will snatch at motives for new contention. Who will then hinder the minds and tongues of men

¹ Quesnel, ii. 78.

from thinking and saying that the emperor is afflicted with the prevalent epidemic of those who oppose the Church, who continually declaim against the depravity of morals, who prefer to impose laws rather than receive them ; and whilst they pretend not to see their own great vices, speak against ecclesiastical rulers without measure and modesty. Moreover, there is danger lest this anxiety, the result of immoderate zeal, should not only be unsuccessful and useless, but may rather exasperate to a worse degree the diseased minds in the Roman Court, which you wish to cure—as soon as they perceive that they and the morals of their court are so roughly handled, that laws are prescribed to cardinals, that the pope is submitted to the council for correction, the authority of the legates diminished ;—demanding the formation of private cliques and the separation of the debates into conventicles of the different nations there represented :¹ rendering the secretary of the council an object of suspicion—in fine, furnishing arms to turbulent men for raising greater outcries and disturbance in the council. Therefore, again and again, there is every reason to fear, lest, whilst we wish to heal the diseases of Rome or Trent, we produce worse distempers, especially in this, as it were, rage of the nations rushing into impious schism. You see what

¹ This was what the Court of Rome and the pope's legates dreaded above all, and so we see in the council all the intrigues and cabals set on foot to obviate that result. The reason why they so strongly opposed it was, that almost all the bishops of Christendom, if we except the Italians, loudly called for a reform, with which the pope was unwilling that they should meddle, and which would have been carried in the council if the decisions had been made according to the nations there represented. But the legates refusing their consent to the regulation, the Italian bishops whom Pius IV. had sent to Trent in great numbers, prevailed over that "article," as well as some others, by their multitude. Hence the Protestants said that the council was the council of the pope, and not that of the Church.—See *Quesnel*, ii. 90, *et seq.*

times we have fallen on :—how low the majesty of the most holy Apostolic See is reduced :—how in every direction they rush to secession, to contumacy, to defection, from the obedience due to the supreme pastor and vicar of Christ. If good men do not oppose this disastrous onslaught, as it were, of a hellish torrent—*tartarei torrentis*—if those who possess power and supreme authority do not bring their wealth to the rescue, but rather if they seem to incline in the same direction [as the “hellish torrent,”] then it is all over with religion—*actum de religione*—all over with probity—all over with peace—all over with the empire itself.¹ In these circumstances, the easiest and most advantageous measures you can adopt are those which will result from your firm and intimate connection with the pope himself. Such is the present uncertain, doubtful, troubled state of affairs, that we can scarcely hope for the continuance of the council ! When matters are inclined to move in a certain direction I would not drive them headlong. We must, therefore, consider the circumstances of the time. To conclude, if we desire the good of the Church, if we wish the welfare of the empire, O most excellent prince, and if to that end it be of use to listen to the opinions of all wise men who are exempt from national prejudices, free from private considerations,—not one will be found

¹ Quesnel, a Roman Catholic, appends a note to this passage in his version of the Jesuit's speech to Ferdinand :—“One must be as blind and as unreasonable as a Jesuit in his sentiments, to proscribe, as an hostile assault, the right which General Councils have always had to reform abuses, even those of the Roman Church. We cannot say as much of what Canisius here says, that it was all over with faith and religion if men wished to reform the excessive abuses of the Roman Court. On the contrary, every one knows that it was those very abuses which chiefly occasioned the two last heresies, which, says the orthodox Quesnel, have effectually annihilated the faith and the Catholic religion in two thirds of Europe. See Father Faber's *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, which serves as a continuation to that of M. l'Abbé Fleuri.”—Ib. 93.

who will not exclaim that we are not to care so much for the conduct of strangers at Rome, as for that of our own folks here at Rome—whom we behold daily more and more rolling in a headlong course of all impiety.”¹

This wisest of men—a Daniel—a Solomon-Jesuit, was nothing less than a spy at the German court, to report to his general, Lainez, all the emperor's measures and resolves on the subject of papal reformation.² His speech, which is a very curious specimen of Jesuitism, had no effect on the emperor: he continued to press for reform; whereupon Lainez, in another session, advanced with the pope's legates, as determined as ever in upholding his Holiness in his bad eminence and inveterate perversity. His address gave great offence, and the Spanish and French bishops very naturally, if not truly, pronounced him a sycophant retained by the court of Rome, very worthy of the title which Lainez as bold as ever. was already generally given to the Jesuit, styling him the advocate and apologist of all that is bad.³ No man can quarrel with the Jesuit, however, for upholding the pope in his prerogatives, however liable to corruption, since the most distinctive operations of the Jesuits depended upon certain “privileges”—hereinafter to be given—which were the immediate application of these prerogatives. But if we permit Lainez to be thus far consistent, a curious document, inconsiderately A curious document brought to light. given to their historian, by the Jesuits, for publication, compels us to think that somewhat less energy in fighting for the pope and his immunity from reform would have been advisable. The

¹ Sacchin. lib. vii. 46.

² Sarpi, vii. 65.

³ Quesnel, v. Pallavicino also mentions their suspicions, lib. xxi. c. vi. 15.

Jesuit Pallavicino admits that Lainez contended for leaving the reformation of the pope to the pope himself—that he placed the pope above all councils—and that he lashed the opponents of that doctrine without reserve—*nec sibi temperavit quin illos perstringeret qui eam negabant*.¹ Sarpi further reproduces those remarkable words, which Pallavicino, who strives to demolish all that Sarpi advances, does not deny to have been uttered by Lainez: “Many have attributed matters to abuses: but when these matters are well examined and sifted to the bottom, they will be found either necessary, or at least useful.”² The analysis of the whole speech which I have given, leaves no doubt on the mind that Lainez was no advocate for papal reform. Now, in the face of this, we find a letter written by him to the Prince de Condé—the leader of the Huguenots—only a very few months before, when in France, at the Conference of Poissy. It must be premised, as we are assured by the Jesuits, that Lainez was very intimate with Condé, with whom he frequently corresponded. The letter replies to the difficulties which Condé had raised against the reunion of the two Churches; and proceeds to say:—

“The principal cause of this separation is the conduct of the ecclesiastics who, to begin with the supreme head [the pope] and the prelates, down to the inferior members of the clergy, are in great need of *reform* as to *morals* and the *exercise of their functions*. Their *bad example* has produced so many scandals that their doctrine has become an object of contempt as well as their life.”

Nothing can be truer than this sentiment: but at the same time, nothing can be more opposed to the

¹ Pallav. ib.

² Ubi suprâ.

sentiments of the Jesuit as expressed in the council, in the capacity of papal legate. The letter concludes with another sentiment, and with a curious substitute for the writer's signature :

“In order to see this union so much desired, I would sacrifice a hundred lives, if I had as many to offer. Thus, from the misfortune of these divisions, the Divine bounty would bring forth, besides union, the blessing of the reform of the Church in her *Head* and her members.

“Your Excellency's very humble servant, in Jesus Christ.—The person who spoke to your Excellency in the King of Navarre's chamber, and whom you commanded to address you in writing what he had spoken.”¹

This substitute for his name is not so remarkable as the opinion that the Divine bounty might bring forth the blessing of reform in the Catholic Church, and all the hierarchy, by means of the Reformation or the Protestant movement — which is an opinion I have advanced, doubtless not without hurting the pride of Catholics. On the other hand, the conclusion to be drawn from these contradictory sentiments of Lainez on different occasions, is, that *policy* was the rule of his conduct ; and he soon gave another instance of his calculation. To serve the pope was a general rule of prudence, but policy made exceptions to it in particulars, as appeared on the occasion when the topic of *Clandestine Marriage* was discussed in the council.

By clandestine marriage is meant a secret union contracted without any other formality than the mutual consent of the parties. The Court of Rome declared its illegality, insisting on priestly intervention. We

¹ Cretineau-Joly, i. 423.

would give that Court full credit for moral motives in this prohibition if we never heard or read of costly “dispensations” and other celestial devices for rendering the passions lucrative, if they could not be made moral. If interest—and the topic of marriage involved very many profitable investments—induced the Court of Rome to cry against clandestine marriage, the Courts of France and Spain supported the pope on this occasion, in order to counteract the misalliances of their royal families and nobility. Lainez opposed the pope and the bishops;¹ and he was perhaps wiser in his generation than either the pope or the bishops in that determination. The love of woman had often made wise men mad, and robbed the Church of an important son or two. The royal, the noble, the rich penitent, might and would again hesitate between priestly power and love’s fierce clamour. In fact, there was much to be said on both sides of the question—as in all matters where private interests get hold of a religious question. Can we imagine that the Jesuits were ignorant of the tendencies of the age? The licentiousness which characterised the preceding century was not so threatening to “religious” influence as that of the sixteenth,—since the latter was accompanied by a powerful reaction against all ecclesiastical authority. Now, when the mountain would not go to Mohammed, he wisely said, “Then let us go to the mountain”—so the precarious tenure of priestly power depended on its levelling, and smoothing, and beflowering the path of orthodoxy. Hence this matter of love-marriage was important in a licentious and rebellious generation, and very likely to give some trouble to the *confessors* of

Lainez
touching
clandestine
marriage.

¹ Cretineau, i. 272.

kings, and nobles, and the great in general, who, it is evident, were the principal objects of the contemplated enactment. The “masses”—the poor—the “people” could always be managed by a burly priest or Jesuit: but kings, and nobles, the rich and the great, must always be managed by a gentle consideration directed to “the rank of the individual,” and so forth—which is at least very ridiculous in the ministers of Him who is “no respecter of persons.” On the other hand, if “clandestine marriage” were legalised, it was impossible to say how many abuses might not be safely tolerated under the wings of expedience. Nevertheless Lainez espoused the thing, and generated argument accordingly. He alleged the marriages of the patriarchal times. He pointed to the abuses of parental authority in prohibiting marriage, and thus promoting licentiousness in their children, whilst clandestine marriages were declared illegal. He went further: he asserted that the regulation would not be adopted by heretics, and might be rejected even in many Catholic countries. Hence, he concluded, rather significantly, that “an infinite number of *adulteries*, and a deplorable confusion in the order of inheritance, would result.”

“It seems to me very doubtful,” he exclaimed, “that the Church can enact such a law, and this for a reason which others have declared, namely, that the Church shall never have the power to alter the Divine right, nor prohibit what the Gospel allows. Marriage is offered as a remedy against incontinence to those who cannot otherwise live chastely:—therefore, as all are bound to take the means to insure their salvation, the Church has not the power to hinder marriage, either as far as a certain age, or in fixing certain solemn formalities.”

In conclusion, he admitted the dangers of “clandestine marriages:” but he thought them more than overbalanced by “the return to the principles of the Gospel, and consequently to *social equality*.”¹ If these were his real sentiments Lainez would have been a philosopher, had he not been a Jesuit. It was decided against him, though he again printed and dispersed his argument. The “formalities” were enjoined: but the decree began with the following words: “Although it is not to be doubted that clandestine marriages, with the free consent of the contracting parties, are ratified and true marriages—as long as the Holy Church has not annulled them,” &c.² Thus Lainez lost the point, but gained the handle:—clandestine marriages were declared ratified and true marriages. It must however be admitted that his arguments were more specious than valid. Marriage without attested formalities implying a bond of union, must presuppose more constancy in the human heart than has hitherto become proverbial.³

¹ Cretineau, i. 270, *et seq.*

² “Tametsi dubitandum non est, clandestina matrimonia, libero contrahentium consensu facta, rata et vera esse matrimonia, quamdiu Ecclesia ea irrita non fecit,” &c.—*Dec. de Ref. Matrim.* Sess. xxiv. c. 1. It was in the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiv. c. 1) that the publication of banns for three Sundays was first enjoined—and it is one of the least objectionable of the many things of Rome which the Church of England has retained—to the grief and regret of all who sigh for the purification of Christianity, in doctrine and in discipline.

³ The proposed intention was good, and similar to that of his brother-Jesuit, Salmeron, who permitted a still more objectionable abuse: “Quær. 2. An permitti possint *meretrices*? Prima sententia *probabilis* affirmat, eamque tenent *Salm.* de 6. præcept. c. 2. punct. 4. n. 84, cum *S. Thom. Cov: Trull. Led.*, &c.: huicque clarè adhæret *S. Aug.* l. 2 de ord. c. 4. Ratio, quia demptis meretricibus, *pejora peccata evenirent* (!) præter prævaricationem mulierum honestarum (!) Ideò, *S. Aug.* loc. c. ait: *Aufer meretrices de rebus humanis, turbaveris omnia libidinibus.* (!) On the other hand, Liguori quotes a contrary opinion of other divines, but concludes with a favourable opinion, distinguishing as to the *locality*: “Licet in *vastis urbibus* meretrices permitti possint, nullo

The sagacity of General Lainez was not less conspicuous in the last, or twenty-fifth, session of the famous Council. Amongst the various abuses which had crept into the Church, was monkish ^{His sagacity.} vagrancy, mendicity, or beggary. Under pretence of their pious intentions, the mendicant or vagrant monks were a pest to communities, and a shame to religion, from the practices to which they were compelled, as they argued, to resort for their livelihood. The pope willingly consented to reform every abuse in which he was not himself interested : so a reforming remedy was applied to this monkish ulcer, by permitting most of the Orders to possess funded property. The permission gave general satisfaction to the monks themselves ; for, though they had been always individually poor and collectively rich, it was absolutely necessary to grant the present statute, at a time when the monks were become so despicable, on account of their clamorous poverty, and the practices to which their alleged necessities compelled them to resort. Zamora, the General of the Minor Observantines, begged, in the name of St. Francis, whose rule his people followed, to be excluded from the privilege : the General of the Capuchins followed his example : the exemption was duly granted. Why did the General of the Jesuits—those men of transcendental poverty—not put in a claim in the name of Father Ignatius ? He did : nor could he consistently do otherwise on so trying an occasion ; and his demand was granted. But behold, next day, he requested to have his Company excluded from the exemption, saying,

tamen modo in aliis locis permittendæ sint.—*Ligorio*, Theol. Moral. t. iii. lib. 4 ; Tract. 4. 434, p. 165 ; Ed. Mechl. 1845. Such is the Catholic theory, which evidently would suppress the *Society for the Suppression of Vice*. But such a decision published in the year of our Lord 1845 !

doubtless, with one of his boldest faces, that “the Company was indeed inclined always to practise mendicity in the houses of the professed : but, she did not care to have that *honour* in the eyes of men, and that it was enough to have the merit before God—a merit which would be greater in proportion to the fact of being able to avail herself of the Council’s permission, and yet never proceeding to the practice.¹ His object was to be free to use the permission or not, according to circumstances ; ² and, like a true Jesuit, he expressed his mind in that neat metaphorical fashion, which never leaves the Almighty or His glory exempt from the assaults of Jesuit-profanation.

It was in the same session that the Company was called a “pious Institute.” That little word “pious” has been amplified into mountains of approbation, turned ^{The “pious Institute.”} and twisted into every possible sort of laudation by the Jesuits. Nobody will gainsay them the fullest use of the word, when it is known that, in the same sentence, the Council of Trent—with all its admitted cabals and contentions, not to say browbeating, sycophancy, and corruption—is called the *holy* synod—*sancta synodus*. The simple fact is, that having made some regulations respecting the novices of the monks, the decree proceeds to say, that, “By these regulations, however, the holy Synod does not intend to innovate or prohibit the clerical Order of the Company of Jesus, to serve the Lord and his Church according to their pious Institute, approved by the Holy See.”³

¹ Sarpi, viii. 72.

² Id. ib.

³ “Per hæc tamen sancta Synodus non intendit aliquid innovare, aut prohibere, quin religio Clericorum Societatis Jesu juxta pium eorum Institutum, à sanctâ Sede Apostolicâ approbatum, Domino et ejus Ecclesiæ inservire possint.”
—*Sess. xxv. c. 16.*

It was only quoting the words of Paul III., when he accepted the Order.¹ Such is the frivolous circumstance on which the Jesuits have rung incessant and interminably varied changes in all their apologies for the Company of Jesus ; but it is excusable in comparison to the fact, that they have not scrupled to appeal to the so-called, self-boasting “enemies of the Christian religion” for what they think an approbation. More anon on the subject. But surely the Jesuits, who boast of this little word pronounced in the “holy Synod” of Trent, could never have read or considered the extravagant epithets applied to the members of the Council on the day of its closing—the day of “Acclamations.”

It is one of the most ridiculous documents that Rome has bequeathed to a posterity which will at last shake off all the cobwebs she has heaped upon humanity. I will endeavour to give you an idea of that glorious day. Eighteen long years had the Babel-Council battled with confusion worse confounded. Infatuated—all the world knows how—there were calls for mortar, and bricks were presented—calls for water, and sand was given—calls for a plummet, and a brickbat was brought. And then they “gave it up.” As nothing *could* be done, all *was* done. Every old dogma remained exactly as it was before—only with additional anathemas. Certain reforms respecting the discipline of the hierarchy were certainly “decreed ;” but—and the fact must be well impressed on our minds—these would never have changed the old order of things, had it not been for the world’s enlightenment, mainly promoted by the Protestant movement. Similar regulations had been made in other “holy

The glorious
Acclamations
at the end of
the Council.

¹ “In eorum pio vivendi proposito.”—*Confirm. Instit. Lit. Apost.*

Synods," or Councils, many a time before, and to what purpose, during the undisputed reign of proud Orthodoxy, bastioned by her bristling prerogative ? ¹ I repeat it—if the Roman Catholic be now gratified with the pleasant sight of a more moral clergy, he has to thank Luther's "Heresy" for this most desirable consummation, and he may grant the fact without sacrificing his orthodoxy, though his religious pride may be somewhat humbled.

And now for the "acclamations of the fathers at the end of the Council—*acclamationes patrum in fine Concilii*"—such being the title of the chapter. It was the 4th of December, 1563. A voice exclaimed, "Most reverend fathers, depart in peace." All cried, "Amen." And then followed the "acclamations." It was a succession of *toasts*, without wine to moisten their parched tongues withal. The Cardinal de Lorraine proposed the toasts. I shall give them literally. "To the *most blessed* Pope Pius our lord, pontiff of the Holy Universal Church, many years and eternal memory." The fathers responded : "O Lord God, preserve for many years, and a very long time, the most Holy Father for thy Church." The "Peace of the Lord, eternal glory, and

¹ The general reader will find enough to convince him of this, in a French work entitled, "Dictionnaire portatif des Conciles," Paris, 1764. The book should be translated into English for the enlightenment of our Catholics, who really know little of these matters. The work was compiled by the *catholic Alletz*—author of many useful and religious publications. By a reference to that work, p. 701, it will be found that one of the commonest infamous crimes during the time of Popes Julius, Alexander VI., Leo X., and the rest, was declared punishable by total sequestration from the rest of the Christians during the life of the sinner, after receiving one hundred strokes of a whip, being shaved and banished for ever, without receiving the sacrament excepting on his death-bed. See *Council of Toledo*, in the year of our Lord 693—eight or nine hundred years before. I have before alluded to the decisions of councils in the matter of discipline—Book I.

felicity in the light of the saints," were cried to Paul III. and Julius III., who began the Council. "To the memory of Charles V., and of the *most serene* kings who promoted the Council." Benediction was shouted, waking the unnatural echo, "Amen, Amen." "To the *most serene* Emperor Ferdinand, always august, *orthodox* and peaceful, and to all our kings, republics, and princes, many years." And the holy synod shouted: "Preserve, O Lord, the *pious* and Christian emperor: O celestial Emperor—*Imperator cælestis*—guard the kings of the earth, the preservers of the right faith." To the legates of the apostolic see, and the presidents of the Council, "Many thanks with many years," were imprecated: to the cardinals and "*illustrious*" orators, the same: to the "*most holy*" bishops, "life and a happy return to their sees": to the heralds of truth, "perpetual memory": to the orthodox Senate, "Many years." "The most holy Council of Trent, may we confess her faith, may we always observe her decrees." And they lifted up their voices, crying "May we always confess—may we always observe." Confess what? Observe what? I do not know, for it is not stated, and cannot possibly be imagined—*semper confiteamur, semper servemus*. "Thus we all believe; all feel alike; all subscribe, consenting and embracing. This is the faith of Saint Peter and the Apostles: this is the faith of the fathers: this is the faith of the orthodox." "So we believe, so we feel, so we subscribe," was the roar of the confessors in congregation. "Adhering to these decrees, may we be made worthy of the mercies and grace of the first, great, and supreme priest, Jesus Christ of God, with the intercession of our inviolate mistress, the holy God-bearer, and of all the saints." "So be it, so be it; Amen, Amen,"

—and at last, there was one final toast. And here let me ask, have you not often with horror imagined the dreadful sound of that howl, when the cruel Jews cried, “Crucify him—Crucify him?” Then you may fancy the sound, when the cardinal cried: “Anathema to all *Heretics*”—and their parched tongues gasped the final acclamation: “Anathema, anathema!”¹ I trust that we have found more than mere *epithets* to interest us in this astonishing affair. It is, however, most curious for the Jesuits (with their “pious” picking) to observe, that

¹ At the conclusion of the acclamations, “the legates and presidents enjoined all the fathers, *under penalty of excommunication*, to subscribe with their own hands, before they left Trent, the decrees of the Council, or to approve them by a public instrument.” There were 255 in all, composed of 4 pontifical legates, 2 cardinals, 3 patriarchs, 25 archbishops, 168 bishops, 7 abbots, procurators lawfully absent 39, generals of orders 7. For the whole of the affair, see *Il Sacro Concilio di Trento* (Latin and Italian), Venezia, 1822, p. 389, *et seq.*, end of 25th Session. The pope made a batch of nineteen cardinals, all selected from his partisans in the Council, and he admitted and confirmed the decrees by a bull dated 26th January, 1564. They were immediately published and received in the churches of Italy as at Rome. Spain and Poland also received them: but the Germans and the Protestant princes would not hear of the Council, and stuck to the Confession of Augsburg. The Emperor Ferdinand, who had such fine epithets in the acclamations, the Duke of Bavaria, and the other Catholic princes demanded communion in both kinds for the laity, and the marriage of priests. In France the *doctrine* of the Council was received “*because it was the ancient doctrine of the Church of Rome*,” says Dupin, a doctor of the Sorbonne. But the decrees about discipline, which are not according to the common-law, were never received there, either by the king’s or the clergy’s authority, whatever efforts were made to get them received and published in that country.—*Dupin, Hist. of the Church*, iv., p. 116. Such was the very doubtful *settlement* of the faith by the universal Council of the Christian Church—the most holy synod of Trent. Its immediate effect was redoubled rancour against the “heretics,” giving all the selfish feelings fierce motives for persecution, ending in the horrible “religious” wars of France. One thing may be said in favour of the Council; it enriched the city of Trent, by the concourse of so many wealthy and sumptuous bishops, ambassadors, and others; and made it “illustrious” on the map of Northern Italy—illustrious to the devotee, the fanatic, and the calculating Pharisee; but to the right-minded, to him who thinks as he reads, to the *Christian*, that city is a monument of human infatuation, a true comedy of “Much Ado about Nothing.”

the names least provided with laudatory adjectives, are those of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints.

From Trent to Rome the progress of General Lainez was a triumph, minutely described by his historians, as the result of his exploits in France and in the Council, his sustained credit, the celestial mission for which he was appointed, and the

Lainez triumphs from Trent to Rome.

immense authority of his fewest words—*dicta ejus vel pauca vim ingentem habebant*—but, unfortunately, in the midst of his triumph, his mule took fright, dashed him to the ground, and ran over him. He escaped unhurt, which deliverance all confidently ascribed, says Sacchinus, to the special patronage of God and the God-bearer Mary—*singulari Dei ac Deiparæ patrocínio haud dubie factum*. One of his first official acts was the appointment of Francis Borgia to the post of assistant, in the place of another, who was discharged; and one of the first hopes and expectations of the Jesuits was the quiet possession of a seminary in contemplation by the pope; but the result was not as agreeable as the hours of hope. Admitting the grasping spirit of the Jesuits, we must still take into account the selfish passions of their opponents: immense opposition was made to the proposed appointment, by the Roman clergy.¹

Opposition to the Jesuits at Rome.

The Roman professors, like all other professors, hated all monopoly, excepting their own; and they accordingly sent to the pope their protestation, showing—"that it was neither for the honour nor the interest of the Church to confide the education of young ecclesiastics to *strangers*; mothers who nurse their own children are most esteemed on that account, and the children are better brought up. Rome was not deficient

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 4, 10.

of men of very great merit, more capable than the Jesuits to fashion young clergymen in science and piety. The instruction which these Jesuits give to their pupils is not solid ; and they will carry off the best pupils of the seminary to turn them into Jesuits ; all they want is to add revenues to their colleges—in fine, the rights of the clergy of Rome are threatened.”¹

About the same time, Father Ribera and all the Jesuits of the colleges of Milan were attainted of foul crimes and misdemeanours. This Ribera
Foul charges. was father-confessor to Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan—a famous saint in the calendar. His uncle, Pope Pius IV., made him an archbishop in his twenty-second year, which was, perhaps, rather worse than Paul III.’s creation of a cardinal out of a boy, not yet out of his teens. However, both were papal relatives, in the time of papal abuses ; and Charles was
Charles Borromeo. intended for a saint ; and thus the fact must be passed over, if it cannot be excused.² The young archbishop suddenly assumed a life of great rigidity, and,

¹ Cretineau, i. 470 ; Sacchin. lib. viii. 13.

² Charles Borromeo is represented as the model of churchmen in general, and bishops in particular. “All the favour he enjoyed, and all the papal authority he could command, all the enticements of the pleasures which surrounded him, and which might have corrupted men of a more advanced age, only served to give this young cardinal the occasion for practising virtue and edifying the Church. In effect, he was so exempt from luxury, avarice, and all kinds of intemperance, that he always passed for a model of innocence, modesty, and religion. As a bishop, he gloriously acquitted himself of all the duties of a holy shepherd. He animated the faithful by the holiness of his life, and the admirable purity with which he daily applied himself to the practices of piety. He restored the ruined churches ; he built new ones. He corrected irregularities ; he abolished the profane customs which the corruption of the age had introduced, and which the negligence of the bishops had encouraged. He laboured to reduce the morals of the time to the rules of primitive discipline ; and by his vigilance and example, he reformed the great city of Milan, which was before so debauched, so little used to the practices of religion, and so abandoned to luxury, lust, and all sorts of vices.”—*Gratiani, La Vie de Commendon*, t. ii. 9.

with most commendable zeal, looked after the conduct of his clergymen, the monks, and professors of his see. All this was attributed by the Jesuits to the unction of Father Ribera, and the “Spiritual Exercises” of Loyola, and the harassments consequent to the reforms set on foot by the zealous archbishop, suggested, according to the Jesuits, one of the foulest charges imaginable against the confessor Ribera.¹ Frankly, there is some probability that the charge was false. It is easy to concoct charges and to utter imputations against any man, and the world is but too eager to spread and believe them : in the present case, as in many others, relating to other men, the accusation *proves* nothing excepting the *aspersion* on the reputation of the Jesuits. I need not say that the hostile histories of the Jesuits broadly and boldly assert the charges, as though they were facts,² though Charles Borromeo himself is stated to have recognised Ribera’s innocence, and continued to honour him with his confidence.³ Meanwhile the fate of this Jesuit tended to bewilder the judgment which men might form in his favour. Lainez sent him off to *the foreign missions*. The proximate occasion was as follows :—The excessive fervour of his nephew, Charles Borromeo, induced Pope Pius IV. to believe other rumours, which affirmed that the Jesuits were striving to get him into the Society. The pope had large ecclesiastical views respecting his nephew, and this announcement roused him from the indifference in which the fouler charges against the Jesuits had left his Holiness. He frowned on the aspiring Society. Lainez was ill. The brethren resorted to propitiation. They scourged themselves five

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 13 ; Joly, i. 465.

² Quesnel, ii.

³ Guissano, a contemporary ; De Vità S. Car. Borrom., and others.

times, fasted three times ; the priests offered ten masses, and the laity prayed ten times, whilst all joined together in the evenings to rehearse the litany.¹ Scarcely recovered, he proceeded to the Vatican, and protested that he had always advised the archbishop to *moderate* his fervour. Still the pope feared Ribera's influence on his penitent's mind. Lainez cut the Gordian knot at once, promising to despatch Ribera to the Indies.²

Lainez cuts
the Gordian
knot.

The pope was satisfied, for his Holiness had insisted on that condition—*enixe contenderat* ;³—but it still remains uncertain whether the restoration of papal favour was owing to the proof of innocence on both heads of accusation respecting the Jesuits, or to the ready compromise tendered by Lainez, who sacrificed the Jesuit-confessor. Ribera's reputation was likely to suffer by the sort of banishment, as the world would deem the Jesuit's disappearance ; but the good of the Society was paramount to the interests of the member : every Jesuit surrenders his reputation, as well as his life, into the hands of his superior. He is “indifferent” to his reputation. We might pause here to inquire how such indifference reacts on his conscience—making it as soft wax that takes every form, as an old man's stick used at pleasure, as a corpse that has no voluntary motion, according to the letter of the Jesuit-law—the dying words of Ignatius. Self-respect is the ministering angel of God vouchsafed to console us for every loss, excepting that of reputation. Succeed in depriving a man of that, and make him *feel* the fact, and you will have made him desperate in heart, though imperative circumstances may compel him to be and

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 15.

² Cretineau, ii. 468.

³ Sacchin. lib. viii. 28.

remain in your hands, as plastic wax, an old man's stick, melting carrion. The imputations cast on the Jesuit-colleges and Ribera were not satisfactorily shaken off. They remain positively affirmed, and have an air of probability, enhanced by the consideration forced upon us, as often as we think of Roman celibacy, and test it with the principles of physiology. And certain facts, too, which we may have heard positively asserted—not by strangers, not by Protestants,—with names and places well known—such facts throw a hideous discredit on Roman celibacy. *Vigilum canum tristes excubiæ*—the drowsy watch-dogs of the “rules” would nod at last : *nec munierant satis*—they fell asleep. To throw this consideration into the question bewilders the case still more ; and we would willingly cling to the defence put forth by the Jesuits in the motive they allege for Ribera's exile, namely, to appease the pope in the matter of his nephew ; and we would even believe that the pope honestly and heartily exonerated them from the charges, by his subsequent conduct towards them ; but, to explain this, it were sufficient to consider that he had no reason to believe *all* the Jesuits guilty ; and, moreover, that a general and thorough reformation in this matter would have been a labour similar to that of Hercules in the stables of Augeas. The Jesuits were useful to him and his cause. With all their faults he loved them still. If it may be said that the charges were not proved, it may also be added that the defence and concomitants were suspicious. There we will leave the matter. As a further proof of the pope's good-will and gratitude for finding himself so obsequiously humoured, the Roman Seminary was imperatively put into the hands of the Jesuits, in

Reflections.

spite of the Roman professors.¹ Thus, by the dexterous management of Lainez in humouring the pope by sacrificing his subject, Ribera, the tables were turned against the enemies of the Company, and the very charge which was thought surest to penetrate the worldly-minded pope, to the injury of the Jesuits, actually opened the speediest outlet to their deliverance, with honour and profit in addition. On the other hand, there can be no doubt nor wonder that the simple, uninitiated ones amongst the Jesuits, trembling in the growl of Vatican thunder, ascribed the thing to their scourgings, fastings, masses, prayers, and litanies—their “propitiations to God—*placamina Dei*,”—just as the “cures” by vegetable pill, jalap, rhubarb, and calomel, are the trophies of quacks and the faculty.

So complete was the return of the pope’s fostering angel to the Company, that he announced his intention to pay the Jesuit-houses a visit on the following day, in order to assure General Lainez of his regards in particular, and the whole Company of his esteem in general. Surrounded by six cardinals and a mob of minor dignitaries, the holy father commenced his atoning progress. In the church of the professed he said prayers—*post fusas preces*, then their house he explored, which he praised for its cleanliness and appropriate convenience; and then he went to the college, to be struck with wonder and admiration. On entering the great hall of the students he beheld the walls all covered on one side, with written poems. “What means that?” asked the pope.

How the
tables were
turned.

The pope’s
visit to the
Roman
College.

Grand
reception.

¹ “Deliberatum pontifici omnino esse Seminarii procuracionem Patribus demandare.”—*Sacchin.* lib. viii. 16.

“Extemporaneous poems on the advent of your Holiness, in the sixteen languages spoken by our pupils from as many different nations,” said the Jesuits. The pope expressed his gratification, and the Jesuits proceeded with their adulation. A seat—call it a throne—was placed for his Holiness, and one of their orators addressed him in the name of his “cohort,” “in that oration which was published, and gave universal satisfaction,” says Sacchinus. At the conclusion of the oration, there issued forth a procession of select boys, in appropriate costumes emblematical of the various languages, arts, and sciences professed in the college; and besides their emblems and decorations, each had on his breast a label inscribed with the name of the art or science, and its professor, whose representative he was—a considerate precaution in the Jesuits, for the enlightenment of the ignorant in the mystery of the emblems—*rudioribus loquebatur*—which was scarcely a compliment to the pope and his company, though probably very necessary—for the emblems were devised to typify Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Rhetoric, Dialectics, Mathematics, Arithmetic, Geometry, *Music*, Astronomy, Moral Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, and lastly, the king and queen of all, Theology—*princeps ac regina omnium, Theologia*. Each typical boy advanced to the pope, and dedicated his respective science to the pontiff, in a short and graceful poem. So pleased was the pope with this last contrivance, that he said he would do much more for the College and for the Company than he had hitherto done—*dicens multo se plura pro Collegio, proque Societate, quam fecisset adhuc facturum*. Thence Pope Pius IV. proceeded round the inclosures of the college, expressing a particular wish to see the house which had belonged

to Paul IV., his implacable foeman : it is to be hoped that he said nothing bitter, after murdering his nephews, and contented himself with a *De Profundis*, in the bottomless gulf of his vengeance. Thence the pope advanced to the German College of the Jesuits : but as it was getting late, he declined hearing the verses they had manufactured for his reception—*versus ad excipendum paratos* : but he took a glance at the company awaiting his arrival, and the supper-table all laid and ready ; and after the usual questions and answers in similar visitations, respecting the organisation and professional course of the college, the holy father went home. Sacchinus says the pope's domestics reported that the Company entirely engrossed his attention on that day—which we need not be told—that he greatly praised her institutions and labours, and severely lashed those who had blamed her so unjustly”—and the reader must decide whether the pope had seen enough on that occasion, to justify his judgment. Sacchinus,

Explanation. wiser than the uninitiated simple ones before alluded to, propounds the true cause of the pope's pacification, as he calls it—namely, the banishment of Ribera to the Indian mission—the Constitutional sink of offensive Jesuits ;¹ and the pope was solicitous, or solicited, to make amends for that admitted disgrace of the Jesuit, by *the visit of patronage*, as Ribera's departure might cast a slur on the innocence of the other fathers.²

¹ Const. p. ii., c. ii., D. “ Quando non tam propter rationem vel magnitudinem peccati, quàm ob removendum offendiculum, quod aliis præbuit, demitti aliquem esset ; si alioqui aptus esset, expendet prudentia superioris an expediat facultatem ei dare, ut ad locum alium Societatis valde remotum, eandem non egrediendo, proficiscatur.” This has been quoted before in its proper place when treating of the Constitutions.

² “ Hæc igitur profectio pontificem solitudine liberatum haud mediocriter

So that whilst this writer lays it down that God and St. Ignatius were the authors of the pope's pacification—he fails not wisely to exhibit the human means employed for the purpose—means which he may be permitted to couple with the name of Ignatius, but which scarcely comport with that of God—though the Jesuit quotes Scripture for the fact, saying : “since the ways of the Lord are ways of pleasantness, I will add the means whereby I think the result was accomplished.”¹ All things considered, the whole affair of pacification was a sort of “dust in the eyes” of the public in behalf of a set of men whom the public believed somewhat infamous, but who were useful servants to the pope notwithstanding, and therefore to be accredited by a display of pontifical approbation.

We must not forget the display, however. It is remarkable in many respects. Already it appears that the Jesuits were directing their wits to the contrivance of *emblematic illustrations* which, by the middle of the next century, they exhibited in perfection. If Alciati gave them the idea, their own inventive faculties carried it out with admirable spirit and effect. Nothing can exceed the aptness, point, and in many cases, most exquisite delicacy of some of their emblems, in their illustrated works. Their *Imago*, of which specimens have been given in this history, is not the best of their productions in this department, though decidedly the most extravagant, simply because the vanity of the Company made her

Reflections
on the display.

affecit, ut Patrum cæterorum animadvertere innocentiam posset.” — *Sacchin.* lib. viii. 19.

¹ “Equidem placati pontificis, tametsi auctorem Deum, ac B. Ignatium haud pro dubio pono, quia tamen molles viæ Domini sunt, quibus id effectum adminiculis putem, adjiciam, &c.” — *Id.* ib.

members mad on the subject of their “exploits.”¹ We must also remark, in this display, the admirable method of their adulation. How difficult but splendid in its power in the art of flattery! Even to administer merited praise requires some tact to make it pleasant: but to flatter grossly, and yet to seem honest withal, requires some training, considerable taste, great judgment—and a deep knowledge of the human heart, resulting from mental dissection, which few have the patience to pursue, either with regard to others or themselves—and a knowledge of both is indispensable. On this occasion the *modus operandi* of the Jesuits is a model of flattery, delicate in its grossness. And in that dedication of all the arts and sciences to the pope, they reached the climax of flattery—and perhaps the fact reminds you of that metaphorical description I gave of Loyola’s interview with Pope Paul III., about to establish the Company.² Lastly, I would draw attention to the rapidity of Jesuit-execution on that occasion:—all was planned and achieved in *one* day and night³—and yet they could devise and exhibit fourteen emblematic costumes to represent the shape of that which had no shape “distinguishable in member, joint, or limb”—in concrete solidifying abstract “vain wisdom all and false philosophy”—and lastly composing sixteen poems in sixteen languages, singing flattery to the pope—flattery whose greatest fulsomeness was but “a pleasing sorcery” to charm the sense and captivate the soul.⁴

¹ The subject will be further developed when the literature of the Jesuits is discussed.

² See vol. I. p. 139.

³ “Eo die subortis impedimentis non venit, insequenti autem,” &c.—*Sacchin.* ib. 16.

⁴ What a contrast is the Jesuit method of complimentary exhibitions to our modern affairs of the kind! In these the *dejeûner à la fourchette*, or the dinner

This “memorable day” of the Company of Jesus might “charm pain for awhile, or anguish, and excite fallacious hope ;”—its glorious sun was destined however to suffer horrible eclipse. It was by no means clear to the men at Rome that the papal visit to the Jesuits was not a *visitation*—one of those uncomfortable things which ought always to be notified in advance, as is considerately done amongst those who stand on prerogatives. But if the pope really intended a searching visitation, the Jesuits took right good care to keep him intent on the most pleasing sounds imaginable, and after tiring him out with their sights and flattery, sent him home with the right impression on his *heart*. Let it therefore be *pro benignitatis argumento*, a token of his love and its “considerations.” The pope seemed pacified with the Jesuits : these retained the Roman seminary—and yet, after his visit or visitation, the pope did not think proper to justify the Jesuits respecting the late most hideous accusations. Out of the smothered cinders the conflagration burst forth anew and with tenfold energy. The foes of the Jesuits advanced with ruinous assault. A *bishop* led them on. This looks imposing : but whatever impression that majestic name should make, the Jesuits totally erase it by handing down to posterity, that this Catholic bishop was a bastard, a blinkard—one of those who had no See—of cracked reputation—a disappointed man.¹ Here

Another
enemy.

with many “covers,” is the only remarkable invention to please the sense and captivate the soul. It is curious here to note three different methods by three different sections of humanity, each “paying respect” by three different sections of the human body, the head, the stomach, and the feet : thus the savage Indians dance honour to the brave ; the Jesuits administer the same in emblems and in verse ; the English eat and drink it amain—which smacks somewhat of the savage.

¹ “Ducem se Episcopus præbuit ex iis, quibus nulla diocæsis est, spurius ipse

you have a specimen of the sort of “characters” the Jesuits give their opponents—even in their own church and religion, thus indirectly dishonoured ; — but all through a natural instinct, similar to that which would make a drowning man grip and drag down to the depths below, even the mother that bore him.

This feature is one of the most objectionable in the Jesuits. Their rancorous, crushing, revengeful hatred has been frightful. Whoever once offended them was visited in a thousand ways during life, and their books exhibit the same fury lashing the dead. This is scarcely consistent with the conduct expected from the Companions of Jesus ; but it reconciles us to the disappointing fact, that Jesuitism was only a section of humanity, with all the passions, as usual, directed into different channels, but not a whit the better for that, since, with the best possible intentions proposed in theory, they imitated the worst possible men in practice. And they managed this bishop, so unfortunate in his birth, his person, and fortunes. He seems to have set to work in right good earnest notwithstanding. He wrote two small books—*libellos, utrumque famosum et impudentium refertum probrorum*—both of them touching “the immediate jewel of their souls,” as Iago would say, and full of “uncleanly apprehensions.” He distributed copies amongst the cardinals in Rome, and far and wide

ortu, et luscus, nec optimâ famâ Venetiis diu versatus ; quem proprius etiam urebat dolor, quòd cùm operâ ejus Cardinalis Sabellus ad visendas uteretur Urbis ecclesias jam posthabito illo,” &c.—*Sacchin.* ib. 20. As a specimen of Jesuit-variations on the same theme, take Bartoli’s account of the bishop. “Per dignità Vescovo, ma *in partibus* ; per nascimento, basti dirne che di nobil famiglia, ma non curato da’ suoi piu che se loro non si attenesse, atteso la non legittima conditione del nascere : preso dal Cardinale Savelli in aiuto a riformar le parochie riuscitogli *piu bisognoso di reformation ne’ costumi* egli, che quegli cui riformava.”—*Dell’ Ital.* f. 489.

out of Italy, amongst the noble and the great ; but, according to Sacchinus, he proved *too much*, and this seems to have ruined his case. “As a certain poet tells,” observes Sacchinus, “of a certain woman, who gave a cup of poison to her hated husband, and, not content with that, mixed up another, but which turned out to be the antidote and cure of the former,—so this bishop, carried away by a too great desire to do harm, and heaping up many things so enormous and contrary to fact, the whole mass destroyed itself, and one poison was made harmless by the other,”¹—a comparison which shows that the Jesuits consider moderate charges poisons, and immoderate ones antidotes of the former. The philosophic Bayle said the same thing, and I have had very often to regret, in ploughing through the materials of this history, that neither the Jesuits nor their opponents have profited by the warning. But the bishop, with the utmost confidence, said he had written nothing which he was not prepared to prove before a just tribunal, with proper witnesses. A cardinal, the *patron of their Seminary*, was appointed to investigate the case between the Jesuits and the bishop. The latter brought his witnesses : they were ex-students of the German College, and ex-Jesuits. That was enough to damage the case ; their testimony was pronounced defective on that account at once, and their statements were rejected.² These are the simple facts of the case and the judgment. The alleged proofs of great private disorders were unsatisfactory, by an error in form, such as any lawyer would turn to account. The accused were acquitted. The accuser was imprisoned. And he would have been more severely dealt

The blindness of their enemies.

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 21.

² Sacchin. lib. viii. 27 ; Bartoli, f. 492.

with, had the Jesuits not interceded for him, as they tell us. This is all that history has to do with. To say that it was easy and prudent, by way of precaution, to expel those who might give evidence against them, would, perhaps, be an injustice to the Jesuits, similar to their own usual disparagement of those who have ventured to question their method, unfold their real motives, and dissect their exploits.¹ As an additional favour, the pope, who from the first had promised to be their patron and protector,² wrote a letter to the Emperor Maximilian, Ferdinand's successor, and other princes, exonerating the Jesuits, as they assure us, from the late aspersions, which, it seems, had penetrated into Germany, to the great scandal of the Catholics and contempt of the heretics.³ It was certainly kind of his Holiness fully to reward so perfect a concurrence as he found in the general of his cohort; and it would have been scarcely fair to continue to acquiesce in the outrages visited on "those whom, in a *moment of weakness*," we are actually told by the Jesuit historian, "he abandoned to the studied injustice of the enemies of religion."⁴

Their public agitations interfered but little with the educational arrangements of the Jesuits. Having men for all work, their public athletes wrestled with the foe whilst their patient teachers were engaged in a scarcely less arduous undertaking—the battle with ignorance in the young and the old. To

Academic
display.

¹ Quesnel says: "In fine, by dint of falsehood and friends they succeeded so well in imposing on their judges, that they got out of the terrible scrape, which was a source of such grief to St. Charles Borromeo, that he left the court of Rome and retired to his archbishopric of Milan."—T. ii. 129, referring to an Italian Life of the Saint.

² Sacchin. lib. viii. 7.

³ Sacchinus gives two letters as the originals on the subject.

⁴ "Ceux que, dans un moment de foiblesse, il a abandonnés aux injustices calculées des ennemis de la Religion."—Cretineau, p. 468.

stimulate the love of praise or approbation so natural to all, the Jesuits now began to distribute rewards of merit to their pupils. The first distribution, in 1564, was attended with great pomp and circumstance, and graced by a concourse of Rome's nobles and cardinals. A tragedy was performed; and at its conclusion a table covered with the prizes was deposited:—the prizes were select works of the ancients, elegantly and sumptuously printed and bound. When the judges who had awarded the prizes were seated, a boy, acting as herald, proclaimed *quod bonum ac felix eveniret*,—a good and happy issue to the proceedings. He then announced the names of the successful competitors. As each was called he proceeded to the stage, where he was received by two other boys: one gave him the prize, repeating a distich of congratulation, the other bestowing in like manner upon him a solemn axiom against vain glory. Most of the prizes were won by the students of the German College, which was in a flourishing condition. There were two hundred and fifteen students from various nations—many of them nobles, and intimately acquainted with the cardinals and nobility of Rome. Few were Germans, but there were two Turks, and one Armenian, of excellent wit; all of whom were maintained by the pope, and civilised by the Jesuits.¹ At the same time the Jesuits were engaged on a translation of the Council of Trent into Arabic.

The Council
of Trent in
Arabic.

They erected an Arabic press, at the pope's expense, and the Jesuit of the unfortunate expedition to Egypt, John Baptist Elia, executed the translation. It is difficult to discover the object of this extraordinary translation, unless the Jesuits were

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 38, *et seq.*

preparing for another expedition. The measure proposed and carried by Canisius was more immediately to the purpose. To prevent Protestants from furtively sharing the advantages of Catholic education, he proposed a religious test or formula of faith which the candidates for academic honours and professorships should accept—and the pope sanctioned and ratified the measure;¹ a measure excusable, and consistent with the aims, means, and ends of the “religious” people in those times:—but perhaps—in the absence of more sensible, religious, consistent and honourable motives—the very fact of this test being a Jesuit-invention should induce our modern “religious” people to abolish the oath of mockery devised to defend Protestantism, which needs no human defence but perfect freedom of discussion, and real, determined efforts on the part of God’s paid servants, to promote education among the people. In addition to their test we shall constantly find that the Jesuits made every effort to educate the people: if the same could be said of our moderns, who cling most fiercely to their test, they would at least merit some small portion of the praise which is due to the Jesuits—for *earning* their bread in their vocation.

And now, as the vegetable world, what time the spring sets free the sap, bursts the seeds, puts forth her opening buds, soon with leafy energies to usurp the plains, the valleys, and the mountain-sides—thus the Company of Jesus, under the first suns of apparent favour, rushed into life, and showed how she had been gathering sap, during her seeming winter-sleep in France, the Gallic province of the Company, as yet only in her Catalogue. In the year

The Jesuits
at Paris.

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 41.

1564 the Jesuits entered into the lists with the University of Paris. Following up the very peculiar "reception" which had been granted them at the Conference of Poissy, provided with the wealth of Claremont, the strong veterans of the Company resolved boldly to throw themselves upon Paris and astonish the natives. In the *rue St. Jaques* they bought a huge mansion called the *Cour de Langres*, and turned it into a college. Over the portals they clapped an inscription, *Collegium Societatis nominis Jesu, the College of the Company of the name of Jesus*. They had been expressly forbidden to use their former title; they had agreed to the terms; and now "by this subtlety they hoped to neutralise the opposition of the parliament and the university: but they were disappointed."¹ A reflection on this trick is forced from their modern historian.² He admits that "such an assault of quirks was as little worthy of the great bodies which sustained it, as of the religious Company against which it was directed. It is not with wretched arms that those who govern others should be attacked or defended. The parliament and the university began the war, the Jesuits followed their example. They were placed on the ground of *chicanery*, they showed themselves as clever as they exhibited themselves eloquent in the church and professorships"—an extraordinary combination of qualities, decidedly. As the new teachers of Paris, the Company resolved to be represented by men whose science even her rivals were the first to admire. Father Maldonat, the most celebrated interpreter of the Scriptures, expounded Aristotle's philosophy; and

Maldonat,
Vanegas,
Alciati.

¹ Cretineau, i. 437; Goubault, i. 50; Pasquier, 26; Quesnel, ii. 129; Cou-drette, i. 100.

² Cretineau, ib.

Michael Vanegas delivered commentaries on the “Emblems” of Andrew Alciati,—a famous professor of the sixteenth century, and one of the first, after the revival of letters, who embellished the topics which his predecessors had sunk in barbarous obscurity. In his “Emblems” he treats of morality: but according to a Jesuit¹ he endeavours to wreath roses round about the bristling thorns;—a pleasant epicurean treat;—specious—fantastic—but comfortable as a robe of gauze in the warm days of summer.² No better subject could possibly be selected for the times when men, being strong partisans of “religion,” honestly desired that their passions should be allowed for, and indulged as much as possible. Orthodox in faith, they wished to be consistent in morals: it was necessary, in order to ensure orthodoxy, that morality should be easy and comfortable. We shall soon see that the Jesuits perfectly knew the world they had to deal with in this ticklish matter.

Other Jesuits, equally renowned, taught the Greek and Latin languages. They collected an audience of several thousands at their lectures.³

Emboldened by success, the Jesuits resolved “to penetrate into the enemy’s camp:” they induced Julien de Saint-Germain, Rector of the University of Paris, in 1562, to grant them letters of induction, and all the privileges enjoyed by the members of the university. In 1564, diplomas in hand, the Jesuits began their academical course, announcing

They
attempt the
university.

¹ Feller, Biog. univ. *Alciat*.

² He died in 1550 (at Pavia) of plethora, says Feller, from excess, like a true philosopher—*Epicuri de grege porcus*. Minoë, however, represents him in a somewhat different light. Feller is always a suspicious authority.

³ Cretineau, i. 439.

themselves as forming an “integral part” of the university. This manœuvre gave the crowning stroke.¹

The new rector, Marchand, convoked the faculties in a fright. Privilege was astounded—

Dreadful
commotion.

for never since created man
Met such embodied force, as, named with these,
Could merit more than that small infantry
Warr'd on by cranes.

A consultation ensued. Were the Jesuits to be admitted into the bosom of the university? The proposition was scouted indignantly—negatived unanimously—away with the Jesuits!

But the Jesuits would not go. They persisted and were cited to an interrogatory.

“Who are you?” they were asked.

“*Tales quales*, such as the parliament called us,” they replied. And in vain the rector Prévot put the question in four different forms:² the Jesuits were a match for

¹ Cretineau, i. 439.

² *Rector*. Are you Seculars, or Regulars, or Monks?

Jesuits. We are in France such as the Parliament called us, namely, the Company of the College which is called of Claremont.

R. Are you in fact Monks or Seculars?

J. The assembly has no right to ask us that question.

R. Are you really Regular Monks, or Seculars?

J. We have already several times answered. We are such as the Parliament called us; we are not bound to answer.

R. You give no reply as to your name, and you say you do not choose to answer as to the fact. The decree

Rector. Estisne Seculares an Regulares, an Monachi?

Jesuitæ. Sumus in Galliâ *tales quales* nos nominavit Suprema Curia, nempe Societas Collegii quod Claramontense appellatur.

R. An reipsâ estis Monachi, an Seculares?

J. Non est præsentis congregationis illud a nobis exposcere.

R. Estisne reverâ Monachi, Regulares, an Seculares?

J. Jam pluries respondimus: *Sumus tales quales nos nominat Curia*, neque tenemur respondere.

R. De nomine nullum responsum; de re dicitis non velle respondere. Senatus-consultum prohibuit ne utamini

him : they were not to be caught by the trap. If they acknowledged themselves of the *Society of Jesus*, they would render themselves obnoxious to the Act of Parliament forbidding them to use the title. So they abdicated the sacred name for the nonce, and assumed *tales quales*—ridiculous enough—but in its most awful moments it is hard to avoid laughing at Jesuitism.

Then the famous “law-suit” ensued between the Jesuits and the University of Paris, destined to be rendered remarkable in the history of human nature for every extravagance and malignity on both sides of the disgraceful contest. Stephen Pasquier with his “Catechism of the Jesuits,” and the Jesuits with their “Chace of the fox Pasquin,” will soon tear charity to pieces, and make a scare-crow of her remnants, to defend their ripening fruits. We shall see them anon ; the vintage is deferred.¹

of the Parliament has forbidden you to use the name of Jesuits or Society of the name of Jesus.

J. We do not hesitate touching the question of the name ; you can arraign us in law if we assume any other name against the regulation of the decree.

vocabulo *Jesuitarum*, aut *Societatis nominis Jesu*.

J. Non immoramur circà questionem de nomine ; potestis nos vocare in jus si aluid nomen assumimus contra determinationem arresti.—*Du Boulay, Hist. de l'Université*, t. vi.

¹ All the authorities before referred to, beginning with Cretineau and ending with Coudrette. The Jesuits presented a Memorial to the Parliament, in which there are certain admissions which deserve attention. “As the name of Religious is given only to monks who lead an extremely perfect life, *we* are not Religious in that sense, for we do not think ourselves worthy to profess so holy and perfect a life ; the occupation of the former being only to apply themselves to works of piety, whereas all ours consists in other things, and chiefly in the study of those arts which may conduce to the spiritual good of the public”—a most unlooked-for avowal—for if there be a character which they strive most to gain credit for in their histories and biographies, it is that of sanctity and moral perfection—which was an easy matter, for they said that God had granted the boon to Ignatius that no Jesuit should commit a mortal sin during the first hundred years of the Company, and that Xavier had got the privilege extended over two hundred years more—which unfortunately elapsed before the pope

D'Alembert's reflections on both parties, at the present scene of the tragi-comedy, are apposite. "Scarcely had the Society of Jesus begun to appear in France, when it met with numberless difficulties in gaining an establishment. The universities especially made the greatest efforts to expel these new comers. It is difficult to decide whether this opposition does honour or discredit to the Jesuits who experienced it. They gave themselves out for the instructors of youth gratuitously; they counted already amongst them some learned and famous men, superior, perhaps, to those whom the universities could boast: interest and vanity might therefore be sufficient motives to their adversaries, at least in these first moments, to seek to exclude them. We may recollect the like opposition which the Mendicant Orders underwent from these very universities, when they wanted to introduce themselves: opposition founded on pretty nearly the same motives, and which ceased not but by the state into which these orders are fallen, now become incapable of exciting envy.¹

suppressed them, otherwise a Company of Saints would have perished. The Memorial further says: "With regard to the questions which you have put to us, we cannot reply to them in a clearer, more precise, or distinct manner than we have done. We therefore beseech you to consider all these things, and to act in this affair with your usual moderation, prudence, and kindness. If you will grant us the honour of admitting us among you, and permission to teach, without obliging us to resort to a law-suit, you will always find us obedient to the laws of your University in all things," &c.—*Quesnel, Du Boulay, Mercure Jesuit*. 347, *et alibi*.

To explain the dexterity of their ambiguous reply, *tales quales*, we must remember that no other answer could have rid them from the embarrassment. If they had called themselves Secular Priests, all their "Privileges" as regulars would fall,—besides, their vows were well known. Secondly, they would have surrendered their claim to the rich legacy of the Bishop of Claremont, given to them as Regulars. Had they called themselves Monks they would have been at once excluded from public tuition—a privilege never conceded to Monks by the University.

¹ I have shown my concurrence in this opinion respecting the motives of

“On the other hand, it is very probable that the Society, proud of that support which it found amidst so many storms, furnished arms to its adversaries by braving them. It seemed to exhibit, from this time, that spirit of invasion which it has but too much displayed subsequently, but which it has carefully covered at all times with the mask of religion, and zeal for the salvation of souls.”¹

The University of Louvain, the most celebrated after that of Paris, made the same opposition to the Jesuits.

The Jesuits could win over, and won over, kings and their people ; but their rivals in the public mind, their rivals in the “interests” of tuition, were inexorable. Antagonism fixed as fate was between them,—for it was the battle of two monopolies. There was another reason. The Jesuits were innovators ; their system was considered a novelty ; and they promised to “keep pace with the age,” accommodating themselves right cleverly to the wants of the times, like any clever

opposition ; still, we must listen to the expressed motives of the universitarians. After alluding to the nondescript nature of the Company, and the consequent mystification, they proceed to say fairly enough, that “this body is not receivable, but that the members [a few are named] are receivable ; for the University receives all individuals, and prepares them for places among her members, each according to his state and qualifications,—to the Secular in the Faculty of Arts, &c., to the Regular in Theology, &c. The University does not object to there being a college at Claremont, according to the decree of the court, nor to there being Jesuit-bursers in the University. The University, nay Christendom, cannot and ought not to receive and tolerate a house or college entitling itself the House or College of the Jesuits, nor calling itself the College of the Christians ; for of these two names of our Saviour, Christ is common to him with the patriarchs, prophets, priests, and kings ; and Jesus is his proper name, which was given to him at the Circumcision, according to the custom of his people. And let the Jesuits go and call themselves so, if they like, among the unbelieving infidels, for to preach to whom they were first instituted. *The University admits the council above the pope*, wherefore it cannot receive any company or college whatever, which *places the pope above the council*.”—*Du Boulay*, t. vi. p. 587 ; *Annales de la Société*, i. 22.

¹ Sur la Destruction des Jesuites, p. 19, *et seq.*

artist, trader, bookseller, and author; whereas the universities librated in their apogee, for ever the same, from the beginning even until now, “quenched in a boggy Syrtis, neither sea nor good dry-land,” inextricably confined in the region of “sable-vested night, eldest of things.” An university can no more change its skin than an Ethiop. But the Jesuits were “legion”—ready for everything, provided it could be made useful in their vocation—glory to the Company and glory to the Church, with comfortable colleges and endowments, not *excepted*. No lazy drones were the Jesuits: no bibbers of wine, beyond the stomach’s comfort: no runners after women unto madness; but always on the watch—always ready for work, work, work, and no respite. “Legion” they were, and would rather be sent into swine than remain idle. If they could not walk on *two* legs, *four* would be their locomotives; and they had no particular objection to fins. Again I say that, in labouring for their hire, the Jesuits have utterly shamed all their competitors, much as it may please their rivals of the *universities*, ancient and modern, to see them ravenously “cut up,” and hear them savagely abused. Who would not prefer to join the “party” of the Jesuits, rather than condescend to appear in the ranks of those who fatten on the emoluments of “faith,” without a reasonable, honest, or honourable motive for “hope,” and confining “charity” within the precincts of their own cuirassed egotism—cool, calculating, harsh, and exclusive.

Touching the
skin of
universities.

Jesuits as
compared
to their
opponents.

A stirring time ensued for the Jesuits. *Religious* war—what a mockery! Religious war was raging in France. Denied the preceptorate, they had still an ample

field in the contusion of heresy. Their superabundant energies had a thousand outlets. Scattered over France, unrecognised by the law of the land, but sanctioned by the law of obedience, and impelled by the fury of "religion," they danced around the boiling cauldron of discord, each dropping in some infernal ingredient "for a charm of powerful trouble," whilst their Hecate at Rome cried "Well done ! I commend your pains."¹ For, let us look back and scan results. Charles IX. had given the Huguenots a "pacification," an edict which permitted them to serve God as they pleased. This was in 1561, immediately after the conference of Poissy. It was a grant eventuated by expediency ; but the principle of enlightened toleration was nobly asserted by the old Marshal St. André, and his wisdom prevailed over the blindness of the age. In truth, Providence left not the men of those times without counsel ; but the inveterate selfishness of kings, nobles, and priests, and ministers, palsied every effort which God so often directs for the good of humanity. All that France could talk or think of, was the conference of Poissy and its results. The Protestants, proud of their rights, thought that all doubts were ended, and sang victory to their ministers. Edict in hand, they transgressed its boundaries, would share the churches with the priests, who yielded in ignorance or in terror, or with a secret inclination to change their skins by joining the Huguenots.² Troubles soon ensued—skirmishes, assaults, bloodshed, open hostility.

The religious
war in
France.

¹ "And every one shall share i' the gains.
And now about the cauldron sing,
Like elves and fairies in a ring,
Enchanting all that you put in."

² D'Aubigné, Mem. col. clvxxii.

In the party of Rome there was division—estrangement—hostility amongst each other. Seven French bishops the pope excommunicated for granting toleration, or for adopting some of the new doctrines. The Queen of Navarre had embraced Calvinism : she announced her convictions by breaking down the Catholic images, seizing the churches, expelling the priests : Pope Pius IV. came down with his prerogatives and excommunicated the Queen of Navarre, if in six months she did not appear before him to give an account of herself—under penalty of being deprived of all her dignities and dominions—her marriage declared null and void—her children bastards—menacing the queen with all the penalties awarded to heretics by Christ's vicar upon earth.¹ The King of France interposed in behalf of his relative, and the Vatican bolt was suspended mid-heaven : but the spirit which prompted the measure was encouraged. It was encouraged by the violence of the Calvinists, and by the unequivocal resistance of the French bishops to the exorbitant prerogatives of the popes—the ultramontane pretensions decreed by the Council of Trent. Madness then dictated the conduct of the ultramontanes—and the people—scape-goats for ever—were dragged into the remorseless gulf of “civil” warfare—the warfare of a country's people fighting for its destruction. The pope's cohort fanned the flame of discord—spread the conflagration through the length and breadth of the land. When Lainez was expressly ordered by the pope to leave France for the last *Sittings of the Council*² after the conference of Poissy—

Proceedings
of the two
parties.

The pope's
cohort.

¹ Davila, i. 162 ; Sarpi, viii. 61.

² “Jam dudum Pontifex Maximus Lainio mandarat ut ad concilium se

where he expressed such uncompromising, insulting sentiments to the Calvinists—"he enjoined," says his own historian, "he enjoined his companions to pursue heresy in every direction. Some battled with it in Paris, others fronted it in the remotest provinces."¹ Verily a nation went up upon the land, strong and without number, whose teeth were the teeth of a lion—the cheek teeth of a great lion. Was it to do evil that they went? Was that their intention? Fanatics as culpable as themselves may say so:—but let justice be done to the infatuated organs of papal ambition, and the dread spirit of sacerdotal influence. They thought they had a good conscience. They felt confident that they were fighting as God willed them to fight: the evil that ensued was sanctioned and sanctified by a text of Scripture. Beware how you lash these Jesuits, forgetting yourselves. Look around—read—and think of all that humanity has suffered from the religious sentiment perverted. In truth, God was above and earth was beneath, with man i' the midst—but who had stuck themselves between man and his God? Popes, monks, priests, Jesuits, and all who were like them—stuck betwixt God and the souls of men, which must go through them in order to go to God. Therein was the very gulf of human ruin—the Babel-mandeb of misery, wails, pangs, gnashing of teeth—or the desert whence swarms the multitude of ravening insects to prey on humanity. And in those dreadful

Tridentinum conferret."—*Sacchin.* lib. vi. 70. The pope's own affairs were to be discussed, as you remember, and Lainez was to uphold the very abuses which he had denounced to the Prince de Condé!

¹ "Pendant ce temps, Lainez parti pour le Concile de Trente, avait enjoint à ses compagnons de poursuivre partout l'hérésie. Les uns la combattaient à Paris, les autres lui tenaient tête au fond des provinces." — *Cretineau*, i. 442.

times of religious barbarism, kingdoms and the poor man's home were made desolate by the spirit it generated—and the wretched people rushed beneath the wheels of the crushing Juggernaut, as their “religious” advisers impelled them:—what the palmer-worm left, the locust devoured—what the locust left, the canker-worm corroded, leaving remnants still for the caterpillar, whose royal wings, so beautifully bedecked, waved as the insect sucked the sap of a nation. You must have specimens of how they managed matters in France, in those religious times. In 1562, the Bishop of Chalons flattered himself that he could convert a congregation of Huguenots at Vassi.

Massacre of
Huguenots
at Vassi.

He tried, was baffled, and retired with shame, confusion, and mockery. Thereupon he inflamed the zeal of the Cardinal de Guise, who summoned two companies of soldiers, sounded a charge—the conventicle was furiously entered—all who did not escape by the windows were slaughtered, whilst the priests busied themselves with pointing out the wretches who were trying to escape over the roofs of the houses. The princes and ladies who witnessed the foray, are said to have displayed the same edifying zeal. On a subsequent occasion three hundred wretches were shut up in a church and starved for three days. Then they were tied together in couples, and led off to slaughter—on the sands of the river they were murdered after a variety of torments. Little children were sold for a crown. A woman of great beauty excited pity in the heart of him who was going to kill her,—another undertook the deed, and to show the firmness of his courage, he stripped her naked, and took pleasure, with others around him, “in seeing that beauty perish and fade in death—*d voir perir et faner*

ceste beauté par la mort ! During the slaughter of their mothers babes were born, to be thrown into the river by the murderous fiends ; and they say that one poor babe held up its little hand as the piteous waters bore it up and swept it along—and they *watched* it out of sight!—*la main droicte levée en haut, autant que les veuës le peuvent conduire.*¹ The Bishop of Orange negotiated a

subsidy from Italy : seven thousand men marched under Fabrice Cerbellon to execute a butchery. Babes at the

breast were pricked to death with poignards :
Other
 “ Catholic ”
 barbarities. some were impaled, others were roasted alive ;
 and some were sawed asunder. Women were

hanged at the windows and door-posts ; children were torn from their breasts and dashed against the walls : girls were ravished, and still more hideous and brutal crimes were committed by the *Italians*. The slaughter was indiscriminate—for even some Catholics perished ; and those who had sworn the oath required, by way of capitulation, in the castle, were hurled over the precipice. Then a fire broke out, consumed three hundred houses—among which was that of the bishop, the cause of the whole calamity—*cause de tout le mal.*²

Turn to the other side. The brutal Baron des Adrets had changed sides. From the Catholics he went over

to the Huguenots. He took with him his
“ Protestant ”
 barbarities—
 Des Adrets. infernal passions to disgrace the cause which
 he espoused, from resentment or other base
 motives. He inflicted a reprisal for the slaughter at Orange. At St. Marcellin he surprised three hundred Catholics, cut them to pieces or made them leap a precipice. Montbrison was besieged, and was capitulating. The baron came up, cut all to pieces, except

¹ D'Aubigné, col. clxxxiii.

² D'Aubigné, Hist. Univ. col. cciii.

thirty, whom he compelled to leap a precipice by way of amusing himself after dinner. One of them hung back at the brink : “What!” exclaimed the baron ; “you require *two* attempts for the leap!” “Sir, I’ll give you *ten* to do it in,” was the man’s reply—and the baron pardoned him for his wit.¹

And now you would like to know the prevalent principles of human conduct in those times. The Protestant D’Aubigné will tell us this baron’s sentiments on the subject—and as he brought them from the side which he left and still imitated or surpassed in cruelty, the avowal is worth a hundred facts, however horrible. “I asked him three questions,” says D’Aubigné—“Why he had perpetrated cruelties so ill becoming his great valour? Why he had left his party by which he was so much accredited? and, Why he had succeeded in nothing after deserting his party, although he fought against them? To the first he replied : ‘That in retaliating cruelty no cruelty is perpetrated—the first is called cruelty, the second is *justice*.’ Thereupon he gave me a horrible account of more than four thousand murders in cold blood, and with torments such as I had never heard tell of—and particularly of the precipice-leaping at Mascon, where the governor made murder his pastime, to teach the women and children to see the Huguenots die, without showing them pity. ‘I have repaid them something of the kind,’ said he, ‘but in smaller quantity—having regard to the past and the future :—to the past because I cannot endure, without great cowardice, to witness the slaughter of my faithful companions :—but for the future, there are two reasons which no captain can reject : one is, that the only way

The “principles” prevalent.

¹ D’Aubigné, Hist. Univ. col. cxi.

to put a stop to the barbarities of the enemy is to inflict retaliation.' Thereupon he told me of three hundred horsemen whom he had sent back to the enemy on chariots, each man with a foot and a hand cut off: 'In order,' said he, 'to change a warfare without mercy, into one of *courtesy*, and the thing succeeded—*pour faire, comme cela fit, changer une guerre sans merci, en courtoisie* In a word,' he continued, 'you cannot teach a soldier to put his hand to his sword and his hat at the same time.' With mighty and unflinching resolutions in his heart, the idea of retreat was out of the question—'in depriving my soldiers of all hope of pardon, they were forced to see no refuge but the shadow of their flags; no life but in victory.' And lastly, touching his ill success personally, he replied with a sigh: 'My son, nothing is too hot for a captain who has no longer more interest than his soldier in victory. When I had Huguenots I had soldiers, since then I have only had traders who think only of money. The former were bound together by dread without fear—*de crainte sans peur*,—whose pay was vengeance, rage, and honour. I had not bridles enough for them. But now my spurs are used up—*ces derniers ont usé mes éperons.*'"¹ "The horrors perpetrated by the Baron des Adrets," quotes the Jesuit Feller, with approbation, "the horrors perpetrated by the Baron des Adrets alone suffice to *justify* the severest measures which are taken in some countries against the introduction of anti-Catholic sects and dogmatisers. What horrible scenes would France have been spared had she been on the watch like Italy and Spain, to expel, or extinguish in its birth, a scourge which was destined to produce so many others, and which, in

¹ D'Aubigné, col. cexv. *et seq.*

establishing the reign of errors by fire and sword, has placed the monarchy within two inches of its destruction!"¹ And who, may we ask, eventuated these calamities? Who roused destruction to swallow up those whom argument could not poison? Who drove the heretic to vengeance? In whose ranks was Des Adrets trained to slaughter? And to talk of Spain and Italy! It had been indeed a blessing for these countries had "heresy" been vouchsafed to them by heaven for enlightenment. They would not be now amongst the lowest, if not the most degraded of nations.

In the midst of these dreadful doings the Jesuits tramped over France, ferreting out heresy—worming for the pope. Montluc, the bishop of Valence, was no Procrustes of a bishop: he temporised a little with the heretics. This was enough for the Jesuits, who would temporise with none but the orthodox.² Emond Auger rushed to battle. Suddenly he appeared on the banks of the Rhone, like Châteaubriand's "ancient bison
amidst the high grass of an isle in the Missis-
sippi." The Jesuit preached, and he taught, and doubtless he converted: but in the heyday of orthodoxy—whilst he hugged that Dalilah—the Philistines were upon him! The Huguenots, under the ferocious Baron des Adrets, took him prisoner. They raised a gibbet to hang the Jesuit. A Jesuit can brave grim death better than most men: because, as he has more motives to *live* for, so has he more to *die* for—and all are condensed into two words, OUR ORDER. Emond held forth, like the

The Jesuit
Auger.

¹ Biog. Univ. *Adrets*.

² Cretineau calls this bishop "a skilful politician and still more skilful courtier, abandoning his flock to the teeth of the wolves."—t. ii. 442. The Jesuits made wolves of the mildest sheep; but then they were *orthodox* wolves, and that's the difference.

swan, melodious in death: he captivated the coarse-grained Huguenots: the heretics relented: they sent him to prison. One of them actually fancied he could convert the Jesuit! And they tried—and left him in his dungeon thinking “What *next*?” On the following day he was set free by the interposition of the Catholics. His brother-Jesuit Pelletier underwent the same fate, but was liberated by the Parliament of Toulouse. The Jesuits left the scene of their struggles, “where their presence only exposed the Catholics to more certain perils, not having as *yet* the energy to *repel force by force*,” says the historian of the Jesuits.¹ Thence to Auvergne Auger departed; and soon the towns of Clermont, Riom, Mont-Ferrand, and Issoire experienced the effects of his zeal: “he preserved them from the invasion of heresy.”

The civil war raged fiercely on all sides—the battle of Dreux gave victory to the Catholics—the leader of the Huguenots, Condé, was a prisoner, and Beza narrowly escaped. The Duke de Guise, the royal firebrand, had won the victory; about a month after, he was murdered by an assassin—who was arrested, implicating the leaders of the opposite party in the cowardly crime—but it was by *violent torture* that they wrung from the wretch what they wanted to hear—the names of La Rochefoucault, Soubise, Aubeterre, Beza, and Coligny—the great Huguenot leader.² A death-bed suggested merciful wisdom to the

The murder
of the Duke
de Guise.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 444.

² This charge has become a point of controversy. Certainly all crimes were likely to be committed and countenanced on both sides of that “religious” warfare; but Browning makes out a good case in favour of Coligny. The assassin, when drawn and quartered, a horse pulling at each hand and leg, excoriated those whom he had accused, revoking his first deposition. He

dying Guise. The horrible massacre of Vassi at which he presided, he now lamented, and strove to extenuate. He conjured the queen to make peace. Those who advised the contrary, he called the enemies of the State.¹ But it was a "religious" question. An angel from heaven would have been unable to check the restless fury—much less a dying leader—murdered in the cause—and proclaimed a French Moses—a modern Jehu—which, however, was neither comfort nor hope to the man hurrying to judgment. The loss of this great leader was a blow to the cause: spirits drooped: the "men of God" were in requisition; and the Jesuits were not wanting. Wherever zeal for "the faith" was to be reanimated, the Jesuit Auger bore through every obstacle—drove in his spike, which he clenched. Then he published his famous catechism in French, which was subsequently translated into Latin and Greek "for the use of schools." It is said that thirty-eight thousand copies were sold or issued in eight years—every copy of which must have converted its man, for we are assured that Auger converted 40,000 heretics to the faith.² Together with Possevin he accepted the challenge of the eloquent Calvinist Pierre Viret, formerly a Franciscan. It is well said that "the conference prominently exhibited the extent of their theological acquirements, and ended in nothing."

To aggravate the sufferings of humanity torn by civil war and social disunion, a pestilence broke out in France,

excepted the admiral; but soon after he whispered in the ear of the President De Thou, exonerating Coligny as well; and he publicly said, despite the horrors of that dreadful death, "that if the blow was again to be struck, he would strike it again;" which seems to show that the wretch needed no abettor.—*D'Aubigné*, t. i. col. 251. See *Browning*, p. 43, *et seq.* for Coligny's exculpation.

¹ *D'Aubigné*, ib.

² *Biblio. Script. S. J.*

and swept off sixty thousand persons in the city of Lyons alone. Auger exerted himself to the utmost for the relief of the patients, visiting, consoling them, distributing alms which he collected. And then he induced the magistrates to bind themselves by a vow, to propitiate the cessation of the plague : it was made : and when the plague ceased the Jesuit was commissioned to pay or perform it in the church of Our Lady du Puy. On his return the magistrates rewarded the Jesuit by presenting his Company with a college. It was a municipal building, common to all the inhabitants ; and the Calvinists complained of the transfer. Auger told them, and had it stipulated in the document, that the Calvinists should have an equal right with the Catholics, to the education of the Company¹—a poor consolation for the Calvinists, if the Latin and Greek catechism of the Jesuit was to teach the language of Homer and Virgil to their children—with the mythology of the popedom included, conjugated with every verb, and *not* declined with every noun. It was cleverly managed ; for, of course, there was no chance of any child of Calvin remaining long in their hands without being transformed into a son of Ignatius. Thus the Jesuits had reason to bless the plague, and their veteran's devotedness to the pest-stricken, for a splendid prospect at Lyons. Charity does not always meet its reward here below—in the generality of mortals—but the Jesuits, somehow or other, seldom, if ever, failed to turn their devotedness to account. Still, what they gained, they worked for—earned by some equivalent—which cannot always be said of those whose brilliant “rewards” puzzle us when we strive to account for them, or compute their advantages.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 447.

It evidences the unscrupulous or unflinching boldness of the Jesuits, that in spite of the opposition made to their admission into France—in spite of the stringent conditions of the decree by which they were *not* tolerated in their true capacity, they pressed forward reckless of consequences. Already they divided France into two provinces of the Order,—the Province of France, and the Province of Aquitaine or Guienne.¹

Boldness of
the Jesuits.

Over all parts of the country they wandered in pursuit of heresy, winning a few, but exasperating many, and stirring the fermenting mass of discord.

The active and eventful life of General Lainez was drawing to a close : but he could afford to die, beholding the fruit of his labours in the ever enlarging bounds of his Company. In whatever direction he turned his eyes—there was ardent hope in his men, if not immediate prospect in its objects :—there was always some consolation—some tangible solace for their pangs. And nowhere were greater efforts made for the Company's supremacy, than in Germany.

In the year 1551 the Jesuits had no fixed position in Germany. In the year 1556 they had overspread Franconia, Swabia, Rhineland, Austria, Hungary, Bohemia and Bavaria. The professors of the University of Dillingen—Dominican monks among the rest—were dismissed to make room for the Jesuits, who took possession in 1563. It was a sort of compact between the Cardinal Truchsess and the Company of Jesus. In the spreading novelty of their adventures—in the fame which their every movement achieved—in the minds of the orthodox sticklers for papal prerogatives,

The Jesuits
in Germany.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 447.

the Jesuits everywhere met with a cheer and a hand and a useful purse. They “were winning many souls and doing great service to the Holy See” — wherever they flung their shadows heresy grew pale and orthodoxy brandished the spear of defiance. They suited their method to the German mind :—what failed with the Protestant, was a nostrum, a holy dram to the Catholic ; and they laid it on thickly and broadly and with infinite variety—so that every one found his peculiar taste consulted, and opened his heart accordingly. The public exhibitions of the Jesuits were the most brilliant ever witnessed, conducted with dignity and decorum, and full of matter—“patronised” by royalty and nobility and the usual concomitants.¹ Following out a maxim of Lainez, propounded when he ordered public thanksgiving for the Company’s increase, the Company required that all who would undertake the difficult task of tuition should devote their whole lives to the undertaking—so that every year’s experience might be as many steps to perfection in that art which may so easily be made subservient to any given scheme—but which, for complete success, imperatively demands unflinching industry, inventive self-possession, simplicity of character, a heart of magnetism to attract, and a thorough perception of human character in all its varieties. First impressions are with difficulty erased : life’s beginnings are the prophets of its endings.² The Jesuits had a care of the foundations when European heretics were likely to be their hostile sappers. Dust and sand they threw in the

Touching
education.

¹ Agricola. Hist. f. 68 ; Ranke, 138.

² “Quæ prima inciderant animo, difficillimè aboleantur, et ut vitæ posita initia sunt, ita reliquum consequatur.”—*Sacchin.* lib. ii. 91.

eyes of the savage, because merely “conversion” or rather “baptism” was the object—inducing ruinous degradation in the loss of caste, or separation as by a contract, from father, mother, friend, and acquaintance—and consequently utter dependence on the conquerors of their country. These served—these fought willingly enough by their brutal instincts:—but principle is required in the European—a principle of some specified kind, whether it centres in gold—in partyism political or “religious”—or in God, the unerring guide to all who heartily ask, and seek, and knock. And it was necessary for the Jesuits to sow and to water, to trim and keep vigorous the principle of antagonism—the Catholic antagonism of the sixteenth and following century. A man’s skin may be easily torn and diachylon will heal it: but tear out his heart—and you may do as you please with the carcass. A dreadful comparison:—but is it not precisely thus with those whom men have won, and bound to themselves by bonds they cannot describe—and yet cannot resist—nay, rather bless them—and would not be free—for freedom from such bewitching tyranny would entail death in desolation? To that result the Jesuits cleverly applied. And they began with childhood,—primitive education.¹ The men selected for these commonly despised beginnings were such as would devote their whole existence to the training of this most important stage of human existence. Experiment and experience build up a teacher’s art. A given object is to be gained:—ten thousand psychological facts must suggest the method. And so the Jesuits wisely

¹ You remember what Virgil says: “*Adeo à teneris assuescere multum est.*” And the dictum of Terence: “*Si quis magistrum ad eam rem cæperit improbum, ipsum animum ægrotum facile ad deteriolem partem applicat.*”

would have a man devote his whole life to the undertaking. They were successful, as a matter of course :—for, in spite of all that is said of chance, and luck, and good fortune, rest assured that all success depends entirely upon the selection of the appropriate means of achievement. If men would but investigate, and test this fact by experience, we should not so often hear God’s providence indirectly blamed by pretended submissions to “ His wise decrees.” God wills the accomplishment of every law He has framed for success or happiness to the intellect, the moral sentiment, and the instincts of man. Each in its department, has its rights and its laws—and in proportion to its endowments and loyalty to God, will be its success—which we call “ good luck ” and “ good fortune.” Good luck it may be called—but certainly it was found that the pupils of the Jesuits in Germany learnt more under them, in half a year, than with others in two whole years. Even Protestants recalled their children from distant schools and gave them to the Jesuits. Be not surprised :—people look to results. Results are pounds shillings and pence in their eloquence to the mass of mankind. Everybody can, or fancies he can count them unmistakeably. Then, Jesuit-results gave “ *general satisfaction*.”¹ Schools for the poor were opened. Methods of instruction were adapted for the youngest capacities. And then was printed a right orthodox *Catechism*, with its plain questions and unanswerable answers, composed by the “ Austrian dog,” Canisius, as the Protestants called him—the “ scourge of the heretics ” as the Catholics proclaimed him—and *unus è Societate Jesu*—one of the Company of Jesuits, as he

Touching
“ luck,”
“ chance,”
and “ for-
tune.”

Canisius and
his catechism.

¹ Ranke, *ut antea*.

was in reality, neither more nor less—and quite sufficient. He was the first provincial of Upper Germany—he enlarged the bounds of his province by his eloquence—held the heretics in check by his disputations—and fortified the orthodox. His protracted residence in Austria, and his incessant clamour for the faith, procured him the title of *Austrian dog*: “but he was no dumb dog,” says Ribadeneira, the glorious Jesuit: “and his bark was no whimper; his bark and his bite defended the flock in the fold from the wolves on all sides lurking.”¹ Canisius was the first *author* among the Jesuits, after holy Father Ignatius, if the Spiritual Exercises were really the products of his pen—and not a joint-stock concern, with the founder for a stalking-horse.² Thus the first book published by the Jesuit-Company, was *A Sum of Christian Doctrine—Summa Doctrinæ Christianæ*, by Canisius, but *anonymously*—a curious omen decidedly, for *one of the Company of Jesus* not to acknowledge *a sum of Christian Doctrine*. Subsequently enlarged and translated into Greek and Latin from the original German, it became a classic in the Jesuit-schools, so as to enable “the boys” to “take in” what the Jesuits called “piety,” together with their

¹ “Sed haud canem mutum, aut non valentem latrare, sed qui latratu et morsu lupos passim grassantes ab ovili Christi arceret.” Among their innumerable pious inventions, the Jesuits say that *before the foundation* of the Company, a certain woman, who passed for a saint, admonished the mother of Canisius to “educate him with great care, because a certain order of clerics would soon be founded, which would be of immense utility to the Church, and into which Company her son would be enrolled, and be considered a most remarkable man.” “The event,” adds the Jesuit, “verified the prophecy or presentiment of the woman.”—*Bibl. Script. S. J.* The object of these prophecies, and there are many, was probably to counteract the *other* prophecies, like that of Archbishop Brown already given, as a dread forewarning of the awful doings of the Jesuits.—It is quite natural.

² “Primus omnium Societatis partus, post S. Patriarchæ nostri Exercitia Spiritualia.”—*Bibl. Script. S. J.*

Latin and Greek—*ut adolescentium pietatem . . . und cum ipsis literarum elementis . . . utiliore redderemus.*¹ “Incredible,” says Ribadeneira, “were the fruits of this Catechism in the Church of Christ—and I mention only one testimony thereof, namely, that by its perusal the most Serene Duke Wolfgang Wilhelm of Neuberg admits that he became a Catholic”²—as if, to a Christian mind, the conversion of a Duke in his wealth and glory, were really more estimable than that of a peasant in his rags and degradation. And now you shall have a few specimens of the tree whose fruit was so incredible in the Church of Christ—piety to the young—and conversion to a duke.

After establishing, in the usual way, all the defensive points of controversy, Canisius dashes headlong into the offensive, snarling to admiration. Catholic unity has been established; he proceeds to question and answer as follows:

“Is the same unity found amongst Protestants—*acatholicos?*”

“Not the least in the world—*minimè vero*—for this is most clearly evident from their continual schisms in the principal points of faith.”

“Have you an example in point?”

“Luther himself, for instance, who, whilst in his *Catechism*, he recognises only one sacrament instituted by Christ, *elsewhere* propounds two, three, four, yea, and even seven sacraments.”

Imagine the “fruit” of this clinching “argument”

¹ From the Preface to the translations printed in the Jesuit College at Prague, in 1709, “for the use of the Latin and Greek schools of the Company of Jesus throughout the province of Bohemia, a new edition—in usum scholarum humaniorum Societatis Jesu, per provinciam Bohemiæ, denuo recusus.”

² Bib. Script. S. J. Pet. Canis.

boldly repeated by the young propagandist of the Jesuit schools, as a "fact ;" and also imagine the difficulty into which he would be thrown by the question, *Where?* to that *elsewhere* of the catechist, who pretended not to know the "broad ground-work" for which Luther contended.¹ Next as to *morals*.

The sanctity of "the Church" has been established in the usual way : Canisius proceeds indoctrinating the young for controversy in the social circle :—

"But are there not many wicked people amongst Catholics?"

"Alas! there are, to our shame; but only as Judas amongst the apostles, in the sacred college of Christ; only as the tares among the wheat."

"How stands the matter amongst Protestants?"

"Their doctrine is alienated from all the means of acquiring sanctity—so far are they from teaching it."

"How is this? Don't they boast that they are reformed, and evangelical, and think themselves much purer than Catholics?"

"The reason is, they teach that good works are of no avail for salvation; that these are only filth, which render us more and more hateful in the sight of God."²

"What's their ditty on good works?"

¹ "The sacrament itself," writes Luther to the Moravian brothers, "is not in itself so necessary as to render superfluous faith and charity. It is mere folly to squabble about such trifles as those which, for the most part, engage our attention, while we neglect things truly precious and salutary; wherever we find faith and charity, sin cannot be, whether the sin of adoring, or the sin of not adoring. On the other hand, where charity and faith are not, there is sin, sin universal, sin eternal! If these cavillers will not speak concomitantly [*i.e.* as we speak], let them speak otherwise, and cease all this disputation, since we are agreed as to the broad ground-work."—*Hazlitt, Life of Luther*, p. 132.

² Luth. Resol. Contr. Eck. Assert. Art. xxix. xxxi. xxxii.; Lib. de Libert. Christ. Serm. in Dom. 4 post Pasch.; Calv. l. iii. Inst. c. xii. s. 4; c. xiv. s. 9.

“ They daily sing these verses :

‘ All our works are vain : they bring
Nought but bolts from Heaven’s King.’ ”

“ What do they say of the evangelical counsels, perpetual chastity, and the rest ? ”

“ They say it is impossible for us to live chastely ; that it is impious to vow chastity ; and—*tam cuique necessarium esse carnis opus, quam edere, bibere, dormire.*”¹

Very strange matter to come out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, decidedly.

“ What do they say of the Ten Commandments ? ”

“ They say that it is not in the power of man to keep them ; that they no more pertain to us than the old ceremonies of the circumcision, and the like.”²

“ Did Luther ever teach that sin is not anything contrary to the commandments of God ? ”

“ Yes, he did expressly, in his *Postilla* of Wittemberg, published during his life-time, and in the sermon already quoted, the fourth Sunday after Easter.”

“ What follows from that doctrine of Luther ? ”

“ That to adore idols, to blaspheme God, to rob, to commit murder, fornication, and other deeds against the Commandments, are not sins.”

“ Do you think that this doctrine, so detestable, is taught even by the disciples of Luther ? ”

“ The more honest amongst them are ashamed to own it. The rest follow their master boldly—*cæteri magistrum sequuntur intrepide.*”

“ How is this reconciled with what they say, namely, that all our works are mere sins ? ”

¹ Luth. de Vitâ Conjug.

² Luth. in c. iv. ad Gal. ; in c. xl. Exod. ; Calv. l. ii. Inst. c. vii. s. 5 ; c. viii. ; l. iii. c. iv. s. 28.

“ Let *them* see to that ; *I* certainly don't see it—*hoc ipsi viderint, ego certe non video.*”

“ What do the Protestants teach respecting the sacraments ? ”

“ Nothing for certain : what they assert in one place, they deny in another.”

“ *How do you know this ?* ”

“ *From their books*, as has been already said respecting Luther.”¹

We will not stop to consider how strange these bold assertions sounded from the lips of children : how they were made to say that what they “knew,”

Reflection.

they knew “from the books” of the Reformers, —but we cannot fail to note, as something remarkable, that the very first Jesuit-author gave an example to all the rancorous enemies of the Company, in imputing the foulest inculcations to the body, from isolated passages of their casuists ; which, however objectionable, might be justified by an appeal to the Constitutions of the Company, positively forbidding the publication of any work not approved by appointed examiners. Let the fact be remembered, with every other to which your attention is called ; for the history of the Jesuits is a history of RETRIBUTION in every sense of the awful word. I offer no excuse for Luther. He committed himself by word and deed on many occasions. But this is not the question. The question is, how fearfully those imputations were adapted to embitter the social circle of Germany ; to aggravate that rancour which a thousand other causes already lashed far beyond the control of Christian charity, or political wisdom. In effect, the stream was poisoned at its source. The very fountain

¹ Catechismus Catholicus, p. 28—33, Leodii, 1682.

of life, whose gushing sweet waters should remain for ever sweet and clear, were made bitter and foul by the wand of the Jesuit, to spurt and to flow on, bitter and foul for ever. For, this Jesuit-book was intended “briefly, clearly, and accurately to instruct *tender youth*—*teneræ juventuti*, and the whole *Christian people*—*universo populo Christiano*, in the *orthodox* doctrine of *salvation*—*in doctrinâ salutis orthodoxâ*.”¹ It may be said that it was only natural for one party to strive to build up itself on the ruin of the other. I subscribe to the explanation: truly, that was one of the most prominent methods pursued by the Jesuits, and their opponents, in general.

The method was successful in Germany. Soon the children who frequented the schools of the Jesuits at Vienna shamed their parents by their resolute orthodoxy and discipline. They refused to partake of forbidden meats on days of abstinence. In Cologne, the rosary (a string of consecrated beads) was worn with honour. At Treves, relics became in fashion where before no one had ventured to show them. At Ingolstadt, the pupils went in procession, two and two, from the Jesuit-school to Eichstadt, in order to be strengthened at their confirmation “with the dew that distilled from the tomb of St. Walpurgi.”² These manifest proofs of orthodoxy attested the success of the Jesuit-method with the young: constant preaching and victorious discussions captivated the older portion of the community:—Germany was forgetting Luther and his companions, as they listened to the Syrens of Jesuitism, singing melodious measures. The dissensions among the German divines³ gave additional vigour to the firm

¹ Title-page of the book, Ed. Leodii, 1682.

² Ranke, p. 139.

³ Ranke, Ibid.

shaft of controversy as it sped and was driven home and clenched. A Lutheran nobleman challenged Bobadilla to a controversial contest. Ferdinand, the patron of the Jesuits, was to appoint the umpires. The Jesuit accepted the challenge and the terms. The Lutheran added that he would join the Catholics if the umpires pronounced him vanquished—which shows how people thought themselves justified in changing sides, during those times of religious madness. Ferdinand and his whole court were present, and the discussion began: “but,” says the Jesuit, exulting and classical, “the petulant fencer soon discovered what a powerful *net-man* he encountered in the arena.”¹ The Jesuit flung his net over his antagonist, “who was so tied and stretched that he could not get out,” according to the same authority. “Then all the umpires, all the audience proclaimed Catholic truth triumphant, Bobadilla the victor, and the meddler defeated.” The termination was tragical enough. “Though he bit the dust,” says Agricola, “the foaming heretic stood up alone against the decision, and with the usual obstinacy and impudence, denied that he was vanquished, and protested that his judges were partial and knew nothing of the matter in debate.” Ferdinand sent him to prison,

Painful
catastrophe.

¹ This term, *Retiarius*, applied by the Jesuit Agricola to the Jesuit Bobadilla, is rather unfortunate. The figure refers to the ancient gladiators at Rome, and the *Retiarius*, or net-man, bore in his left hand a three-pointed lance, and in his right, a net, whence his name from the Latin *rete*. With this net he attempted to entangle his adversary by casting it over his head and suddenly drawing it together, and then, with his trident, he usually slew him. But if he missed his aim, by either throwing the net too short, or too far, he instantly betook himself to flight, and endeavoured to prepare his net for a second cast; while his antagonist as swiftly pursued, to prevent his design, by despatching him.”—*Adam's Antiq.* 318. A very apt representation of all controversial encounters; and the part given to Bobadilla may be deserved, but it is not very honourable notwithstanding.

in a monastery, for three days, although “the impudent man merited worse treatment: but the emperor, for other reasons, preferred mildness,” adds the Jesuit. The poor fellow went mad; and wounded himself mortally—*ibi miser, irâ in rabiem versâ, lethale seipsi vulnus intulit*—and died. And to console humanity for the wretched affair, they tell us that he was converted at last!¹ Is it not too bad? But for the Jesuits it was glorious. Children, women, and men surrendered—and then a famous leader of Protestantism, the disciple and friend of Melancthon, Stephen Agricola, fell a prey: Canisius was his hunter.

By their success, by their victories in the battle of orthodoxy, the Jesuits won patronage from all in power who were interested in the suppression of the Protestant movement. Ferdinand, Emperor of Austria, availed himself of their services,—establishing thirteen Jesuits in Vienna, whom he housed, provided with a chapel, and a pension, in 1551. By the recommendation of the prior of the Carthusian monks and the provincial of the Carmelites, an endowed school which had been governed by a Protestant regent, was handed over to the Jesuits in 1556. In the same year eighteen Jesuits entered Ingolstadt, invited to counteract the effects of the large concessions which had been forced from the government in favour of the Protestants. Vienna, Cologne, Ingolstadt, these were the three metropolitan centres whence the Jesuits radiated over the length and breadth of Germany. From Vienna they commanded the Austrian dominions; from Cologne they overran the territory of the Rhine; from Ingolstadt they overspread Bavaria.

The three
Jesuit centres
in Germany.

¹ Hist. Prov. Germ. Sup. ad Ann. 1544, D. i. n. 60, Aug. 1727.

Befriended by the emperor and the courtiers, and by the bishops, who held to Rome without reserve, they forgot their difficulties and labours : it was a time to swarm and scour the land in quest of new hives in the midst of honied flowers.

The patronage they enjoyed.

Smiles they found where smiles were most desirable ; and whenever or wherever they were vouchsafed them, they took care that the world should know how it fared with the men whom “the king would honour.” When Cardinal Truchses returned to Dillengen after giving them the university, they went out to meet their patron. He entered Dillengen in state ; and from amongst the crowds assembled around him, he singled out with marked preference the Jesuits, giving them his hand to kiss, greeting them as his brethren ; visited their house, and dined at their table. These facts alone were equal to ten years’ labour for the advancement of the Company ; and the Jesuits invariably dwell upon them with undisguised complacency.

Nor were they unworthy of reward for their indefatigable industry. To science they were devoted as well as to orthodoxy. They were determined to rival their Protestant competitors of the

Their industry.

universities, if not to surpass them ; and such was their success that they were awarded a place amongst the restorers of classical learning. In those days the ancient languages constituted education—as they do in the estimation of many at the present day. The Jesuits cultivated them with vigour : but they did not neglect the sciences. At Cologne the Jesuit Franz

Coster, a Belgian, lectured on the book of Genesis and astronomy, to the great delight and admiration of his audience. He was despatched to that

Franz Coster.

manifestation by Ignatius himself ; and his youthfulness—his age was only twenty-five—excited wonder, whilst the extent of his learning, the variety of the languages he had mastered, the elegance of his diction showed that Nature had not endowed him in vain, and proved that he laboured to evince his gratitude for her endowments. And yet the man was never ill in his life, until death whispered him away in the eighty-eighth year of his age—a life passed in constant labour, but totally free from the usual effects of anxiety and care.

Theology was, of course, the prominent feature of those times : it consequently was the main concern of the Jesuits. In public lectures they sowed the seeds of theological intelligence ; and in public disputations—which they considered indispensable—they exhibited the full-grown tree with enticing fruit on its branches.

Enthusiasm is electric to the German—it insures his admiration, and tempts his imitation. The first rector of the Jesuit college at Vienna was Vittoria, a Spaniard, who had rendered his admission into the Society memorable by running about the Corso during the Carnival,

clad in sackcloth, and scourging himself till the blood ran down in streams from his lacerated shoulders. No wonder, then, in those fervid pilgrimages of which you have read, or that enthusiastic zeal of their pupils in shaming their unscrupulous parents, when their masters hid within them the volcanic elements of such flaming devotion. Princes and the great they honoured with poems and emblems in infinite variety, *varii generis carminibus et emblematis salutârunt* ;—and the sons of the *most distinguished noblemen*, amongst their *sodales*—for their sodalities were not less indispensable than their disputations—washed

Their enthusiasm, tact, and labours.

and kissed the feet of poor scholars on Maunday Thursday.¹ The Jesuits, by their own account, published books of piety, introduced the sacraments, catechised incessantly, and gave public exhortations. They dived into the dwellings of the people, with every possible effort and assiduity—*variâ industriâ et labore*—battled with the popular superstitions—magic amongst the rest—checked the quarrels of wives and husbands—reconciled the differences of the citizens from whatever cause resulting. The Spiritual Exercises were taught and practised. Night and day they visited the sick in the hospitals and in their dwellings. They were not deterred by the most disgusting ulcers, the filthiest cabins of the poor, nor contagious pestilence itself. They were the companions of the convicts in their cells. They consoled and cheered them on the scaffold of death. In short, says their historian, “We bestow our care on the sick and the hospitals—we give assistance to asylums for orphans, and other public dwellings of the wretched, so that we may be useful to all and every one. On holidays, when others are taking their rest, *we* labour more assiduously than ever in the holy undertaking.”²

And
boasting.

Thus was the zeal of the Jesuits manifest, their

¹ Agricola, P. i. D. v., n. 314. *et seq.*

² “Operam impendimus valetudinariis et Xenodochiis, operam orphanotrophis, aliisque publicis miserorum domiciliis, ut omnibus prosimus et singulis. Quodsi dies festi incideant, tùm enimverò, cùm aliis quies, nobis præ alio tempore sanctè laborandi onus advenit.”—P. i. D. iii. 2. As if conscious of the trumpeting in which he has been indulging in the preceding summary of the method, Agricola pays a vague compliment to the “venerable clergy, &c.,” for *their* labours, and boldly appeals to the example of *St. Paul*. “Who will ascribe this to ambition,” he asks, “rather than to holy emulation and imitation? Who ever dared accuse Paul of boasting in narrating what he did and endured at Corinth for the Gospel? *He* had no slight reasons for making the declaration: *the Company also has hers: habuit ille causas cur id exponeret non sanè leves, habet et Societas.*”—*Ibid.*

learning evident, their industry beyond question, their devotedness to Catholicism reflected in their pupils and the thousands of citizens whom they garnered in their sodalities—all bound heart and soul to the Jesuits, and the Jesuits to their *patrons*, the pope and the Catholic party in Germany—including emperor, dukes, princes, and all the ramifications of Germanic nobility.¹ Ranke shall conclude this summary: he says: “Such a combination of competent knowledge and indefatigable zeal, of study and persuasiveness, of pomp and asceticism, of world-wide influence, and of unity in the governing principle, was

¹ “Amongst their most influential friends was the family of the Fuggers, a very barbaric patronymic, but all golden to the Jesuits. The family originally followed the trade in flax or linen; but its descendants cleverly embarked in speculation, opened a trade with America, bartering their haberdashery for the precious metals and Indian merchandise. They became so wealthy, that they purchased a great many German lordships from Charles V., were created barons and counts, invested with very ample privileges, married into the noblest families of Germany and Belgium, possessed the highest influence at court, and, finally, rose to the highest rank in church and state. Charles V. did not know the value of his American mines and slaves; his subjects worked both to immense advantage, if such it was in the end; but Philip II. soon found out the secret and filled his bags, which he emptied to “stir” all Europe, ruining his kingdom in the bargain, by way of attesting the old neglected proverb about “ill-gotten wealth.” For the account of the Fugger-family, we are indebted to the Jesuit Agricola, who says, “that he would be uncivil and ungrateful if his pen did not remember them.”—P. i. D. iii. 53. A member of this wealthy family, Ulric Fugger, was chamberlain to Paul III., but he subsequently turned Protestant. He was a great collector of manuscripts of ancient authors, and spent so much money in the mania, that his family thought proper to deprive him of the administration of his property. He retired at Heidelberg, where he died in 1584, leaving his splendid library to the elector. He was the only Protestant of the family; but, says the Jesuit Feller, “It happened against his intention that he rendered great service to our religion, by bequeathing 1000 florins to be applied to a pious purpose, requesting his relatives to make the application; for the sum, which was greatly increased, subsequently served for the foundation of the magnificent college at Augsberg, one of those which was most useful to the Catholic Church in Germany. The Jesuits occupied it even after their suppression, in 1791.”—*Biog. Univ.* In other words, the Jesuits got hold of this Protestant bequest, and their modern member approves of the roguery.

never beheld before or since. The Jesuits were assiduous and visionary, worldly-wise and filled with enthusiasm ; well-comported men, whose society was gladly courted ; devoid of personal interests—each labouring for the advancement of the rest. No wonder that they were successful.”

What had the Protestant movement to oppose to the tactics of Jesuitism ? Remember that the latter was based on untiring perseverance, unity of purpose, endless expedients to meet every emergency, strict discipline in personal conduct, undeviating method in tuition, and, above all, unity of will to which no achievement seemed impossible—the will bequeathed to them by Loyola. Remember all this, and you know the secret of their success, particularly if you believe what Ranke tells you, as if he were speaking of *England* at the present moment, with respect to the world of religion. He says : “ The Jesuits conquered the Germans on their own soil, in their very home, and wrested from them a part of their native land. Undoubtedly the cause of this was that the German theologians were neither agreed among themselves, nor were magnanimous enough mutually to tolerate minor differences of doctrine. Extreme points of opinion were seized upon ; opponents attacked each other with reckless fierceness, so that those who were not yet fully convinced were perplexed, and a path was opened to those foreigners, who now seized on men’s minds with a shrewdly constructed doctrine, finished to its most trivial details, and leaving not a shadow of cause for doubt.”¹

The Jesuits
as compared
to their
opponents.

Yet, let the mighty fact of the political utility of the

¹ Ranke, p. 137 ; Agricola, *ubi suprâ* ; Bibl. Scrip. S. J. ; Sacchin. P. ii. l. i.

Jesuits be borne in mind incessantly. Their patrons speculated on their influence with the masses. And the pope, so interested in the return to Catholic unity, held out succour to needy kings and princes, provided they promoted his accredited measures tending to that desirable fulfilment. Kings and princes talked of the spiritual and intellectual benefits they pretended to derive personally from Jesuit-indoctrination ; but kings and princes care a vast deal more for their authority and exchequer.

Their political utility to kings and other patrons.

Albert V. of Bavaria. Albert V. of Bavaria, for instance, was in a desperate struggle with his subjects. He was loaded with debt, and continually in want of money. He laid on taxes, but the nobles and the people, who are naturally entitled to some little return for sweat and blood represented by gold, demanded concessions, chiefly religious, as a set-off to the loyal inconvenience of paying royalty, without a royal equivalent in return “graciously conceded.” Well, the Jesuits came in : Albert took them by the hand : he declared himself their friend : he seemed to be impressed with their preaching—nay, he even declared, that whatever he knew of God’s law, he had learnt from Hoffäus and Canisius, two Jesuits. Such being the case, it was a matter of “principle” in Albert to patronise the Jesuits. And a nobler motive than the knowledge of God’s law can scarcely be imagined. But, unfortunately for all this very fine talk, there was another *case* brought in with the Jesuits, sent as a present by Pope Pius IV., with whom we are so well acquainted ; and this case was nothing less than a *tenth of the property of the Bavarian clergy*. We must add this to his knowledge of God’s law, subtract his debts from the sum total, and pass the remainder to the

credit of his independence, at one holy swoop most gloriously achieved. For he saw the advantages which would result from his intimate connection with Rome ; and now that his coffers were made heavy and his heart was made light, his conscience was prepared to adopt the pope's warning when he sent him the grant, that "the religious concession demanded by the people would diminish the obedience of his subjects ;" it was a sort of motto inscribed on the Simoniacal grant of what he had no right to give, and the king no right to use for paying his debts, and still less for making himself independent of his subjects. Then the Jesuits set to work, penetrated in every direction, insinuated themselves into every circle, and the result was that demands for religious concessions ceased amain, and the supplies rolled in without stipulations for equivalent privileges, a right royal benevolence of the wretchedly gulled poor people. This Jesuit-achievement totally undermined the nobles. Their mouthpiece (the people) was lockjawed, and they had to bark for themselves. They barked, and they stirred, and they gave signs of biting. This was just the thing wanting : the king, now independent remember, came down upon them, excluded all the individuals compromised from the Bavarian diet, and, without further opposition, became complete master of his estates, which from that time forth never stirred any question of religion. So absorbing was his power, so complete his domination, so contemptuous his consciousness of independence, that when the pope granted permission for the Bavarian laity to partake of the cup in 1564,¹

¹ In 1561 the French bishops requested the king to demand from the pope permission for priests to marry, and communion under both kinds especially. The boon, they said, would facilitate the return of the heretics to the church. Five

the king disdained to effectuate the boon, he did not even divulge the fact, though he had formerly, in his difficulties, represented the concession as the very safeguard and guarantee of his throne.¹ Circumstances had altered this case ; and now “the concession would diminish the obedience of his subjects,” his present object was to show himself a right orthodox Catholic king.

To the Jesuits, and the tyranny they suggested and enabled him to practise, the king of Bavaria owed this alteration in his royal fortunes. They roused his cupidity, and he became “most anxious to possess his Bavaria entire,” by the means of orthodoxy.² Vigilance and exhortation were the contribution of the Jesuits ; if these failed, rigour and severity were forthcoming. He made the Jesuits inspectors and examiners of his books, leaving it to them to decide on their orthodoxy and morality. All the hymns and psalms of the Lutherans which his subjects used to sing in the streets and public places, he proscribed, prohibited by an edict. He compelled his bishops to submit their candidates for priest's orders to the Jesuits for

How it
came about.

bishops were of opinion that the king had authority enough to establish the use of the cup without further ceremony. It was proposed and agitated, in the papal consistory, and bitterly opposed by a vast majority. The Cardinal de St. Ange said, “that he would never consent to give so great a *poison* to the subjects of his most Christian Majesty by way of medicine : *better let them die first.*”—See *Dupin, Hist. du Concile*, i. 503, *et seq.* for the whole negotiation : it is worth reading.

¹ Ferdinand of Austria had long solicited the pope to grant this privilege to his subjects, and urged it as his last comfort in the lingering disease of which he died. It was granted at last, and the comfort was universal : “but,” adds the Jesuit Agricola, “it was as scratching to the itch,—*quale fricatio est prurigini*,” and then proceeds to show how detrimental the concession proved to the cause of orthodoxy.—P. i. D. iii. 117.

² “Princeps hic avidissimus totam suam Bavariam habendi, videndique Orthodoxam, non vigiliis, non hortatibus parcebat, rigore etiam, si lenia non sufficerent, ac severitate usus.”—P. i. D. iii. 4.

examination. All public functionaries were required to swear the Catholic oath ; certain senators demurred—he sent them to prison. Two members of an illustrious family he drove from their domains and banished them from Munich, for refusing or demurring to take the same oath. A third, who was wealthy, who had enjoyed great favour and authority at court, was suspected of heresy for demanding the use of the cup : Albert degraded and disgraced him. Others, whom he found were meditating resistance, he contented himself with humbling in a more pointed manner, ordering them to appear before him, and causing their gems and ancestral signet to be smashed on an anvil in their presence, to show them how he thought they had disgraced their nobility. “By this act alone,” says the Jesuit Agricola, “he obtained the title of Magnanimous, for having, without arms, subdued the proud and spared the vanquished—*absque armis et debellare superbos et parcere subjectis.*”¹ In fact, as Ranke observes, the Jesuits could never sufficiently extol the king—that second *Josias*, as they said—that *Theodosius* !

Study this sample, and you will understand much of Jesuit-method, royal gratitude, and the people’s gullibility, till they are enlightened or roused to madness, and become worse than the most
A word in season.
ruthless of tyrants. Let the rulers of earth bear the blame. They will not regulate their measures by the strict principles of justice to all, and moral rectitude. They succeed for a while notwithstanding. Then their circumstances change : they get involved somehow : events in neighbouring kingdoms set their subjects in a ferment. Terror then chills their hearts ; they are

¹ P. i. D. iii., 5, *et seq.*

ready to make “concessions”—in other words, they now fear the people. And the people find that out, and the “glorious” fact makes them drunk with vanity and their evil passions. Outbreaks ensue. God only knows where they will end. And then perchance some partisan-historian will say that there was *no* excuse for the people, *because* the government were ready to make “concessions !”

The Bavarian Protestants in the provinces clamoured for the cup, notwithstanding ; and *Nostris*, Our Men, were sent to quell the rebels—*ad reducendos errantes mittuntur nostri*. A supply of Jesuits was demanded from Canisius. He offered to go himself : but the king thought him too necessary to the Church to send him on so perilous a mission, where his life would be endangered. His substitutes were provided with the most ample powers and authority, to inflict a visitation not only on the rustics, but even the churches, and the very monasteries themselves, if necessary. They set to work bravely and in earnest, and with greater vigour, when they found how widely and horridly the evils had increased ;¹ for the rustics considered Luther a saint, pronounced the mass idolatry, and with great abuse and execrations celebrated the pope as Antichrist.² Schorich was the name of the Jesuit leader on this occasion.³ According to the method stated to have been invented by Canisius and Faber, he began

The Jesuits
hunt down
the heretics.

¹ “ Aggressi sunt opus fortiter simul et gnaviter, idque tantò magis, quanto latius horridiusque mala invaluerant.”—*Agric. ubi suprâ*, 119.

² “ Lutherum pro Sancto habere, Sacrificium Missæ pro idolatriâ, Papam pro Antichristo, immania inter convitia et execrationes proclamare edocti erant.”

³ This Jesuit had been originally one of the *domestics* at the Company’s establishment in Rome. Ignatius discovered signs of talent in the fellow, set him to study, and he became one of the most efficient members of the Company, to associate with bishops and shake hands with kings, princes, and nobles.—*Ib.* and *Sacchinus*.

with the mild measures of "charity and good works." He was particularly modest with the ecclesiastics, very sparingly resorting to threats and authority—*nisi forte*—unless, peradventure, severity evidently promised advantage—*cum severitas evidenter speraretur profutura*. The result was, that, within seven months, 3000 rustics submitted to the king and the pope; and the few, whom neither flattery nor threats could subdue, were banished from their country—*patriâ ejectis*. And moreover, lest the gathered harvest should be again scattered, their teachers were also banished, under penalty of death: their "heretical books" were taken from them: "orthodox" works were forced into their houses: and those unfortunates whom they despaired to reclaim were, by the prince and bishops, compelled to leave the country.¹ All this is calmly, complacently related by the Jesuit. He even calls the forcible abstraction of their books a *clever provision*—*solenter provisum*;—and finishes off with a prayer to God for the continuance of the harvest and prospects as they were after those acts of deception and tyranny. And yet, to the present *hour*, the Jesuits and their party denounce their own proscription by Queen Elizabeth; although there happened to be one shade of difference in *their* case, which was, beyond doubt, directly or indirectly its treasonable intentions,—whilst these poor Bavarians were remaining quiet in their remote misery, and

¹ "Ut ne porrò collecta messis rursum dispergeretur, solenter provisum est, ut pulsus sub poenâ capitali, errorum seminatoribus, Parochis quorum sanandorum spes erat, subtraherentur libri hæretici, Catholicorum vero librorum suppellex cæteri de quorum emendatione desperatum fuerat, ocyus jussu Principis ac Antistitum, totius Baviariæ fines deserere coacti sunt. '*Precari numen juvet,*'" he has the heart to add—"we must pray to God that as he has hitherto given great increase to the plantation and the watering, so he may make the same more and more fruitful and everlasting."—*Agric.* 120.

requiring to be ferreted out and hunted ere they gave an excuse to Jesuit-proscription and tyranny. Again, therefore, remember that the history of the Jesuits, more strikingly than all others, is a history of *Retribution*. And we shall find it so in Bavaria, when the whole Catholic cause, in the heyday of its exulting tyranny, shall crumble amain, and be punished, in spite of Jesuit-preaching, Jesuit-charity, Jesuit-sodalities.¹

The Jesuits had cleverly contrived their means : they were therefore successful to the utmost possible extent.

Results. Numerous establishments arose in all parts of Germany. Colleges were erected and filled. Houses were founded : residences were planted : and at length, in 1564, so flourishing were the prospects, that the German legion of Loyola was divided into two provinces, enlarging in length and breadth.²

The Jesuits during the Plague. In the same year the Plague, which decimated France, swept over Europe. It reached the Rhine. Scattering dismay, despair in every home, the exterminating angel sped apace—wailings in his rear, and shivering terror in his van. Men shunned each other : the ties of affection—the bonds of love, plighted or sworn, broke asunder : all fled from the bed of pestilence—except the Jesuits. At the call of their

¹ In 1576 the Sodality of the Virgin Mary in Upper Germany, and in the houses of the Jesuit-province alone, never numbered less than 30,000 of all ages, without counting the members among the people—"all fighting for her who is terrible as an army drawn up in battle array," says Agricola. He distinctly states that these Confraternities, owing to their multitudes, were divided into various classes according to the different ranks of the members ; but that all acknowledged the congregation at Rome, "even as an ocean whence they flowed as rivers": a most incongruous metaphor, but very expressive notwithstanding. Subsequently Pope Gregory XIII. united all these Sodalities into one body, with the congregation at Rome for its head, and placed its entire government in the hands of the Jesuits, their General Aquaviva and his successors.—*Agric. P. i. D. iv. 203, 204.*

² Sacchinus.

provincial, they came together ; and at the same bidding they dispersed, and fronted the angel of death. In the pest-house kneeling—in the grave-yard digging—in the thoroughfares begging—the Jesuits consoled the dying, buried the dead, and gathered alms for the living. Blessed be the hearts of these self-devoted men ! They knew no peril but in *shunning* the awful danger. For humanity—and, through humanity, for God—be that the stirring trumpet, whose echoes are deeds too great to be estimated, too great to be rewarded by the gold of Mammon or the voice of Fame. And yet Cretineau-Joly, the last Jesuit-historian, professing to copy “unpublished and authentic documents,” bitterly tells us that “this charity of the Jesuits, by day and by night, gave to their *Order* a *popular sanction*, which dispensed with many others,”—and that “the people, having seen the Jesuits at their work, called for them, to reward them for the present, and solicited their presence, provident of the future.”¹ Was it then for the *Order's* glorification that, in obedience to the superior's command, such self-devotedness was displayed ? Was it only to gain a “popular sanction ?” God only knows ! but the doubt once suggested, and that too by a strong partisan, troubles the heart. We would not willingly deprive these obedient visitors of the pest-stricken, buriers of the dead, and feeders of the living, of that hearty admiration which gushes forth, and scorns to think of motives

¹ Hist. t. i. p. 456. “Cette charité du jour et de la nuit donnait à leur Ordre une sanction populaire qui dispensait de beaucoup d'autres. Le peuple venait de voir les Jesuites à l'œuvre ; il en reclama pour les recompenser du présent, il en sollicita dans ses prévisions d'avenir.” Sacchinus was not quite so explicit as M. Cretineau. “Deus liberalitatem expositorum periculo fratrum eâ etiam mercede remuneratus est, quod Trevirenses eximiam caritatem admirati non solum pluris æstimare Societatem cœperunt, sed multi etiam eam vehementer expetere.”—*Lib. viii. 96.*

when noble deeds are done. At least to the subordinate Children of Obedience be that admiration awarded, if we *must* doubt the existence of exalted motives in the Jesuit-automaton ; if we *must* remember that at Lyons the Plague gave them a college, and in Germany “a popular sanction.”

Amidst this mighty promise of permanent restoration to Catholicism in Germany, Lutheranism along the southern shores of the Baltic had achieved Poland. complete preponderance,—at least amongst the population which spoke the language of Luther. Prussia led the way, and was its bridge into Poland, whose great cities connected with Prussia had the exercise of the Protestant ritual confirmed to them by express charters in 1558. Even in Poland Proper, numbers of the nobility had embraced Protestant opinions, as more in accordance with their love of independence. It was a common saying : “A Polish nobleman is not subject to the king ; is he to be so to the pope ?” Protestants had penetrated into the episcopal sees, and even constituted the majority of the senate under Sigismund Augustus,¹ whose passion for women seemed at one time likely to sever Poland, like England, from obedience to the See of Rome. That craftiest of papal emissaries, Cardinal Commendone, exhausted all his wits in forefending the catastrophe. Sigismund’s clandestine marriage with the widow Radzivil, strongly opposed by the nobles and his mother, had set the kingdom in commotion : but love or passion triumphed over opposition, and the threats of deposition : Sigismund continued to reign, and death snatched away his beautiful Radzivil (supposed to have been poisoned by his mother),

¹ Ranke, p. 132.

leaving him in utter anguish and ready for another alliance. His first wife, or queen, was the daughter of the Austrian Ferdinand, who had still eleven daughters disposable. Sigismund sent for another ; and Ferdinand was “too glad” to accommodate his son-in-law with a second helpmate from his stock so numerous. A positive law, civil, religious, and ecclesiastical, prohibited the marriage with a wife’s sister :—but “it was so important for their interests and the good of the state” that the two kings induced the pope, Julius III., to grant a “dispensation.” Both kings were gratified by the fulfilment of their desires — and both were bitterly disappointed in the issue. Sigismund was disgusted with his queen very soon after marriage — hatred ensued — and separation, whilst the king elsewhere indulged his illicit passions which had rioted before. He resolved on a divorce—a new Radzivil having engaged his attentions. The pope refused to annul the marriage, whilst his reformed subjects were willing enough to support the king in his desire, which would thus burst asunder the ties that bound the realm to the See of Rome.¹ Then it was that the wily Commendone was sent by Pius IV. to cajole, and to browbeat the King of Poland.² Prudence and timidity withheld the king—now rendered infirm by his excesses—from the decisive plunge : but to reward his Protestant subjects for upholding their king in his desires, Sigismund showed them more favour than ever ; and in revenge for the pope’s inconsistent obstinacy, he opened them the way to the dignities of state—to the utter indignation of the Catholic party. He died without issue—the last of the Jaggelos.³

¹ Hist. of Poland (Lard. Cyc.), and the authorities, p. 147.

² Gratiani, t. i. c. 17, *et seq.*—a full Catholic account of the agitation.

³ As a proof that the zeal of the Roman church was inspired unto its boasted

Long ere that event, however, the Protestant movement had been gaining ground in Poland. The celebrated Bernardin Ochino had lent the cause his eloquence and influential name. This Italian had been Urbino's partner in reforming the Franciscans, and founding the Order of the Capuchins. Ochino's influence and popularity, as Capuchin, are described in most glowing terms by those who only do so to prepare us for their opinion that his disappointed ecclesiastical ambition made him 'a reformer, in the *other* sense of the word.¹ Be that as it may, he became heretical, and the pope summoned him to Rome :—he set out with the intention of obeying the mandate ; but certain appearances convinced him that he was going into the jaws of the tiger, with evident danger of being made a martyr : he preferred to remain a heretic : so he threw off his cowl, joined the Protestants, and was the first apostate from the Order which he had founded. Commendone found him in Poland doing desperate work at the foundations of Romanism, and resolved to dislodge the sapper. He induced Sigismund's Senate to pass a decree banishing all foreign heretics. Ochino being a foreigner, was thus compelled to decamp by the

expansion, by the Protestant movement only, we may instance Lithuania, which remained Pagan to the beginning or middle of the fifteenth century. Even to that period did Roman zeal permit the Lithuanians to worship all manner of animals, snakes included. They were so barbarous that they considered it an honour to sacrifice the chastity of their daughters ; held it dishonourable to marry a chaste woman, and respected their women in proportion to the greater number of their gallants. And yet we are assured that such a strange state of things continued after they were instructed or "converted."—*Gratiani*, t. ii. 159.

Henry of Valois, brother of Charles IX. of France, was elected to succeed Sigismund ; but a few months after his arrival, Henry suddenly and secretly decamped in order to become the unfortunate Henry III. of France, at the death of Charles IX. See a comical account of his flight in *Gratiani*, i. 506. The electorate was one of the causes which prepared the final and irrevocable ruin of Poland.

¹ *Gratiani*, i. c. 9.

wily Italian cardinal, and he retired to Moravia, where the Plague carried him off at a very advanced year of his age.¹ But this was no eradication of the Protestant plague which infected Poland. The pope sent Canisius to the Diet at Petrikaw, to prevent any decree prejudicial to the Catholic religion. The Jesuit showed himself worthy of the mission, spoke frequently at the meeting, and, according to the Jesuits, made an impression on the Poles and their king;² but this is a mere flourish. If Sigismund had lived long enough it is probable that Protestantism would have become the religion of Poland. His principle or policy was not to interfere with the religion of his subjects, whom he permitted to worship God as they pleased. Protestants were returned to the national Diet; and it was even proposed to abolish clerical celibacy, to decree the use of the cup for the laity, the celebration of mass in the vulgar tongue, and the abolition of papal annates or first-fruits—which last was the probable stimulant to the pope's anxiety.³ Two years after, however, in 1564, the Jesuits penetrated into Poland, and commenced operations at Pultowa—the beginning of some little trouble for Poland; as if their political feuds, which began with the death of Sigismund, were not enough to agitate that restless nation, without a single element of duration in its social or moral character—as bereft of unity of design and conduct as the troops that welcomed Henry of Valois were deficient in unity of fashion as to arms and accoutrement. On that occasion all their horses were of a different colour. Their riders were as motley. Some were dressed after the manner of the Hungarians, or the Turks, others after that of French or Italians. Some

The Jesuits
enter Poland.

¹ Gratiani, i. c. 9.

² Cretineau, i. 458.

³ Hist. of Poland, p. 145.

had bows, others lances and shields ; and some mounted the helmet and cuirass. Some wore long hair, others short, and some were shaved to the scalp. There were beards, and there were no beards. There was a blue company, and a red company, and one squadron was green.¹ Since that event and that occasion the councils of the nation have partaken of the same fantastic variety, entailing the usual misery of a kingdom divided against itself.

The introduction of the Company into Poland was the last expedition set on foot by General Lainez. He expired on the 19th of January 1565, in the fifty-third year of his age. He had ailed ever since the closing of the Council of Trent ; but he continued the business of the Company notwithstanding, and dispensed with a vicar—clinging to authority to the last. He received the viaticum, extreme unction, and the pope's benediction, which last he sent for, like Ignatius in the same circumstances, and which was granted by the pope with "a plenary indulgence." To the fathers he commended the Company—exhorting them to beware of ambition—to cherish union—to extirpate all national prejudices against each other. They requested him to name a vicar-general : but he refused. Then the heaviness of death—apparently apoplectic—came upon him—and he painfully lingered through an agony of four-and-forty hours, when death put an end to his sufferings—seeming in his last moment to glance on Borgia, who was present, as if to designate his successor.²

It was a saying of Lainez that it was a sign of a good general if he was like Moses, who brought forth his

¹ Gratiani, ii. 499.

² Sacchin. l. viii. 200 ; Cretineau, i. 471.

Company out of Egypt into the wilderness, through which he led it into the land of promise:¹—such was his aim, such was his ambition through life; and the means he employed eventuated complete success. His success. The nine years of his generalate were years of incessant struggle and continual harassments:—his Company was constantly attacking or attacked. At the death of Loyola it was in danger of suppression, hampered by a pope most difficult to deal with, agitated by intestine broils and commotion. Lainez managed the pope, emerged with triumph from humiliation—after having with considerable tact, craft, and depth of design, completely palsied his spasmodic opponents, who were never heard of afterwards—quiet as lambs every man of them, not excepting the volcanic Bobadilla.

In nine years he nearly quadrupled the number of his men,—and the Company's houses,—and added six provinces to those he received from Loyola. The Company now consisted of 130 houses, The Company as he left it. 18 provinces, and upwards of 3500 men²—which large figure—if we roundly compute the members of their sodalities of all ranks, and their pupils—must be raised to some thirty or forty thousand souls at least, under the influence of the Jesuits. Well might Melancthon exclaim on his death-bed in 1560, “Good God! what is this? I see that all the world is filled with Jesuits!”³

And how was all this effected? Simply by *unity* of

¹ Sacchin. ib. 214.

² Sacchinus and Cretineau.

³ Florim. de Remond, Hist. de la Naissance, Progrès et Décadence de l'Hérésie, t. v. c. 3. This work is supposed to have been written by the fierce Jesuit *Richeome*, author of *La Chasse du Renard Pasquin*, a scurrilous libel against Pasquier, the famous advocate of the University of Paris.

purpose, whatever was the object, strict *method*, careful *selection of instruments*, during times when kings and princes were eager to enlist every talent into their service,—whilst the “religious” battle raged on all sides, involving every peril or every deliverance, as the issue of defeat or victory.

Great facility of expression, self-possession, a tenacious memory, vast boldness, perhaps effrontery, and the *unscrupulous* zeal of a partisan seem to have been the public recommendations of Lainez to those for whom he battled ; and their rewards to his Company amply testified their estimation of his achievements. Vast must have been the self-gratulation of the man, in the possession of such unbounded influence over the destinies, the desires, the deeds of mankind. Meseems, I hear some grovelling spirit ask—was he very *rich* ? Was he well *paid* for his services ? We are taught from our earliest youth upwards, we are so much accustomed to value everything by its production of *money*, that we cannot understand how infinitely that vile motive is surpassed by the consciousness of swaying man’s more exalted nature—that *soul* which God himself complacently calls from its earthy integuments left behind where they lie, in the cold hard earth, with the gold he despises. On the other hand, the general of the Jesuits was the treasurer of the Company’s increasing wealth, which he distributed with a sovereign will, unaccountable in his constitutional independence. All that he desired for himself, he possessed—but that was infinitely less than what the pettiest of kings or republican presidents require. It is gratifying to many who judge by cost, thus to behold a cheap ruler—a cheap government. In the Jesuit-system it was corporate

avarice, corporate ambition, of which each member, in his ceaseless efforts, was the exponent. Those passions gained in intensity by this expansion ; for they lost all those moral checks—those qualms of conscience which individual avarice, individual ambition must ever experience. *Our Company* and its *ends* easily satisfied the Jesuit that all the passions he indulged in enriching, in exalting the Company, and promoting those *ends* which answered both purposes—were as many virtues, and his conscience said Amen.

In private life, Lainez is represented by the Jesuits as being exceedingly fascinating and amiable—pouring forth from his treasury of knowledge his axioms of wisdom, original and selected.¹ He was considerate to those whom he expelled from the Company, giving them their dinner and wherewithal to return to their homes.² He used to say that any one might impose upon him³—but this will scarcely go down after having heard him say that *Catherine de' Medici* could not deceive him, and that he knew her of old.

His private character.

His sister's husband fatigued him with solicitations to promote his advancement, since he possessed such influence amongst kings and the great. Lainez wrote him word that every man must live by his profession,—a soldier by war, a merchant by trade, a monk by religion—and declined to step beyond his bounds. Some relatives wished him to procure an “opening” to the holy orders and a living for a boy—a species of corruption common in those times ;—Lainez sternly refused, saying, “ You know not what you ask.”⁴ The man was unquestionably consistent according to circumstances, and his example on this occasion is truly

Two creditable traits.

¹ Sacchinus.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

worthy of imitation by those to whom the highest offices in church and state, particularly the former, are made a stumbling-block by importunate and unscrupulous relatives.

He left behind numerous unfinished treatises in manuscript. Their titles will throw additional light on the man, his thoughts, and pursuits. Twelve books
His writings. on *Providence*; a commentary on the whole Bible, one book; three books on the Trinity; a collection of sentences selected from the "Fathers;" treatises on exchange, usury, *pluralities*, the disguises and finery of women, the kingdom of God, the use of the cup, and a tract against the concession of churches to heretics.¹

Lainez was diminutive in stature, of fair complexion, somewhat pale, with a cheerful expression, but intense—
His person. wide nostrils, indicating his fiery soul; nose aquiline, large eyes, exceedingly bright and lively: so far the elements of Sacchini's portrait of the general; but Father Ignatius, you remember, daguerreotyped him in three words—*no tenga persona—he is not good looking or imposing*. His hand-writing was execrable.²

In accordance with the last glance of the dying
Borgia elected general. Lainez, or on account of the rank which he had occupied in the world, Borgia was elected general, by a large majority in the congregation. It is said that the seven votes which he did not

¹ Bib. Script. S. J. He also wrote treatises on the Doctrine of the Council of Trent, the Sacraments, Grace and Justification, Instructions for Preachers, an Epistle to the Missionaries in India, which last is all that we have access to, besides his speeches in Sacchinus. A tribute of praise is deserved by this indefatigable Jesuit for his industry, his constant labour.

² Cretineau gives a *fac-simile*.

receive were given by those Jesuits who knew him most intimately ; and when he took leave of the retiring congregation, he requested the fathers, all the professed aristocrats of the Company, to treat him as a beast of burden. "I am your beast of burden," said Borgia : "you have placed the load on my shoulders : treat me as a beast of burden, in order that I may say, with the Psalmist, 'I am as a beast before you, nevertheless, I am continually with you.'"¹ Under very different auspices, and in very different circumstances, had the bold, astute, determined Lainez seized the sceptre of Loyola. If *he* quoted Scripture on that occasion, the text must have been, "Take us the foxes, the little foxes that spoil the vines ;" for there was imminent peril from without and within the Company. Times were altered ; and if a vigorous head was still necessary to govern the body, a man of influence was imperatively so at a time when the Company had penetrated into every kingdom of Europe, and only required "patronage" to insure boundless increase and endless duration. Francis Borgia was more or less connected with most of the kings and princes of Europe, then reigning. True, the bar-sinister blushed in his escutcheon : but that was no time for men to care whether a great lord was a descendant of the Vanoccia Julia Farnese on one side of his primitive ancestry, and Pope Alexander VI. on the other. Francis Borgia seemed intended to show that "good fruit" might come from a "bad tree." A lover of contemplation was Borgia. The world disgusted him : he left it with all its honours, pomps, and vanities, and gave himself to the Jesuits, at the very time when they lacked a great name amongst them, to catch the vulgar.

¹ Sacchin. P. iii. l. i. n. 23 ; Cretineau, ii. 12.

A man of strange notions and stranger perpetrations was Francis Borgia. He wrote a book entitled *The*
His corporal
austerities. *Spiritual Eye-salve*, and another *On Self-Confusion*;¹ and never was man (not intended for a saint) given to more flagrant atrocities against his own poor body. We are assured that he considered his body his “mortal enemy,” with which he should never declare a truce: he never ceased evincing to the same unfortunate body that “holy hatred” which he bore it, tormenting and persecuting it in every way that his “ingenious cruelty” could devise. He used to say that life would have been insupportable to him, if he had passed a single day without inflicting on his body some extraordinary pang. He did not consider fasting a “mortification,” but a “delight;” and, in fact, like all other abused delights, it ruined his constitution and made him a human wreck; the most hopeless and pitiable of all wrecks imaginable. Savagely he lashed his body. Some one counted 800 strokes on one occasion; and he tore his shoulders to such a degree that there was danger of real mortification or gangrene in the ulcerous imposthumes which resulted from the wounds. He would lie prostrate with his mouth glued to the ground, until he brought on fluxions in his mouth, and lost several teeth, and was in imminent danger of death from a cancer in the same organ. In a chest he kept hair-shirts, whips, and other instruments of torture, and cloths to wipe away the blood which he drew abundantly from all parts of his body.² It is said that these excessive delights produced qualms of conscience, or scruples in the man, before he died: and, doubtless, when “all was over,” he must have discovered their futility, nay, their positive

¹ “Collyrium Spirituale,” and “De Confusione sui.”

² Verjus, Vie, ii. lib. iv.

guilt in the sight of Him who is offended by the infringement of *all* His laws : those of health, therefore, are not excepted. One would almost fancy that *this* Borgia wished to atone, in his own person, for all the atrocities which the other Borgia, Pope Alexander VI., inflicted on mankind. His age, at his election, was sixty-five.

Important decrees were passed in the congregation, after the election of the general. They throw light on existing abuses in the Company, but show that these were met at least with legislative prohibitions. The general was required to look to the colleges of the Company. Some moderation was to be had in taking charge of them ; their multiplicity was to be checked ; and the general was enjoined to strengthen and improve those which existed rather than undertake others. It was expressly stipulated that no colleges were to be undertaken unless they were sufficiently endowed and well provided with the means of subsistence—a wise precaution, and it had been well if the Jesuit missionaries had brought some similar wisdom to bear on their “conversion” and baptism of the savages, when they undertook to make them “temples of the Holy Ghost.” It was even resolved in the congregation to consider what colleges, so unfurnished, should be thrown overboard—dissolved by those who began to discover that *gratis*-instruction is all very well in a prospectus, but excessively inconvenient in practice—and by no means expedient in the present scope of the Company. It appears that there was another enactment on this interesting subject : but it is omitted in the list as “private business—*privata negotia*.”¹

¹ Dec. II. Congr. Dec. viii. in MS. Dec. xi. The next decree is MS. Dec. xiii. See the present work, vol. i. p. 277, for remarks on these omissions.

Complaints were made on another score. The Jesuits began to feel the inconvenience of frequent removals at the word of command. The aristocratical dignitaries liked permanency as well as their constitutional general : but it was decided against the remonstrants :—the mutations were pronounced useful to the removed member and the Company, and even absolutely necessary :—*but* the superiors were enjoined to exercise their prudence in the matter ; and all royal mandates were to be respected, princes were not to be offended ; and in case the removal was absolutely necessary the consent and satisfaction of princes must be obtained.¹ We remember the trouble which Philip II. gave the Jesuits for having been accustomed to abstract money from his dominions. Borgia himself proposed the question whether the royal edicts in this matter should be obeyed, for the greater edification of princes ; and the congregation approved his opinion, and declared that such edicts against the exportation of moneys should be obeyed—but we may ask why the “edification of princes” was necessary to prevent the men who vowed poverty from meddling with the exportation of gold.² The difficulties which had arisen as to the distribution of the wealth given to the Company by its members, was a serious question. It appears that the Sons of Obedience sometimes wished to have their peculiar fancies and predilections consulted in its appropriation to this or that locality, notwithstanding the rule of the Constitutions and that most glorious “indifference to all things,” which prescriptively results from the “Spiritual Exercises.” It was now enacted that all must be left to the disposal

The wealth
of the
novices.

¹ Ubi suprà, Dec. xii.

² Dec. xv.

of the general—*dispositioni præpositi generalis relinquunt*. Thus the fathers enacted, saying: We venerate the holy memory of our fathers—*veneramur enim sanctam memoriam patrum nostrorum*.¹

It was positively enacted in this Second Congregation, Anno Domini 1565, that no Jesuit was to be assigned to princes or lords, secular or ecclesiastic, to follow or to live at their court, as confessor or theologian, or in any other capacity, “except perhaps for a very short time, such as one or two months—*nisi forte ad perbreve tempus unius vel duorum mensium*.”²

Royal
confessors.

In the same congregation difficulties were proposed as to the simple vows, particularly as to chastity—*præsertim castitatis*. The question was referred to previous enactments; and there occurs a hiatus of *two decrees* in the document;—but by way of compensation the next that follows is an enactment touching the “*renovation* of the vows.”³

The vows;
chastity in
particular.

And a prohibition was enacted against “all manner of worldly business, such as agriculture, the sale of produce in the markets and the like, carried on by Our men”—which we should have scarcely thought necessary so soon.⁴

Worldly
business.

No *poor-boxes* were to be seen in the churches of the Jesuits—“as it is so necessary for us that they should not be placed, not so much to avoid the thing which is forbidden us, but all appearance of it—*sed rei illius omnem speciem*.”⁵

All law-suits were prohibited, particularly for temporal matters: if they could not by any means be avoided, no Jesuit should undertake them without special permission from the general or his

Law-suits.

¹ Dec. xxiii.

² Dec. xl.

³ Dec. lxiii.

⁴ Dec. lxi.

⁵ Dec. lxxviii.

delegate. The Jesuits were to yield with loss rather than contend with justice.¹

The Spanish title, *Don*, was to be utterly banished from the Company.²

Lastly, the Constitutions, as translated from the original Spanish into Latin, were to be once more collated and amended—showing that they had not as yet received the “last hand,” though five-and-twenty years had elapsed since the foundation of the Company.³

Nor did the aristocrats of the now most respectable Company of Jesus fail to hint that circumstances permitted some modification in the matter of *begging for alms and donations*. Alms, they said, were good things in themselves, good for the Company ; and it was a good deed—*opus bonum*—to induce all men as much as possible to do good things ; but for greater “edification,” for the “sincerity and purity of our poverty, our men must be ordered not to persuade any externe to give alms to us rather than to other poor people ; but let us be content to beg simply and plainly for the love of God when we beg alms. However, for the purpose of getting donations or legacies, we may explain our wants simply and plainly, leaving the manner and matter (*definitionem*) to the devotion of the person from whom we beg these kinds of alms also—a *quo petimus has etiam eleemosynas*—and we can only suggest to him to have recourse to prayer and the other means, whereby he can resolve on the donation or legacy, according to what the Lord shall inspire unto him, and right reason shall suggest.”⁴ Such are the prominent and characteristic enactments

¹ Dec. lv.

² Dec. lxxxv.

³ Dec. lii.

⁴ Dec. lvi.

of the Second Congregation. The characteristic mandates of the first, under Lainez, were those relating to the perpetuity of the generalate,¹ and the non-admission of the choir,² which last was mysteriously veiled under the name of common prayer, or prayers in common—*orare simul*—points which Pope Paul IV. contested ; and the points now mooted happen to be precisely those which form the burthen of the world's accusations in this period of Jesuit-history.

Scarcely was the decree against law-suits passed in the congregation, when the Jesuits at Paris prepared to contest the right of the University in refusing to permit their academical pursuits. Nor was that corporation their only opponent. The bishop, the curés, the Cardinal-Bishop of Beauvais, the administrators of the hospitals, the mendicant friars, in a word, the most respectable and distinguished personages of the French metropolis, united in demanding the expulsion of the Jesuits, not only from Paris, but from France. All had presented petitions to that effect, and had appointed advocates to plead their cause.³ This determined opposition would have been sufficient to strike others with dismay ; but it only roused the Jesuits to more vigorous efforts than ever. They knew that favour and patronage were their only hope of success. Accordingly they dispatched Possevin to King Charles IX., with an humble petition. This dexterous and crafty Jesuit was passing his probation in important expeditions. A clever speaker, and copious linguist, with a prodigious memory, and all the boldness that a Jesuit requires, with just enough modesty to show

The Jesuits
at law.

Possevinus.

¹ Dec. I. Cong. xlvii.

² Ib. Dec. xcviii.

³ Du Boulay, Hist. vi. 643 ; Annales, lib. xxviii. *et seq.* ; Quesnel, ii. 155.

that there is such a virtue in existence, determined in heart, and proud of his vocation, which raised him from nothing to the companionship of kings, he was just the man for these times, when kings and nobles needed enterprising emissaries—just the man for the rising Company of Jesus, preparing to move the universe. Charles IX. was then at Bayonne, with his mother, Catherine de' Medici, where they were having an interview with the Queen of Spain, the king's sister, and wife of Philip II. This meeting was a sort of *Holy Alliance*, for mutual defence, or, rather, offence, against the heretics driven to rebellion. It was in this interview that the famous Massacre of St. Bartholomew, or something similar, was proposed by the Duke of Alva, who represented the cruel Spaniard on that occasion.¹ A fitting occasion it was for Jesuit

¹ Davila, i. 165. Dr. Lingard, viii. p. 60, gives a mystifying note against this general belief at the time in question ; and the Doctor appeals to Raumer, who, he tells his readers, has published "one hundred pages" on the conference at Bayonne, "and yet there is not a passage in them to countenance the suspicion that such a league was ever in the contemplation of the parties at that interview." In the first place, we must read *ten* pages instead of "*a hundred*," remarking, at the same time, that the "mistake" is one of the most curious ; and how the Doctor could write "one hundred," though he brackets the pages [112—122], is unaccountable. Secondly, there *is* a passage in Raumer's documents to countenance the assertion, and here it is: among the conditions stipulated as "the main objects," were "the security of Christendom against the infidels, and the maintenance of the Catholic religion, and especially to prevent the daily weakening of the royal power in France ;" and further, though the Doctor says that "Philip acceded to the request with reluctance," yet Raumer's documents state that, though he hesitated at first, from natural indecision or anxiety, lest other states should *suspect the objects of the interview*, "he was even himself inclined to betake himself to the neighbourhood of Bayonne." Finally, there is *another* passage still more to the point. Alva "advised and exhorted her [Catherine de' Medici] to insist, in such fashion, upon obedience and strict execution of the law, that none should presume, on any pretext, to transgress it, without being *so punished that he should serve as an example of dread to all*."—P. 120. It seems, therefore, that Raumer's documents tend to strengthen the assertion ; if there was no "league" agreed upon, there was certainly the sen-

intervention, and for this same Possevinus to deliver himself of a monster opinion, as he did afterwards, lauding the Spanish bigot for his atrocious cruelties inflicted on Jews and heretics.¹ The Jesuit's mission was to induce the king "to terminate the chicanery of the French Parliament and University,"² says Cretineau-Joly, who, we remember, paid the Jesuits themselves the compliment of possessing craft equal to any. The law-suit came on in 1564. Stephen Pasquier was the advocate of the University, and Peter Versoris, another famous pleader, championed the Company, or rather, says Quesnel, he delivered an

Pasquier.

timent of such a league suggested and accepted by Catherine, p. 120 ; and the "example of dread to all" does look very much like the Massacre of St. Bartholomew ; however, much was to be done before it could be attempted. See also p. 276 of Raumer, for further attestation of the Spaniard's ferocious policy. This curious topic is a grand controversial affair between parties, and this is the reason why the doctor tries to weaken its outposts before he explains it off at its occurrence. Meanwhile Capefigue, a Catholic writer, but not less conscientious than the doctor, and quite as laborious, opens a tremendous cavern of "awful disclosures." He shows, that during the progress of the French king before he reached Bayonne, he constantly gave a minute account of his affairs and proceedings to Philip. "Philip II.," says Capefigue, "could not come to Bayonne, but sent the Duke of Alva, the most intimate of his confidants, the man who entered most perfectly into his idea. The queen-mother [Catherine de' Medici] wrote to the King of Spain, thanking him for permitting his wife to visit her and her son the king. 'I cannot fail to tell you the happiness I feel at seeing a thing approach which I have so much desired, and I hope will give not only great satisfaction to the king, my son, and to me ; but *good and security to repose, and preservation to all Christianity.*' In the midst of festivities, tournaments, feats of arms and balls, they talked of nothing in the conference of Bayonne but the expedients to get rid of the Calvinists, who were accused of being alone the causes of the troubles which tormented France." Alva rejected the idea of a new negotiation—*transaction*. "They discussed the means of destroying Huguenotry for ever, and the Dispatches of the Duke of Alva attest that even at that time *the idea of a general massacre of the heretics was not rejected.*"—*La Réforme et la Ligue*, pp. 285—287. From Catherine's letter it is evident the meeting was intended for other purposes besides a *friendly meeting*, as Lingard asserts.

¹ See his *Judicium de Polit. et Milit.* p. 86, also p. 93, ed. 1592.

² Cretineau, i. 448.

oration whose materials were furnished by the Jesuit Caigord of Auvergne—a method not unusual with the *apologists of the Company of Jesus*. It would tire the most patient of men to enter into the arguments on both sides. Suffice it to say, that no efforts were spared on either side to insure the victory. Elsewhere may be found the long speeches on that occasion :¹ but not in

Sacchinus, for the Jesuit has invented ha-
Jesuit-in-
vention. rangues, with his usual deep-mouthed rhetoric :—this trick adds to the discredit which is certainly attached to his History—as curious a piece of invention as any that the Jesuits ever produced. Patronage defended the Jesuits where their eloquence was of no avail. Possevin returned from Bayonne with letters from the Chancellor de l'Hôpital, to the Parliament, with recommendations from the queen-mother, and many lords, to the bishop and the governor of Paris. The Jesuits had induced the pope to write to the bishop,
The method
of success. begging his lordship to favour his “cohort.”

In a word, they stirred all the powers, secular and ecclesiastical, to obtain what they foresaw would be refused on technical, if no other grounds, at the ordinary tribunals of justice. Still, with all this machination, with all this credit, and patronage, the result fell short of their desires. All they obtained was the suspension

of the suit ; and that in the meantime matters
The result. would remain as they were before, namely, that without being aggregated to the University, and without judgment being passed on the rights of the parties respectively, the Jesuits might continue to teach publicly till further orders.² Fiercely did bitter hearts pour leprous distilment into the ears of Christians during

¹ *Annales des Jésuites*, i. 28, *et seq.* ; *Quesnel*, ii. ; *Coudrette, et alibi.*

² *Ib.*

that agitation. A more rancorous enemy than Stephen Pasquier the Jesuits never had ; and no man did the Jesuits ever abuse so hideously and disgustingly as they bespattered Stephen Pasquier. The latter published his celebrated *Catechism of the Jesuits*, denouncing the Company with the utmost severity. This might be excusable in an ambitious lawyer, seeking his advancement to fame and wealth over the destruction of his enemies : but there was no excuse for “the men of God,”—the poor, the humble, the chaste members of the Company of Jesus, to retaliate with ten-fold atrocity of insult the most disgusting, as they did by their mouth-piece the Jesuit Richeome. The very year after the appearance of Pasquier’s *Catechism*, this Jesuit, under the name of *Felix de la Grace*, put forth his famous *Hunt of the Fox Pasquin*, in which he seems to exhaust rancour unto gasping ; so fierce and foul are the epithets and metaphors he pours on the devoted head of the enemy.¹ “Pasquier raves,” said another Jesuit, Father *La Font*, “until some one

Pasquier
and Father
Richeome.

¹ Here is an extract from the work ; it were absurd to attempt a translation : “Pasquier est un porte-panier, un maraut de Paris, petit galant, boufon, plaisant, petit compagnon, vendeur de sonnettes, simple regage, qui ne merite pas d’être le valet des laquais, belitre, coquin qui rotte, pette, et rend sa gorge ; fort suspect d’hérésie, ou bien hérétique, ou bien pire ; un sale et vilain satyre, un archi-maître sot, par nature, par be-square, par be-mol, sot à la plus haute gamme, sot à triple semelle, sot à double teinture, et teint en cramoisi, sot en toutes sortes de sottises, un grate-papier, un babillard, une grenouille du palais, un clabout de cohue, un soupirail d’enfer, un vieux renard, un insigne hypocrite, renard velu, renard chenu, renard grison, renard puant, et qui compisse tout de sa puante u——e. Fier-à-bras, trompette d’enfer, corbeau du palais, hibou de quelque infernale contrée . . . Catholique de bouche, hérétique de bourse, déiste, et peu s’en faut athéiste de cœur . . . O ! que si de toutes les têtes hérétiques ne restait que la sienne, qu’elle serait bientôt coupée ! Asne qui chante victoire, et comme un baudet qui pensant avoir atteint son bran, sautille et braie avec son bast, paniers, et elitelles,” &c.—*La Chase du Renard Pasquin, decouvert et pris en sa tanière, du libelle diffamatoire, faux, marqué le Catéchisme des Jésuites, par le Sieur Félix de la Grâce.* Villefranche, 8vo, 1603.

of our Company, or some other person, for the good of the public, makes a collection of his ignorance, ravings, stupidities, malignities, heresies, for to raise
 Father La Font. him a tomb where he may be confined alive ; whither the carrion-crows and the vultures may come from a hundred leagues off, attracted by the smell of his carcass, which men will not be able to approach nearer than a hundred steps without stopping their noses on account of the stench—where briars and nettles grow—where vipers and basilisks nestle—where the screech-owl and the bittern hoot, in order that, by such a monument, those who live at present, and those who shall live in future ages, may learn that the Jesuits have had him for a notable persecutor, calumniator, liar, and a mortal enemy of virtue and good people, and that all calumniators may learn not to scandalise, by their defamatory writing, the Holy Church of God.”¹

Reflections. The men who wrote thus of an opponent were highly esteemed for their piety and zeal, and Richeome, particularly, produced many pious tracts, among the rest, “*The Sighs and Counsels of a Christian Soul*,” just as the foul Aretino wrote a life of St. Catherine. And the Jesuit tells us, moreover, that the author of that foul, disgusting abuse, so untranslatable, “received this reward for his most excellent virtue, namely, that his head was seen surrounded with rays—God thus rendering illustrious that obscurity which he courted :”—in his eightieth year when laid up by gout, he amused himself with washing pots in the kitchen.² Doubtless some will say that such abuse was usual in those days. Let the excuse have its weight : but whose duty was it to give a

¹ Lettres de Pasquier, x. 5 ; Œuvres, ii. ; Quesnel, ii. 152.

² Bib. Script. S. J. Ludov. Richeom.

better example, to teach a better method of rewarding evil, to imitate Him who only denounced the robbers of the widow, the vampires who sucked the blood of orphans, the hypocritical Pharisees? Surely the "Companions of Jesus" have no right to excuse themselves by appealing to abuses which their title required them to correct. It is indeed painful to hear the restorers of religion, the re-establishers of virtue, the apostles of India and Portugal, pouring forth abuse too foul to be translated, and such as would disgrace the worst of sinners. Those were indeed dreadful times when God's representatives on earth conformed themselves unto the image of the worst of men. Such a sample as I have given is necessary to prepare your mind for the "religious" horrors about to follow. With such fire-brands (Richeome was twice provincial in France), with such "bellows" amongst them, on a mission from Rome, "God's oracle," sanctifying all that is worst in the devil, the *men* of those times may truly be excused for most of their atrocities, since "the priests of the Lord" inflamed their hearts with cruelty and made their swords more ravenous with a benediction. Another bad element in that lowering political and religious firmament was the Pope of Rome.

Pius IV. died in the same year of Borgia's election, and was succeeded by Pius V., a pope after the fashion of Paul IV., in the moments of his intensest rigidity. One of those grim bigots who think Pope Pius V. they honour God whilst they gratify the devil. "We forbid," says he in one of his Bulls, "every physician who shall be called to attend a bedridden patient, to visit the said patient for a longer space of time than three days, unless he receive a certificate within that time, that the patient has confessed his sins

afresh.”¹ One of those infatuated Pharisees who irritate men to the very sins they denounce, he would “put down” blasphemy and sabbath-breaking. How? Why, he imposed *fines* of *money* on the rich. A rich man who did these things—who broke God’s sabbath or blasphemed his name, had to pay money into the papal exchequer: but—and is it not always thus?—the poor man—“the common man who cannot pay shall, for the first offence, stand a whole day before the church doors with his hands bound behind his back; for the second he shall be whipped through the city; for the third, *his tongue shall be bored*, and he shall be sent to the galleys.”² A fiend of the Inquisition was Pius V., and a rancorous hater of the heretics. He sent troops to aid the French Catholics in their “religious” war, and he gave the leader of these troops, Count Santafiore, the monstrous order to take no Huguenot prisoner, but to kill forthwith every Protestant who should fall into his hands;—and the ruthless religionist “was grieved to find that his command was not obeyed!”³ To the ferocious Alva, after his bloody massacres, he sent with praises a consecrated hat and sword. His own party lauded this pope for what seemed in the man, singleness of purpose,

¹ Supra Gregem Dominicum, Bull. iv. ii. p. 281; Ranke, 92.

² Ibid. English law, in this point at least, is curiously just and equitable. By the Act of 19 Geo. II., c. 21, it is decreed, that if any person shall profanely curse or swear, and be convicted thereof, &c. &c., he shall forfeit, if a day-labourer, common soldier, sailor, or seaman, one shilling; if any other person under the degree of a gentleman, five shillings; for every second conviction double, and for every third and subsequent conviction, treble. The penalties are to go to the poor of the parish. Of course all such methods of reform are useless, because they do not reach the root of the abuse or evil; and, certainly, in the case of the jolly tar, the same act ought to have increased his wages to meet his increased expenditure on the item of his oaths.

³ “Pio si dolse del conte, che non havesse il commandamento di lui osservato d’amassar subito qualunque heretico gli fosse venuto alle mani.”—*Catena, Vita di Pio V.* p. 85.

loftiness of soul, personal austerity, and entire devotion to his religion : but all humanity should execrate his memory, because under these cloaks, so easily put on, his nature was grim bigotry, rancorous hatred, sanguinary “zeal” for his religion.¹ He was afterwards canonised—made a saint by Rome ; although the Indian savage might say, as in the case of the cruel Spaniards, that he would rather not go to heaven, if he had to meet there such a thing as this sainted Pope Pius. He will give the Jesuits some little trouble, but will command their services to the utmost.

In spite of the decree against the presence of Jesuits at the courts of princes, we find them striving with more ardour than ever to penetrate within the dangerous precincts of royal favour. ^{Court-favour.} The Emperor Ferdinand had married two of his daughters, one to the Duke of Ferrara, the other to Francis de’ Medici. The Jesuits had been the spiritual directors of these princesses before marriage ; and the devoted penitents clung to the fathers with fond endearment. The fathers went with them into their new state of life : but they had the misfortune to excite the disgust and resentment of the ladies at court, who strongly denounced the tyranny of the Jesuits. General Borgia did not remove them according to the decree ; but wrote them a letter of advice.²

Ferninand’s successor, Maximilian, was no great patron of the Jesuits. The deputies who met in 1565 earnestly demanded the expulsion of the Jesuits from ^{Disgraces.} Austria. The tide of popular opinion almost swept them from Vienna. In connection with the

¹ See Ranke for a full account of this pope, p. 90 ; and Mendham’s “ Life of Pius V.”

² Quesnel, ii. 169 ; Sacchin. Pars iii. lib. i.

strange and curious inquiries proposed in the congregation, touching the vow of "chastity especially," a foul charge raged against the Jesuits in Bavaria: a student of their college at Munich was the accuser: the procurator of the college was the accused. The King of Bavaria undertook to investigate the matter, which was one of the most extraordinary cases that ever puzzled a lawyer or mystified a surgeon. It is impossible to enter into the details which Sacchinus gives at full length: but if the Jesuits had no other proof of the procurator's innocence than the "fact" alleged in exculpation, the guilt of mutilation is not removed—and if the expedient suggested to convict the youth of imposture was exceedingly clever, it seems to point to some experience in similar cases, which, consequently, only renders the present more probable.¹ Nevertheless, the event points to the rancour that the Jesuits everywhere excited by their ferocious zeal and intemperate religionism,—which induced Maximilian to discountenance the

Company. That Catholic king complained
 Maximilian. to Cardinal Commendone that the Jesuits, whom the pope had given the cardinal as advisers, were carried away with too great a zeal for religion, and that

¹ "Exoritur in Baviâ . . . infestus rumor . . . Jesuitas, ut pueros ad castitatem sanctam compellant, eos eunuchos facere . . . Ipsemet, ad fidem faciendam cum obsignatis chirurgorum, qui inspexerant, testimoniis, circumducebatur puer." Sacchinus then states that the youth had been expelled from the college for indifferent morals—*ob mores laud bonos*,—and then makes the most extraordinary assertion, that "eâ erat naturâ, ut, quoties liberet, introrsum testes revocatos apparere non sineret. Inde nequam procaci joco, . . . excisos sibi a Godefrido Hanats . . . affirmavit." The physicians of Wolfgang, a "heretic prince," says Sacchinus, "pronuntiant eviratum puerum." When the boy was brought before Albert and *his* physicians, "statuitur puer in medio nudus . . . at nec virilitas cernebatur . . . cùm ab Ducis chirurgo, *sagacis ingenii homine*, continere spiritum, ac ventrem inflare jussus, id quod calumniatores querebantur exemptum, palam in conspectum dedit."—*Sacchin.* i. 100, 101; *Agric.* D. iii. 150.

they did not possess that moderation which the present circumstances required — although he thought them learned and upright. He particularly objected to Canisius on account of his obstinate pertinacity ; and even when requested by the Jesuit party at Augsberg to promote the establishment of a Jesuit college, his letter, without giving the Jesuits any commendation, merely alludes to the request, by stating that the people of Augsberg *say* the restoration of the Catholic faith cannot be more easily effected than by a college of the Company of Jesus, &c., quoting the petition of the Jesuit-party, with which he leaves the merits of the case, though, for political reasons, he requested his minister at Rome to use his endeavours for the fulfilment.¹ It was not in his nature to side with the Jesuits : though he made a public profession of the Catholic faith, and maintained the establishment of the church, he never swerved from the most liberal toleration, and in Germany made the religious peace, which he had so great a share in promoting, the grand rule of his conduct.²

In Spain other troubles, of their own making, harassed the Jesuits. Under the specious pretext of doing penance, they had established in several towns confraternities of flagellants, who, not content with whipping themselves in the churches of the Jesuits, performed the verberation publicly and in solemn procession. They had even introduced the practice amongst women, as elsewhere. The bishops of Spain were indignant at the abuses ; they prohibited them ; and proceeded to examine the book of the “Spiritual Exercises,” so well adapted to produce that wild devotion, which manifests

The Jesuits
in Spain.

¹ Agric. *ubi supra*, 159, 183.

² Coxe, Austria, ii. 24.

itself through all the passions. The Jesuits were alarmed : but credit set them at rest. Their Jesuit courtier, Araoz, was high in favour with Philip II., who now began to find out the utility of the Jesuits in his senseless and atrocious machinations, schemes, and perpetrations. The affair passed off without effects.¹ Philip had ulterior views respecting the Jesuits.

In India matters were more disastrous. There the Jesuits were trying the impossible problem of serving two masters at one and the same time. They had been received, together with the Portuguese, by the chieftain of Ternate, the most important of the Moluccas. The barbarian introduced the Portuguese for the sake of commerce ; and the Portuguese brought in the Jesuits to serve their own purposes.² I need not state that the Jesuits made conversions : but it was painfully discovered that their converts gathered around

The Jesuits
in India.

¹ Sacchin. lib. i. 117 ; Quesnel, ii. 176.

² The Jesuits supply curious information on this topic. They tell us that in Cochinchina the very words, in the native language, employed to ask the people "if they would become *Christians*," meant nothing else but "if they would become *Portuguese*." This was the general notion among the pagans. The Jesuit Buzome says he saw a comedy performed in the public place, and, by way of an interlude, they introduced a man dressed like a Portuguese, with an artificial paunch so constructed, that a child could be concealed within. In the sight of the multitude the actor pulled out the child, and asked him if he wished to go into the paunch of the Portuguese, namely, "Little one, will you go into the paunch of the Portuguese or not?" The child said "yes," and the actor put him in accordingly. This scene was repeated over and over again, to the amusement of the spectators ; and it was certainly a most appropriate emblem of the fact. Now the Jesuit says that these identical words were used by the interpreters when they asked the natives if they would become Christians ;—that to become a Christian was nothing else than to cease to be a Cochinchinese and become a Portuguese ; in point of fact, swallowed into the paunch of the invader ! The Jesuit says he made efforts to correct "so pernicious an error," but the results did not eventually attest his success, if the "error" could possibly be dispelled in the face of events so admirably typified by the capacious paunch and the simple child.—*Relazione della nuova Missione &c., al Regno della Cocincina*, p. 107. Ed. Rome. 1631.

the Portuguese, as in Brazil, leaving their king in a pitiable plight. By these accessions, under Jesuit-influence, the Portuguese became masters of several towns, until at last the poor king found himself a mere tributary vassal of the strangers, whom he had invited to trade, but who had come accompanied by Jesuits. The savage looked out for friendly assistance in his ruined fortunes. The Mohammedans of the adjacent isles espoused his cause ; harassed the Portuguese for some time ; and effected a descent on Attiva, the head-quarters of the Portuguese, and the residence of the Jesuit Emmanuel Lopez. The Portuguese were absent on other conquests : their settlement was pillaged, all their stations were retaken by the king of Ternate. The Jesuits took to flight, abandoning to the vengeance of the conqueror 72,000 “ converts,” whom they deserted, apparently as easily as they had made them Christians.¹

In Brazil the Jesuits had succeeded in establishing numerous houses and residences : but their prosperity became, as usual, the source of discord and division. The usual causes of strife among mortals, avarice and ambition, produced a schism among these religious missionaries ; and Borgia deemed it necessary to send out a visitor to remedy the evils as well as he could.²

The Jesuits
in Brazil.

The savages of Florida next became the objects of their zeal. Three Jesuits set out on the expedition. One of them, Father Martinez, left the ship in a boat with some of the Spaniards : a storm overtook them : they were driven to the coast. Wandering into the interior they were attacked by the

In Florida.

¹ Quesnel, ii. 175 ; Sacchin. lib. iii. 138, *et seq.* ; Observ. Hist. i. 226.

² Quesnel, ii. ; Cretineau, ii. 137.

natives, who had so much reason to hate the Spaniards for their cruelties, and many of the party were massacred, among the rest, the Jesuit. The other two missionaries, after much suffering inflicted upon them by the savages of Florida, managed to do little or nothing in the shape of conversion, but nevertheless “founded” two establishments in the country, and wrote to their general for more companions.¹

On the continent of India the glorious Inquisition, which they had advised and proved to be so necessary, was doing its work, and they were making
Persecution. wholesale conquests worthy of their zeal. If they did not convert the infidels, they at least demolished their temples, burned their idols, and caused their Brahmins to be imprisoned and slaughtered—in other words, did, or were a party in doing, what the Catholics and Protestants were doing against each other in Europe at the same time. If the vilest passions of human nature be not sufficient to account for all those contemporaneous atrocities, we must ascribe them to a sort of moral cholera sweeping over the earth and making cruel souls instead of putrid bodies.²

In Portugal the Jesuits were high in favour. Father Torrez was confessor to the queen-regent, Gonzalez to the young king, Henriquez to the Cardinal
The Jesuits in Portugal. Dom Henry, the monarch’s great uncle. All the lords of the court followed the royal example, and placed their souls into the hands of the Jesuits, who thus acquired unlimited influence in the kingdom and its colonial possessions. Between the queen-regent and the Cardinal Dom Henry the Jesuits interfered, gave

¹ Quesnel, ii. 190 ; Sacchin. lib. iii. 262, *et seq.*

² Quesnel, ib. ; Sacchin. lib. ii. 101, lib. iii. 129, *et seq.*

their hands to the latter, and intrigued to dispossess the queen of her authority, in favour of the cardinal. Torrez was denounced as the leader of the machination, and the queen-regent discharged the Jesuit. The result did not correspond with her wishes. The Jesuits had a party, and the king's confessor was a Jesuit ; and the cardinal was their patron for the nonce. The king was induced to discharge the queen, and the cardinal became regent ; but only to be soon supplanted by the Jesuits, whom it was impossible to dislodge.¹ Under Jesuit-tuition, the young king Sebastian grew up a royal mad-
 man—fierce with the right orthodox hatred Sebastian.
 of all that was not Christianity according to the interpretation of Rome. He conceived the design, if it was not suggested, of invading the Moors of Morocco. Headlong he rushed to destruction : all advice to the contrary only stimulated his madness. On the plains of Alcazarquivir his whole army was cut to pieces or captured by the Moors. The king and kingdom of Portugal perished together. Fifteen Jesuits accompanied the expedition. The calamity is laid to the charge of the Jesuits, in perverting the royal mind by their fanatical exhortations : the Jesuits deny the allegation, and insist that their member, the king's confessor, was opposed to the invasion ;² which assertion, however, may have been caused by the unfortunate result. The Jesuits would have been happy to vindicate to themselves the glory of the invasion, had it proved successful. Cardinal Henry succeeded : his short reign was the agony of Portugal's independence : for Philip II. worried her to death. Amongst the numerous candidates who aspired to

¹ Quesnel, ii. 100 ; Hist. Abrégée du Port., P. iii. c. 17, p. 736.

² Franc. Syn. p. 115.

succeed, Philip was the most determined ;¹ and the Jesuits lent him their assistance. Henriquez, the royal confessor, confirmed the vacillating mind of the priest-ridden king, who gave his vote to the Spaniard,² and died soon after, when Philip sent into Portugal the Duke of Alva, with thirty thousand men, and quietly grasped the sceptre, surrendered almost without a blow, and with that sceptre, the American, Indian, and African possessions of Portugal—all destined to furnish the royal bigot with gold, which he would lavishly spend “to stir” all Europe in his senseless schemes.³ At the time of the event, the common opinion, in Coimbra, at least, was, that the Jesuits were a party to the betrayal of the kingdom into the hands of the Spaniards. Their college was stormed by the people : they were denounced as traitors to their country, as robbers, and devoted to destruction.⁴ The Jesuit-rector came forth and pacified the mob : and, by the intercession of two other Jesuits, the Spanish general spared the city, which would have been otherwise given up to the horrors of Spanish warfare.⁵ Such was the beginning and end of Jesuit-

¹ The Pope of Rome actually presented himself as candidate for the crown of Portugal ! He rested his claim to the kingdom as the *property of a cardinal*, to whom by ecclesiastical law he was heir.—*Hist. of Spain and Port.*

² Rabbe, i. 231.

³ *Hist. of Spain and Port.* 126, *et seq.* ; Rabbe, i. 229, *et seq.*

⁴ Franco, *ubi suprâ*, 125. “Plebs rumore inani permota divulgavit, nostrum collegium esse plenum milite Castellano et armis, ut repentè captam urbem traderemus Regi Philippo . . . securibus lacerant scholarum valvas, alii scandere per murum, multi ad ostium posticum, multi ad commune ; Nos Lutheranos, proditores patriæ, latrones vocant, necandos omnes.”

⁵ This Jesuit tells a curious tale, how the Portuguese women consulted *Nostros* “Our Men,” on that dismal occasion, asking the Fathers “whether it was lawful for them, in order to escape the lustful brutality of the Spaniards, to commit suicide, to throw themselves into the river, or rush to places infected with pestilence.”—*Franco*, 126. Philip’s only opponent, Prince Antonio, expelled the Jesuits from Coimbra for harbouring a Spanish spy ; he met them as they were depart-

influence in the councils of Portugal from 1556 to 1581. History accuses the Jesuits of these two prominent transactions—the invasion of Morocco, and the usurpation of Philip—as being promoted by members of the Company. The amount of their guilt can never be ascertained : but their innocence would have been certain, had their generals enforced the decree prohibiting the Jesuits from being confessors to kings, or living at courts ; and had not the Jesuits themselves elsewhere mingled with politics during that eventful period. It was certainly somewhat suspicious that Philip showed them marked and distinguished honour immediately afterwards, when he visited his usurped kingdom. He paid their House his first visit, and increased its allowance : and his partisans joined in the benevolence, so that the House was never richer than immediately after the usurpation of the Spaniard. The Jesuit Franco attributes this result to “Our services,” —*ministeria nostra*. How far they were honourable to the “men of God” is the question.¹

ing, and relented, ordering them to return : but the Spanish general came up “with his veteran army and easily routed the tumultuous forces of Antonio,” says the Jesuit Franco. Franco, 126.

¹ “Tantâ rerum publicâ mutatione, credidère qui gerebant animos Societati parùm benevolos, eam fore cunctis ludibrio, sed egregiè decepti sunt. Nam cessante causâ æmulationis, quæ fuerat Regum favor, ministeria nostra, vel inimicis amabilia, nobis omnium amorem procurârunt. Nunquam Domus Professa magis adjuta eleemosynis, nec majoribus frequentata concursibus.”—*An. 1518, 2.* Cretineau-Joly, the apologist of the Jesuits, treats the question controversially. If the Jesuits are satisfied with his defence, we have no reason to think that he has done his best to make the matter worse. One slight blunder, if such only it can be called, I will “signalise.” He says that “Henriquez, the confessor of the old king, received an order from the general of the company not to meddle with any political affair ;” and for this fact he refers us to Franco, anno 1576. Well, there is no such fact in Franco for that year, nor any other in the *Synopsis*. In 1578 the general requested “the old king” Henry “not to apply his confessor to the administration of secular business,” to which the king consented ; but this is evidently not Cretineau’s

In 1567, Pope Pius V. wished the Jesuits to do more "service" than they thought expedient, and they demurred and memorialised him accordingly.

Reform attempted with the Jesuits.

However favourable to the Jesuits, Pius V. did not approve of their dispensing with the monastic choir. Another objection was the constitutional rule by which the Jesuits bound themselves to the Company, whilst the Company entered into no contract with the members in like manner ; and, thirdly, the usual abuse in the Company of making priests of their men almost as soon as they became Jesuits. These reformers, of everybody and everything, particularly objected to being reformed themselves. Their memorial to the pope's delegates contains nineteen arguments against the proposed reform. Sacchinus enters into the details at full length, and Cretineau exhibits the docu-

Their memorial.

ment. It is astonishing what eloquence is expended in proving that the Company of Jesus was not instituted for the purpose of praising God. Here is a sample or two : Action is the end of the Company, the reformation of morals, the extirpation of heresy. "And what ! do not these causes exist ? The conflagration devours France. A great part of Germany is consumed. England is entirely reduced to ashes. Belgium is a prey to the devastation. Poland smokes on all sides. The flame already attacks the frontiers of Italy ; and, without speaking of the innumerable nations of the East Indies, the West Indies, the New World, all begging us to break to them the bread of the word : without speaking of the daily progress of

fact as above. If I stopped to signalise such references on both sides of the Jesuit-question, I should be almost continually striking some enemy or some friend of the Jesuits ; it is always *signaque sex foribus dextris, totidemque sinistris*, six for one, half-a-dozen for the other.

Turkish impiety, how many persons are there buried in ignorance in Spain, Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and other regions of the Christian world infected with error, not only in the villages and country places, not only amongst the laity, but even in the ranks of the clergy, in the midst of the most populous cities.”¹ In the estimation of the Jesuits all their “services” in these various and equivocal departments compensated for the choir. The choir would interfere with their studies as well. “We are, however, ready,” they said, “to respect, *as we hope*, by the aid of divine grace, the will of God in the least sign of the pope’s will in the matter; but you must take into consideration the sentiments which would agitate the other religious bodies if a change in their rules were mooted. We, too, are *men*, and it cannot be doubted that there are in our Company members who would never have joined it, had they foreseen that the choir would be established in it;” a most extraordinary declaration by men who are prescriptively “indifferent to all things,” dead to their own will, resigned to every fate as holy Obedience shall appoint. “And now, moreover, the members have very little inclination for the choir, because they say it does not enter into our profession; and had it been the will of God, He would have *manifested it to Ignatius our founder*.” The memorial proceeds to menace the total disorganisation of the Company as likely to result from this reform, and the Jesuits conjure the pope to take into consideration their weaknesses, as men, in their prejudice against the choir; but the last argument is as characteristic as any. “Look to the heretics,” they exclaimed. “Do you not see how they strive to prove that there is a

¹ Cretineau, ii. 28.

rash inconsiderateness, or even error, both in the judgments of the pope and his predecessors, and those of the council? They will publish this doctrine in their books—they will howl it from their pulpits, and, after that, they will strive by degrees to undermine everything else. They will pretend that the other orders have also been rashly confirmed, and that the holy council has also given a thousand other proofs of its temerity. In their insolent joy they will proclaim that discord has crept between the pope and the Jesuits—those papists so cruelly bent against us. Truly, whatever may be the orders of the holy Father, even if we had to sacrifice our lives a thousand times, we hope never to give so disastrous an example. But with all the respect and zeal of which we are capable, we beseech the common protector of the Church, and still more our protector and father, not to offer to the enemies of God, and our own, so favourable an opportunity for insulting and blaspheming against the holy Church.”¹ Thus they put the question to the pope. We cannot fail to observe what boldness the Jesuits have acquired in about ten years. They talked not thus to Paul IV. on a similar occasion. Borgia and

A curious
comparison.

Polancus had an interview with the pope. Pius V. was strongly inclined to the choir: but he would dispense with slow singing; the Jesuits might only pronounce the words of the divine office distinctly: “it is however only just,” said the pope, “that in the midst of your affairs, you should reserve a short time to attend to your own spiritual wants.” And then he smiled, significantly doubtless, saying: “You ought not to be like chimney-sweeps, who, whilst they

¹ Cretineau, ii. 32, *et seq.*; Sacchin. lib. iii. 25.

clean chimneys, cover themselves with all the soot they remove ;”¹—a comparison as expressive as could possibly be applied to the Jesuits in every department of their labours. Nevertheless, Borgia, who was “the beast of burthen” according to order, held out against the pope, and, by his importunity, induced the pope to give in, or to defer the matter until the publication of the new Breviary,—such was the submission of the Jesuits and their “beast of burthen” to the will of the holy Father.

But if the article touching the choir was not to be swallowed by the Jesuits, the proposed abolition of the simple vows, and the prohibition of their receiving the priesthood until they took the four vows of solemn profession, roused them to desperate opposition. The latter would at once change the whole nature of the Institute. It would throw the Company into a most embarrassing dilemma. They must either relax the rule respecting the select number of the Company’s aristocracy—the professed, or at once resign their numerous emissaries in all parts of the world, in every court and city—emissaries whose functions as priests were their excuse in the most difficult machinations. It would have spared the world much suffering, and the Jesuits themselves much humiliation ; but these were not the questions then : the pride of place—the pride of the *Jesuits*, the greatest that ever existed—the strong, unconquerable desire to extend, to enrich the Company,—a thousand motives rushed to the rescue of this constitutional right and privilege. On the other hand, if in order to have duly qualified emissaries, they relaxed the rule, and admitted a “multitude” to the profession of the four vows,—in

Other
reforms
attempted.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 35.

other words, to the aristocracy of the Company, then would the monarchy be insensibly changed into the old monkish democracy, and this was not to be endured by the aristocrats in place, who induced their “beast of burthen” to avert the calamity by a crafty expedient.

Pius V. issued a positive order to his grand vicar not to permit any Jesuit to be ordained before he took the solemn vows, or was made a professed. This was a thunderbolt to the Jesuits. With bulls, breves, and privileges on his back, away went the “beast of burthen” to the cardinals to remonstrate: but the pope was inflexible. To all the arguments of Borgia’s riders, the pontiff replied that at least as much virtue and talent was requisite for the priesthood as they exacted for profession in the Company; consequently, those whom they thought worthy of the priesthood, “ought to be worthy—*à fortiori*—to take the four vows.” Nothing could be more reasonable; but Sacchinus thinks otherwise. He exhibits all his sophistical eloquence to prove that it is easier to make a thousand priests than one good and veritable Jesuit; which, after all, is perhaps too true.¹ What was to be done? The aristocrats deliberated whether the pope was to be obeyed. Opinions were divided. The privileges of the Company were to be defended. Borgia’s expedient met the difficulty most admirably. His advice was that the Jesuits should present themselves for ordination, not as Jesuits, but as *beneficiaries* or secular ecclesiastics. It follows, from this suggestion, that the Jesuits must have had very many benefices in the *res Societatis*, the capital of the Company, in order to derive titles for their numerous ordinations; and it throws some light

The subter-
fuge.

¹ Sacchin. lib. iii. 26, *et seq.*; Quesnel, ii. 210

of truth on the charge against the Jesuits, on a former occasion, that they would clutch all the benefices and parishes of Rome. The modern historian of the Jesuits does not mention this *ruse de religion* suggested by Borgia ; but he says that the matter was accommodated “by a transaction which neither prejudiced the substance of the Institute, nor the authority of the Holy See.”¹ Nor had the Jesuits less cogent reasons for not abolishing the simple vows, Cogent reasons. that is, the vows which bind a Jesuit to the Company, immediately after his probation, whether that be two years, according to the Constitutions, or one year, or one month, according to expediency. By a corrective rule of the Constitutions, the Jesuits are allowed to retain their claims to property, and, consequently, their revenues, for a certain time dependent on the will of the superior, notwithstanding the vow of poverty ;² a strange piece of inconsistency, but perfectly justifiable to a conscience ruled by holy obedience. This enjoyment of their hereditary rights, which this peculiar dispensation permitted to all Jesuits who had not taken the solemn vows—and consequently the vast majority of the Company—this power which they retained of *inheriting* from their relatives, and even of profiting by speculations, were the resources which guaranteed the Company from the inconveniences of holy poverty and degrading mendicity, alluded to in one of the late decrees, as I have stated. “Certain it is,” says Sacchinus, “that this formula of the vows is very convenient for tranquillising the mind, for enforcing the authority of the Company, for its own profit and that of others ”³—which

¹ Cretineau, ii. 36.

² Const. P. iv. c. 4, (E) §.

³ “Certum est votorum illam formulam Societati percommodam esse ad tranquillitatem, ad profectum et suum et alienum.”—*Ubi supra*, 20.

word "profit" is somewhat ambiguous—*perhaps* the Jesuits mean spiritual profit, like Leo X.'s indulgences, which served two purposes, as we remember.

The whole affair passed over as sweetly as any other contest of the Jesuits with the pope. Now, more than ever, they were in position to demand respect-
Pleasant
termination.ful consideration ; and though, by the advice of the more prudent provincials, it was resolved to obey purely and simply, yet there was no doubt whatever in the minds of the aristocrats, that they would have their own way in that matter, as in every other, provided they did "good service to the Holy See." Pius V. was the last man in the world to hamper the Jesuits, or to "throw cold water upon them;" you might just as well expect an incendiary to dip his matches in water. Soon he showed how he loved them. "This lightning without a tempest," says their historian, "left no traces between Pius V. and the Company of Jesus."

Pope Pius demanded a detachment of Jesuits from the Roman College, whom he dispersed all over Italy to
A pious
masquerade.propagate the faith and morality. Numerous were the conversions, vast the harvest of virtue, if we are to believe the romancist of the Company ; but, after all, they left the Italians bad enough, if those who fought the pope's battles were specimens. Still, the Jesuits did their best—stormed and coaxed—blazed and chilled—soothed and frightened, after the usual manner : but the close of one of their missions is too curious to be omitted. It was nothing less than a pious masquerade for the edification of the faithful ; and it came to pass at Palermo in Sicily. The subject was, The Triumph of Death. The affair came off on Ash

Wednesday. Sixty men, selected from their sodality, covered with a blue sack, and each of them holding a lighted taper, marched in two lines before a troop of musicians, playing on divers instruments. In the rear of the latter, there appeared a huge figure of Christ on the cross, which was carried in a coffin, escorted by four angels and many persons, each of them carrying a torch in one hand, and in the other, one of the instruments used in the passion of the Redeemer—such as a nail, scourge, crown of thorns, hammer, and so forth. Immediately behind the coffin marched two hundred flagellants, dressed in black, and scourging themselves with all their might, and astonishing and frightening the spectators, both with the clatter of the numerous strokes they gave themselves, and with their blood, which, says the edifying historian, streamed in the streets. They were inflamed to this pious cruelty by a troop of choristers disguised as hermits, by their beard and bristling hair rendered frightful and unrecognisable. They sang, in the mournful tone of lamentation, hymns on the vanities of this world. Next came twelve men, emaciated, pale, all skin and bone, mounted on sorry hacks, precisely in the same sad predicament as to bone and skin. They marched in a line, whilst the leader of the troop sounded a trumpet whose note was frightful. This *trumpeter* was followed by an ensign who carried a banner on which DEATH was painted. All who followed this personage carried, each of them, some attribute of death, according to the inventive genius of these inexhaustible Jesuits. In the rear of this awful procession was a very high chariot, after the fashion of Juggernaut, drawn by four oxen, all black, and driven by a coachman, who represented old TIME. This chariot was adorned with divers

paintings, representing the trophies of death. It was lighted up at the four corners with four huge lanterns, which gave a light as red as blood, and by a prodigious number of torches made of black resin. From the middle of this chariot there issued a skeleton of colossal magnitude, holding in his hand a tremendous scythe, and carrying on his back a quiver full of poisoned arrows, with spades, hoes, and other grave-instruments, at his feet. Round about this skeleton appeared fifteen slaves, representing the different ranks and conditions of men. Death held them all enchained ; and they sang hymns adapted to the situation which they represented. This frightful skeleton was so tall that it rose as high as the roofs of the houses, and chilled with affright all who beheld it. Through all the principal streets of Palermo the procession wended, and made a great impression on the natives, says the historian, even on those who were accustomed to approve of nothing that was done by the Jesuits.¹

Nor was the inventive genius of Jesuitism confined to the horrible. In the same year, 1567, at Vienna, they performed the usual procession on the festival of *Corpus Christi*, with striking magnificence, and glorified themselves as much as the wafer they elevated to the adoring multitude. Their Austrian provincial, Father Lourenzo Magio, presided, and was assisted by no less a personage than the pope's nuncio, and the most distinguished of Vienna's gentry and nobility. A troop of musicians, followed by numerous children representing angels, opened the procession. A band of Jesuits went next in two lines, each being escorted by two of the principal inhabitants with tapers in their hands. Another troop

Another.

¹ Sacchin. *ubi suprà*, 106, *et seq.* ; Quesnel, ii. 211, *et seq.*

of angels followed the Jesuits, and sounded little bells as they walked ; and all the rest of the Jesuits brought up the rear immediately before Father Magio. This personage carried the wafer under a superb canopy, borne by the pope's nuncio, and the most distinguished inhabitants of the city. Magio not only received the incense from young ecclesiastics, but what was most edifying, says Sacchinus, one of the principal noblemen of the land scattered flowers before the holy sacrament, during the procession. It passed under a magnificent triumphal arch built for the occasion ;—and what inspired more devotion, according to the same authority, was the appearance of twelve young Jesuit-scholars, dressed as angels, but representing twelve different nations. These angels met the procession, and one after the other, addressed a complimentary speech to the wafer, each in the language of the nation he represented. It was *thus*, says Sacchinus, that the Company succeeded in triumphing over heresy in Germany.¹ If there was then, as at the present day amongst us, a poor-hearted race of sentimental heretics who looked for a god where benighted pagans find one—then these Brahminic processions served the Jesuits a turn : but it unfortunately happened in the very year 1567, that two of their principal professors apostatised and abjured the religion of Rome. The first was Edward Thorn, and the second Belthasar Zuger. Both were pro-
Jesuit-
apostates.

fessors in their college at Dillingen. In these men the Jesuits lost two excellent members, and the loss was the more afflicting inasmuch as they foresaw that the detestable heretics would ring a triumphant peal on the occasion :—nor were they wrong in the expectation.

¹ Sacchin. lib. iii. 120, *et seq.* ; Quesnel, ii. 213.

The apostacy was duly celebrated throughout Germany, and numerous pens inflicted plagues on the Company.¹ but the Jesuits were, on this occasion, wise enough to hold their peace, and not make bad worse, by those petulant recriminations with which they subsequently disgraced themselves and their Company :—I allude to the time when their PRIDE overtopped Lucifer's, just before he was seen falling from heaven.

In the same year, 1567, Pius V. despatched the Jesuit Edmund Hay to Mary Queen of Scots. A nuncio was added to the mission, and the Jesuit had his socius : but he proceeded alone to the scene of peril.² It was the critical year in the destinies of Mary. She had notified her marriage with Darnley, and the pope sent this mission to congratulate the queen, and to regulate her conduct, chiefly, however, as to the restoration of papal supremacy in Scotland. The zealous pope sent her a letter written with his own hand, assuring her of his paternal affection for herself and her kingdom, and his desire so ardent to see the Catholic religion re-established, that he would sell, said he, the *last chalice of the church* in the cause—a sentiment which shows the mistaken notions of these times,—as if any church can be really defended or established by *money*. The Jesuit was to follow up this devotedness of the pope, by holding forth flattering hopes to the queen, flattering indeed, but cruelly fallacious. Elizabeth being apostolically deprived of her right to the throne of England, proscribed, excommunicated—nothing would be easier than to place Mary on the throne—as soon as it was made vacant—which was to become

Pope Pius and
the Queen of
Scots.

¹ Quesnel, ii. 207 ; Sacchin. *ubi suprâ*, 126, *et seq.*

² Sacchinus ; Tanner ; Quesnel, ii. 215.

the “stirring” problem for the Catholic party with the Jesuits at their head.¹ But that was no time for distant hopes: misery, such as few women should endure or deserve, now began to make despair the cruel prompter of every act performed or permitted by the unfortunate Queen of Scots. Was ever woman more beloved or desired—was ever woman more humiliated or debased than Mary Queen of Scots? The first calamity that befel her was her education at the dissolute court of France: the next was her marriage with a fragile thing evidently destined to be prematurely cut down: let a veil be thrown over her short widowhood in the dissolute court of France,—for it is not necessary to believe that she did anything more (as is asserted) than write sonnets on her lord deceased. Thus prepared—an ardent, self-willed creature, accustomed to the display of woman’s omnipotence—with that sensualism impressed on her features, which constitutes the most unfortunate “destiny” of woman, Mary became Queen of Scotland. It was necessary that she should take a husband. She chose Darnley, her first cousin—almost a brother—the pope gave a dispensation: but the union did not prosper. Darnley disgusted her. The young queen lavished her affections on an accomplished Italian. It is possible that Rizzio was a Jesuit in disguise, sent to the queen by the pope, just like the Jesuit Nicholai, who was sent in disguise to the Queen of Sweden to “wait upon her.”² Darnley got Rizzio murdered. Then Darnley was murdered; and within three months the queen is the “wife” of Bothwell, who was accused of her husband’s murder—and a

¹ Thuan. l. 40; Sacchin. lib. v.; Quesnel, ii. 219.

² Sacchin. lib. v.; Maimbourg, ii. 249.

married man withal. These events took place between 1565 and 1567—within two years. And in the next year she began that protracted captivity in England—rendered so disastrous to the Catholics and herself by the machinations of her friends, which she must be excused for promoting—and finally, by her cruel death, destined to enlist those sympathies of the human heart in her favour, which bewilder the judgments of history, and will for ever procure the unfortunate Queen of Scots admirers and defenders. Her purer sonnets and her letters I admire: they are literally beautiful: but they only attest certain fine states of her finer feelings: they cannot wash away facts, though we add to them the tribute of tears. I lament her fate: but I do not believe her guiltless.¹ And yet pity wrings the hands when we reflect that after all her imprudences or levities or sins, if you please—she was made the pretext of so many designing machinators who speculated on her misfortune. Philip of Spain and the Jesuits fed on her calamity like the vultures of the desert.

And now that most Christian king, from a suspicious disturber of the Jesuits, has become their hearty friend.

Spaniards
in Peru.

His distinguishing visit and alms to their house in Portugal, immediately after his usurpation of the throne, was followed up with a more glorious reward:—verily had Philip discovered that the Jesuits were useful servants. With gushing bounty he acceded to their request—and flung open to the enterprising Jesuits the gates of Peru. Kingdom of the

¹ See Raumer's admirable Contributions, Eliz. and Mary; also Politic. Hist. of England, i.; and Hist. of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. It seems to me that Raumer's industry has completely established the above opinion; and the question should be now at rest, leaving the Queen's voluminous letters to stand by their own merits, which they will certainly do.

unfortunate Incas—too rich in gold and precious gems—the only excuse for the unutterable crimes that Christians committed against their God, to the destruction of its inhabitants! A hundred pens have celebrated the Eden of Peru;—its incalculable wealth, its wise government, the contentment of its people: and all remember how the kingdom of the Incas was swept away by the Spaniards under Pizarro—the cruel free-booter, whose atrocities were countenanced, promoted, exhorted by the Dominican Bishop Valverde. Spain's king was enriched: enormous fortunes were made by his subjects: God's skies above did not rain thunderbolts: the dreadful criminals enjoyed the fruits of iniquity; and recklessly added crime to crime—as though there was no God—no avenger in this world as well as the next. What a picture is that which Las Casas unfolds, describing the destruction of the Indies by the Spaniards. The natives slaughtered for sport. An Indian cleft in twain to prove dexterity. Pregnant women torn asunder. Babes at the breast cut in pieces to feed wild beasts and hungry dogs. Some they burnt alive; others they drowned; and some they hurled headlong down a precipice. The Indians whom they compelled to fight against their own countrymen, they also compelled to feed on the flesh of their prisoners, whom they slaughtered and roasted. And those whom they made their slaves, perished in such numbers by starvation and ill treatment, that Las Casas assures us, their dead bodies floating on the waves answered the purpose of a compass to a mariner sailing to the Aceldama of Peru. In forty years eighteen millions of Indians were the victims offered up by Spain in thanksgiving for the New World which the pope conceded to her king. And yet it is

admitted that these poor pagans were the most docile, the most peaceful creatures in the world. But what a sample of Christianity had they experienced! They hated it accordingly; and when for refusing to receive “the faith,” some of them were condemned to death, and the monks still tried to “convert them,” they asked “Whither do Spaniards go after death?” “The good go to Heaven,” was the reply. “Then,” they exclaimed, “we would rather not go to Heaven to meet with Spaniards.” They evidently could not distinguish the *men* from the *religion* they professed—poor miserable pagans—but their betters were as blind in their hatred of the Jew and the heretic.¹ It is well known that to supply the place of the slaughtered Indians, or to have more work performed, the Spaniards transported negroes from Africa; and the dreadful crimes of the conquistadores found defenders in Spain, who argued on *the justice and equity of the war carried on by the King of Spain against the Indians*—words which are the title of a book by Spain’s historiographer, the

Sepulveda. Canon Sepulveda. The Universities of Alcala and Salamanca decided against the publication of the work: but the canon sent the manuscript to Rome, where it was printed without censure. It is creditable to Charles V. that he forbade its publication in his dominions, and caused the suppression of all the copies he could find.²

To this depopulated country the Jesuits were dispatched, under the most favourable auspices, like their glorious beginning. Very different was this mission

¹ For the whole account, see Las Casas’s book *On the Destruction of the Indies by the Spaniards*. I quote from the French, *De la Destruction des Indes par les Espagnols*.—Rouen, 1630. ² Thuan. i. 54; Du Pin, Bibliot; Quesnel, ii. 250.

to all others. It was a gushing, a hearty gift to the Company of Jesus, from King Philip II. of Spain and Portugal. At the king's expense a house was to be built for them at Lima, the capital of Peru. Philip's
"idea."

A general muster of Jesuits was made from the three provinces of the Company in Spain, to found a colony in the wealthy kingdom of the Incas—destined to become one of the richest strongholds of the Jesuits in the day of their glory.¹ Philip's idea was that "to *eternise* his domination in a country whose very name had become synonymous with riches, it was necessary to teach the natives to love the Gospel," and "with the hope of insuring a triumph to his new system of conquest, he demanded Jesuits from Francis Borgia."²

There were eight Jesuits in the expedition. The Jesuits
arrive.

A cordial reception welcomed the Peruvian Apostles. A magnificent college and a splendid church arose as by the lamp of Aladdin. And the Jesuits did good service to the king—did their best to carry out his idea by making the gospel subservient in "eternising his domination" in Peru. Indefatigably they catechised the Indians, and preached to the Spaniards. One of them evangelised the negroes—"taught them patiently to endure the toils of slavery." Much better would it have been—much more consistent, had the Jesuits taught the king to obviate those toils by proving, as they could, that slavery was incompatible with Christianity—but that was not the way to carry out the king's "idea"—so they endeavoured to make useful, willing,

¹ Sacchinus, *ubi suprà*, iii. 265, *et seq.*; Quesnel, ii. 252.

² "Philippe II. sentit que, pour éterniser sa domination sur un pays dont le nom même était devenu synonyme de richesse, il fallait apprendre aux indigènes à aimer l'Evangile. Dans l'espoir de faire triompher son nouveau système d'occupation, il demanda des Jésuites à François de Borgia."—*Cretineau*, ii. 155.

docile slaves for the master whom *they* also served. They established schools for the young, and a congregation of young Spanish nobles. In a single year their success was so great, that twelve more Jesuits were imported. With that astonishing rapidity in acquiring

Progress.

languages, which is constantly asserted by their letters, these Jesuits astonished the natives by addressing them in their own vernacular. Soon they dispersed all over the kingdom—radiating from the capital, which was a certain conquest. Three years scarcely elapsed when a college arose in Cusco, the ancient capital of the Incas : but that was already built : it was a Peruvian palace, and its name was Amarocana, or the *House of the Serpents*. Another college had arisen in the city of Paz. To supply labourers for these numerous vineyards an extraordinary effort was necessary or expedient. The Jesuit-provincial of Peru was

“ Abuses.”

also counsellor to the viceroy—in direct contravention of the Constitutions of the Company, and a decree of the late congregation—but that mattered little :—the thing was expedient. The provincial looked to the *end* : the *means* were “ indifferent.” He introduced native recruits into the Company, and dispatched them to the work of conversion without sufficient instruction. He even admitted the half-castes into the Company. His Jesuit-subordinates were indignant at these and other misdemeanors in his administration, made representations at Rome, and the first provincial of Peru had the honour to be recalled, after beholding the glorious advance of his work in the midst of internal division.

This is one of the peculiar features of the Jesuit system : however divided amongst themselves, the Jesuits

were always united in their outward labours : if they retained the weaknesses and vices of humanity as individuals, they managed somehow to make the rest of mortals “perfect”—in other words, as the pope said, “they cleaned chimneys though they covered themselves with the soot.” This resulted from “system”—from rigid observance of appointed routine—mechanical means effectuating mechanical ends. But hence also, the want of durability in all their achievements. Philip was satisfied with the results ; and in 1572 he sent thirteen Jesuits to Mexico, to carry out the same idea.¹ It is some consolation that the reign of blood was abolished by this “new system of conquest”—and it was a blessing for the poor remnants of the Peruvian Israel, that the Jesuits were ready to serve the king according to his “idea.”

Peculiar feature of
Jesuitism.

But this was neither Philip's nor the pope's “idea” with regard to the heretics of Europe. Pius V. had long resolved to establish the Inquisition in all its rigour throughout Italy, and in every place where his authority might prevail. In spite of all his efforts, Avignon shrank with horror from the “idea” of the terrible tribunal. Pius, on the contrary, esteemed it exceedingly, because there was no chance of his own limbs being dislocated by the tortures, and because he believed it the most effectual method of promoting orthodoxy—so despicable was his opinion of human nature—or so utterly blind he was to the fact that compulsion is the least successful of all human expedients. The kingdom of heaven suffers violence in a certain sense, but man invariably kicks against the pricks in every possible sense : it is his nature. Pius V. asked

Possevinus
at Avignon.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 155, *et seq.*

Borgia for a man capable of providing the Avignonians with the machinery of the Inquisition. *Ed abbiamo martiri*—"and we have martyrs for martyrdom if required," said a Jesuit general on one occasion, enumerating the classes of his heroes—and on this occasion, Borgia had a man whom he deemed capable of *making* martyrs "if required." This was the famous *Possevin*—of Savoy and Bayonne notoriety. Possevin set to work with sermons, gently to entice the people to embrace the horrible monster of the Inquisition. Their taste was too rough to appreciate the delicacy. They were not "perfect" enough to be zealots. So Possevin undertook by sermons to lick the young cubs into shape—excuse the metaphor, for it is the veritable figure invented by the Jesuits to typify the function of their preachers—*concionatorum munus*. In the *Imago* you will see the great bear at work—*fashioning minds with her tongue—vos mentes fingite linguâ*.¹ But the young cubs of Avignon had overgrown the licking season. The Jesuit's sermons excited suspicions, which were confirmed by the movements of the pope's legate, and the people of Avignon rose up with one accord against the Jesuits, who had a college in the city. They stormed the college: the fathers barricaded the doors, and held out until the magistrates issued a decree by which they revoked the grant of the college to the Company. This

¹ Page 465. Here is the last grotesque stanza of the ode printed beneath the Jesuit-Bear in the *Imago*.—What an incongruous comparison!

"Pergite ô vastum, Socii, per orbem,
Et rudes doctâ recreate linguâ:
Pergite, æterno similem Parenti
Fingere prolem."

"Go forth, O Brothers, over the wide
world,
And the unshapen polish with your
wise tongues:
Go, and like unto the eternal Parent
Fashion the young cubs."

was an infallible method, it appears, to deal with the Jesuits, who required “well founded” colleges: being deprived of their revenues they decamped forthwith. Under the mask of disinterested piety the Jesuits undertake to give instruction *gratis*: their terms are accepted to the letter: then the mask falls to the ground, their charity evaporates, and more unconcerned than the she-bear of nature, they resign their unshapen cubs without a pang, excepting that which results from the loss of a “consideration.” They struggled, however, to have the edict revoked,—and left no means untried to soften the magistrates. They appealed to the pope, whose scheme had produced the catastrophe. And the accommodating pope formally denied to the magistrates that he ever thought of introducing the Inquisition, and interceded so warmly for his obedient friends, that the gratuitous teachers were again provided with their college and revenues, and proceeded with their work of charity.¹ If we but compare the conduct of the Company in the three circumstances lately described, it is evident that the Jesuits were ready to carry out any “idea,” however at variance with its antecedent or consequent. In India they were

Reflections.

demolishing the pagodas of the Hindoos—persecuting the priests without quarter or mercy—propagating the faith with powder and shot.² In Peru they were persuading the poor savages and negroes to serve King Philip and the Spaniards, for the sake of God Almighty and his Christ. At Avignon they were appealing to the same motives in order to make the people submit to the relentless Moloch of Rome’s Inquisition—*simplex duntaxat*

¹ Tanner. Ant. Possev.; Sacchin. lib. v. 139; extract ex Archiv. Avonen.; Quesnel, 258.

² Antè, p. 258.

et unum,—they always kept right before the wind—though their gallant bark rolled herself to pieces at last.

Pope Pius V. had other work for his faithful legion : he converted them into warriors of the faith. The pope's hatred of heresy and heretics roused him to the maddest efforts in the cause of orthodoxy.

He equipped armies and sent them to the aid of various princes then battling with the Turks or their heretic subjects ; but he never sent troops without Jesuits to “excite the soldiers to do their duty, and inspire them with a generosity altogether Christian ;” thus the fathers had the happiness to contribute to the wonderful victories of Lepanto, and Jarnac and Moncontour,¹ the last over the wretched Huguenots of France. Awful times were those—times of incessant commotion, social, political, and “religious.” The correspondence of Pope Pius V. in the midst of those social tempests is a curious expression of the sentiments prevalent at that epoch of humanity. When Charles IX. had resolved on war with his heretics, Pius V. wrote to all the Catholic princes, inviting them to maintain that zealous son of the Church, who was undertaking the complete extermination of the miserable Huguenots. His letters to Philip II. and to Louis de Gonzague, Duke of Nevers, to the Doge of Venice, to Philibert, Duke of Savoy—all have for their entire object the obtaining of men and money. He granted, himself, ten thousand ounces of gold to carry on the holy war. In his letters to Charles IX., to Catherine de' Medici, he speaks of nothing but the enormity of the crime of heresy, and the vengeance that ought to be inflicted for it, either to satisfy the just anger of Heaven or to reclaim

¹ Verjus, ii. 22.

the obedience of rebellious subjects—two ideas which were then intimately connected. “Give no longer to the common enemies,” said the pope, “give them not the chance of rising against the Catholics. We exhort you to this with all the might, all the ardour of which we are capable May your majesty continue, as you have constantly done, in the rectitude of your soul and in the simplicity of your heart, to seek only the honour of God Almighty, and to combat openly and ardently the enemies of the Catholic religion to their death.” Whilst the common father, the type, the personification of Catholicism displayed and developed such ideas, ought we to be astonished at the zeal, the heroic ardour which animated his people in the war against the Huguenots?¹ And fierce and horrible was that bloody warfare to become. There was to be no hope, no rest for the Huguenot. So incessantly was he kept in the roaring blaze of persecution, that the word Huguenot became, and still is, the name for a *kettle* in France. Huguenots and Catholics all were drunk with the rage of mutual slaughter, whose prime movement came from the Pope of Rome. The King of Spain fanned the flame of civil war; kept it alive by his incessant advice, not without gold—the gold that was cursed by the blood of Indians crying to God for vengeance. And that vengeance was man’s own making—the most awful that can befall humanity—the prostitution of religion to the vile passions and interests of calculating parties. There was some excuse for the multitude—the people who were roused to fight the battles of the designing great ones—but the great waded through their despicable blood to the accomplishment

¹ Capefigue, Ref. 299.

of their desires. And there is some excuse for the Jesuits, if their time-serving devotedness to all who would employ them, made a virtue of that intensest lust of their hearts to overtop all competitors in the struggle for influence on mankind. With the armies sent into

The Jesuits. France by Pope Pius, Jesuits went exulting, exhorting, inspiring desperate energy to the fiend of their religion, panting for the blood of a brother. Nor did the Jesuit-aristocrats fail to enlist the feelings of the whole Company in the enterprise. Their historian tells us that Borgia ordered prayers to be said throughout the Company, a *thousand masses* to be celebrated, for the success of this worse than pagan warfare ; and he adds, that doubtless the said prayers and masses eventuated the glorious Catholic victories of

Their exploits. 1569 ! Jesuits were present, as they tell us ; and the battle of Moncontour merited, according to the Jesuit martyrologist, eternal glory for one of their lay-brothers, named Lelio Sanguinini, who perished amongst the slain of the papal army. And at the battle of Jarnac their famous Auger had the honour of assisting the Duke d'Anjou—afterwards Henry III.—in donning his cuirass and pulling on his boots.¹ The function of a valet he soon exchanged for that of propagandist—"converting" in eight days, 360 Huguenots, and founding a convent of nuns—and then, Their ill fame. in horrible mockery of premeditated woe, publishing a book which he called *The Spiritual Sugar to sweeten the Bitterness of the Wars of Religion* !² Adored were the Jesuits by their party : but execrated by their opponents. Listen to one of the latter.

¹ Sacchin. lib. iii. 124—147, *et seq.*

² Sacchin. *ubi suprâ*, 129, *et seq.* ; Quesnel, ii. 267.

“It is not the preaching of the word of God that they [the *other* party] demand. They care not whether this kingdom be peopled with good preachers, or that the people be instructed in their salvation, or that the strayed sheep may be reclaimed. No,—they want *Jesuits* who inspire the venom of their conspiracy, under the shade of sanctity, in this kingdom :—Jesuits, who under the pretext of confession (what horrible hypocrisy) abuse the devotion of those who believe them, and force them to join that league and their party with an oath ; who exhort subjects to kill and assassinate their princes, promising them pardon for their sins, making them believe that by such execrable acts they merit Paradise. True colonies of Spaniards, true leaven of Spain in this kingdom, which has for years soured our dough, has Spaniarded the towns of France under the brows of the Pharisees, whose houses are more dangerous than citadels, whose assemblies are nothing but conspiracies. Such are they known to be : such are for us the fruits of the general assembly which they lately held in Paris, over which presided a certain Jesuit of Pontamousson, the director of those designs. Others there are who blame the king [Henry III.] in open pulpit, inflame the people, arm them with fury against the magistrates, preaching the praises, recommending the virtues of those pretended scions of Charlemagne. This is the ardent zeal, this is the religion that animates them. And would you see them ? When they are in Germany, they are Lutherans. They have an eye to the clergy ; they have an eye to the service ; they take precious good care of their residences ; possessing numerous bishoprics, numerous abbeys, contrary to the canons, contrary to the Council which they go preaching in

France ; and selling the woods, they waste the domain, leaving the churches and dwellings to rot ; selling relics, reserving for themselves all that is most precious. Few alms they give : the poor are naked, and even the priests die from hunger. True heirs, not of Charlemagne indeed, but of *Charles de Lorraine*, who knew how right devoutly to sell the great cross for his profit, with the richest jewels of Metz.”¹ Such being the sentiments against the Jesuits in France, the question is, not how far they merited this obloquy, but how far it was impossible for them to be otherwise than thorns in the sides of the people—by their very presence alone keeping alive and stimulating the rancour of parties.

Wherever they wandered, the Jesuits were drawn, or naturally fell, into every scheme that disturbed, agitated, harassed humanity. In that very year when they joined the pope’s army in France, they enlisted themselves in the expedition of the Spaniard, warring with the Moors of Grenada, whom he drove to revolt. Ferdinand the Catholic had burnt 4000 Jews together : he had driven the greater part of the Moors into exile ; those who remained had purchased by the ceremonial of baptism a dear permission to see the sun shine on the tops of Alhambra. The Spaniards despised them, insulted them. They hated the Spaniards and their religion. Clinging together in the Alrezin of Grenada, they never resigned the language of Mohammed ; and the dress of the Arab still grace the descendants of that race whose blood had bettered the Man of Spain. The Jesuits went amongst them, and, according to their historian, made numberless

The Moors
of Grenada.

¹ Mornay Du Plessis, Mem. i. 457, *et seq.*

conversions. If they did so, there was no necessity for advising royal interference to promote the cause of religion. In concert with the Archbishop of Grenada, they induced King Philip to prohibit, under severe penalties, the use of the baths, all which were to be demolished. Besides, the Moorish women were to dress in the fashion of Spain : all were to renounce their language, and speak only Spanish. The Moors revolted. A thousand remembrances nerved their arms, and awoke the energies which had won for their race glory, kingdoms, supremacy among the nations. Led on by a youthful but valiant descendant of that race, they spread havoc and dismay far and wide. They began with the house of the Jesuits, which they forced, and sought, but in vain, the life of the superior. Throughout the surrounding country they profaned the churches, maltreated the priests and the monks. A war with the rebels ensued ; and the Jesuits joined the armies of their master “ to excite the soldiers, and inspire Christian generosity : ” whilst those who remained at Grenada stood as sentinels to guard the city from surprise. The Moors were finally defeated, and reduced to a worse condition than before. They were forced more strictly to conform to the Church : they were scattered at a distance from Grenada, cantoned amongst the interior provinces ; and the prisoners were sold as slaves.¹ It was no consolation to the Moors that the Jesuits lost their house in the Alrezin of Grenada.

The warlike spirit of the Company animated the sons of Loyola in India as well. The Portuguese were masters of Amboyna, where they were well defended ; and they conceived the design of building a fort in an

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. ; Quesnel, ii. ; Hist. of Spain, 122.

adjacent island. The inhabitants granted permission; but whether they repented of their imprudence, or were impelled by their neighbours, they set upon the Portuguese workmen engaged in the erection. Vengeance, of course, was resolved. Fearful ravages ensued: the Jesuit Pereira was amongst the leaders of Portugal; but still the barbarians had the advantage. Two Jesuits headed a reinforcement and decided the victory in favour of the Portuguese, who would otherwise have been cut off to a man. The first Jesuit was Vincent Diaz: he wore a cuirass, and carried a huge cross in the van, whilst father Mascarenia edified the rear. Diaz was wounded, and would have been killed had he not been cuirassed. The conquest of the whole island gave finality to the achievement of these free-booters — with the timely aid of the warrior-Jesuits.¹

It cannot be denied that the Jesuits were doing their utmost to serve the pope in extending the lever of his power and prerogatives. Nor can it be gainsaid that Pope Pius was a good master to his good and faithful servants. He had enriched them with benefices. He had exalted them with bulls. He had made them powerful with privileges. And now he generously gave them the *Penitentiary* of Rome. That word, like a vast many others, has been strangely perverted in the course of time. Its meaning on the present occasion demands some explanation, particularly as this grant was the sixth house of the Jesuits in Rome. The Roman Penitentiary is an establishment instituted for the accommodation of the pilgrims from all parts of the world,

1570.—
Papal
favours.

The Peni-
tentiary of
Rome.

¹ Sacchin. lib. v. ; Quesnel, ii. 271 ; Voyage aux Indes, iii. p. 197.

impelled to Rome by their devotion, or by the guilt of some enormous sin, whose absolution was reserved for Rome in particular ; in other words, there were, and there are, certain terrible perpetrations for which there is no absolution either from priest or bishop without the special licence of the pope. The Romans, you perceive, are hereby highly favoured in not having to go far for pardon. This may have been one of the causes which made Rome (the city of Rome) at all times the very model of every possible crime imaginable. Now, to hear the confessions of these multilingual pilgrims, there were attached to this Penitentiary eleven priests who spoke, altogether, all the languages of Europe. These were presided over by a cardinal with the title of Grand Penitentiary. They did not live in community ; but each had a fixed salary, constituting a benefice for life. Their salaries were liberal ; and, as it usually happens in such cases, particularly in matters spiritual, the penitentiaries delegated their functions to priests or curates, whom they remunerated as sparingly as possible—a practice which many will pelt at, without considering that their own houses are made of glass. These curates were generally as worthless as their cures or “situations.” According to Sacchinus, these abuses determined Pope Pius V. to transfer the establishment to the Jesuits. There were many objections against Borgia’s acceptance of the concern. It was easy to dismiss the fact that the donation would excite the envy of many,—those whom they supplanted, especially ; but the statutes of the Order positively prohibited the acceptance of any revenues excepting for colleges. It was easily managed. The difficulties vanished like smoke in the clear blue sky of Jesuit-invention. The Jesuits satisfied the

sorrowing penitentiaries outgoing, by granting them a pension ; and, secondly, they transferred some of their students to the house, so as to bring it under the mask of a *college*—thus exhibiting one of those curious and edifying practical equivocations whose neatness is equal to their utility on delicate occasions. Thus the holy general yielded to the scheme, like a gentle “beast of burthen,” and received on his back at one load, for the *res Societatis*,—the stock of the Company,—no less than twelve of the richest benefices in Rome, which were enjoyed by the Jesuits to the day of their destruction.¹

They were not less favoured in France. At length, after all their useless efforts to manage the University and

The Jesuits
favoured by
Charles IX.

Parliament, royal favour enabled them at once to dispense with the sanction of their rivals. It was certainly to be expected that Charles IX., so completely under the influence of Philip II., should follow the example of the Spaniard, and patronise the men who could carry out his “idea” so successfully. The time was coming when the Jesuits would be useful in France. The French king issued a mandate to his parliament for the speedy termination of the process against the disputed donations, which he confirmed to the Company without reserve. The Jesuits followed up this display of royal patronage with extraordinary efforts at conversion :—they would repay the king with the souls of Huguenots. Auger and Possevin, the two grand apos-

Auger and
Possevin.

tolical hunters of the Company, were incessantly in the pulpit or on horseback. Possevin laid the foundations of a college at Rouen, and threw himself on Dieppe, a stronghold of heresy. He preached two or three sermons, and, wonderful to tell, fifteen

¹ Sacchin. lib. vi.; Quesnel, ii. 283.

hundred Huguenots were converted. Pity that such an apostle did not do the same in every town of France : there would have been no Huguenots left to be slaughtered : the space of a single year would have been enough to forefend the maledictions of ages. Possevin left his work unfinished : he was called from his miraculous apostolate to gratify the Cardinal de Bourbon at Rouen, with a course of Lent sermons ! His substitute, however, even surpassed the apostle. As rapidly, *he* converted fifteen hundred Huguenots, — which must have exhausted heresy at the small seaport of Normandy. This natural association of seaport with fishes, seems to have suggested a corresponding miracle to the secretaries of Jesuit-ambassadors—for we are told that this last apostle at Dieppe, attracted into the
A miracle.
 nets of the fishermen the shoals of herrings which had swum off to other coasts—since the *introduction of heresy*, says Sacchinus ! Poitiers, Niort, Chatelleraut, and other towns of Poitou, furnished similar miraculous conversions to six other Jesuits—although in the middle of the eighteenth century these towns continued to be strongholds of heresy, filled with Calvinists, notwithstanding the fine houses which the Jesuits possessed in Normandy and Poitou.¹ And if it be more difficult to make one good Jesuit than a thousand ordinary priests ; and if an ordinary Jesuit may convert fifteen hundred heretics with two or three sermons,—then the conversion of a Jesuit must be tantamount to that of some ten thousand he-
Another apostate.
 retics—and such a conversion came to pass about the same time : a German Jesuit apostatised and took a wife. He was of the college at Prague. Vain were

¹ Sacchin. lib. vi. ; Quesnel, ii. 286, *et seq.*

all the provincial's efforts to reclaim the lost sheep ; vain were the prayers of the Jesuits ; vastly they abuse the man for his secession ; deeply they cut into his reputation for bringing discredit upon them—in the midst of the lynx-eyed heretics. And they pour the phial of God's judgment upon his head, devoted to destruction by the curses of the Jesuits, saying : “ The plague which spared the city of Prague seized the apostate : it killed him and the woman who had the melancholy courage to link her destiny with his ! ”¹ Those who can say such things may be simply infatuated with rancorous zeal : but they can claim no praise or congratulation as to their hearts or their minds. And as a set-off to that rancour, public rumour trumpeted the bad morals of the Jesuits themselves at Vienna, and appealed to the evidence of a woman for the attestation of sin : nay, it was proclaimed that disguises were used to facilitate the indulgence of vice. Truly or falsely, it matters little to inquire, since the Jesuits so rancorously blasted the reputation of a member who joined the ranks of the detestable heretics.²

The fortunes of war harassed the Jesuits more effectually than the loss of a member or the obloquy of fame. The “ idea ” of the Spaniard was even destined to recoil upon himself with vengeance redoubled, and to re-act against all who lent a hand to its development. The mighty schemes of heretic-extirpation prompted by Pope Pius, undertaken by King Philip and King Charles, were fast progressing to a dreadful consummation. To work the ferocious Alva

The Spaniard
in the
Netherlands.

¹ “ La peste, qui épargnait la ville de Prague, atteignit l'apostat : elle le tua avec la femme qui avait eu le triste courage d'associer sa destinée avec la sienne.” — *Cretineau*, ii. 48.

² *Sacchin. ubi suprà*, 93, *et seq.* ; *Quesnel*, ii. 287.

went, exulting over the tortures and the blood of the rebels in Flanders. For the Catholic refugees from England there was gold in abundance, splendid liberality. For the native heretics there were tortures, unspeakable cruelty—and yet—*eventu vasto*—with vast benefit to the Catholic cause, according to the Jesuit Strada.¹ Alva had cut down the Protestant leaders Egmont and Horn. The prisons were filled with nobles and the rich. The “*Council of Blood*” had the scaffold for its cross of salvation; and the decrees of the Inquisition for its gospel. Men were roasted alive: women were delivered over to the soldier’s brutality. Alva boasted that he had consigned to death eighteen thousand Flemings. And who were these adversaries of the Spaniard? Who were the men whom this ruthless tyranny drove to revolt? A peaceful tribe of fishermen and shepherds, in an almost forgotten corner of Europe, which with difficulty they had rescued from the ocean; the sea their profession, and at once their wealth and their plague; poverty with freedom their highest blessing, their glory, their virtue. The severe rod of despotism was held suspended over them. An arbitrary power threatened to tear away the foundation of their happiness. The guardian of their laws became their tyrant. Simple in their political instincts, as in their manners, they dared to appeal to ancient treaties, and to remind the lord of both the Indies of the rights of nature. A name decides the whole issue of things. In Madrid that was called rebellion, which in Brussels was styled only a lawful remonstrance. The complaints of Brabant required

¹ “Hæretici plectuntur eventu vasto. Jamque hæretici trahebantur ad ergastula, plectebanturque, territis ex eo non paucis, iisque, qui supplicio afficiebantur, non rarò Ecclesiæ restitutis.”—*De Bello Belg.* 166.

a prudent mediator. Philip sent an executioner, and the signal of war was given.¹ Driven to frenzy, the cruel battle-field was their only refuge—retaliating slaughter, destruction, their only hope:—for kings had not yet been taught to *feel* that they are simply the servants of their people for *punishment*, as soon as they cease to be the exponent of God's providence over the land they call their kingdom. The Pope of Rome sanctioned the wickedness of kings in those days. Pope Pius, as I have stated, praised and rewarded Alva for his atrocities; he stimulated Philip with exhortation, and even gave him a “dispensation” to marry the betrothed bride of his *own son*—a dispensation to marry his *own niece*, who was disappointed of a husband by the *untimely death* of Don Carlos—of which it were to be wished that Philip was guiltless.² Such was the mediation of the popedom

The pope's
sanction.

¹ Schiller, *Revolt*. Introd.

² “Protestant writers accuse the king of poisoning his son during his captivity [being suspected of heresy, and known to be *favouring the malcontents of the Netherlands*], and also his young queen, a few months afterwards, when she died in premature child-bed. Spanish writers generally state that Don Carlos died of a fever; and of the authors who may be esteemed impartial, some allege that Carlos intentionally brought on such a fever by intemperance, whilst others assert that he was solemnly delivered by his father into the hands of the Inquisition; was convicted by that fearful tribunal of heresy, and sentenced to death, when, as an especial indulgence, he was allowed to choose the mode of his execution, and chose poison. The better opinion seems to be, that his death was a natural one. As such it was announced; when the king received the intelligence with expressions of deep sorrow, retiring to a monastery for a short time, the court went into mourning, and all the usual forms of grief were observed. Philip gave, however, an air of credibility to the horrible and improbable accusation of his enemies, by wooing his son's second betrothed bride, although his own niece, shortly after Isabel's death. A dispensation being with some difficulty obtained from the pope, the Archduchess Anne became her uncle's fourth wife, and the mother of his heir, inasmuch as Isabel had left only daughters.”—*Hist. of Spain*, (Lib. of Usef. Knowl.) 120. Cretineau gives a curious note on this affair. I must remind the reader that Philip's Queen, Isabel of France, had been promised to Don Carlos; and it is alleged that Carlos never forgave his father for robbing him of his beautiful promised bride,

'twixt heaven and earth in those days. And think you that the temporary punishment inflicted by the French and Napoleon has settled the account of humanity against the popedom? We have yet to see it swept away for ever—and many of us may live to see that desirable day for religion—for all humanity.

In the midst of the disorders produced by the revolt of the Netherlands, the Jesuits did not think proper to expose themselves to the discretion of the conquerors, nor the fury of the vanquished. They decamped. But they took precautions to
The Jesuits
decamp.
conceal their flight. They doffed their gowns and donned the dress of the country, belted on a sword, and thus equipped they dispersed in different directions—taking the additional precaution of cutting their beards. Their hair they always wore short; and that circumstance may have had some effect in exciting their incessantly active brains—for short bristling hairs are powerful electrics.¹ But the *res Societatis* was not

and that the king entertained a deep and savage jealousy of his son's attachment to that princess. Cretineau's curious note is as follows: "According to a manuscript half Spanish, half Latin, taken during the Peninsular wars in 1811, from the archives of Simancas . . . which manuscript was in the possession of the Duke de Broglie, and probably the composition of some chaplain of Isabel,—Don Carlos died in a bath, his veins having been opened; and Isabel was poisoned by a drink which King Philip forced her to swallow before his eyes. This writing confirms the intimacy supposed to exist between the queen and the king's son," t. ii. p. 66. What a complication of horrors! And yet this Philip was the very god of orthodoxy. What a fearful example of believing like a saint and sinning like a devil! According to De Thou, Pope Pius V. praised Philip for his stern uncompromising severity in the *catholic cause* (!) for which he had not even spared his own son,—*qui proprio filio non pepercisset*. xliii. I must here observe that Cretineau, or the translator he quotes, has taken great liberties with De Thou in the seven lines he puts into inverted commas, as though they were translated from that author, to uphold his idea in defence of Philip's cruelty.—ii. 66, note.

¹ Hence to cut short the hair of prisoners is to prolong their wickedness by keeping up their physical excitement in solitude. A clean shave would be infinitely more to the purpose, just as in madness.

utterly neglected and forgotten. They left a few companions thus disguised, to wander up and down, and yet keep an eye on the interests of the Company, so as not completely to lose the establishment which they had earned with so much difficulty.¹

The town of Mechlin or Malines was taken by assault, and Alva gave it up to his hounds for rape and rapine.

1572. The
sack of
Malines. None were spared : even the monks and the nuns were plundered and maltreated by the

troops of the most catholic king under his general, complimented and rewarded by the Pope of Rome, father of the faithful, successor of St. Peter, Christ's vicar upon earth. The sack lasted three days : and the fortunate soldiers, glutted with crime and laden with the booty, marched into Antwerp, where they began to sell off their stolen goods to the best advantage. "A priest of the Company of Jesus, who was in high repute in Antwerp, assembled some of the merchants," says Strada, the Jesuit, "and induced them to

Pious
merchants. buy up the articles so wastefully sold by the troops, in order to restore them to the original owners at the same price." The "pious merchants" complied, according to Strada ; the goods, which were worth one hundred thousand florins, were bought in for twenty thousand, and resold to the owners at the same price—the portion which was not redeemed being distributed among the poor—*inter inopes*. Nay, the same merchants made a subscription, and freighted a vessel with provisions for the unfortunates at Malines. Even the soldiers, by the same Jesuit's exhortation, sent in the same vessel more than a hundred precious vestments, besides other sacred furniture, to be restored to the

¹ Sacchin. lib. viii. 225, *et seq.* ; Quesnel, ii. 291.

monks and nuns gratuitously.¹ Such is the Jesuit-version of the affair, which, however, was differently related by other parties. These say that the soldiers gave a portion of the booty to the Jesuits, as it was a common practice with them to share their spoil with the monks : and the Jesuits converted the same into money, with which they built their costly and magnificent house in Antwerp. Sacchinus denies the fact, as a matter of course, stating that the Jesuits were publicly accused of having built their house out of the spoils of Mechlin ; and further, that they had used some of the same money to procure the favour they enjoyed with Alva's successor in the Netherlands—an instance, adds the historian, of the malignity and perversity of man, which can find nothing good or virtuous without putting upon it a wrong construction.² It would have been better to supply the place of this moral axiom, by stating whence the funds were obtained for building or beautifying the house at Antwerp. However, perhaps we may *halve* the evidence on both sides, and believe that the Jesuits displayed a kind consideration for the unfortunates of Malines, *and* provided for their house in the bargain. It is delightful for a sportsman to kill two birds at one shot.

In the midst of these awful scenes of war in almost every other province of the Company, the Jesuits at Rome were cultivating the arts with their usual activity, were training youth according to their system, and with curious results. The German Col-
lege, as I have stated, was filled with the sons
of the nobility—youths destined for the highest functions

1570. The
Jesuit-
schools.

¹ Strada, 432.

² Sacchin. lib. viii. 231 ; Meteren, Hist. Des Pays Bas ; Quesnel, ii. 291.

in church and state—youths who would become men and be placed in a position to influence many a social circle, many a city, many a kingdom. Considering the dominant ideas of the Catholic reaction headed by the pope, considering the perfect concurrence of the Jesuits in that movement, we may take it for granted that the hatred of the heretics was intensely inculcated in their schools, as Possevinus told the Duke of Savoy. In the spreading establishments of the Jesuits, therefore, we behold one immense source of the desperate spirit of contention which made that most immoral first century of the Jesuits, the most bigoted withal. Everything was postponed to the bugbear orthodoxy. To insure fidelity to “the Church” everything would be sacrificed. And it was the great, the noble, and the rich, whose heart and hand the champions of Catholicism were eager to enlist around their banners. With such support there would be no necessity for the pope “to sell the last chalice of the Church” for gold, whereon and whereby to establish and defend Catholicism. So the Jesuits were excessively endearing, kind, indulgent to these sprigs of nobility, whom they effectually bound to their cause, and to themselves or the Company: but not without the usual consequences of partiality, indulgence, and connivance in the management of youth. If there be a class of human beings for whose guidance the most undeviating singleness of heart, the most candid simplicity, with rational firmness, be absolutely necessary, it is youth—youth of all ranks—but especially the children of the great and the rich, who imbibe that unnatural pride, selfishness, and self-sufficiency which are destined to perpetuate the abuses of civilisation. Amongst the Jesuit-establishments the evils of their system were already apparent.

Even in the life-time of Ignatius, we beheld them with grief, though we bitterly laughed at the incongruous contrast of rules as rigid as cast-iron, and conduct as unbridled as the ocean—amongst their own scholastics—the embryo-Jesuits of Portugal. We must not, therefore, be surprised to read of a “row” in the Roman and German Colleges, managed by the Jesuits. The Jesuit-theatricals were the origin—*un-*“holy emulation” was the proximate cause of the strife.

A tragedy.

The students at the German College had performed a tragedy with the usual display: the pupils at the Roman College had also prepared their drama to succeed among the Roman festivities usual during the carnival. From a commendable spirit of economy, or to lessen the cost of their attractions, the Jesuits thought proper to request the pupils of the Roman College to perform their drama in the theatre already constructed in the German College. As soon as this was made known, the students of the German College resolved to give a second representation of their tragedy. It appears that it was “by particular desire” of the public, who had duly applauded the histrionic efforts of the young Jesuits: but the pupils of the Roman College were determined to fire off their gun, and resolved not to lose the opportunity. The Germans took possession of the theatre: the Romans rushed on, and a desperate struggle ensued; “In fact,” says Sacchinus, “there was every likelihood of seeing a real tragedy enacted, and the theatre converted into a gladiatorial arena.” On such occasions the young are themselves frightened by the serious consequences of their unbridled humours; and in that condition they are easily managed. Borgia interposed, prohibited both companies from acting, and dismissed

Facts and reflections.

the audience.¹ Still the Jesuits persevered in the practice of these exhibitions, and became famous for their theatrical pomps and vanities. Their Shakspeares composed tragedies—absurd and wretched platitudes most of them—and their Keans and Kembles delighted their silly parents and friends, who deemed it an honour to have the family-genius exhibited to the multitude. The Jesuits of course humoured the weakness—sacrificed to the vanity; but those who have some experience in these matters, who have witnessed the total absorption of every other thought by the preparations for a college performance, the feverish anxiety to win applause, the positively demoralising impression produced by the concourse of gaily-dressed women, on the eyes at least of the students previously so strictly secluded,—whoever has witnessed these concomitants of college-theatricals, may be permitted to think that they should have been dispensed with by those who make a boast of their moral students. But these displays served the purpose of the Jesuits. They captivated the most vulgar portion of humanity—parents blinded by vanity, intoxicated with over-fondness for their progeny. Not only did the Jesuits stimulate the histrionic ambition of their pupils by these regular displays, but their very *prizes* were neatly bound and gilt plays, composed by their Company—harmless, stupid matter enough decidedly, and not worth the binding; but it is the “spirit” thus entertained and stimulated, which demands attention.²

¹ Sacchin. lib. vi. 9, *et seq.*; Quesnel, ii. 312, *et seq.*

² I fortunately fell in with one of the prizes, now in my possession—*Petri Mussonii Virdunensis e Societate Jesu Tragediæ*, “performed in the theatre of Henry IV.’s College,” at La Fleche. On the fly-leaf there is a manuscript declaration by Chevalier, the prefect of Studies at the college, attesting that the volume was merited by an “ingenuous youth” named Michel Tartaret, to whom

Their colleges answered another purpose as well—they presented a field of selection whence the noble oaks and mighty poplars emerged and towered aloft, overshadowing the fortunate confederation. Bellarmine.

Robert Bellarmine was now in condition to begin the glorious career of his pen and his tongue, in defence of orthodoxy. The Jesuits consoled themselves for the disaster at Montepulciano, by the thought that the city gave them a Bellarmine.¹ A cousin of Pope Marcellus II., he was sent very young to the Roman school of the Jesuits, and imbibed a “vocation” into the Company. It is said that his humility and simplicity of character led him to join the Company, on account of the vow by which the Jesuits engaged themselves not to accept any prelacy or church-dignity, unless compelled by an express command of the pope.² It seems to me that Ignatius could not have devised a better expedient for making his men most likely to be chosen for such appointments. It made them conspicuous amongst the monks—so eager for bishoprics and other church-pickings; and it slyly appealed to that *ruimus in vetitum*, the grasping at the forbidden fruit, which alone, without other motives, will make men, and self-willed popes particularly, enforce their desires. Of course the general as wisely kept a check on his ambitious individuals. Bellarmine

it was presented in the public theatre of the same college, as a reward for penmanship—“hoc volumen in primum scriptionis præmium, in publico ejusdem Collegii theatro, meritum et consecutum esse.”—*Aug.* 19, an. 1626. I shall allude to the work anon. The matter is certainly unworthy of the binding, which is red morocco, richly gilt, with beaded edges. The price was high, and upon my objection, the bookseller said that it was the *binding*, the *outside*, that made it valuable; otherwise, said he, you might have it for a shilling. But he altered his opinion when I paid the price, and explained to him the purport of the manuscript declaration on the fly-leaf, of which he was not aware, and which, of course, would have enhanced the price of the curiosity. ¹ Bartoli, Dell’ Ital.

² Frizon, Vie de Bellarm. i. ; Quesnel, ii. 309 ; Fuligat. Vita, i.

passed through his preliminary studies with great success and edification. We are told that he excelled in poetry, and never committed a mortal sin, nor even a venial sin with full deliberation.¹ In fact he is compared by his Jesuit-biographer to the heavens, which were made for the utility of others.² Without being prejudiced against this celebrated man by the wretched absurdities which the Jesuits say of him, it must be admitted that he was one of the best Jesuits—in the better sense of the word—that ever existed—an earnest believer in the doctrines of the Church which he successfully defended—to the utter ruin and destruction of heresy, according to the boast of his party, and not without affright in the ranks of the Protestants.³ He entered the novitiate in 1560, aged only eighteen: but his merits or the want of labourers in the Company, induced the general to dispense with the constitutional two years, which were compressed into two months for Robert Bellarmine. He was then hurried through his philosophy, and sent to teach the languages and rhetoric at Florence, and subsequently at Mondovi.

¹ Fulig. Vita.

² Ibid.

³ The title-page to his Life by the Jesuit Fuligati, published in 1624, is a splendid emblem of that boasting. Bellarmine appears clad as a warrior, “with his martial cloak around him,” looking contemptuously but severely on a hideous demoniac, the perfect expression of horrible anguish, tearing out the leaves of a book, whilst her face is averted and dreadfully distorted. Bellarmine has the fore-finger of his right hand on his lip, commanding silence, whilst with his left he holds a fir-top, and a chain which is passed round the neck of the female monster. There are plenty of fir-tops pending from the two trees which bound the emblem, and at the top there is another hideous face with a fir-top stuck in his mouth, by way of “a nut to crack,” I suppose. Then there is a most curious *Anagram* discovered by some idle but orthodox Jesuit. In the words *Robertus Cardinalis Bellarminus e Societate Jesu*, this Jesuit has discovered anagrammatically the following awful prophecy—*Lutheri errores ac astutias Calvinii omnes delebis*—you will demolish all the errors of Luther and wiles of Calvin. I suppose the words “if you can” were *sub-understood* amphibologically, or by equivocation.

His remarkable talent induced the superiors to dispense with the usual course,—and he was sent to preach in various places, the Company availing herself of a papal privilege which permitted her members to preach though not in orders. Genoa, Padua, Venice, and other large towns of Italy listened to the young Jesuit, scarcely twenty-two years of age, with profit and admiration. The success of his public disputations and lectures at Genoa, suggested to the superiors that Louvain, where they had so much trouble with the university, was the right position for such a great gun as the young Bellarmine. Besides, there was a sort of Catholic heretic at Louvain, the famous Baius, whose views of Divine grace were censured by others of his Church, who had other views in view. Hitherto the doctor, Baius, had to contend with hidden enemies, excepting a certain tribe of the monks: but now the Company of Jesus took him in hand, and sent Bellarmine, its famous young preacher, to bestow a few words upon him, which he did in a public disputation against the aforesaid views of Divine grace. Bellarmine was ordained shortly after his arrival; and continued to preach with more zeal than ever. His youth and eloquence astonished all the world, and his reputation became so great that the Protestants from Holland and England were attracted over to hear the new preacher. His great talent consisted in winning over the heretics by mildness. He spared the heretic whilst he inveighed against heresy: he strove to direct the steps of the wanderer rather than to beat him into the fold; and in wrestling with the opponents of Rome by his eloquence, his triumph was always the result of his mildness, which was charming.¹ Bellarmine was

¹ Frizon, i. ; Fuligat. ii. ; Quesnel, ii. 311.

one of the very few Jesuits whose peculiar organisation permitted them to pursue that method with the heretics; and if he had had more imitators in his Company, Christendom would not have seen so much bloodshed amongst the heretics—all victims of that ferocious and sanguinary zeal which irritates and perpetuates dissension. There is a remarkable inconsistency in the Jesuits in this matter. How could men, so constantly complaining of persecution and intolerance, be the first to give the example when their bows, and their smiles, and their soft words failed to convert the heretic? But so it was, however. At the very time when they most lamented the injustice of persecution, they were elsewhere advocating the principle in its widest extent.

Ribadeneyra. Thus, in 1595, one of the first Jesuits, the bosom friend of Loyola, and the most venerable of the Company at the time, Father Ribadeneyra, published a sort of Anti-Macchiavel, whose twenty-sixth chapter is entitled “That the heretics ought to be chastised, and how prejudicial is liberty of conscience—*Que los hereges deven ser castigados, y quan prejudicial sea la libertad de consciencia.*” And after heaping together very many arguments from all sources, in defence of his position, he asks: “If he who coins false money is burnt, why not he who makes and preaches false doctrine? If he who forges royal letters deserves the penalty of death, what will he merit who corrupts the Sacred Scriptures and the divine letters of the Lord? The woman dies justly for not preserving fidelity to her husband, and shall not that man die who does not preserve his faith to his God?” And lastly he concludes, “that to permit liberty of conscience, and to let each man lose himself as he pleases, is a diabolical

doctrine"—attributing the words to Beza, whom he calls "an infernal fury, and a worthy disciple of his master, Calvin." Nor is Bellarmine himself exempt from the charge of intolerance, though he thought Jesuitical craft and persuasion better adapted for success with heretics. In his practice he was a sleek seducer: in his theory he was a stern persecutor. Thus Ribadeneyra refers his readers for more copious details on the subject to "Father Robert Bellarmine of our Company."¹ In fact it was the universal doctrine of the Churchmen; and what is more disgraceful still, actually practised by Protestants. Of all crimes in history none seems to me more hideously inconsistent—to say nothing of its guilt—than the ample share which Calvin had in the burning of Servetus. The plain fact is that there was no true religion, no pure religion on earth in those times, amongst the *leaders of parties*. All was utter selfishness in thought, word, and deed.

The infidels came in for their share. No one need be told that during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries all Christendom was in constant terror of the The Turks. Turks. It was destined for Pope Pius V. to be the great promoter of an expedition which broke the Ottoman power for ever; at all events so completely maimed it that since then Turkey has only served to "keep up the balance of power" in Europe—one of those incomprehensible axioms that statesmen invent to serve a purpose, until another maxim issues from a diametrically opposite procedure. One of these days Russia will swallow up Turkey, and our statesmen will find their balance somewhere else, without losing their gravity—as we hope and trust.

¹ Tratado de la Religion, c. xxvi. ed. Mad. 1595; Bellarm. t. i. l. iii.; De Laicis, c. xviii.

Now, in the year 1571 fright and orthodoxy admirably combined to exterminate the Turks:—but the Venetians—the lord-high admirals of the ocean in 1571. those times—were rather the worse for the war of fright and orthodoxy. The Grand Turk was just preparing to smoke his pipe in Cyprus—a Christian stronghold rather too important to be sacrificed by the devout sons of orthodoxy. The pope, fierce old Pius V., bestirred himself accordingly—applied to the Spaniard, who struck an alliance with him, but sent very few ships to makè the Turk strike withal,—whilst the Ottoman grinned fiercely at the prospects before him, as he scanned his mighty armaments ready to devour the Christians. The pope resolved to stimulate the Spaniard. Pius thought it his duty to exterminate the Turks, simply because they were not Catholics. That was the impelling motive of his ferocious zeal, added to the universal fright of Christendom at the encroachments of the Ottomans. When the Turkish power was crippled, vast praise was given to the pope for his exertions : but, with his known motives, he merited none, and the results of the victory of Lepanto, so beneficial to the terror-stricken Christians, proved decisive merely from the character of the Turks, who could not digest a disaster. Christendom was delivered of its incubus—and the Turks were not capable, by their character, to resume their devilry—whereat we have great reason to rejoice and be thankful. But it must be admitted that Pius bestirred himself with vast determination. He dispatched a cardinal to Philip, and sent General Borgia with him as secretary. The celebrated Francis Tolet had joined the Company—a “monster of intellect” as his master, Dominic Soto, styled him. Pope Pius set

him to work, dispatched him into Portugal to labour for the same league against the Turks. It was a stirring time for the Company. The Jesuits dispersed themselves in all the kingdoms of Europe, and penetrated into their courts, with the noble pretext of begging assistance for the hampered Venetians. The Company profited by the work of charity. Her houses were multiplied to such an extent that it was found necessary to appoint six provincials to visit all the new establishments. The increase of their wealth set the Jesuits in constant agitation. They wished for ubiquity, omnipossession; and by the natural consequence of their indefatigable exertions in these stirring times, they constantly managed to fall in for something—new establishments arose almost daily. Everything favoured their designs. The ignorance of the people and the priesthood and monkhood, in those days,—added to the by-play of the princes, lords, and monarchs, who found the Jesuits useful,—furnished them with the grand fulcrum for the lever of intellect, tact, and craft, set in motion by their boundless ambition.

Jesuit-
expansion.

Early in 1572 Borgia visited the Court of France in behalf of the *pope's affairs*. He returned to Rome almost dying with lassitude, harassments, and disease. In May, the same year, Pius V. expired “in the odour of sanctity;” and on the 24th of August, Charles IX. and his mother Catherine performed the grand religious ceremony of St. Bartholomew's massacre. It was an universal mandate to cut to pieces every Huguenot in Paris and throughout the provinces of France—as if the fiend of religionism in those days wished to mock what we read of the destroying angel in Egypt. How Philip of Spain exulted

1572.
Massacre of
St. Bar-
tholomew.

thereat ! “ So Christian, so great, so valiant an extermination and execution ” as he called it. “ Finish,” he wrote to the king, “ finish purging your kingdom of the infection of heresy : it is the greatest good that can happen to your majesties ”—Charles IX. and Catherine de’ Medici, his mother. At Rome the news was received with enthusiastic acclamations. Pope Gregory XIII., who had succeeded to Pius V., expressed his joy in a letter to Charles and his mother—he congratulated them for having “ served the faith of Christ in shaking off hideous heresy.” Bonfires blazed in the streets at Rome, and from the castle of St. Angelo cannons roared glory to the deed of blood—and at last they mocked God Almighty by a solemn procession to the Church of St. Louis—all Rome’s nobility and people uniting in the impious thanksgiving.¹ Such was the

Rejoicings
at Rome.

¹ Capefigue, *Réforme*. This writer gives the best account extant of that dreadful affair. Nothing more need be known on the subject. A medal was struck, by order of the pope, to commemorate this “perambulating sacrifice of not less than 40,000 human victims to the Moloch of Papal anti-Christianity,” and ruthless tyranny. If the Jesuits were not directly accessories to the slaughter, they were accessories after the fact, by their approval of the deed, as the following notice of the medal by the Jesuit antiquarian Bonanni, proves but too strikingly. The medal has on the obverse, as usual, a figure of the pope : GREGORIUS XIII. PONT. MAX. *An. I.* The reverse has a representation of a destroying angel, with a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, slaying and pursuing a prostrate and falling band of heretics. The legend is, UGONOTORUM. STRAGES. 1572. The Jesuit Bonanni thus proceeds : “The unexpected change of affairs overwhelmed Gregory, the pontiff, and Italy, with the greater joy, in proportion to the increasing fear produced by the account of Cardinal Alessandrino, lest the rebels, who had revolted from the ancient religion, should inundate Italy. Immediately upon the receipt of the news the pontiff proceeded with solemn supplication from St. Mark’s to St. Louis’s temple ; and having published a jubilee for the Christian world, he called upon the people to commend the religion and King of France to the supreme Deity. He gave orders for a painting descriptive of the slaughter of the Admiral Coligny and his companions, to be made in the Hall of the Vatican, by Giorgio Vasari, as a monument of vindicated religion, and a trophy of exterminated heresy, solicitous to impress by that means how salutary would be the effect, to the sick body of the kingdom, so

climax of religious zeal, for which the most ardent machinators of the faith—the Jesuits—with all Catholics of the time—might boast : but alas ! how short-sighted it was—considering the desperation which it would produce in the persecuted—and the excuse it would give, in the eyes of all disinterested observers, for the most savage persecutions by Protestant kings and pagans against the Catholics—presenting that retributive justice which never fails to overtake crime, in some shape or another, *here*—in *this* world, before the criminal departs for the other.

Two days before the massacre, Henry of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV., had married Charles IX.'s sister. He was still in the Louvre. Henry was a Huguenot : the king would force him to abjure his religion. To give the transaction the appearance of conviction, he sent for the Jesuit Maldonat. The Jesuit came—through the scenes of blood he came trembling—but not without self-possession, and addressed the prince of the Huguenots.

Conversion
of Henry
of Navarre.

copious an emission of bad blood—*quam salubris ægro Regni corpori tam copiosa depravati sanguinis emissio esset profutura*. He sends Cardinal Ursino as his legate—*à latere*—into France, to admonish the king to pursue his advantages with vigour, nor lose his labour, so prosperously commenced with sharp remedies, by mingling with them more gentle ones. Although these were such brilliant proofs of the piety of Charles, and of his sincere attachment to the Catholic Church, as well as of pontifical solicitude, there were not wanting some who gave them a very different interpretation. But, that the slaughter was not executed without the help of God and the divine counsel, Gregory inculcated in a medal struck on the occasion, in which an angel, armed with a sword and a cross, attacks the rebels ; a representation by which he recalls to mind, that the houses of the heretics were signed with a white cross, in order that the king's soldiers might know them from the rest, as likewise they themselves wore a white cross on their hats."—*Numism. Pontiff. Rom. a temp. Mart. V. &c. Roma*, 1699, t. i. p. 336. See Mendham, who quotes the original Latin, for some pertinent remarks, and other facts, relating to the massacre, its many medals, and its apologists.—*Life of Pius V.* p. 210—217.

Henry listened, but made no reply, when Charles IX., in a paroxysm of rage, cried, "Either the mass, death, or perpetual imprisonment—choose instantly." The future Henry IV. had no vocation for religious or political martyrdom, so he abjured heresy with his lips, saved his life, and bided his time. We shall meet him again.¹

On the 1st of October, 1572, General Borgia expired. His age was sixty-two—twenty-two of which he passed in the Company. His generalate lasted eight years. His companions requested him to name a vicar-general ; but he refused, saying that he had to render an account to God for many other things, without adding that appointment to the number. Then he humbly begged pardon of all the fathers for the faults he had committed against the perfection of the Institute, and the bad example he thought he had given them, craving their benediction ; and, in accordance with their earnest request, promising to remember them in the abodes of the blest, should God be merciful to him ; and asked to be left alone. But still they troubled the poor man, anxious to depart in peace, and to give his last moment to God alone. They had the heart to ask the dying man to permit a painter to take his portrait. Borgia refused permission. They disobeyed their dying general, because they wanted the bauble to sanction miracles withal, as the event verified.² In spite of his wish to be alone with God—in spite of his refusal to have his portrait taken, the Jesuit-aristocrats persisted ; two of them stood before him, with the painter in the rear, at work with his paint and pencils : they actually

Death of
Borgia.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 123.

² See Verjus, ii. 323, for what he calls "the prodigious effects of a portrait of the saint."

tried to trick their dying general ! What *children* would thus persist in annoying a dying parent ? And yet for them there would be some excuse, since it would be motived by those strong feelings of *nature*, of which we are proud : but these Jesuits totally disclaimed any feeling of the sort in theory, and they were incapable of it in practice, as their cruel importunity attested. Borgia perceived the trick. The poor man had lost his speech : he could not reproach them : but with his hands he tried to express his displeasure, evidently without effect, for he made an effort, and turned away from the persecutors. Then only did they dismiss the painter ; and then he sighed and expired.¹

Throughout the eight years of his generalate, Borgia kept his promise to be the “beast of burthen” of the Company’s aristocracy ; and the pope of Rome used him in like manner, to the utter affliction of the man, whose peculiar organisation ever made him the tool of influence—ever subservient to the will of others—utterly incapable of resistance to impulses from without, and a prey to the wildest notions of ascetic devotion from within. “Thus he was a saint in his infancy at the bidding of his nurse—then a cavalier at the command of his uncle—an inamorato because the empress desired it—a warrior and a viceroy because such was the pleasure of Charles—a devotee from seeing a corpse in a state of decomposition—a founder of colleges on the advice of Peter Faber—a Jesuit at the will of Ignatius—a general of the Order because his colleagues would have it so.”² Had he lived in the times and

His character.

¹ Verjus, ii. 80—83. I need not say that the Jesuit makes a very *edifying* affair out of the disgusting conduct of the “fathers” who besieged Borgia on his death-bed.

² *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1842, an article entitled “Ignatius Loyola and

in the society of his infamous kinsmen, Borgia would, not improbably, have shared their disastrous renown.”¹ How much soever his intimate connection with the “religious” *Borgias* of the sixteenth century—Philip II., Charles IX., and Pope Pius V., must tend to diminish our esteem of the man—the Christian,—yet there is evidence to prove that his mind perceived, and his heart embraced, the best intentions ; but palsied as he was by the weakness of his nature, and the rushing force of circumstances in which he was placed, he lived a man of desire, and after doing what he could to avert evil, he died with bitter thoughts and apprehensions respecting that Company for which he made himself a “beast of burthen”—not indeed from terror or a grovelling nature—but in deference to that internal ascetic devotion which we must experience in order to understand its dictates of undistinguishing submissiveness.

His presence at the court of France, on a mission from the pope, immediately before the horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew, is suspicious ; but, “though he

his Associates.” Cretineau-Joly boldly and confidently palms that article on *Mr. Macaulay*, and quotes from it triumphantly on many occasions ; not without taking some liberties with the original. It is a curious piece of composition, but evidently written *at* some “religious” party—a cento of biting hints very deeply cut in. Certainly, however, no Jesuit nor friend of theirs should appeal to that article, since there is everything in it to produce a bad impression against Jesuitism even in its best aspects—the earlier phase of its history. There is much irony throughout the composition, and its highest praises are knocked down suddenly by a bitter blast of vituperation, all so completely huddled together, that it will be impossible for you to “make head or tail on ’t.” Still, it is admirably written ; as the phrase is, “brilliant as a diamond—flashing like the lightning,” and must have been a thunderbolt to the party in view. It had the honour to eventuate a course of lectures and a publication entitled “*The Jesuits*,” which I have read ; but the author, whose intentions were excellent, might have spared himself the trouble of invading the Edinburgh Jesuitarian, whose intention was certainly not to write up the Jesuits, but to write down some others, who merit no apologists. Verb. Sap.

¹ Edinburgh Review, *ubi suprà*, No. clii. p. 357.

maintained an intimate personal intercourse with Charles IX., and his mother, and enjoyed their highest favour, there is no reason to suppose that he was intrusted with their atrocious secret. Even in the land of the Inquisition he had firmly refused to lend the influence of his name to that sanguinary tribunal [as Ignatius *had* done before him]; for there was nothing morose in his fanaticism, nor mean in his subservience. Such a man as Francis Borgia could hardly become a persecutor.”¹ Or rather, he might lend himself as the indirect, or direct, instrument of persecution, in obedience to his undistinguishing submissiveness—but would never cease to lament his share in the horrible perpetration. It may be asked, is it possible that Borgia was not at least aware of the intended massacre—he who was intrusted with the designs of Pope Pius V., whose atrocious advice and exhortations to Charles IX. we have perused? God only knows at the present moment. If he did, it suffices to explain the dreadful increase of his infirmities, which hurried him to his grave so soon after his return from the Court of France, and five weeks after the awful event had desolated that kingdom.

Humble towards his enemies—he appointed public prayer for the enemies of the Company—kind to his subjects, gentle to all, but merciless to his own poor body, he strove throughout life to conform himself to the frightful image he had conceived of Christian perfection, and constantly displayed an example which few of his Company thought proper to follow, though they wisely made it the subject of glowing laudation.

Summary.

¹ Edinburgh Review, *ubi supra*, No. clii. p. 357.

The vast increase of his Company's establishments is to be ascribed to its own elastic energies rather than to Borgia's wisdom, prudence, or calculation. Always the "beast of burthen," he carried his men whithersoever they wished to advance, or the pope and princes directed their efforts. In the armies of Catholic princes battling with the Turks and the Huguenots, his Jesuits brandished the crucifix, and sanctified the slaughter of war. To the strongholds of vice or heresy and paganism—to Naples, to Poland, Sweden, Spain, France, Scotland, England, Germany, to the East and West Indies, to Africa, and the isles adjacent—all the wide world over, the Company sent her Jesuits to expand her power, wealth, and domination, whilst she did "good service" to her patron princes.

In the midst of this world-encircling expansion, Borgia was not without alarm for the fate of his Company.

Borgia's apprehensions and compliance.

Already had it become the resort of nobles like himself—attracted doubtless by his name—the resort of great names in the circle of letters or the world's renown. His novitiates were filled—his colleges were thronged—the Company was become the receptacle of the vain, the proud, the sensual. Some he found it necessary to expel: but to others he yielded. One young nobleman "felt himself strongly inspired and urged by the grace of the Saviour" to enter the Company: but this "grace of the Saviour" met with one overpowering objection—the young sprig of nobility "could not do without a valet-de-chambre to dress and undress him!" Borgia promised to allow him a Jesuit to perform the function, and fulfilled the promise. Another "refused to obey the voice of God, because he was accustomed from childhood to change

his linen every day ;—and the small dimensions and poverty of the rooms of the novices horrified” a third young lord. Borgia “gave the former his clean shirt every day ; and for the latter he prepared a large room which he got well carpeted.”¹ We are assured by the same authority that these young lords became sick of the indulgences, and begged with equal ardour to be served worse than the other novices—the usual old song in honour of expedient concessions. Doubtless Borgia hoped for that result : but undoubtedly during that rush of applicants, noble and rich, some such expedients were absolutely necessary to retain those Birds of Paradise.

Borgia promoted the education of the Company with considerable vigour,—importing French professors from the University of Paris to teach in his college of Gandia, and sparing no pains nor expense in the cultivation of literature in all the Jesuit-academies :—but in so doing he merely conformed to the ambition of the Company—that “holy emulation” if you please, with which the Jesuits were inflamed, eagerly advancing to the foremost rank in all the departments of knowledge, human and divine. No “founder of a system of education” was Borgia, although during his generalate the Jesuit-system of education became “pregnant with results of almost matchless importance”—destined to begin its parturition in the eventful times of General Aquaviva.² On the contrary,

Borgia and
education.

¹ Verjus, ii. 274.

² The writer of the article in the *Edinburgh*, before noticed and quoted, says that Lainez was the author of the Jesuits’ peculiar system of theology, and calls Borgia the architect of their system of education ; on what grounds, I am unable to discover. The “peculiar system of theology” adopted by the Jesuits was actually no system at all, but an endless variation adapted to circumstances ;

there is reason to believe that he apprehended the pernicious consequences of that wild advancement in letters which left the Jesuits no time to think of the "spirit of their vocation." In a letter which he addressed to the

His prophetic
warning to
the Jesuits.

Fathers and Brothers of the Aquitanian Province in France, he writes in prophetic terms on the subject. The object of the letter is to suggest the means of preserving the spirit of the Company, and the Jesuit's vocation. It was written three years before his death. After quoting the words : *Happy is the man that feareth alway*, and the other proverb : Darts foreseen strike not,—he strikes at the root of the evil as follows : "If we do not at all attend to the vocation and spirit with which members join the Company, and look only to literature, and care only for the circumstances and endowments of the body, the time will come when the Company will see itself extensively occupied with literature, but utterly bereft of any desire of virtue. Then ambition will flourish in the Company ; pride will rise unbridled : and there will be

so that every system of theology may, to a vast extent, find advocates in the multitudinous theologians of the Company. Certainly Lainez advocated some peculiar views at the Council of Trent, but they were nothing new in themselves ; they might be found among the "Fathers." St. Thomas was the Company's theologian ; but according to the Constitutions (as revised) any other might be chosen at the will of the general.—P. iv. c. xiv. s. i. ; ib. B. This refers to *Scholastic Theology* ; of course, in the *positive*, the doctrines of the Church were matters for the Council of Trent or the pope to decide. As to Borgia and "the system of education" attributed to him, nothing need be said except that he had neither the capacity, nor the will, to do more than favour the onward movement, which he found so determined to advance. In proof of the intellectual riot of the Jesuits at the feast of Theology, I appeal to the 83d decree of the 7th Congreg., when an attempt to settle the "opinions" of the Company was utterly abortive. See also the 31st Decree of the 9th Congreg., when the vagaries of "certain professors of theology" were complained of, long after the promulgation of the *Ratio Studiorum* ! This was the case throughout the *seventeenth century*.

no one to restrain and keep it down. For if they turn their minds to their wealth, and their relatives, let them know that they may be rich in wealth and relatives, but totally destitute of virtue. Therefore, let this be the paramount counsel, and let it be written at the head of the book—lest at length experience should show what the mind perceives by demonstration. And would to heaven that already before this, experience itself had not often taught us and attested the whole evil.” Thus we find that Borgia perceived the tendency of the spirit which was salient in the Company. The spiritual maladies which other generals cauterised in vain in their epistles, were already too apparent. The reign of ambition and pride was already begun. Already in receiving their members, the aristocrats of the Company were actuated by the spirit of worldliness, caring more for mental abilities and temporal advantages than true vocation, or the pure spirit of God resulting from a right intention in a right mind. Youths of blood, youths of wit, and youths of fortune or fine prospects, were the desirable members. Pride, mammon, and ambition, prescribed their qualifications. Such were the matters alluded to by Borgia’s prophetic warning ; and it is said that he exclaimed on one occasion : “ We have entered as lambs : We shall reign like wolves : We shall be driven out like dogs : We shall be renewed as eagles.”¹ Unquestionably Borgia would have totally reformed the Company in its most dangerous abuses, had it been in his power. He was no willing party to the Company’s court-favour, its worldliness, its ambition : but he was

¹ I actually heard the Latin of that prophecy of Borgia quoted by one of the novices : “ *Intravimus ut agni, regnabimus ut lupi, expellemur ut canes, renovabimur ut aquilæ.* ”

thrown upon the rushing Niagara,—and if he himself clung fast and firm on the rock mid-way, the roaring waters dashed foaming past into the gulf beneath, where they whirled and whirled for a time with strange upheavings, and then spread onwards to the gulf of destruction.

The thought is saddening: but still more painful when we think what good the Jesuits might have done for humanity in those dreadful times of transition.

This prophetic warning of Borgia was not pleasant to the Jesuits. Before the end of the Company's first

century, the prophecy respecting pride and ambition, was an old experience. Still the words were an eye-sore; and they were

accordingly altered, falsified, or expunged, "by authority," or otherwise. The original occurs in the edition printed at Ipres in 1611: the amendments in that of Antwerp, in 1635, and all the subsequent editions of the Institute. As the trick is an important fact in the history of the Jesuits, I shall give the two texts, side by side, as a sample of Jesuit-invention, &c.

Edition of Ipres, 1611, p. 57.

Profectò si nulla habitâ ratione vocationis et spiritûs, quo quisque accensus veniat, litteras modo adspectamus, et opportunitates, habilitatesque corporis curamus, veniet tempus quo se Societas multis quidem occupatam litteris, sed sine ullo virtutis studio intuebitur, in quâ tunc vigebit ambitio, et sese efferet solutis habenis superbia, nec à quo contineatur et supprimatur habebit: quippe si animum converterint ad

Edition of Antwerp, 1635.

San si nulla habitâ ratione vocationis et spiritûs, quo quisque impulsus accedit litteras modò spectemus, et alia talenta et dona, veniet tempus quo se Societas multis quidem hominibus abundantem, sed spiritu et virtute destitutam mærens intuebitur, unde existet ambitio, et sese efferet solutis habenis superbia: nec à quoquam contineatur et supprimatur habebit. Quippe si animum

opes et cogitationes quas habent, intelligent illi se quidem propinquis et opibus affluentes, sed omnino virtutum copiis destitutos. *Itaque hoc primum esto consilium et in capite libri scriptum, ne tandem aliquando experientia doceat, quod mens demonstratione concludit.* Atque utinam, *jam non ante hoc totum, experientia ipsa sæpiùs testata docuisset.*

converterint ad opes et cogitationes quas habent, intelligent illi se quidam propinquis et opibus abundantes, sed *solidarum virtutum, ac spiritualium donorum copiis egenos ac vacuos.* Itaque hoc primum esto consilium, et in capite libri scribatur, ne tandem aliquando experientia doceat, atque utinam nunquam [utinam *nondum*, in edit. Ant. 1702,] docuisset, quod mens demonstratione concludit.¹

As the Jesuits ascribe the gift of prophecy to Borgia, and relate facts in attestation, it was certainly unfair to endeavour to deprive him of all the credit due to him for a foresight of the calamities which they were obviously preparing for themselves.

As a tribute of respect to Borgia, I shall be silent on the ridiculous miracles which the Jesuits impudently relate as having been performed by the inter-
Borgia's
miracles.
 cession, the invocation, the relics, the portrait, the apparition, and the written life of Borgia—making him sometimes a Lucina, or midwife, sometimes a physician, or a ghost—phases of character which, however amusing in themselves, would be a very unbecoming prelude to the serious, the tumultuous, the “stirring” events about to follow the death of Francis Borgia, third general of the Jesuits.²

¹ See *Morale Pratique*, iii. 76, et seq.

² For Borgia's Miracles, see Verjus, ii. 298—337.

BOOK VII. OR, BOBADILLA.

To Pope Pius V. Catholics must ascribe the glory of having restored the ascendancy of the Roman cause. Call it Catholicism, papal prerogative, or Catholic reaction : it matters little : the result was the same—all flowing as a consequence from the spread of fanatical orthodoxy—the murderous rage of bigotry. What suffering for humanity he prepared, and sanctified ! The reeking blood of men, and the exulting shouts of fiends, with clapping of hands, in the midst of social ruin and desolation, attested that horrible glory of the “mighty paramount” of Rome, at the head of his “grand infernal peers.” He sounded the key-note shrill and piercing, and the thousand instruments of Loyola in unison responded. They bid cry

With trumpet's regal sound the *great result* :
Toward the four winds four speedy cherubim
Put to their mouths the sounding alchemy
By herald's voice explain'd ; the hollow abyss
Heard far and wide, and all the host of hell
With deafening shout return'd them loud acclaim.

It was indeed a “false presumptuous hope ;” but it was a “stirring” hope ; that the popedom would once more

give the law to the universe. Time was when ruin utterly impended ; and then the Mamelukes of Rome adventurously tried “if any clime, perhaps, might yield them easier habitation.” Over the wide world they spread and “worked in close design, by fraud or guile, what force effected not.” India, Japan, Africa, America, became familiar with “the greater glory of God.” In the land of the savage and the heathen, the golden age of the Church was restored *by the Annual Letters of the Company*, at least ; and a Jesuit-empire was established by the numerous houses, or factories, of the same adventurers. Allegiance to Rome was the sign-manual of the conquest, and thus, and thus only, did the Jesuits make heaven compensate Rome for her eternal and temporal losses. That was magnificent, however. And the Jesuits were the divine paladins of that bewildering crusade—the little gods of that pagan metamorphosis, which eclipses the wildest of Ovid. For every *one* heretic made by the apostate Luther, a thousand savages leaped into “the Church,” and made the sign of the cross with holy water. The Jesuits taught them. But this was religion in sport, as far as the popedom was concerned. Pope Pius willed it in right good earnest in Europe. And it was done. He died, leaving every kingdom of Europe distracted with the feuds, the rancour of orthodoxy and heresy, war to the death proclaimed on both sides, reckless, merciless war—the war for “religion.”

Gregory XIII., who succeeded Pius V., was flung on the rushing torrent. The thousand shouts of public opinion cheered him from the shore. Mad with the glorious excitement, he plied his paddles, like the savage Indian, with redoubled energy for

Pope Gregory XIII.

the leap over the roaring cataract—the speed of lightning was the only chance of achievement. Gregory he called himself—the word means “watchful,” “vigilant :” for he had “sharpen’d his visual ray”—

——— “on some great charge employ’d,
He seem’d, or fix’d in cogitation deep.”

You will understand the man as we proceed : his deeds will dissect him.

When the harassed, tormented soul of Borgia took flight, the aristocracy of the Company appointed Polancus vicar-general. He was one of the ancients of the Company. I have before described his laborious and numerous employments in the administration. A man of all work under Ignatius, and the governor of the Company in the last days of the founder ; he was the assistant, admonitor, and secretary of Lainez, the very right hand of Borgia, the depository of the secrets, the general correspondent, and man of business, in short, the Atlas of the Company, which he seemed to bear on his shoulders—*suis humeris universam quodammodo Societatem sustinere videretur*.¹ Undoubtedly here was a general ready made for the Company of Jesus. The ancients of the Company, with Polancus at their head, went, as usual, to the pope for his “benediction,” ere they proceeded to open the congregation for the election. “How many votes do the Spaniards of your Company number, and how many generals of that nation have there been hitherto ?” asked Gregory XIII. “Three generals—all Spaniards,” was the reply. “Well,” exclaimed the man of the watch, “it seems to me that you ought now, in justice, to choose a

The pope
names the
general to
be elected.

¹ Bibl. Script. S. J. Joan. Polanc.

general of some other nation." The Jesuits demurred : it was a blow at their prerogatives. "What," rejoined the pope, "have you no other members as capable as the Spaniards to direct your important functions? Father Everard Mercurian would seem to me worthy of your choice." And thereupon, without giving the Jesuits a moment to protest against the designation, he dismissed them with his benediction, and a charge "to do what was most just."¹

"The apostle," observes the Jesuit-historian, "said that before God there was no difference between a Jew and a Greek;" but the apostles of bigotry, in these times, made a remarkable difference between a perfectly converted Jew or Moor, or their perfectly orthodox progeny, and the true born Christians. The prejudice was desperate and universal—like that against "colour" in America, in the East and West Indies, even in our days, though "enlightenment" and *gold* have, in the last-named kingdom of chromatic prejudice, rendered black and its interminable shades of brown, somewhat more curious and fascinating and respectable, for fathers and mothers to fancy, in their accommodating impoverishment. At the time in question, the descendants of Jews and Moors were "held infamous"—*infames habentur*—and were consequently precluded from the Company of Jesus, according to its Constitutions.² Still, a "dispensation" was usually

Prejudice
in the
sixteenth
century.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 170, *et seq.*

² "Qui etiam juxta Constitutiones titulo infamiae admitti non possunt."—*VI. Congreg.* xxviii. Touching the blood of Israel, I have nothing to say. Expatriated wanderers over earth, persecuted everywhere, hated, despised, their only resource was to heap up *gold*, that universal compensating pendulum of society. But the pitchy touch, added to their degradation, poisoned their hearts, made them a cringing, grovelling race, that consoled themselves for all ignominy when they touched and hugged their bursting bags. It was not thus with the

granted when the applicant had other endowments natural or acquired, to compensate for the hereditary taint of *infidelity*. We may stop for a moment to observe that no proof can be stronger to attest the conviction of “converters” in those days, that they did *not* believe they ever made a Christian out of an infidel. They never ceased to apprehend a relapse. The base motives of bigotry made them always suspicious. In the Sixth Congregation of the Jesuits, it was decided, on this score, to make inquiries in such cases, as far back as the fifth degree inclusive, with regard to those “*who were of good stock in other respects, or noble, or of good reputation.*”¹ Polancus had the misfortune to belong to the “tainted” race. The idea of his being made general of the Company of Jesus was horrifying. The Spaniards were so desperately alarmed that Philip II., Don Sebastian, and the Cardinal Henry of Portugal had written and conjured the pope to oppose the election of every Jesuit suspected of such origin. This explains the conduct of Gregory in suggesting Mercurian for the generalate, and shows that the prejudice was patronised by “the Vicar of Jesus Christ,” just as the prejudice against colour in the West, found accommodating supporters in the priesthood, in spite of their European enlightenment and charity, imbibing

Moors. Wherever they had mingled with the race whom they conquered—wherever they condescended to mix their blood with the Spaniard, they improved it ; grace of body, grace of mind and power withal, noble sentiment, ethereal poesy, beauty, heart, and mind, all were given or enhanced by the blood of the Moor. And now, at the present day, the best of the land should be proud of that “taint” which their predecessors despised. Even Mr. Dunham will give you some idea of “Mohammedan Spain.”—*Hist. of Spain*, &c. vol. iv.

¹ “In ceteris, qui alioqui honestæ familiæ essent, aut vulgo nobiles, vel boni nominis haberentur, informationes fierent usque ad quintum gradum inclusive.”—*Ibid.*

prejudice against colour as deeply as any "Creole."¹ In the present instance, the Jesuits remonstrated, not in defence of Polanco's taint, but in defence of their prerogative of free election. Still the pope told them that they might please themselves, but he enjoined them to announce to him, before proclamation, the choice they should make, should it fall on a Spaniard. On the following day, these remonstrants elected the pope's choice—Everard Mercurian—a *Belgian*, and, consequently, a "Spaniard," inasmuch as he was a subject of King Philip. His age was sixty-eight.

His name has nothing to do with the god Mercury, but was simply derived from Marcour in Luxemburg, the place of his birth.² He was born of poor parents, educated at Liege and Louvain, Mercurianus. became a curate, was disgusted with the little "good" he did, and, inspired by the example of Faber and the Jesuit Strada, joined the Company at Paris, whence he

¹ It is well known to all who have resided in the West Indies that the priests perfectly conformed to this prejudice, and made no effort to correct it. I even knew an instance where the priest *in the confessional* advanced the "taint" of his penitent as a motive for *humility!* *Christian* humility!

² Among the ridiculous books published by the Jesuits to celebrate the canonisation of Ignatius, was "*Les Tableaux, or the Pictures of the illustrious personages of the Company of Jesus,*" published at Douay, to reproduce the impression of the glorious festivities in that town, among the thousands where they were celebrated. I shall hereinafter describe the proceedings. Suffice it here to state, that under the "picture" of Mercurian was the following doggerel:—

"Qu'on ne dise jamais que la chiche nature
Regarda de travers Ardene et Luxembourg;
Rome, arrosé du miel de ce sage Mercure,
Se confesse obligée à leur petit Mercour."

Let no one ever say that nature was stingy
And looked askew on Ardennes and Luxembourg:
Rome, watered with the *honey* of this wise Mercury,
Confesses herself obliged to their little Mercour.

Tableaux des Personages, &c. p. 82.

was summoned to Rome in 1551, was highly esteemed by Ignatius, and, finally, was one of Borgia's assistants. At the intelligence of his exaltation, a brother of his, the son of his *mother*, not a Jesuit, wrote to Mercurian from the Netherlands, congratulating the general, and, of course, begging his exalted brother to remember his poverty, and the sorry condition of all his relatives. Mercurian very properly wrote back, telling the mistaken applicant, that he was the general and servant of the Company, that his office did not increase his revenue by a farthing, and that he was not richer than the least cook of the Company.¹

The decrees passed in this congregation are more historical as to facts than all the histories of the Jesuits, by themselves or their enemies. To these mines of the Company's "spirit" I shall always penetrate, digging for truth. Ere the aristocrats of the Company proceeded to the election, preliminary resolutions had passed : but the pope sent a cardinal who, "in the name of the pontiff, and for the interest of the Universal Church, called upon the electors to elect, for once at least, a general who was not a Spaniard."² Other considerations than Spanish prejudice against ancestral taint, seemed to have enlightened the pope, on inquiry. All the high offices of the Company were filled by Spaniards exclusively. And national prejudices were as strong in the Company of Jesus, as that against Jewish and Moorish taint was throughout the realms of orthodoxy. The "Constitutions of Ignatius"—the peculiar training of the Company—*seemed* to subdue the most decided characters, the most turbulent natures : but

The national
prejudices of
the Jesuits.

¹ Tableaux, p. 79, *et seq.* ; Bibl. Script. S. J. Ever. Merc.

² Cretineau, ii. 171.

these characters, these natures, were *not* subdued. Motives were given unto them, to make them husband or direct their energies to other objects than the immediate suggestions of nature. They remained essentially the same—hence the resistless power of each Jesuit in his peculiar sphere of action. But hence, also, the contemptible littleness, shallowness of his nature, thus contracted and made subservient in all things by selfish motives or fanatical convictions, utterly bereft of that elastic, bounding spirit of freedom, which constitutes the prime prerogative of man—his fearless independence of heart and mind. And hence, also, that national egotism which, it is certain and admitted, prevailed from the first among the Jesuits, and was never uprooted. If we read the gorgeous sentiments of the theoretical Jesuits on self-abnegation, on Christian charity, we conclude that these men, above all others, understood and promoted that equality of loving brotherhood, which He of Nazareth came to suggest and exemplify ; but it was *not* so. “The Jesuits, without giving vent to their complaints, evinced their jealousy respecting that equality.”¹ Ignatius, Lainez, Borgia, doubtless perceived this element of decay in the Company ; but how could they *afford* to attempt that radical reform which would have banished the evil ? Natural passions, strong as ever, and pent up into narrow channels—confined to the littleness, the petty views of small circles, found pride in their *Spanish origin* ; and untold dislikes, selfish disapprobation, when their “foreign” brothers were exalted, brooded in their souls.²

¹ “Les Jésuites, sans faire éclater leurs plaintes, se montraient pourtant jaloux du triomphe de cette égalité.”—*Cretineau*, ii. 172.

² Cretineau, after the Jesuits, mystifies this important fact as follows : “Ignace, Laynez et Borgia, quoique Espagnols, s’étaient, par esprit de justice, conformés

No man in the Company was more in the secret of these matters than the secretary and assistant, Polancus.

Existing
abuses in the
Company. As a preliminary to the election, he proposed to appoint a committee of the fathers to examine and report whether the Company had hitherto suffered, or was in danger of suffering damage. Five fathers were appointed from the five nations, German, Italian, French, Spanish, and Portuguese, who, with the vicar-general Polancus, and four assistants, with Salmeron and Bobadilla, should receive evidence from the other fathers ; but by a large majority it was decreed that the requisite evidence should be taken only from the *electors and the procurators of the provinces*, and to be confined to practices, without extending to persons—not even to practices which might refer to individuals. The evidence of other members, particularly if they were discreet and approved men, was not to be rejected if offered ; but it was not to be asked ; and such evidence was to be given in writing, signed with the names of the informers,—stringent conditions, which point at once to the purely aristocratical exclusiveness of the Company's government. Besides the constitutional qualifications appointed for the general, the peculiar qualities suggested by the Company's present predicament were as follows :—“ 1. Whether the member proposed to be elected general, was likely to govern the Company with a paternal spirit, and not despotically—easy of access, and capable of inspiring confidence. 2. Whether he was likely to direct his serious attention to the re-establishment of that charity and union so much

à un vœu dont ils ne méconnaissaient pas l'influence ; mais, soit que certains pères fussent encore trop assujettis aux passions de l'humanité pour se laisser dominer, soit plutôt que la fierté castillane reprit trop souvent son empire, des dissensions intérieures couvaient au fond des âmes.”—ii. 172.

recommended by the Constitutions, and which had been so much admired in the Company—so that he might *cut off all the occasions of discord, and strenuously apply himself to restore the whole Company to her former and commendable union.* 3. Whether he would be likely to observe the Constitutions as to *admissions into the Company, to dismissals, profession, probation, the integrity of the vows of poverty and chastity; the mortification of the passions, and self-will; the extirpation of the hankering after distinction, the disease of ambition, carnal affection, and the partialities of kindred*—the absolute standard of obedience, &c.,—not indeed according to his own views, but according to the spirit and practice of our Father Ignatius—discarding every spirit foreign to, and at variance with, our Institute. 4. Whether he will seriously endeavour to free the Company from many things which do not beseem our Institute, and which so encumber us that we are forced to neglect those which are proper for the Institute: of the former kind are the *seminaries, the house of boarders, the college of penitentiaries, our presence at the meetings of the Inquisition for passing judgment, &c.*, contrary to the form of our decree. 5. Whether it is feared that he will be inclined to admit new colleges, *whilst the Company seems already so burthened and oppressed by the multitude of colleges, that she cannot support the load she has undertaken.* 6. Whether he will diligently take care to send proper labourers to relieve the wants of the colleges, especially the *foreign missions, where the Company is gravely deficient in the observance of the Institute, and other things*, owing to the want of *good superiors and labourers*, lest those who are the least adapted and qualified be dispatched to them, *as the provinces complain that such*

*has often happened. . . . 8. Whether he will be kind to all without partiality—without being suspected of making exceptions as to persons—not guided by his own passions, or those motives which are called human and worldly. . . . 12. Whether he be full of zeal to promote the perfection of our men, and more inclined to the office of a shepherd, than qualified by industry and business-experience, in carrying on personally, or by others, lawsuits and worldly business; in exacting moneys, and transferring the same from one province to another; since, on that account, our Company is everywhere branded by princes in Church and State, and it is known that there has been thereby danger of schism in the Company.”*¹

Honest Polancus, who suggested these matters, evidently was alive to the diseases of the Company. Had he been elected there cannot be a doubt that he would have attempted extensive reforms : —but he would have been desperately resisted—not by the vulgar herd of the Company, but by the aristocracy—already swaying the destinies of the Jesuit-empire. This document gives us a most favourable impression of Polancus. We are compelled to give him the most unlimited credit for a thorough knowledge of the Company’s members and their concerns ; and we so admire his honesty of purpose, that we rather congratulate him at being postponed on account of his “taint,” to Mercurian on account of the pope’s nomination. Mercurian’s “mildness and prudence”² were better adapted to eventuate a comfortable reign in the midst of abuses, than Polanco’s honesty and reform in the midst of turbulent opposition.

¹ Dec. iii. Cong. ; Corp. Instit. i. 776, *et seq.*

² “*Doux et prudent.*”—Cretineau.

Many characteristic decrees were passed in the congregation, after the election. The distribution of the hereditary wealth of the brothers, given to the Company, was a subject of considerable difficulty still. And again the matter was left chiefly to the discretion of the general—always premising due regard to the will of the kings and princes in whose dominions such property was situate.¹ Sixteen decrees are omitted in the printed copy—all of them doubtless pertaining to that growing anxiety of the Company in the increase of their wealth—in certain quarters too abundant, in others too deficient.

The promise made by the novices to abdicate their wealth, after the first year of probation, was considered a hard matter by some, and in certain places it was not, apparently, complied with. It was now declared to be simply a promise, not a vow—and left to the discretion of the general.²

Against the multiplicity of colleges, which was brought forward, no new decree was made : but the general was seriously and urgently requested and advised to attend to the former decree on the subject—touching the multiplicity of the Company's colleges, and the insufficiency of their revenues.³

Some of the fathers proposed to expunge those enactments of the Constitutions which, by the lapse of time or otherwise, *were no longer in practice*—a startling declaration at so early a period after these Constitutions were universally approved by successive popes, and sworn to by the Company. And yet the slightest alteration suggested by the pope himself, ever met with the staunchest opposition ! It is

Distribution
of moneys.

Abdication of
property.

Multiplicity
of colleges.

Inviolability
of the Consti-
tutions.

¹ Dec. xvi. in MS. D. xxvi.

² Dec. xix.

³ Dec. xx.

inconsistent : but quite natural ; and the fathers on the present occasion wisely and most sagaciously resolved that there should be, on no account, any expunging of obsolete enactments—all must remain just as “Ignatius” left them.¹ Thus, again, you see that the Jesuits could always silence objection by appealing to the inviolate Constitutions. However, there is a hiatus of *two* decrees, after this question about the *old* Constitutions. Whether any expedient was proposed and adopted to supply their place is a matter of curious conjecture. An enemy of the Jesuits would be tempted

Monita
Secreta. to ascribe the idea of the famous *Monita Secreta* to this occasion, particularly as Ribadeneyra tells us that General Mercurian “prepared certain very useful *monita* for the public use of the Company : *ipse monita Societati in publicum usum perutilia concinnavit.*”²

As to the boarders who paid a stipend at the German College, nothing was decided : but the matter was left

Boarders at
the German
College. to the general, as usual, who was to consider whether the “burthen” was to be removed, and the beautiful prospectus-declaration about *gratis*-instruction, honestly practised or not. *Two* decrees are omitted.³ The Constitutions positively

Touching
alms and do-
nations. declared that no alms, no donations, were to be received for colleges which had revenues enough to support twelve scholars, besides teachers. This enactment had been infringed : the question—probably proposed by Polancus—was, How the enactment was to be understood ? It was left to the general to enforce, to interpret, or dispense with it, as he should think proper.⁴ *Four* decrees are sunk in

¹ Dec. xxiii. in MS. D. xxxiii.

² Bibl. Script. S. J. Ever. Merc.

³ Dec. xxiv. in MS. D. xxxv.

⁴ Dec. xxv. It is evident that the general of the Jesuits was superior to the

edifying oblivion ; and the everlasting question about the Latin translation of the Constitutions is again brought forward. It is declared that the two editions already published differed in many points—in The Consti-
tutions. *multis invicem discrepant* : so the demand was, that the congregation should declare whether the first or the second edition, was the true original of the Constitutions—*verum originale Constitutionum*—lest they should subsequently again have to go to the Spanish copy—*exemplar Hispanicum*—which, as it was not printed, and *not open to all*—*nec omnibus commune*—might, perhaps, in the lapse of time, be *rather easily changed or altered* ;—*posset fortasse successu temporis facilius immutari*—a most significant piece of information decidedly. Six fathers were appointed, among the rest Ribadeneyra and Possevinus, to compare the two versions with each other, and with the “autograph ;” in order that the congregation might approve of the second edition and appoint it to be used. The autograph was to be preserved ;¹ and ought to be now in existence, in the Roman archives of the Company ; but there is something very suspicious about these same Constitutions and their editions. The subject was mooted in the preceding Congregation, although a “version” had been approved in the First Congregation, under Lainez. In the Fourth Congregation, in 1581, the version with declarations, approved in 1573, was again objected to, with demands for a new examination and comparison with the eternal original, for correction and emendation.²

Constitutions when it suited the aristocracy to vote him such ; just as the Jesuits, with Lainez at their head, voted the pope superior to the general council of the Church, when it suited their purpose to fetter the bishops by an appeal from the decrees of the Council, to the privileges conceded by their patronising masters, the popes, who used the Company for *his* purposes.

¹ Dec. xxvi.

² IV. Cong. Dec. viii.

In the Fifth Congregation, in 1593-4, it was asserted that the Latin translation of the Constitutions differed in *many points* from the Spanish original of "Ignatius ;" that the points were collected ; and it was demanded that inspectors might be appointed to correct the said edition :—but the demand was not granted—the edition sanctioned by the Fourth Congregation was to be retained—there was no time for the examination—the discrepancies might be referred to the general and assistants.¹ In the Sixth Congregation, in 1608, it was at length proposed to alter the Constitutions, which, it is stated, were not sufficiently respected, notwithstanding they were the "product of so many tears and prayers of Blessed Father Ignatius,—à *B. Patre Nostro tot lacrymis et orationibus conditas ;*"² and finally, in the Ninth Congregation, in 1649-50, several important points of the Constitutions were proposed for *explanation*, which was given accordingly.³ Is it not most extraordinary, most unaccountable, that with so many learned linguists in the Company—men engaged with translating the Council of Trent into every language, even Arabic—there was not one who could render correctly in Latin, the original draft of the Spanish ? The supposition cannot be entertained for a moment. It follows, therefore, that the Constitutions, like the Jesuits, underwent the changes of Old Time, and that it took some time to "lick" them into their present shape, without being much obliged for the same to Blessed Father Ignatius, with his tears and prayers so plentiful, after the good round lapse of a hundred years and over ; the last hand—*ultima manus*—having been *apparently* given to them between 1608 and 1615, when a new edition, with declarations,

¹ V. Cong. Dec. lxxvi.² VI. Cong. Dec. xi.³ IX. Cong. Dec. xxxix.

issued from the Company's press at the Roman College. Such is the curious history of the famous Constitutions of the Company of Jesus. Meanwhile, there was always a collection of general rules for universal observance in the Company ; and it is very probable that during the first century of the Company, access to the Constitutions was strictly confined to the professed.

In the same congregation under Mercurian a decree was passed relating to the property of the members. It was admitted that the Jesuits might enter into contracts with their relatives or any other parties, concerning their inheritances and other goods belonging to them,—the Company claiming no right to the said property : but, no such contracts should subsequently be entered into, without the general being exactly informed touching the circumstances of the brother, the inheritance, the property, the whole affair without reserve,—and the entire disposal of the business should be directed by his judgment and command.¹ It is obvious that this interference was liable to serious abuses, and likely, at least, to produce much bitterness in families—since experience attests that the settlement of money-matters amongst relatives, is generally attended with the unsettling of all the best feelings of kindred—frequently converting those nearest by blood into such rancorous foes as are nowhere else to be found. Besides, the decree was an indirect, if not a direct, infringement of a canon of the Great Council. In fact these Jesuits who were for reforming all the world, and for stretching or clipping all states and conditions to fit the Procrustean bed of the Trent-Council, were themselves the first to

The wealth
of the
brethren.

The Jesuits
oppose the
Council of
Trent.

¹ Dec. xxxix.

infringe the canons where they were at variance with their “Constitutions,” and “Privileges.” By the thirtieth decree in full congregation, the general was enjoined to solicit from the pope, “a relaxation of those derogations :” and they were the following canons, whose perpetual infringement was, amongst the many other causes, the perpetual source of contention between bishops and the Jesuits, the perpetual source of jealousy among other labourers in the vineyard, the perpetual source of pecuniary annoyance among families. The Council of Trent decreed—1. That all the Regulars must present themselves to the bishop, and get his benediction, before they began to preach ; and no Regular is permitted to preach even in a church of his Order, if forbidden by the bishop.¹ The pride of the Jesuits stuck at this ; and they were resolved not to comply with the injunction—under the shield of *Privilege*. 2. All ecclesiastical benefices, whether annexed to churches or colleges, are to be visited yearly by the Ordinaries.² Jesuit-pride and cupidity shuddered at this mandate, and they determined to hide themselves under the wings of *Privilege*. 3. Regulars were not to be ordained without a diligent examination by the bishop—to the complete exclusion of all privileges whatever,—*privilegiis quibuscumque penitus exclusis*.³ 4. In like manner, no Regular, notwithstanding his privileges, can hear confessions unless he has a parish-benefice, or be judged competent by the bishop’s examination, or otherwise.⁴ 5. All censures and interdicts promulgated by order of the bishop must be published and observed by the Regulars in their churches.⁵ Jesuit-pride,

¹ Sess. xxiv. c. iv. ; Sess. v. c. xi.

² Sess. vii. cc. vii. and viii.

³ Sess. xxiii. c. xii.

⁴ Sess. c. xv.

⁵ Sess. xxv. c. xii.

his Order's independence, and giant-elasticity were prepared to snap these new bonds suggested by the Dalilah of Trent in favour of the episcopal Philistia. 6. The Great and Holy Synod of Trent enjoined all Masters, Doctors, and others in the Universities, to teach the Catholic faith according to the rule laid down by the decrees of the said Council, and required them to bind themselves by a solemn oath at the beginning of every year, to observe this injunction.¹ What possible difficulty could the

¹ Sess. xxv. c. ii. Some historical elucidation is here necessary. As far back as 1560, Martin Kemnicius had published a tract entitled, "*The chief heads of the theology of the Jesuits*," printed at Cologne. It is a severe attack on the Company and its origin; but the writer's severity is chiefly directed against the doctrines advanced in the Catechism of Canisius, and a Censure published that year, at Cologne, by the Jesuits. Kemnicius quotes from both productions, to exhibit the extravagant notions of the Jesuits on the Scriptures, sin, free-will, justification, good works, the sacraments, images, &c. &c. A friend of the Jesuits, Payva Andradius, a doctor of divinity, took up their cause, lent them a hand, and attacked Kemnicius in a tract concerning *The Origin of the Company of Jesus*; but he leaves the main charges of Kemnicius entirely out of consideration, lauding the Jesuits for their exertions in the Catholic cause, and, amongst other assertions, stating, that within one or two years, the Jesuits had converted to the faith 20,000 barbarians! This was in 1566. As the Jesuits, as usual, furnished the apologist with the materials, he talks marvellously of Xavier's achievements and other Jesuit-wonders in India, already blazed to the world in a publication of their letters from India, and translated into various languages—*Diversi Avisi*, &c. . . . dall' anno 1551 sino al 1558—two years after the death of Ignatius. A professor of the Holy Scriptures, in the Academy at Heidelberg, had also attacked the whole system of the Company, in a work entitled "*The Assertion of the old and true Christianity, against the new and fictitious Jesuitism or Company of Jesus*." His name was Boquin. Lastly, Donatus Gotuisus, a divine at Treves, came forward with a tract called *The faith of Jesus and of the Jesuits*, in which he contrasts the proclaimed doctrines of the Jesuits, side by side, with the contrary doctrines of the prophets, the evangelists, the apostles, and the fathers of the Church; and he certainly makes out a strong case against the doctrines then propagated by the Company, and throws some light on the demerit of the Jesuits, in taking a solemn oath to teach the doctrines of Trent. The divine of Treves proves himself as deeply learned in the fathers as Lainez in his boastful display at the Council. Some of the Jesuit-doctrines are very curious, for instance: "*The Holy Scripture is an imperfect, mutilated, defective doctrine, which does not contain all that pertains to salvation, faith, and good morals.*"—In *Jesuitarum Censurâ Colonensi*, fol. 220; in *opere Catechistico*

Company of Jesus—pronounced to be a “pious Institute” by the same Council—patronised, cherished, fondled by the Head of the Catholic Church—holding itself forth as the very champion of orthodoxy—what difficulty could the Jesuits decently allege for demurring to comply with *this* injunction? With what part of the Constitutions can this injunction be at variance? Certainly none that we can *now* discover—absolutely none that the rabidly orthodox Ignatius ever penned or sanctioned. And yet, immediately after this canon of the Council, we read the following Jesuit-protest: *So much for the decrees of the Council of Trent, manifestly repugnant to the laws and customs of our Company!—Hæc de locis Concilii Tridentini manifestè pugnantibus cum legibus et consuetudinibus nostræ Societatis.*¹ Surely it is now evident from this opposition of the Jesuits—this extravagant abuse of privilege—that the wide-

Canisii, fol. 126, 160, 161, 162. Again, “The Holy Scripture, in its contents and propositions, is like a *nose of wax*, yielding no fixed and certain sense, but capable of being twisted into any meaning you like.”—*In Censura*, f. 117; *in op. Canis.* f. 44. Thirdly, “*The reading of the Holy Scripture is not only not useful, but in many ways pernicious to the Church.*”—*In Censura*, f. 21; *in op. Canis.* f. 301. And so on proceeds the divine, convicting the Jesuits of heretical and immoral inculcations, as put forth in their Censure, and the Catechism of Canisius. It may gratify the reader to learn that Gotuisus convicts Canisius and the Jesuit, more severely and triumphantly than Canisius did in his attack, before given, on the doctrines of Luther and the Protestants. Besides, Gotuisus lavishes no abuse whatever; he merely quotes and subjoins the contrasts from the orthodox sources above named. In the List of Authors printed at the head of this history, you will find the Latin titles of the works just named. I may observe, by the way, that in the subsequent editions of Canisius, the Jesuits took care to expunge the objectionable assertions, which were intended to “put down” the salient doctrines of the Protestants.

¹ *Corpus Instit. S. J.* i. 815. What stirred the Jesuits still more in the matter was, that Pope Gregory XIII. had just issued a bull revoking all the privileges and concessions before conceded to the Regulars, and plainly subjecting them to the disposal of the common law and Council of Trent, *although exempt*, said the Jesuits in congregation; but on what grounds, we are not told.—*Ibid.* 816.

spread ill-odour of the Jesuits, even among orthodox Catholics, and particularly the bishops, those of France especially, was not without ample cause in the spirit and practice of the Jesuits themselves, seeking and obtaining extravagant exemptions from solemn injunctions, mounted on which, they could easily distance all their rivals in the race whose reward was influence with the people, of all ranks and conditions, wealth and aggrandisement.

Why the Catholic hierarchy opposed the Jesuits.

Nor was this all. There was another canon whose smoke was likely to suffocate the Jesuits. It is mentioned among others "which seem in some way to militate against our Institute and its privileges."

Jesuit-rapacity.

By a curious coincidence, it actually occurs in the very passage where the Company is called a "pious Institute." One would suppose that this soft impeachment, clipped out of the Holy Synod as eagerly as a publisher snaps up a favourable sentence from a review of his speculation, would have gently "moved" the Jesuits to exhibit their "pious" gratitude by swallowing the little fly drowned in the generous wine of the œcumenical toast. Not a bit of it. Nor was it likely, when you perceive that this little fly was, to the Jesuits, a horrible swarm of locusts, eating them out of house and home, for—the Synod decreed that, "before the profession of a novice, male or female, the parents, relatives, or guardians of the same, should give no portion of the said novice's wealth to the monastery, on any pretext whatever, except for board and clothing during probation;" and the reason properly advanced is, "lest the novice, by such donation, be prevented from leaving, because the monastery possesses the whole or the greater part of his substance; and it will not be easy for him to regain

possession in the event of his leaving. Moreover, the holy Synod rather forbids, under the penalty of anathema, anything of the sort, in any way, to be done, whether by the givers or the receivers, and commands that those who leave before profession, should have all their property restored to them just as it was before.”¹ To this mandate the Jesuits were opposed, and they did not blush in seeking to evade it by privilege.

Such are the striking features of the Third Congregation—rather unprepossessing, decidedly. I have enlarged on the subject by way of additional attestation for the preceding facts. If you remember all that you have read, it must be evident that a history of the Jesuits might be written almost entirely from the decrees of their congregations.² Such was the state of affairs at Mercurian’s accession. “Mild and prudent, all he had to do,” says the Jesuit-historian, “was to consolidate the edifice of the Company ;—that was his chief vocation.”³ And yet we have seen that Polancus, the secretary of the Company, and assistant of the late general, thought a vast deal more was to be expected from the “vocation” of Borgia’s successor than mere “consolidation of the Company’s edifice,” destined anon to sink by its own weight—*mole suâ*,—into the gulph over which it was supported, when the flimsy rafters hastily buttressed, shall no longer resist their irrational, infatuated “consolidation.” But much

These decrees attest the history of the Jesuits.

¹ Sess. xxv. c. xvi. ; Corpus Instit. S. J. i. 816.

² If my readers can refer to Cretineau-Joly’s laudatory history of the Jesuits, they will see how very trippingly the partisan sums up the proceedings of this congregation, totally misrepresenting the whole affair, and dismissing, with one flimsy page, this most important passage of Jesuit-history—the very trumpet-notes of warning, booming from the thousand corners of abuses already preparing downfall and destruction.

³ Cretineau, ii. 173.

was to be done and undone ere that event could come to pass, according to the everlasting laws of providential retribution.

To the most "stirring" epoch of Jesuitism we are now advancing. The political schemes of Philip II. suggested the propriety of winning over to the Catholic cause the King of Sweden. I say the *King* of Sweden, for in those days, and long after, it was of little consequence to gain over the *people* of a kingdom, as long as the strong arm of military domination could enforce the will of potentates. We are at the present moment awaking from that dream. Cast-iron despotism is fast melting away in the furnace of public opinion.

Gustavus the Great had established Lutheranism in Sweden. He left four sons, among the rest Eric XIV., who succeeded him, and John, Duke of Finland, afterwards John III. of Sweden. Eric was an Sweden. astrologer and magician.¹ By the revelations of his stars or black art, he believed that his brother John would dethrone him, and thereupon threw him into prison, together with his young wife, the Princess Catherine of Poland, sister to Sigismund Augustus. Of course all the sons of Gustavus—"the brood of King Gustavus," as the Swedes call them—were Lutherans; but John's Catholic wife was a good decoy of Catholicism in the northern wilderness. Meanwhile, King Eric plunged into all manner of vice and atrocity. His old tutor, Denis Burgos, offered him good advice: the savage plunged his dagger into the old man's heart. Many a murder was on his conscience. The ghost of his old friend and tutor seemed to haunt him; then he seemed to relent, and liberated his brother John, with his young

¹ Florin. de Raym. (the Jesuit Richeome), l. iv. c. xvi.; Maimb. ii. 245.

wife, from prison. But Eric was half mad at least ; his magical terrors came upon him again, and he resolved to cut off all his fancied enemies at one fell swoop. He would celebrate his nuptials with a maiden of low condition, and, at the marriage-feast, he would suddenly cut off all his brothers and the nobles. His Dalilah betrayed him to his intended victims. John put himself at the head of the nobles, took Eric prisoner, and then put him to death in the most violent manner.¹ Thus it was that John of Finland became King John III. of Sweden in 1569.

In 1674 the Jesuit Warsevicz was dispatched by the pope to King John III. He represented himself as the

The Jesuit
Warsevicz
and King
John.

ambassador of Queen Anne of Poland to her sister Catherine, King John's Catholic partner : —this was the only means he had to penetrate to the Swedish Court. Warsevicz was, we are told, one of those Jesuits whom nobility of birth, experience of the world, a knowledge of mankind, had familiarised with all the positions of humanity. So the queen hid him in a room of the palace : Warsevicz awaited the propitious hour : she sounded at last ; and King John consented to see the Jesuit.² The Jesuit's mission had a two-fold object. He had to treat with the king concerning an alliance with King Philip, who was anxious to frighten the Netherlanders from the north as well as the south ; and, secondly, he had to prepare the king for a relapse or return to the faith of his ancestors.³ According to the Jesuits, the king had fructified his former imprisonment by studying the "Fathers," and thus became quite

¹ Maimb. ii. 245, *et seq.* ; Ranke, p. 150. Maimbourg merely says that Eric "died ten years after ;" but the fact of the murder is elsewhere attested, as given by Ranke.

² Cretineau, ii. 187, 188, 189.

³ Ibid. 189.

learned in theology ; but they say the result was only “chaos amidst light :” six days the Jesuit laboured on the king ; but no sabbath came :—the king’s anomalous Catholicism was nothing more than Protestantism befouled by the prominent vices of Romanism—an incongruity which we behold with regret amongst those who, at the present day, are the fiercest brawlers against popery. The expedition was a failure : Warsevicz took leave, and departed, after a month’s sojourn in Sweden—the first Jesuit who penetrated into that country so essentially anti-catholic.

It was evident, however, that King John, whether through the “Fathers,” or through his wife, was inclined to Catholicism : only he wished, from political ^{Tricks of the} motives, to compromise the matter by certain ^{Jesuit Nicolaï.} engraftings, as I have said, which the Jesuit accordingly reported to his general and the pope. Three years afterwards, a Jesuit, named Nicolaï, a Norwegian, was sent from Rome, in disguise, to the Swedish court, with the intention of waiting on the queen, like Mary Queen of Scots’ Italian Rizzio, and to concoct, with her Majesty’s aid, the means of re-establishing the faith in Sweden. According to the Jesuit Maimbourg, the king entered into his plans, and even cleverly advised him how to set about the matter. At all events, on the same authority, this Jesuit Nicolaï presented himself to the Lutheran ministers and preachers, and told them that he had passed all his life in the study of the high sciences, in which he thought he had, by God’s grace, made very considerable progress, which had gained a reputation in several universities ; that having heard that the king was establishing a new college at Stockholm, he had come to offer his services to his majesty,

because he much preferred to be somewhat useful to Sweden, so near to Norway, his country, rather than to strangers whom he had hitherto served, by teaching them the sciences which he professed ; and therefore he begged them to employ their credit with the king, in order to get him employment in that college. This trick succeeded admirably, says the Jesuit Maimbourg, whom I have been translating in all the foregoing tissue of lies. These ministers, continues the Jesuit, were surprised at hearing a man speak Latin so easy and elegantly, and *had not the least idea that he was anything but a Lutheran, since he was a Norwegian—n'avaient garde de s'imaginer qu'estant de Norwege il fust autre que Lutherien ;*—they believed effectually that he was a very clever man, which was true, and did not fail to recommend him particularly to the king, who, *playing his own part with equal perfection, told them that he relied on their recommendation.* Whereupon he gave him the professorship of theology ; in which, without explaining himself, *he adroitly sapped all the foundations of Lutheranism in his lectures—où, sans se déclarer, il sapait adroitement dans ses leçons tous les fondemens du Lutheranisme.* The rector of the college and one of the incumbents of Stockholm detected the Jesuit's manœuvre : the other ministers, says the unblushing Jesuit, were too ignorant to see through the thing. The former came forward and opposed “such fortunate beginnings,” says Maimbourg. But the king, under pretext that they disturbed public repose by their seditious speeches, drove them from the city, and made Nicolai rector of the college, saying that it was only justice in him to do so, in order to justify so skilful a man, whom those two seditious men had *calumniated—que ces deux seditieux avaient*

calomnié. Was there ever such bare-faced effrontery? Or did the Jesuit believe it impossible for any moral sentiment to shrink from denouncing so disgusting an instance of diabolically-deceitful means, employed to promote an end deemed "good" by the perpetrators? John III. followed up his Jesuit-roguery. He published at the same time a new Liturgy, drawn up by himself, and intended to abolish by degrees, as he said, the Lutheran practices.¹ A battle of pamphlets ensued between the exiled rector and incumbent, and the roguish Jesuit, respecting the new Liturgy, which the former denounced, and the latter defended, although "it was not altogether Catholic," as his brother-Jesuits admit. Thereupon the king advanced boldly with Catholic reforms, according to the Jesuit's account, and even sent an ambassador to Pope Gregory XIII., to treat for "the reduction of Sweden to the obedience of the Church, *on certain conditions*." Pontus de la Gardie was the ambassador.²

¹ Maimb. Hist. du Lutheran. ii. 249 ; Sacchin. P. iv. l. v.

² This adventurer is one of the many examples which that stirring epoch presents, of splendid fortunes achieved by talent. Pontus was a Frenchman of low birth, born in Languedoc, and originally a simple soldier in Scotland under Orsel, one of Francis II.'s lieutenants. Thence he enlisted into the armies of Denmark, turned Calvinist, and was made prisoner by the Swedes, under Varennes, their general, another French adventurer who commanded the heretics. Varennes took a fancy to his countryman, recommended him to Eric, who befriended him greatly, and placed such confidence in him, that he appointed him assistant to John, when, after his liberation, he made him lieutenant of the kingdom; assuring his brother that Pontus would prove very useful to him. And so he did with a vengeance; for Pontus was the foremost in the conspiracy against his benefactor, cut all the guards to pieces, and compelled the king to surrender at discretion. By this exploit he secured the good graces of John III.; and thenceforward became historical under the name of *Count Pontus de Gardie*, and the right hand of the monarch. A history of French adventurers, who have thus cut their way to riches and renown, would be highly interesting, even if it ended only with Bernadotte in the same kingdom. I remember when a boy, a French priest was dining at the table of the

It appears that John's main object was to induce the pope to prevail on king Philip to pay some large arrears of revenue due to his wife, from the kingdom of Naples. At all events, that was the pretext of the embassy, according to the Jesuits. The conditions for Swedish orthodoxy were four in number—the nobles were to retain the church property which they had seized ; but the king would give them a good example of restitution by restoring, from the royal share of the booty, two hundred thousand livres of revenue. Secondly, the married bishops and priests were to retain their wives ; but celibacy was to be enforced on all future candidates for orders. Thirdly, communion in both kinds. Fourthly, the divine service must be performed in Swedish. No decisive answer could be given to these terms ; but the Jesuit Possevin was dispatched by the pope to complete the king's conversion.

The stipulations.
Possevin's splendid embassy.

Possevin took with him two companions, an Irish Jesuit, William Good, and a Frenchman, Father Fournier, by way of attendants ; for “ this skilful man,” says Maimbourg, “ wishing to have a good pretext for treating freely with the king without giving umbrage to the senators,” entered Stockholm as an ambassador from the Empress Maria of Austria. Dressed in a rich and appropriate costume, splendidly embroidered, a sword at his side, “ not a trace of the Jesuit remained on his person,” says the Jesuit ; “ but *to redeem beforehand*

Swedish Governor of St. Bartholomew, in the West Indies. The Swede made some disparaging remark on the French nation ; the priest took him up, gallantly saying : “ A paltry nation indeed, whose *lieutenants* are worthy to become *kings* of Sweden,” alluding to Bernadotte. Pontus de la Gardie was accidentally drowned, in 1584. He had married a natural daughter of King John III., and left behind him two sons to inherit his wealth and titles, among “ the great lords of Sweden.”

these transient honours, he had made the greater part of his journey on foot!"¹ Such is a specimen of the method how the Jesuits managed their vow of poverty. Doubtless they played the same tricks with that of chastity—in fact, we shall find the subject "signalised" in a subsequent decree for the Company. According to Sacchinus, Possevinus completely converted the king, heard his confession, gave him absolution, and thus tranquillised his conscience, distracted by the execution or murder of his brother Eric.² Possevinus returned to the pope with no less than twelve conditions, now urged by the king, for obedience to Rome: if he was really so gloriously converted, he would scarcely have urged conditions which he knew would not be granted to a king of Sweden, "after having been refused to other princes more powerful than himself," observes the Jesuit Maimbourg.³ The conditions were almost universally rejected by the cardinals; but Possevinus was ordered to return to the king for further negotiation.

The pope resolved to send the Jesuit with more honours than ever. By a breve he made Possevin his legate, appointed him vicar-apostolic of Russia, Moravia, Lithuania, Hungary, and all the north; *his power was unlimited*; and an universal jubilee was announced for the success of his mission.⁴ That *unlimited* power seems to declare that the Jesuit might accept the king's conditions, should he be unable to make Sweden surrender at papal discretion. Evidently the pope thought Sweden was in his grasp: else why make the Jesuit a bishop of all the north, if, in spite of the stiff conditions, he was not to receive the submission of

He returns
with power
and hopes.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 195.

² Sacchin. lib. vi. ; Maimb. 254.

³ Maimb. ii. 255.

⁴ Cretineau, ii. 201.

Sweden to the dominion of Rome? Nay, further, Possevinus had induced Philip II. to send a plenipotentiary to Stockholm, who was even subservient to the Jesuit, Philip having entrusted Possevin with his confidential negotiation. In fact, it was a determined onslaught on Lutheran Sweden: all that pomp, and splendour, and power, and prayer might effect, was brought to bear on the success of the scheme. Possevin's companion was the Jesuit Ludovico—a *prince* Odescalchi; and on his route he had an interview with King Albert of Bavaria; and, by the pope's order, held a conference with the Fuggers, the great bankers of Germany, "whose colossal fortune was at the service of the Church," as we are told expressly. At Prague, he had audience from the Emperor Rodolph II. At Vilna he conferred with the King of Poland. What a glorious and important embassy for the Jesuit! And at length when he got a sight of the Baltic, he found a Swedish frigate awaiting his lordship's embarkation. What more could he desire to "consolidate" the scheme so admirably planned? Indeed, the Jesuit was so confident of victory for Rome, that he would boldly enter Stockholm in the dress of his Order.¹ The Jesuit always throws off his mask as soon as he finds or fancies his weakness changed into strength.

The result. The result was a lesson to all the crafty schemers concerned. Pontus de la Gardie, who had turned Catholic again, at Rome, was at Stockholm before the Jesuit arrived. The adventurer gave an unfavourable account of his embassy, and having himself received a large portion of church property, likely to be restored with the return of papal dominion,

¹ Cretineau, ii. 202.

he joined the other nobles situated like himself, in a remonstrance to the king against the project. A general revolt was menaced. Numerous letters poured in from the Protestant princes of Germany. The king's brother, Charles, had even sent emissaries to seize Possevinus on his route. They caught a wandering dignitary, but he turned out to be an Irish bishop of Ross, and not the Jesuit Possevin, who enjoyed, without being aware of it, the misfortune of this poor Irish bishop, and continued his journey without molestation.¹ But what was his surprise to find all his hopes utterly ruined beyond redemption! He had brought very fine letters from the pope, the emperor, the King of Poland, the Duke of Bavaria, and many other Catholic princes, congratulating King John III. on his *conversion*—and what did he find when he presented himself before the king, boldly enveloped in the garb of the Jesuit? The king openly professed Lutheranism, more so than before: he was even oppressing the Catholics: he refused to perform all he had promised. All Possevin's efforts were in vain: the miraculous converter was utterly baffled by the king's inflexibility. The Jesuit Nicolai had been driven off—and he richly deserved it for his dirty craft—the college was restored to the Lutherans, its lawful owners; and Possevin, papal nuncio, vicar-apostolic of all the north, and Jesuit, “was obliged to leave Sweden, and resign the hope which he had conceived of finishing the great work he had so fortunately begun.”² Once Lutheran, and Lutheran for ever, was the national will of Sweden: the minds and hearts of the nation would never swerve from that determination. As barren as

¹ “Qui jouissait heureusement, sans le sçavoir, de la mauvaise fortune de ce pauvre Evesque Irlandais,” &c.

² Maimb. ii. 255—258.

her rocks, as hard as her iron, would Sweden ever be to the propagandism of Rome. And yet Sweden is tolerant, nobly so ; in spite of the craft and tricks which have been from time to time played upon her by the emissaries of the great propagandist. On the other hand, we must give the Jesuits credit for having done all they could—for having left no means untried to achieve their end : they failed, but the fault was not theirs : it was a blessing for Sweden that Providence interposed and swamped the bark of Rome, just sailing into port with her cargo of bulls, priests, indulgences, confessionals, all the elements of old chaos renewed.

Everard Mercurian, the general of the Jesuits, died in 1580, after a reign of eight years. Intestine broils and commotions characterised his generalate. The inequality of the gradations of rank, the mode of election, the facility of expulsion granted to the general, gave to a party formed in the Company desperate employment ; whilst another insisted that the Spanish members had a right to elect a head for themselves alone. Nor was this turbulent spirit confined to the bosom of the Company.¹ In a political quarrel between the Spanish governor of Milan, and Cardinal Borromeo, the Jesuits divided on either side according to their nations, and one of them, Julius Mazarini, who sided with the governor, being his friend and confessor, attacked the cardinal from the very pulpit, and lashed him without moderation. The archbishop bitterly complained of the outrage ; the general of the Jesuits reprimanded the delinquent ; and he was suspended from his apostolical functions for the space of two years.² These wild imaginings of the Jesuits should not surprise

¹ Cretineau, ii. 218.

² Ibid. 222.

us ; they are but the preludes of coming events. Mercurian had soon resigned his functions to an assistant, Father Palmio. Perceiving that this appointment would be, or was, taxed with partiality, he gave Palmio an assistant, Father Manare ; and thereby hurt the feelings of Father Palmio! ¹ Can it be believed that a Jesuit—and one who was so far advanced in perfection, being a professed—could possibly exhibit the petty passions of little men ? There is the fact, however. But, notwithstanding these internal broils and outward extravagance, the Company's star was high in the ascendant—nothing could check her aggrandisement—gods and men united to promote her splendid perversion. Already she numbered more than five thousand men, one hundred and ten houses, and twenty-one provinces. Never before had her men been more in requisition, more exalted, more conspicuous. In embassies here, embassies there—everywhere infringing the prominent mandates and decrees of their Constitutions and congregations. In a whirlpool they floated : they swam indeed lustily : but in that desperate struggle they knew not what they were doing—progress in some direction, it mattered not how or whither—still progress was the one thing needful. The generalate of the superannuated Mercurian was as disastrous to the Jesuit-Institute as a long minority to a turbulent empire.

In Pope Gregory XIII. the Jesuits found admirable support. Completely had this pontiff imbibed the spirit of his predecessor. Not only would he imitate him, but he was resolved to surpass him in his zeal for the

¹ “Palmio se montra sensible à cette substitution d'autorité.”—*Cretineau*, ii. 224.

cause of orthodoxy.¹ To Catholic princes at war with their heretic subjects he was lavishly bountiful with golden ducats : he gave the King of France Gregory's subsidies to the warriors of the faith. four hundred thousand scudi (80,000*l.*) for that blessed object ; but, he raised the money by a tax on the cities of " the Church," which was an oppressive injustice ; and he gave liberal assistance to the Archduke Charles and the Knights of Malta, with a slice of ecclesiastical benefices, which was much more consistent at least, and much less deplorable.²

Wherever there was a Turk to be bombarded, or a heretic to be hunted down, aid from Gregory was always forthcoming with a cheer and a benediction. Gregory's zeal for " religion." England, and her Elizabeth above all, caught his fancy : deeply was his heart set on the ruin of that queen in her island-throne. Of this determination the pope made no secret : a general combination against England was his soul's desire. Year after year his nuncios negotiated on this subject with Philip II. and the Guises : Gregory plied them with the most ardent zeal. The French league, so dangerous to Henry III. and Henry IV., owed its origin to the connexion between the pope and the Guises.³ It was zeal for religion run mad.

In the same spirit, Gregory patronised the Jesuits with their strict system of ecclesiastical education. The " seminary " of all nations. To the houses of the professed he made liberal presents ; he purchased houses, closed up streets, and allotted revenues for the purpose of giving the whole college the form it wears to this day. It

¹ " Nella religione ha tolto non solo d'imitar, ma ancora d'avanzar Pio V." — *Seconda relat. dell' ambasciat, apud Ranke*, 108.

² Vite de' Pontef. dal *Plat. ed Altri*. Ven., 1703.

³ Ranke, *ubi suprà*.

was adapted to contain twenty lecture-rooms and three hundred and sixty cells for students. This was called the "Seminary of all Nations." At its foundation, in order to signify its purpose of embracing the whole world within its scope, twenty-five speeches were delivered, in as many different languages, as usual, each immediately accompanied by a Latin translation.¹ To testify their gratitude to the pope for all his benefactions, the Jesuits placed, in the large hall of the college, pictures of the two-and-twenty colleges which the pope had founded in various parts of Christendom ; and they also displayed the pope's portrait, with the following inscription : " To Gregory XIII., Sovereign Pontiff, Founder of this College, the whole Company of Jesus, defended by him with the most ample privileges, and increased by mighty benefits, placed this monument in memory of their best parent, and to attest their gratitude." Nor did the Jesuits stop here. They were never equalled in devising complimentary rewards for those who befriended them ; whatever may be said against them, and justly too, for their abuse of the religious sentiment in man—their wild encroachments on the rights of others—their domineering spirit, if you will—still, it is impossible to deny them the respectable praise of having almost invariably made an adequate return to their benefactors—adequate, because always exactly the thing to be relished by their patrons. On the present occasion, by way of displaying the enlarged dominion of the Holy See, the great hobby of the zealous Gregory, they induced some petty kings and lords of Japan to send ambassadors to the pope ! The royal blood of Japan or its representatives did the

Jesuitico-
Japanese
embassy to
Rome.

¹ Ranke, *ubi supra*.

Jesuits fetch in a journey of twenty thousand miles, to do homage to the father of the faithful. The king of Bungo and the king of Arima, the king of Cugino and the king of Omura, each sent his representative, a youth of about twenty years of age. Great was the jubilation of the holy city at the advent of these kings of the east. But the Jesuits took great care of the precious samples, and lodged them in the Gesù, or House of the Professed. The pope granted them audience in full consistory and with vast magnificence : all the princes of the Roman court vying with each other to honour the interesting strangers.¹ They had, of course, previously paid their respects to King Philip II., now ruler of the East by his usurpation of Portugal, and the king had received them with even more magnificence than the pope of Rome, whose feet they came to kiss, in attestation of the success and gratitude of the omnipotent Jesuits. It seems to have been too much for the pope. Overjoyed at the glorious event, the old pontiff exclaimed : “ *Nunc dimittis*, Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace,”—and *effectually* died a few days after, killed by his joy at papal supremacy in the isles of the sea—snuffed out as a lamp by the trumpet-blast of orthodoxy! The idea was indeed a comfort amidst the wild anarchy then raging over Italy and in Rome, as you will read anon. I need scarcely state that there were many who believed the whole affair a hoax concocted by the Jesuits ; but, for my part, I think it probable that it was a veritable embassy, proving the influence which the Jesuits had achieved in Japan ; but if it was a hoax, it must be admitted that it was well conceived, admirably executed, and, what is very

¹ Vite de' Pontef. Greg. XIII.

significant, rather *expensive* for the mendicant Company of Jesus.¹

¹ Charlevoix, Hist. du Japon. iii. 106—158. The Jesuit gives a very diffuse but interesting and curious account of the whole affair. He says that Aquaviva requested the pope to receive the ambassadors without pomp—which, if made, was a very ridiculous request—at all events, rather too late, after all the grand doings in Portugal and Spain, as even the good old Charlevoix Jesuit remarks: “but,” says he, “it would have been useless even if made sooner, for Gregory XIII. had taken his resolve: at the news of the arrival of the embassy in Italy, he had held a consistory, in which it was declared that it was incumbent on the honour of the Church and the Holy See, to receive the embassy with all possible pomp and splendour.”—P. 120. Gregory sent his company of light cavalry to escort the ambassadors: a multitude of Roman lords, also mounted, with the gentry of the vicinity, formed a cavalcade which extended almost all the way from Viterbo to Rome, which they entered with the sound of trumpets, and the deafening acclamations of the holy mob of the Eternal City. The Jesuits joined in the jollification; and with their general Aquaviva at their head, escorted the curiosities to their church, where the *Te Deum* was performed. Nothing could exceed the splendour of the procession to the Vatican. All the foreign ambassadors, with their retinue, graced the pageant with their august presence: the cardinals, the chamberlains of the pope, and officers of the palace, all in their red dresses, immediately preceded the Japanese, who were on horseback, and in their national costume. Nothing could surpass the costliness and magnificence of this costume: it must have swallowed the revenue of a whole Jesuit-province, if the thing was a hoax, or the kings of Japan wisely resolved to make the Jesuits “pay for the piper.” In fact, Charlevoix intimates that Valegnani, the Jesuit leader of the Japanese, was resolved to let them have no *magnificent equipage*, and to make no show with the affair (p. 108), consequently we are at a loss to account for the production of the following magnificent equipage—*équipage magnifique*. “They wore three long robes, one on the other, but of so fine a texture that all three did not weigh as much as one of ours,” says the Jesuit, “and all of dazzling white. These robes were covered with flowers, foliage, and birds, beautifully painted, and seeming to have been embroidered, though each was all of a piece: the figures were coloured after nature, but unusually brilliant. These robes opened in front, and had extremely wide sleeves, which only reached the elbows; but in order that the fore-arm might not be uncovered, as is the custom in Japan, *Father Valegnani had caused them to be lengthened* with the same stuff, as well as at the collar, which generally opens so low that a part of the shoulder is visible. On their shoulders they wore a kind of scarf, twelve inches long, and eight inches wide, tied with ribbons, crossed over the breast, thrown behind, and knotted like a girdle. These scarfs were similar to the robes in material; but of a much finer texture. They had on boots of extremely fine leather, open at the toes. Their cimeters and swords were of the finest temper, and the hilts, as well as scabbards, were adorned with fine pearls, other precious stones, and many figures in enamel. Their heads were uncovered, and shaved quite clean, except at top,

But Gregory had been as lavish in his benefactions on the Jesuits. Their German college had become embarrassed with debt and penury from the failure of the funds ; the pope granted it not only the San Apolinare palace and the revenues of San Stefano on Monte Celio, but also ten thousand scudi (2000*l.*) from the apostolic treasury. He also founded an English college at Rome, and found means to endow the establishment. He aided their colleges in Vienna and Grätz out of his privy purse. There was probably not a Jesuit school in the world that had not cause, in some way or another, to applaud his liberality.¹ And what was his motive ? Not because he might think that the Jesuits promoted holiness—that was a matter he cared little about. His was a jovial nature. He had not scrupled to have a natural son before he became a priest, and though he led a regular life afterwards, he was at no time over-scrupulous, and to a certain kind of sanctimony he rather manifested dislike.² Why, then, did he patronise the Jesuits ? Because he thought them the ablest restorers of Catholicism, and therefore the best props of the popedom and its prerogatives. All the wealth he gave them was therefore so much money deposited on interest.³ It

whence depended behind a tuft of hair. The features of their countenances were equally *foreign* with their dress ; but people remarked that amiable air which is given by virtue and innocence, a modest haughtiness and a *je ne sçai quoi* of nobility, inspired by an illustrious blood, and which nothing can belie.”—P. 123. I must confess that these last remarks of the Jesuit makes one suspect that the affair *was* a hoax, most clearly conceived and practised on the stupid king Philip and as stupid Pope Gregory. What baubles entrance with delight old zealots, fanatics, and shallow-brained mortals ! ¹ Ranke, *ubi suprâ*. ² Ibid.

³ According to Baronius, his expenditure on the education of young men, amounted to two millions : if this sum did not include the cost of the twenty colleges of the Jesuits, it will be impossible to account for the raising of the money.—*Ranke*, i. 431, with authorities.

was an infatuation of course ; but think of the thousands of pounds as senselessly wasted in our days by simple contributors to "religious" funds, by all denominations, year after year, to no purpose whatever in the advancement of civilisation,—funds which, if expended on the wretched poor of England, would go far to sweeten the bitterness of heart in those who find life miserable, and to prepare body and soul together for better days of enlightenment, whose advent we may accelerate indefinitely by the real determination to "fulfil *all* justice."

Gregory spent 200,000 scudi (40,000*l.*) yearly on "pious works,"—*opere pie*. We need not stop to inquire what real good he did for Humanity : but we must be curious to know how he got the money—even should the answer prove that those who received it were little better than receivers of stolen goods. Well, then, Pope Gregory got his pious funds by spoliation. He found out more rights to the property of others than the hungry wolf discovered causes of complaint against the poor lamb in the fable. He laid an impost on the corn of the Venetians : they did not comply soon enough with his measures : he forced their warehouses at Ravenna, sold the contents by auction, and imprisoned the owners. Then he discovered a host of abuses among the aristocracy of his own dominions, and wolfishly concluded that their abolition would be profitable to the papal treasury. On a most flimsy pretence of feudal rights, he seized and appropriated numerous domains belonging to the barons or gentry of Romagna and other provinces, and congratulated himself at having by such *legal* means, and not by taxation, augmented the revenues of the popedom by 100,000 scudi (20,000*l.*) The Churchmen of course approved

Gregory's
spoliations.

of these spoliations—because the end justified the means always in those days of rabid orthodoxy, which is invariably roguish. Many great families were thus suddenly ejected from properties they had considered their own by the most lawful titles : others saw themselves threatened. Daily search into old papers was made in Rome — and every day new claims were created from the musty nothings. Ere long no man thought himself secure ; and many resolved to defend their possessions with the sword, rather than surrender them to the commissioners of the papal treasury. One of these feudatories once said to the pope, to his very face, “ What is lost, is lost ; but a man has at least some satisfaction when he has stood out in his own defence.” He did not stop short with the aristocracy. His injudicious, or rather, tyrannical measures inflicted severe losses on towns as well ; by raising the tolls of Ancona, he ruined the trade of that city, and it has never recovered from the blow. Of course

Their result. men rose up against this multiplied iniquity.

The whole country was in a ferment : feuds broke out on all sides. Then troops of outlawed bandits swelled into armies, and overran the provinces. Young men of the first families were their leaders. Murder and rapine overspread the country. Anarchy reigned throughout the papal dominions. The confiscations of course ceased—but they had done their work already. The aged pope was forced to receive the bandit leader Piccolomini at Rome, and give him absolution for a long list of murders which he read with shuddering. It availed little or nothing. His own capital was full of bandits and revolvers. And then the pope, weak and weary of life, looked up to heaven, and cried, “ Thou wilt arise,

O Lord, and have mercy on Zion!"¹ Can anything be more bitterly ridiculous? Nevertheless such was the regenerator of Catholicism—and such was the country whence the Jesuits were sent to reform and convert all nations of the universe—Great Britain among the rest, whose "religious" troubles we are soon to contemplate.

Claudius Aquaviva was elected General of the Jesuits by a large majority. His age was only thirty-seven. When the fact was announced to the pope by the fathers, he exclaimed, "What! you have
Aquaviva. elected to govern you a young man not forty years of age!" Claudius Aquaviva was the son of the Duke d'Atri. Renouncing the world, the Court of Rome, all the hopes which his name and talents inspired, he had given himself to the Company; and now the Company gave him herself in return—another instance of Jesuit-gratitude. Piety, virtue, science, became his ambition. A deep, indefatigable student, hard study and the constant effort to repress his impetuous passions, are said to have rapidly blighted his personal graces: his black hair was already turned to grey:—sufficient by way of introduction to a man whose deeds are his best portrayers.²

The Fourth Congregation continued its sessions. The murmurs and heart-burnings of the middle ranks in the Company found a mouth-piece in the midst of that aristocratical assemblage. "Many there
Murmurs of
the plebeian
Jesuits. are in the Company," said that benevolent voice, "who have lived many virtuous years, and complain that their admission to the 'State of the Company'—*status Societatis*, is deferred too long. They fall into many temptations. They are absorbed in overwhelming

¹ Ranke, 109—111.

² Cretineau, ii. 229.

sadness, and become a scandal by renouncing our holy Institute.”¹ A strong case was that, and as strongly put to the vote :—but in vain : *nihil innovandum*—no innovation was the decree : all was left as usual to the judgment and prudence of the general, who was advised to enforce the letter of the Constitutions, without respect of persons, remembering that this was of vital importance to the preservation of the Company.² The complaint, the decree, and the advice, are equally characteristic and remarkable :—that Company which has been “stirring” all the world, is now about to be “stirred” itself.

Another proposition was made. It was a sort of speculation—a literary speculation by the gratis-teachers.

Educational speculation. Some of the members proposed that, on account of the great fruit that would accrue, and the want of good masters, and the advantages that might be derived from the enterprise, the Jesuits might receive boarders in the *northern* countries, and take them under their care ; but that the stipend should be given over to the procurator : the pupils were not to be solicited, nor received against the will of their parents. The Congregation did not at once reject the proposition : but it was declared much preferable for the Company to be free from such burthens, *as far as possible* ;—and the matter was committed to the prudence of the general, as usual.³

And now the aristocracy began to feel their power, and to apprehend their peril. They decreed that every Jesuit—whether lay-brother or scholastic,—who after taking the vows should return to the world, might be punished as an apostate,

Power of the Jesuit aristocracy.

¹ Cong. iv. ix.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. xiii.

according to the privileges and apostolical letters granted to the Company.¹

Mercurian and Gregory XIII. had bequeathed the Jesuits and the popedom to Aquaviva and Sixtus V., two men who deserved to be contemporaneous.

The very antipodes of each other by birth—
for Sixtus was the son of a swineherd—

Pope Six-
tus V. and
Aquaviva.

energetic unity of purpose stamped both as leading influences of the age. Both were by their natural organisation impelled to seek, to achieve, and maintain that sovereign power which results more from mental qualifications in the possessor, than from the privileges and prerogatives of rank or station. Such characters in history relieve the dull, drowsy monotony of rulers by prerogative—rulers by “right divine,” without any *other human* right to win admiration or command respect.

England and Elizabeth now began to engage the special attention of the Jesuits. Protestant ascendancy had triumphed: in other words, Catholicism was shorn of its wealth, dignity, and power:

State of parties
in England.

the Catholics themselves, as in the reigns of Henry and Edward, had virtually acquiesced in the change of their religious fortunes. They had unanimously acknowledged Queen Elizabeth's title to the throne of England:² it is stated on Catholic authority that a great majority of the people then inclined to the Roman Catholic religion:³ and yet, in spite of this national submission to the Protestant queen, Pope Pius V. fulminated a Bull of deposition against the Queen of England, in order to “stir” her people to rebellion, and rouse all nations to crush the interesting heretic. This was in 1570, just after the failure of an insurrection set on foot by a few

¹ Dec. liii.

² Dodd, ii. 4.

³ Butler, i. 271.

designing leaders, with papal approbation, to attempt the liberation of Mary Queen of Scots—the heiress to the throne of England. The Bull had long been prepared by the pope, but prudently withheld during the machinations; and was now torn from its quietude by the old man's impotent rage of desperate disappointment at the failure of the insurrection.¹ Pius said in his Bull: “We do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, as being an Elizabeth
“deposed” by the pope. heretic and favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of excommunication, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And moreover, we do declare her deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and also the nobility, subjects, and people, of the said kingdom, and all others who have in any sort sworn unto her, to be for ever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty of dominion, allegiance, and obedience: and we also do by authority of these presents absolve them, and do deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things beforenamed. And we do command and charge all and every one, the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her orders, mandates, and laws: and those which shall do the contrary, we do include them in the like sentence of anathema.”² Thus spake the “Servant to God's Servants,” as the popes called themselves by a prerogative which was the only one they *never* effectuated. Copies of the precious parchment were sent to the Duke of Alva for dispersion on the

¹ Ling. viii. 56; Camd. An. 1570; Rapin, *ib.* &c.

² Camd. *ib.*

coast of the Netherlands, and he forwarded samples to the Spanish ambassador in England. An enthusiastic or zealous Catholic, Felton by name, and a wealthy gentleman by inheritance, posted one of the Bulls on the Bishop of London's palace-gates, bidding the result—which was that he was hanged; for the deed was declared treason by the law of the land; and was decidedly seditious. Felton gloried in his exploit, called the queen a pretender, but sent her a diamond ring as a token that he “bore her no malice”—one of those curious abstractions with which party-leaders justified every atrocity. It is the famous *right intention*—*recta intentio*—of the Jesuit and other casuists.¹

A partisan of the pope is hanged.

Meanwhile, however, the great body of the English Catholics were by no means inclined for a “stir,” according to some authorities. “They never were pressed with, nor accepted of, the pope’s Bull, that pretended to dispense with them from their allegiance,” says the Catholic Church-historian. “They were entertained by the queen in her army,” he continues, “and now and then in the cabinet, till such times as the *misbehaviour of some particular persons drew a persecution upon the whole body, and occasioned those penal and sanguinary laws, to which their substance and lives have ever since been exposed. From that time, by a strange sort of logic, a Catholic and a rebel have passed current for the same thing, and so they are commonly represented, both in private conversation, in the pulpit, and at the bar.*”² But there was a different opinion proclaimed abroad in those stirring times. On the person of the Scottish Jesuit Creighton,³ when

The Catholics of England.

¹ Ling. viii. 56, *et seq.*

² Dodd, iii. 5.

³ William Crieghton. “This Father,” says Dr. Oliver, “was possessed of

apprehended and imprisoned in 1584, was found a paper detailing "Reasons to shewe the easines" of invasion, grounded on the examples of history, instancing particularly the case of Henry VI.—"how a few and

considerable zeal and talent, but was deficient in judgment. To his misplaced confidence may be principally ascribed *the failure of Pope Pius IV.'s secret embassy to Mary Queen of Scots* (see p. 105 of 'Tanner's Confessors of the Society of Jesus')," says the pious and loyal doctor. "From the Diary kept in the Tower of London, by the Rev. Edward Rishton, we learn that Father Creighton, on returning from Scotland (where he had converted the Earl of Arran), was apprehended and committed to that prison on the 16th September, 1584. How long he remained in custody I know not, but Father Parsons addressed letters to him at Seville in 1596. It is clear that James VI. of Scotland [England's Master *Jaques*, as Henry IV. called him] had actually employed him in a *delicate embassy*; for, in a letter to Father Thomas Owen, dated 4th June, 1605, he says: 'Our kynge had so great a fear of ye nombre of Catholiks, and ye puissance of pope and Spaine, yt he offered libertie of conscience, and sent *me* to Rome to deal for ye pope's favor and making of a Scottish cardinal; as I did shew ye kyng's letters to F. Parsons.' Having no guile himself," says Dr. Oliver, "he suspected none in his weak and hollow-hearted sovereign." True enough, decidedly, of Master Jaques, if not so conclusive of this admirable Crichton. Bartoli gives another version of the capture of this Jesuit. He says that "Creighton was caught by the heretics at Ostende, and sent as a gift to Elizabeth, who was so pleased with the prey, that she gave the bearer many gifts, among the rest, a collar of gold," f. 287. Creighton was mentioned by Parry as having dissuaded him from murdering the queen; and, owing to this, says Bartoli, the queen set him free (1585), saying, "How can the Jesuits be all leagued to kill me in England, if this Jesuit defends my life even in France?" It appears from Camden that the documents found on Creighton aggravated the negotiations between Elizabeth and Mary, "women that were already displeased with one another, but principally by the discovery of certain papers which Creighton, a Scottishman, of the Society of Jesus, passing into Scotland, and being taken by some Netherland pirates, had torn in pieces: the torn pieces whereof, being thrown overboard, were by the wind blown back again, and fell by chance into the ship, not without a miracle, as Creighton himself said. These being put together by Waad with much pains and singular dexterity, discovered new designs of the Pope, the Spaniard, and the Guises, for invading England."—*Ad An.* 1584. Bartoli complains of Camden's bad faith in recounting this affair, which, however, he strangely mis-translates, with worse faith, making Camden talk to the following effect: "Volle dar luogo [alla favola] delle misteriose lettere stracciate del P. Critton, poiche si trovò in mano degli Ollandesi, e gittate in mare: e quegli sparsi minuzoli, dal pazzo movimento *dell' onde*, con un piu che mezzo miracolo, ragunati, e poco men che non disse da sè medesimi, con magistero musaico, ricongiunti."—*Dell' Inghilt.* f. 291.

weak have overcome a great many"—and appealing actually to the *general wish and expectation of the Catholics* of England: "as for the contreye of England, it is easy to be overcome with a few forces, few fortresses or strong places in the lande. So as one army would suffice to end that warre, the *people given to change and alteration, chieffely when they get some beginnunge or assurance.*"¹ This is a strong contradiction to Dodd's testimony. And yet Dodd is fully confirmed by Camden. "The most part of the moderate papists," says the queen's historian, "secretly misliked this Bull; . . . and foreseeing also that hereby a great heap of mischiefs hung over their heads, who before had private exercise of their religion within their own houses quietly enough, or else refused not to go to the service of God received in the English Church, without scruple of conscience. And from that time many of them continued firm in their obedience, when they saw the neighbour princes and Catholic countries not to forbear their wonted commerce with the queen, and that the Bull was slighted as a vain crack of words that made a noise only."² The following pages will throw some light on these discrepancies, and will show how it came to pass that the "people," or rather a faction, were "given to change and alteration;" and how the effects of the pope's Bull were anything but "a vain crack of words" to the poor, honest Catholics of England. It will follow that both assertions which I have quoted are true; and it will be curious to note what *influence* can effect with the most discordant elements of individuals and nations, provided there be some point or two

Influence.

¹ MS. Bib. Cotton. Jul. f. vi. fol. 53 (Brit. Mus.). A curious document.

² Camd. *ubi supra*.

whereon its grappling-irons may be flung. This metaphor does not adequately express the workings of influence, which are, however, admirably figured by the doings of the little busy bee. If you are a florist, never hope for the continuation of a favourite flower in all its purity, without a sprinkling of sulphur to protect it from the bee. In a range of five miles around the hive, that indefatigable propagandist, with *pollen on its wings*, will vitiate, adulterate every flower that it fancies, as well as yourself. Sprinkle your flower with sulphur, and then hope on. We have now to see how Queen Elizabeth sprinkled her flowers to protect them from the bees of Loyola.

An almost total disorganisation had taken place in the ecclesiastical incumbency of the Roman Catholics, after the accession of Elizabeth. Most of the monks The priesthood in England. had fled to the continent : most of the secular clergy conformed to the new religion. Those who remained were called “the old priests,” and “Queen Mary’s priests.” Some retired to the continent, particularly the Netherlands, where, as I have stated, they were liberally patronised by Philip II., and some obtained considerable preferment. The greater number remained in England ; and of these some obtained sinecures, in which conformity was generally dispensed with : others remained in privacy, unknown, or at least unheeded. Those who actively discharged the duties of their profession were supported by individuals among the Catholic nobility and gentry who adhered to the ancient faith. Ensconced in London and other large towns, or residing with their patrons in the country, they have gained the honour of having “preserved the remnant of the Catholic religion in England.” Age,

infirmity, and death, had diminished their numbers : a total extinction of the ancient faith was expected both by its friends and its enemies.¹ How true, but incongruous, is this statement at all times repeated.

Reflections.

Why must priests be absolutely necessary to preserve the faith of a nation, if that faith is really a matter of conviction ? How are these priests *themselves preserved* ? Does this not point at once to that very cankerworm of Christianity—the inculcated dependence of man on guides as weak as himself, and from their partisan education so likely to have so many selfish motives for “preserving” what they call “religion ?” Never will the asking, the seeking, the knocking, so consolingly set forth by the Redeemer, be fully accomplished until man be enabled to stand *alone*, in the matter and manner of his faith and practice. Too long has proud man usurped the place of God in the human heart and in the human mind. Too long have we been compelled to be as the blind led by the blind—ever falling into the pit of restless, unmitigated disappointment. We are told, forsooth, that man naturally requires human guidance in these matters of religion—we are told so in spite of the forementioned divine charter of all real religion. It is an axiom invented by sacerdotal craft to sanction its prerogatives. On the contrary, *resistance*, the *spirit of independence*, are the prime impulses in all God’s organised creatures—and in man immensely more than in any other ; but, as in the former, brute force subdues resistance, so in the latter, brute force *and* influence, or the appeal to certain motives, manage to fetter that resistance and spirit of independence. This state of things is fast disappearing.

¹ Butler, i. 306, *et seq.*

Man is becoming enlightened on the score of dictatorial religionism, as in all the other checks and clogs of human advancement. The time will come when each man will think for himself, and be none the worse in practice, because he will be freed from the source of numerous abuses which vitiate the heart, deceived by a specious nomenclature craftily invented. Then it will not be asked, "What shall we believe, or do, to be saved?"—but each shall find his God in proportion to his own asking, seeking, and knocking. Systems are vanities. They may suit their *framers*; but cannot be made applicable to every individual; and therefore are too *finite* for the infinitude of man's religious sentiment, which God alone can fit and fill for ever. System-mongers have always been the bane of humanity. They have given their paltry names to a class of ideas the very product of their own individual organisation. By influence they built up a *Party*, and then burst forth all the evils of the selfish speculation. Consider the words of Him who made and taught us. What system did *He* frame? None. Good *action*—the *perfection* of man's nature in his duty to himself, his fellow-creatures, and, *therefore*, to God—these constitute the splendid sum of Christ's doctrinal example. Ye who think, who meditate good thoughts for man's advancement, beware of the usual vanity of system-mongers. Root out the foul stuff unworthy of your exalted calling. Let the conclusion of all your God-inspired argument be freedom to the mind—the equipoise of all the faculties and sentiments, and inclinations which are man's organisation, his dependence on nothing but God fulfilling His part in the covenant of man's creation—who is by *nature* perfect in his sphere of action, through his *feelings* and *intellect* called

to be perfect even as his Father in heaven. When such shall be the result of enlightenment, man will dispense with the things of party-systems for the "preservation" of his religion—"total extinction of his faith" will never be expected, because his faith will not depend upon party-ascendancy, party-views, and party-abuses.

In order to "preserve the remnant of the Catholic religion" in England—a phrase which scarcely comports with that of "*a great majority* of the people," asserted by the same pen—William Allen conceived the project of perpetuating the Catholic ministry in England by a regular succession of priests, to be educated in colleges on the Continent, and thence sent to the English mission.¹ Allen was a zealous man in the cause of orthodoxy: he did not approve of the common practice of conformity in vogue among the Catholics; he objected to their attending the divine service in Protestant churches, to avoid the severe penalties of recusancy. The English Catholic divines were very far from being unanimous on the question: but Allen was decided, and determined to take what he supposed to be the most effectual means of consolidating a Catholic party in England. The result would be disastrous to human life, to human welfare, to human progress, to everything that makes life valuable—but what mattered that? It was the result of ZEAL—and therefore, though heaven should rush amain, let the thing be done. And it was done with a vengeance. His zeal was patronised: funds flowed in: a college arose at Douay in French Flanders. All his clerical revenues abroad, this zealous man sunk in the stirring scheme of stiff-necked orthodoxy. This

Catholic
seminaries
abroad.

¹ Butler, i. 310.

was in 1568. His establishment became the resort of all the emigrant ecclesiastics. Soon he sent missionaries into England. *Their* favourable account of the scheme, and “the fruits of it, which appeared in the activity and success of their missionary labours, operated so much in its favour, that a petition was signed by the Catholic nobility and gentry of England,” by the university of Douay, by several religious communities, and by the Jesuits, recommending the infant college to the liberality of the pope. Gregory XIII. immediately settled on the college an annual pension of 2100 scudi, and soon afterwards raised it to 2500 (500*l.*)—and subsequently to 1500*l.*, which was punctually paid—from whatever source the zealous pontiff derived his contributions, always generous in the midst of his injustice. These prosperous beginnings did not endure. A party in Douay demanded the expulsion of the collegians:¹ the magistrates yielded to the cry, and ordered Allen, with his associates, to quit for a time—not without reluctance, however, and with a strong testimonial in favour of the exiles. On the invitation of the Cardinal de Lorraine and other members of the house of Guise related to the Queen of Scots—the grand and self-seeking nucleus of the Catholic party in France—Allen and his associates repaired to Rheims and were received with hospitality. This event chanced in 1576. During the *four* following years Allen sent one hundred priests into England; and during the *five* next years he expedited a greater number to the same disastrous vineyard! Forty in one

¹ Parsons, the Jesuit, accuses Elizabeth of this demonstration.—*Philop.* 65, *et seq.* There may be some likelihood in the thing: for no adequate idea can be formed of the machinations of parties in those dreadful times. See Dodd, ii. 164.

month laid down their lives in their cause.¹ Another establishment was founded at Rome, by Gregory XIII. Thus Douay, Rheims, and Rome, maintained the seed of orthodoxy which was to germinate and ripen into nonconformity in England. Hence these schools were called *Seminaries*, and the priests there prepared were named Seminary-priests—names derived from a Latin word for seed. This vegetable metaphor acquired growth subsequently—and we now hear of “propagating” the faith—propagandism—and propagandists—terms which seem to have been invented by way of contrast to Roman celibacy.

The opinion prevalent in England, at the court and amongst politicians and churchmen, respecting the training pursued in these seminaries, was very nearly, if not precisely, in accordance with the reality. “Whilst among other things, disputations were held concerning the ecclesiastical and temporal power, zeal to the pope their founder, hatred against the queen, and hope of restoring the Romish religion by the Queen of Scots, carried some of them so far that they really persuaded themselves, and so maintained, that the Bishop of Rome hath by divine right full power over the whole world, as well in ecclesiastical as temporal causes; and that he, according to that absolute power, may excommunicate kings, and, having so done, dethrone them, and absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance.” The consequence in England was that “many withdrew themselves from the received service of God, which before they had frequented without any scruple. Hanse, Nelson, and Maine, priests, and Sherwood, peremptorily taught the queen was a

The nature of the training in these seminaries.

¹ Butler, i. 306—309; Dodd, ii. 156—170.

schismatic and an heretic, and therefore to be deposed : for which they were put to death. Out of these seminaries were sent forth into divers parts of England and Ireland at first a few young men, and afterwards more, according as they grew up, who entered overhastily into holy orders, and instructed in the above-named principles. They pretended only to administer the sacraments of the Romish religion, and to preach to Papists : but the queen and her council soon found that they were sent underhand to seduce the subjects from their allegiance and obedience due to their prince, to oblige them by reconciliation to perform the pope's commands, to stir up intestine rebellions under *the Seal of Confession*, and flatly to execute the sentence of Pius Quintus against the queen, to the end that way might be made for the pope and the Spaniard, who had of late designed the conquest of England. To these seminaries were sent daily out of England by the Papists, in contempt and despite of the laws, great numbers of boys and young men of all sorts, and admitted into the same, making a vow to return into England : others also crept secretly from thence into the land, and more were daily expected with the *Jesuits*, who at this time first came into England. Hereupon there came forth a proclamation in the month of June : 'That whosoever had

Proclamation
against the
seminaries.

any children, wards, kinsmen, or other relations in the parts beyond the seas, should after ten days give in their names to the ordinary, and within four months call them home again, and when they were returned, should forthwith give notice of the same to the said ordinary. That they should not directly or indirectly supply such as refused to return, with any money. That no man should entertain in his

house or harbour any priests sent forth of the aforesaid seminaries, or *Jesuits*, or cherish and relieve them. And that whosoever did to the contrary should be accounted a favourer of rebels and seditious persons, and be proceeded against according to the laws of the land.”¹

Events had rendered the English government vigilant, if not severe ; but the pope and the Spaniard scarcely made a secret of their aims against England.

About two years before this edict was issued, the pope had sent an expedition to invade Ireland. It was a joint-stock concern, conducted by one Stukely, an English refugee and adventurer, formerly patronised by the queen, but subsequently disappointed, a man without honour or conscience. Camden calls him a ruffian, a riotous spendthrift, a notable vapourer—who had sold his services at the same time to the queen and to the pope, alternately abusing the confidence and betraying the secrets of each, adds Lingard—what a man for a champion, a saviour in a time of trouble and disaster ! But

Stukely's
expedition
to Ireland.

¹ Camden, Ad. Ann. 1580. “ If the Company of Jesus could not put her foot into England,” says Bartoli, “ England meanwhile put hers into the Company ; many of that nation, and men of the most valuable qualities, entering the Company. Lainez and Borgia had conceded the favour to so many, that Mercurian, their successor, seeing their multitude daily increasing, exclaimed : ‘ Now it seems God’s will that the Company should march to battle against the heresy of England, since he sends to her such a numerous and valiant host from England.’ In a single year, 1578, Flanders alone gave the Company twelve select Englishmen, and they were multiplied from year to year. Their good qualities made them a part of the most worthy and estimable of the Company. They were all exiles, and scattered over Ireland, Flanders, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Spain and Italy. Many of them became eminent for piety and in letters, and were chosen to sit in the general congregations. Others went as missionaries to the East, and to the West, and to the camp of war in Hungary, fighting against the Turks ; and lastly, some devoted themselves to attend the pest-stricken, and perished in the heroic ministry.”—*Bartoli*, f. 72.

he promised to be useful to the pope notwithstanding : with three thousand Italians he would drive the English out of Ireland, and fire the fleet of England,—the apparent preliminaries, as was imagined, to get Ireland as a kingdom for the pope's natural son, whom the holy father had made Marquis of Vineola ; whilst Philip II. thought of retaliating on Elizabeth for her aid to his Netherlanders, by aiding her rebel Irish. It is curious to note that “in the meanwhile amity in words was maintained on both sides.” What an age of craft and machination ; and yet, by the numberless spies fed and maintained by all parties, in all parts of Europe, nothing was done without being made known respectively : but, as a matter of course, it followed as a certain result from this trade in rumour and espionage, that discordant intelligence mystified all deliberations—except those with Elizabeth in the midst, and her cool-headed wily politicians around her ;—from a frightful, heterogeneous, chaotic jumble of vain rumours, the English cabinet *created* security for the realm, and discomfiture for its voracious enemies. The pope made Stukely his chamberlain, Marquis of Leinster, and advanced 40,000 scudi (8000*l.*), 600 men, 3000 stand of arms, and a ship of war, for the expedition. Stukely put to sea, and reached the Tagus, where he found King Sebastian just ready to start in his disastrous enterprise against Africa. Sebastian “with youthly heat and ambition” had long before promised the pope his assistance against all Turks and heretics, and was to lead off the expedition against England : in the meantime he persuaded Stukely to go with him first and finish off the Turks before he belaboured the heretics. Stukely, the “subtile old fox,” was entrapped, went, and perished with the king and kingdom of Portugal, in the

memorable battle of Alcazarquivir, — finishing “the interlude of a loose life with an honest catastrophe or conclusion.” It was altogether a providential affair for England, or rather for the poor Catholics, ever the scape-goats. Besides the destruction of Stukely, the fall of Sebastian diverted Philip’s attention from England to the usurpation of Portugal—which for the nonce he preferred, in spite of the importunities of the Catholic fugitives recommending England to his majesty’s zealous attention. Thus all seemed at an end. Of course, the English spies had duly notified all the foreign proceedings : a fleet was waiting on the coast of Ireland to give Stukely a warm reception : it was now recalled, and Sir Henry Sydney, the Lord-deputy, bade Ireland farewell with a verse out of the Psalms, saying, “When Israel departed out of Egypt, and the house of Jacob from amongst a *barbarous people*.” Meanwhile, Fitzmaurice, “an Irish refugee, likewise, with the aid of papal funds,” who had joined Stukely, continued the voyage, with a few Irish and English exiles, and Spanish soldiers, and the famous Dr. Sanders on board as papal legate, provided with a bull constituting the invasion a regular crusade with all its “privileges.” A descent was effected near Kerry : but the people were sick of “stirs” which had hitherto only drenched them with disaster ; and they held off until the Earl of Desmond took arms against the queen. Then the whole island was in commotion. How fared the issue ? Reverse after reverse—like the sledge-hammer’s tempest on the glowing metal—befel the insurgents. Fitzmaurice himself was cut off in a private quarrel with one of his kinsmen. Desmond slunk off, to perish miserably soon after : the pope’s funds fell short : the

promised aids were not forthcoming : the English punished the invaders and insurgents with horrible cruelty. Sir Walter Raleigh had a large share in this transaction. Men and women were driven into barns, and there burnt to death : children were strangled : all Munster was laid waste : English colonists overran the desolated region.¹ Which do you abhor most—the cruelly infatuated enterprise, or the savage ferocity of the victors ? I confess that I place them exactly on a par—both of them horrible abominations, which there should be no Heaven, no God to behold. But the ruthless hope of zeal sank not. To the rescue once more was the cry of infatuated zeal in the *few*—was the clamour of the self-seeking *many*—was the resolve of the cool, calculating, indefatigable *Jesuits*. And England, herself, it was resolved to make the field of “Spiritual Exercises,” to eventuate political “change and alteration.” The notorious Father Parsons, or Persons, and the ardent Campion were dispatched to found the English province of the Company of Jesus, immediately after the failure of the late invasion. Not without rejoicings they departed ; and Campion was congratulated on the glory he was about to achieve by his headlong, enthusiastic intrepidity. The Jesuits gave out that the Virgin Mary had appeared to Campion, in a visible form on an old mulberry-tree in the garden of the novitiate, and showing him a purple rag—*un panno tinto purpureo*, she had foretold to him the shedding of his blood in the glorious death which he subsequently suffered.² If Campion originated this story, our sympathy with the man and his fate must be largely

¹ Camd. *propr. annis.* ; Ling. viii. 129, *et seq.* ; Ranke, 151, *et seq.* ; Crawf. i. 300, *et seq.*

² Bartoli, Dell Inghil. f. 88.

diminished : it were better to transfer it to the account of Jesuit-inventions so disgraceful to the best members of the Company.

Not without being perfectly aware beforehand of what was to follow, did the Jesuits embark in this ruinous expedition. From the words of Mercurian before given, it is evident that they thought the time was now come for a demonstration. Besides, we have also seen that they had often tried to gain admission into England. And yet they admit that "it was easy to foresee that whether few or many of our Company were in England, great commotions must necessarily arise both among the Catholics and Protestants. This was so true, that soon after the arrival of the two first—as we shall presently see—there were more disputes on that score than on any other, as well among the Catholics as among their adversaries ; and this is precisely what Parsons wrote to us at the time : 'It is expected'—these are his words—'that the persecution of the Catholics will be redoubled, and that new and more sanguinary edicts will be issued against the missionary priests and the Catholics in general, as the government of that kingdom is in the hands of Protestants ; and this we shall see fulfilled soon after the two first of our Company shall have set foot in England.'"¹ They went notwithstanding, and their historian pretends that their General Mercurian consented with reluctance to the mission—though the same writer quotes the general's exclamation prophetic of that mission. At all events, the Jesuits

*The malice
prepense of
the Jesuits.*

¹ This is Butler's translation from Bartoli : but in my own copy of Bartoli, all the letter of Parsons is omitted, and there is only the phrase—*e così appunto ne scrissero fin d'allora*. I know not whether Butler interpolated the passage from other sources by way of elucidation. My edition is that of Rome, 1667.

might have endeavoured not to fulfil their “apprehensions,” instead of aggravating their debts to humanity, by producing them to the very letter, in every particular.

Robert Parsons, or Persons, was born in the parish of Stowey, in Somersetshire, in the year 1546.¹ “His
 Parsons. parents were right honest people,” says Parsons himself, “and of the most substantial of their degree among their neighbours while they lived; and his father was reconciled to the church by Mr. Bryant, the martyr; and his mother, a grave and virtuous matron, living divers years, and dying in flight out of her country for her conscience.”² Surely it mattered little to the man whether honour or dishonour attended his birth, at a time when the natural sons of popes and kings were exalted to the highest rank by no other recommendation; but in the desperate hatred which Parsons boldly excited, no epithet nor reproach was too foul to be flung on the terrible worker. On the other hand, Parsons richly deserved the worst representations, for he spared no man in his rancour. In his Response to the Queen’s Edict, he lavishes the lowest reproaches, imputations, and infamy on the queen’s ministers, and

¹ He used both forms of signature; but though often written *Persons* by Catholics, it is generally pronounced *Parsons*.

² In one of his anonymous diatribes, entitled “A Manifestation of the great Folly and bad Spirit of Certayne in England calling themselves Secular Priests,” 1602. —“But several Romish priests and others, and among the rest Mr. Thomas Bell, (*Anatomy of Popish Tyranny*) and Dr. Thomas James (*Life of F. Parsons, in Jesuit’s Downfall*) assert that ‘he was basely born of mean parentage at Stokersey, in Somersetshire; that his supposed father was a blacksmith, his right father the parish priest of Stokersey; by means whereof he was binonymous, sometimes called Rob. Parsons, sometimes Rob. Cowback.’ And Mr. Gee remarks that the world is not agreed either about his name or parentage, for the name of Parsons, or Persons, as he writes it himself, they will have it to be given him upon a scandalous reason, while the true name of his supposed father was Cowback, or Cubbock.”—*Bayle, Parsons* [A.]

still more on the queen herself.¹ In 1563 he went to Baliol College, Oxford, either as a servitor or scholar, where he distinguished himself as an acute disputant, became Master of Arts, a Fellow of the College, and a celebrated Tutor in the University. He did not take priest's orders; but on two occasions he swore the oath of abjuration of the pope's supremacy. In alluding to this transaction, he exhibits his own character at that time in no very favourable light. "What a crime!" he writes; "ambitious youth that I was, lest I should lose my degree, I pronounced that most iniquitous oath with my lips, though I *detested* it in my mind—*licet animo detestarer*. Spare me, O merciful God," &c.² In 1574, he was expelled from the college. Accounts vary as to the cause of this event. His friends attribute it to his Catholic sentiments, which he did not conceal;³ whilst Camden, who was at the University at the time, and knew Parsons, declares that "he openly professed the Protestant religion, until he was, for his loose carriage, expelled with disgrace, and went over to the Papists."⁴ Archbishop Abbott, also contemporaneous with Parsons at Baliol, and styled an "unexceptionable witness," by Gee, an enemy of Parsons, coincides with

¹ See for instance his character and parentage of Bacon, p. 18; and of Cecil, p. 38; but above all, the disgraceful disparagement with which he befools Queen Elizabeth and her parentage: he actually intimates that Henry VIII. was not her father! "Si tamen illa Henrici Octavi filia fuerit, quod Sanderi historia ex Annæ Bolenæ matris incontinentiâ dubium planè et incertum reddit," &c., p. 260, Ed. Rom. 1593.

² "Proh scelus! his juramentum illud nequissimum juvenis ambitiosus, ne gradum amitterem labiis pronunciavi, licet animo detestarer. Parce mihi, misericors Deus, ac grande hoc juventutis meæ delictum condona; nondum enim noveram, quid esset te super omnia diligere, et honorem tuum rebus anteferre mundanis."—*Apud Oliver*.

³ Morus, Hist. Prov. Angl. l. ii. c. 7. "Cum catholicis sentire haud obscure præ se ferebat."

⁴ Ad. Ann. 1580.

Camden, not, however, without evidencing, at the same time, that there was an animus against the redoubtable Parsons, who seems to have been always similar to himself, either as Protestant or "Papist." The Archbishop says : " Bagshaw, being a smart young man, and one who thought his penny good silver, after he had his grace to be bachelor of arts, was with some despite swindged by Parsons, being dean of the college. *Hoc manet altâ mente repostum* ; and Bagshaw afterward coming to be fellow, was most hot in persecution against Parsons. It was the more forwarded by Dr. Squire's displeasure, who was then master of Baliol College, and thought himself to have been much bitten by vile libels, the author whereof he conceived Parsons to be ; who, in truth, was a man at that time wonderfully given to scoffing, and that with bitterness, which also was the cause that none of the Company loved him. Now, Dr. Squire and Bagshaw being desirous of some occasion to trim him, this fell out." Hereupon the Archbishop informs us that Parsons, as Bursar, falsified the reckonings much to the damage of the college, by taking advantage of the weakness of his colleague, who happened to be " a very simple fellow." Other disgraceful swindling is mentioned to the round sum total of one hundred marks, about 70*l*. Then they found out that he was illegitimate, and the Archbishop declares " that Parsons was not of the best fame concerning incontinency ;" but this is only on " hearsay." His enemies now rose up *en masse*, resolved to expel him ; but, at his earnest request, they permitted him to " resign," which he did accordingly, after having endured considerable humiliation from the now triumphant Squire and Bagshaw, whose conduct exhibits all the spitefulness

which grovelling natures call revenge.¹ As we have no reason to doubt the Archbishop's veracity, so are we justified in condemning the proceedings as the petty machinations of a party whose object was revenge rather than justice. This Bagshaw, however, turned "papist" not long after, became a secular priest, and figured in the "stirs" amongst his own party, at the time when they forgot even Protestant persecution to fight their petty battles of jealous prerogative. Doubtless Parsons was "a violent, fierce-natured man, and of a rough behaviour;" but there was nothing in this treatment at Oxford either to quiet the former or to mollify the latter. The whole tenor of a man's life is often decided by the pang of humiliation shot through the heart in the moment of its pride. Bartoli seems to have been conscious of this fact when he wrote commenting on this transaction: "But the synagogue of his victors," says the bristling Jesuit, "who, at having expelled him with shame, indulged their stupid merriment, will in a few years lament it with despair; and they shall have him there in the same Oxford, in a different profession of life, and with more trophies for the faith than the few he achieved amongst his pupils, which they envied him so much; and as long as he lives, yea, as long as his spirit shall live in his books, heresy will be forced to remember Robert Parsons, without any other consolation for its grief than a vain biting at air, badly striving to write and to talk him down, which is the only availing effort of desperate rancour."²

¹ See Bayle, *ubi supra*, for the archbishop's letter to Dr. Hussye. Parsons [B.]

² "Ma la Sinagoga de' vincitori, che dell' haverlo vergognosamente cacciato, matteggiarono in isciocca allegrezza, non tarderan molti anni a farne le disperazioni per doglia; e havranlo quivi stesso in Ossoio, in altra professione di vita, e con altri acquisti alla Fede Cattolica, che non quello scarso de' giovani suoi

Edmund Campion was born in London in 1540, the year in which the Company was founded. His parents were Catholics. At Christ's Hospital he distinguished himself as a scholar, entered subsequently at St. John's, Oxford, and had the honour on two or three occasions, to address Queen Elizabeth at Woodstock or Oxford, as spokesman of the College; and such was the opinion that Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley, conceived of his wit, erudition, and good taste, that he pronounced him to be one of the *Diamonds* of England.¹ But it appears that he was all along a Protestant in name only, tormented however with that inner anguish which sometimes results from conscious simulation. As usual, this result is attributed to the "Primitive Fathers," that Catholic source of all conversions. Campion read the "Fathers," was "converted," and yet suffered himself to be "prevailed upon by dint of importunity" to receive the Protestant order of deacon. This proceeding is said to have "formed the climax of his misery. So bitter was his remorse that he hastened to throw up his fellowship, and quitted the University in 1569."² He fled to Ireland, where he was hunted by the queen's commissioners, and compelled to escape in the disguise of a servant to avoid martyrdom. In 1571 he reached Douay College, studied theology for a twelvemonth, and went to Rome in 1573, was admitted into the Company of Jesus, and sent to the novitiate at Brunn, where he saw the Virgin Mary on the mulberry tree, with the purple rag of Martyrdom,

pupilli, che tanto gli invidiarono : e fin ch' egli viva, anzi fin che viverà il suo spirito ne' suoi libri, havrà l'eresia onde ricordarsi di Roberto Personio ; senza altra consolatione al suo dolore, che d'un vano mordere all' aria, facendo a chi peggio ne scrive, e parla ; che è quel solo in che il furor disperato sa mostrarsi valente."—*Bartoli*, f. 91.

¹ Oliver, 63.

² Ibid. 64.

as I have related according to the Jesuit-legend. During the seven subsequent years he taught rhetoric and philosophy at the Jesuit College in Prague, was promoted to holy orders, and was vouchsafed another prediction of his destined martyrdom, according to the statement of Parsons, who says that a certain young Jesuit wrote on Campion's door the words *Campionus Martyr*.¹ It may have been a pious joke on the professor's proclaimed aspirations, and his desperate zeal:—for at Rheims, on his journey to England, he exhorted the students of the seminary to martyrdom, in an address on the text—*I am come to send fire upon earth*—and becoming violently excited, he cried out *Fire, fire, fire*, so lustily that the people in the streets, thinking there was a conflagration, rushed in with their buckets and water.² The career of the ejected Parsons was by no means so determinate. From England he went to Calais, thence to Antwerp, and Louvain, where he met Father William Good, his countryman, and under whom he went through the “Spiritual Exercises.” Padua was his next refuge. Here he applied himself to the study of medicine, and likewise civil law: but he changed his mind, and fulfilling the advice of his exercitant, Father Good, he abandoned his studies, went to the English College at Rome, and gave himself to the Company in 1575—one year after they “trimmed” him so disgracefully at Oxford. In 1578 he was ordained priest,³—his two years of probation and his four years of theology being epitomised into less than three, by “dispensation,” for the quality of his metal, or by the

¹ Oliver, 64.

² Bartoli, f. 100. This fact was a standing joke amongst the novices in the English novitiate at Hodder—one of our “pious stories” during recreation.

³ Bayle, Oliver, Bartoli.

desire to “fix” him—which however was not necessary, for Robert Parsons was now in his element. The expedition to England left Rome in 1580. The pope gave the Jesuits his benediction, and their general, Mercurian, enjoined them not to meddle in the least with any “political interests in the affairs of England—now continually agitated by the suspicions of the government, the dread of innovation, the tumults of Ireland, the imprisonment of the Queen of Scots, and the miserable oppression of the Catholics, besides the suspicion of danger from without.” The Jesuits were neither to speak nor listen to any one on the subject of politics : they were strictly to observe the prohibition, and Campion and Parsons were to make that protestation on oath to the ministers and magistrates of England, as soon as they should set foot in the country.¹ On application from Parsons and Campion the pope granted that the Bull of deposition against Elizabeth should be understood in this manner :—that it should always bind the queen and heretics : and should by no means bind Catholics, as matters then stood—but hereafter bind them, when some public execution of the Bull might be had or made—which points at once to the *hopes* of the party, and their *determination* : in the event of invasion the Catholics would be bound to stand against the queen—and it was now the “mission” of the Jesuits so to strengthen them in their “faith,” that this “hope” of the infatuated party should not be disappointed. Forsooth this was no mitigation of the Bull—but rather an aggravation ; though neither Allen, Bartoli, nor Butler, ventures to explain its bearings on the events that followed.

Instructions
to Parsons
and Campion.

¹ Bartoli, f. 93.

Ambo animis, ambo insignes præstantibus ausis, these two Jesuits were well contrasted, according to the Constitutions—Campion being (by the admission of an enemy) “of a sweet disposition, and a well-polished man,” whilst Parsons was “a violent, fierce-natured man, and of a rough behaviour.”¹ Parsons was appointed superior of the mission, or expedition, which consisted of a lay-brother besides seven priests, two laymen, and “perhaps” another who is not named—making in all thirteen—by way of a good omen from the gospel-number, I suppose.² After a prosperous journey through the continent, which they fructified by a conference with Beza at Geneva, Parsons resolved to penetrate first into England, leaving Campion to follow the more adroit and brazen-faced leader.³ He gave out that he was a captain returning from Flanders to England. His dress was “of buff, layd with gold lace, with hatt and feather suted to the same.”⁴ He assumed not only the dress of an officer, but looked the character to admiration, and *v’aggiunse l’infiorarsi di gale, alla maniera de gli altri*—“full of strange oaths,” he swaggered away, to simulate the soldier completely—*quel tutto che bisognana a parer dipinto un soldato*. When Campion saw him in his character, the imitation was so complete, that he thought the sagacity of the English searchers, however keen-sighted, would be baffled and deceived: “thus no one would ever suspect that, under so different an appearance, a Jesuit was concealed—*si nascondesse un Gesuita*.”⁵ He embarked,

Disguise of
Parsons.

¹ Camden, ad Ann. 1580.

² “E forse un decimoterzo, che altri vi contano.”—*Bartoli*, f. 93.

³ “Ragion volle che al Personio, e Superiore, e piu destro, e piu franco, toccasse il fare al P. Edmondo la strada.”—*Bartoli*, 101.

⁴ Oliver, 159.

⁵ *Bartoli*, f. 101.

and reached Dover the next morning. Here the searcher, according to his commission, examined him, “found no cause of doubt in him, but let him pass with all favour, procuring him horse, and all other things necessary for his journey to Gravesend.” It is at least amusing to think of the multitudinous falsehoods that Parsons must have told from the time of his embarkation to his shaking hands with the searcher, and decamping with flying colours. However, according to Jesuit-conscience, and Dr. Oliver, “This manifestation of *God’s care and protection*, inspired the Father with *courage and confidence*, and he told the searcher *that he had a certain friend, a merchant*, lying in St. Omer’s that would follow him very shortly, to whom he desired the said searcher to show all favour: and so he promised to do, and took a certain letter of the same Father to send to Mr. Edmunds, (for so Father Campion was now called,) and conveyed it safely to St. Omer’s, in which letter Father Parsons wrote unto him the great courtesy which the searcher had showed him, and recommended him to hasten and follow him in *disposing of his stock of jewels and diamonds*.”¹ The astonishing dexterity of these Jesuits is proved by the fact, that their portraits were hung up on the gates of the towns, the seaports particularly, so as to insure their detection.² Nor must we fail to remark how active were the queen’s spies in discovering the project. This chapter in the history of Elizabeth’s reign is worthy of investigation: a history of the method and men, and *cost* of that spy system would be as interesting

Espionage in
the days of
Elizabeth.

¹ Oliver, 101, 159. Bartoli says, “un *Patritio* mercante Irlandese (era questi il P. Edmondo) lo spacciassero di presente”—because his speedy presence in London was necessary for his affairs.

² Bartoli, *ubi suprà*.

as that of the Jesuits. With great difficulty Parsons journeyed on towards London. In consequence of the queen's proclamation, and the general suspicion prevailing against strangers, he found it impossible to procure accommodation at the inns, coming, as he did, without a horse. At last he found his way to the Marshalsea prison, where he met his brother-Jesuit, Thomas Pound,¹ a fact which seems to prove that the present expedition was not the first settlement, but only a more determined and better organised assault on the dragon of heresy; and we may note the hypocrisy of the Jesuits in pretending to undertake the mission so reluctantly. The fact is, they wished to secure a right for saying to the secular priests—Your master, Allen, invited us—we consented with reluctance—and you must be silent on the score of our obtrusive ambition and interference. Meanwhile, Campion, in his garb of a pedlar or merchant—doubtless with jewels in his box to keep up the deception—reached London: Parsons was waiting for him on the banks of the Thames, and saluted him with a sign, and then shook hands with him as an expected friend, in so natural a manner that no one could suspect it was “all artifice and a trick,”—*tutto artificio e scaltrimento*—says the Jesuit-historian.²

A meeting of the Jesuits and missionary priests now took place, and by unanimous consent Robert Parsons presided. He disclaimed all political objects, contrary to the general report, and the direct consequence of his presence and that of his brother-Jesuits, in England. The conversion of England, with the co-operation of the secular priests, was the only object in view. He swore an oath to that effect—*e sotto fide giurato certificato*. Then he appealed

Parsons holds
a meeting
and entraps
the priests.

¹ Bartoli and Oliver.

² Bartoli, 104.

to the Council of Trent, and protested against the attendance of Catholics at the divine service of Protestant churches, and strongly recommended non-conformity, which, of course, was just the very thing to bring on the poor Catholics a torrent of fires, racks, and gibbets. What cared the "fierce-natured man" for that? No Virgin Mary on a mulberry-tree had doomed *him* to martyrdom with a purple rag—and he had no particular fancy for the thing in itself, and so, "until some public execution of the pope's Bull of deposition against the queen might be had or made," he was resolved, by command of authority and inclination, to quicken that result by goading the government to fury against the wretched Catholics, thereby to rouse, as he hoped, all Catholicity, with King Philip II., to the invasion of England and destruction of the queen. In order to prevent conformity, which was, in most instances, the result of indifference to Catholicism, Parsons urged the necessity of supplying all parts of the kingdom equally with priests, and induced the secular priests to place themselves under him as subjects—*non altramente che sudditi*—and these "verysimplefellows" offered to go and labour in any manner, and at any place, which he should prescribe to them. Thus, besides the end already mentioned, Parsons at once achieved a party in England, arrogating to himself and his Company an ascendancy in the concerns of the mission, destined to divide the body of missionaries into factions, which tore and worried the English Catholic Church in the midst of ruinous persecution. Heavens! Can there be a greater curse on humanity than priestly craft, ambition, and selfishness, united to all the recklessness of the Jesuits?¹

¹ Butler, i. 365, 371, analysing Bartoli and More.

Then began the sowing of the seed. Parsons and Campion “travelled up and down through the countrey, and to Popish gentlemens houses, covertly and in the disguised habits sometimes of soul-
 Progress of the mission.
 diers, sometimes of gentlemen, sometimes of ministers of the word, and sometimes of apparitors [a sort of underling church-officer], diligently performing what they had in charge, both by word and writing. Parsons being a man of a seditious and turbulent spirit, and
 Machinations.
 armed with a confident boldness, tampered so far with the Papists about deposing the queen, that some of them (I speak upon their own credit) thought to have delivered him into the magistrate's hands. Campion, though more modest, yet by a written paper challenged the ministers of the English Church to a disputation, and published a neat, well-penned book in Latin, called ‘*Ten Reasons* in Defence of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome ;’¹ and Parsons put out another virulent book in English against Chark, who had soberly written against Campion's challenge Neither wanted there others of the Popish faction (for religion was grown into faction) who laboured tooth and nail at Rome and elsewhere in princes' courts, to raise war against their own country ; yea, they published also in print, that the Bishop of Rome and the Spaniard had conspired together to conquer England, and expose it for a spoil and prey : and this they did of purpose to give courage to their own party, and to terrifie
 The queen's manifesto.
 others from their allegiance to their prince and countrey. The queen being now openly thus assailed both by the arms and cunning practices of the Bishop of Rome and the Spaniard, set forth a manifesto,

¹ It was privately printed at Lady Stonor's house at Henley.—*Oliver*.

wherein (after acknowledgment of the goodness of God towards her) she declareth, ‘That she had attempted nothing against any prince but for preservation of her own kingdom ; nor had she invaded the provinces of any other, though she had sundry times been thereunto provoked by injuries, and invited by opportunities. If any princes go about to attempt ought against her, she doubteth not but to be able (by the blessing of God) to defend her people ; and to that purpose she had mustered her forces both by sea and land, and had them now in readiness against any hostile invasion. Her faithful subjects she exhorteth to continue immovable in their allegiance and duty towards God, and their prince the minister of God. The rest, who had shaken off their love to their countrey, and their obedience to their prince, she commandeth to carry themselves modestly and peaceably, and not provoke the severity of justice against themselves : for she would no longer be so imprudent, as by sparing the bad to prove cruel to herself and her good subjects.’”¹

Such being the queen’s and her cabinet’s sentiments, and such being the undoubted, the admitted facts whereon they rested, the influx of missionary priests and Jesuits roused them to exert their prerogatives to the utmost, and harassing inquiries were everywhere set on foot to discover the priests and the Jesuits, with severe denunciations against all who harboured them, and against all who quitted the kingdom without the queen’s license ; and rewards were offered for the discovery of the offenders. Hereupon Parsons and Campion in concert addressed a letter to the Privy Council. The letter of

Parsons and
Campion ad-
dress letters
to the council.

¹ Camden, ad Ann. 1580.

Parsons is lost, says Butler, but Bartoli gives it nevertheless. It is entitled a Confession of the Faith of Robert Parsons, and complains of the general persecution, the suspicions against the Company, which he calls most blessed, and affirms the fidelity of the Catholics, which he states to be based on better grounds than that of the Protestants, especially the Puritans, who were then as ruthlessly proscribed as the Catholics.¹ Campion's letter is preserved; he gave a copy of it to one of his friends, with directions to preserve it secret, unless his friend should hear of his imprisonment; and then he was to print and give it circulation. His friend printed one thousand copies three or four months after, and thus it became public before his apprehension.² Such is the *ex parte* statement emitted by Butler; but the man who subsequently printed his "*Ten Reasons in Defence of the Church of Rome*," in such circumstances, would scarcely shrink from flinging before the public, then in uttermost excitation, his ultimate defiance to the excommunicated authorities; or, as he apprehended its probable effect on *himself*, why did he not shrink from *ever* permitting it to entail misery on his fellow Catholics?

But then comes the question, who was that "friend" alluded to by the strong Jesuit-partisan Butler, so vaguely, as if he did not know his *name*? Why, he was no other than the *Jesuit Thomas Pound*.³ Butler knew this well enough, but it did not

A curious
elucidation.

¹ Bartoli, f. 113, *et seq.*

² Butler, 371; Bartoli, 126, 127.

³ "Convien sapere, che quel nobile Confessore di Christo, e Religioso della Compagnia, Tomaso Pondo, nelle cui mane dicemmo havere il P. Campiano dipositata la sua lettera, e protestatione a Consiglieri di Stato, e inguintogli il divulgarla al primo udir che farebbe lui esser preso: dopo tre ò quattro mesi da che gli stava otiosa nelle mani, rilettala, e col sommamente piacergli, persuaso,

suit his views to state the fact, so plainly evidencing the infatuated or reckless defiance of the Jesuits to all authority, and cruel indifference to the suffering of the Catholics whom they pretended to benefit and console. In his letter, Campion briefly informed the council of his arrival, and the object of his mission, according to the expressed *words* of the Company; and earnestly solicited permission to propound, explain, and prove his religious creed, first before the council, then before an assembly of divines of each university, and afterwards, before a meeting of graduates, in the civil and canon law.¹ Then he blazed forth and displayed the heart-and-soul ardour of his infatuated enthusiasm, saying: “As for our Company, I give you to know that all of us who are scattered and spread over the wide world in such numbers, and yet continually succeeding each other, will be able, whilst the Company lasts, to frustrate your machinations. We have entered into a holy conspiracy, and we are resolved to bear with courage the cross you place upon our backs—never to despair of your recovery as long as there remains a single man of us left to enjoy your Tyburn—to be torn to pieces by your tortures—to be consumed and pine away in your prisons. We have right well considered the matter,—we are resolved, and with the favouring impulse of God, neither force nor assault shall end the battle which now commences. Thus, from the first was the faith planted,—thus it shall be planted again with vigour renewed.”² “The spirit of this letter may be admired; its prudence must be questioned,” says Butler, and, we

che a ben fare, dovea farsi altrimenti da quello ch'era paruto al P. Edmondo con libertà, e findanza d'amico, senza altro attendere, la pubblicò prima del tempo.”—*Bartoli*, f. 126.

¹ Butler, i. 371; *Bartoli*, f. 114, *et seq.*

² *Bartoli*, f. 76, 115.

may add, that its publication by another Jesuit aggravates the cruel infatuation. It gave great offence. Campion himself, in a letter to Mercurian, his general, says, that "its publication put the adversaries of the Catholics into a fury."¹ The thousand copies of the *Defiance*, circulated through the court, the universities, throughout the whole kingdom; and all the world were in expectation of the result. All the Catholics, and a large portion of the Protestants, wished that permission might be given to Campion to make his appearance either at London or one of the universities, for an open field to enter the lists with the Protestant theologians,—and vast would have been the concourse from far and near to witness such a glorious tournament, the like to which might never chance again.² Thus wished enthusiasm and frivolity; but what good could possibly result in those times, or any times, from a contro-
Touching
controversial
encounters.
versial tilting-match?—in a matter wherein dexterity is infinitely more likely to triumph than truth or reasonable argument—wherein, though vanquished, the disputants will argue still, for ever and a day after—in short, where infinite truths are to be propounded by finite intellects, and decided by the votes, the shouts, the stamping and clapping of hands of an audience, even incalculably less qualified to judge than the disputants themselves? Whatever was the motive of the queen and her council, their non-acceptance of the misguided Jesuit's challenge and defiance was wise in a political point of view. In truth, the elements of national discord were lawless enough, without congregating ten thousand selfish partisans on a given spot to explode with the volcanic rancour of religionism. It was infinitely better

¹ Butler, i. 372.² Bartoli, f. 127.

to let the people indulge their curiosity by listening to the adventures of Admiral Drake, then just returned to

England, “abounding with great wealth and
An episode.

greater renown, having prosperously sailed round about the world ; being, if not the first of all which could challenge this glory, yet questionless the first but Magellan, whom death cut off in the midst of his voyage.” Far better it was for Elizabeth to send her idlers to gaze at the good old ship that had ploughed a hundred seas, and which she had tenderly “caused to be drawn up into a little creek near Deptford, upon the Thames, as a monument of Drake’s so lucky sailing round about the world (where the carcass thereof is yet to be seen) ; and having, as it were, consecrated it for a memorial with great ceremony, she was banquetted in it, and conferred on Drake the honour of knighthood. At this time a bridge of planks, by which they came on board the ship, sunk under the crowd of people, and fell down with an hundred men upon it, who notwithstanding, had none of them any harm. So as that ship may seem to have been built under a lucky planet.”¹

Why were there any of the queen’s subjects compelled to absent themselves from this national jollification ? Why, amidst that ceremony, wherein England’s queen identified herself with the fortunes of her subjects, gently praising them unto heroic exertion for their country’s weal—why were there *Catholics* who slunk off, having no heart to cheer, no voice to huzza for their queen ? They were busy with their catechism and “the Faith,” and thus promoting the “hope” of the Jesuits and their masters, or, rather, their patrons and friends :—but the Jesuits will not succeed as they

¹ Camd. ad Ann. 1580.

desire. In the most acceptable moment the people of England will be eager to prove their loyalty, in spite of papal bulls and Jesuit-nonconformity. And thus it will be for ever. In England loyalty is England's loyalty. an instinct: but it requires to be cheered by the smiles of royalty. Like a loving heart, it craves some love in return. Give it but that, and all the world may be priest-ridden, faction-ridden, sunk into republican anarchy, or democratic tyranny; yet England's instinct will shrink from that perilous imitation of an exceedingly ambiguous model; and she will remain for ever the hardest-worked nation under God's heaven—the most persevering spider in existence, whose web you may tear every morning, and every night you will see it again, as a proof of her industry; for, far from preying on any other nation, it is the most remarkable fact in the world, that she has wasted on others incalculably more than she has ever gained by allies, or by colonies; and yet she endures. In spite of all her desperate wounds from time to time, still she is a veteran, but not yet pensioned off to repose. Her rulers, her nobles, her people will again and soon be called to decide the fate of the political universe, as they were at the end of the sixteenth century, when that decision went under the name of “religion,” with Philip II. and the pope on one side, and Elizabeth, with the people of England, on the other.

The terrible edict which went forth against the Jesuits flung them into constant peril, but made them objects of sympathy in England. In fact the very words of that edict which throughout England proclaimed it treason to harbour the Jesuits, was a sort of useful advertisement to them, Devotedness of the Catholics.

made them interesting, covered them with merits to which in a time of perfect toleration they would have laid claim in vain. "We are eagerly desired," writes Parsons to his general, "and whithersoever we go we are received with incredible gladness ; and many there are who from afar come to seek us, to confer with us on the concerns of their souls, and to place their conscience into our hands ; and they offer us all that they are, all that they can do, all that they have,—*cio che sono, cio che possono, cio che hanno.*"

Campion said that these generous Catholics seemed to have forgotten themselves, and set aside all thought for themselves, and to have centred all their solicitude on the fathers. But the Jesuits did not permit these consolatory demonstrations to throw them off their guard. They took every precaution to prevent detection and to baffle the numberless spies everywhere in quest for the pope's emissaries, the Spaniard's jackalls, and, by their own account, the idols of their infatuated dupes. They were

Disguises of
the Jesuits. always disguised, and frequently changed their disguises, their names, and places of resort.

Thus they deluded the spies, constantly falsifying the descriptions with which they were represented. The fashion and colour of their garb of yesterday, was not the same as to-day : the spies met the Jesuits and had no eyes for the prey. Perhaps they got hold of their names : they repeated them asking for their bearers : they asked in vain, these were no longer the names of the invisible Jesuits who perhaps stood behind them, beside them, before them. Before sun-rise the spies ransacked a house into which one of the Jesuits had entered the night before : he was already flown and many miles off. "My dresses are most numerous,"

writes Campion, "and various are my fashions, and as for names, I have an abundance."¹ The escapes of Parsons were truly wonderful: the wily old fox was never to be hunted down or entrapped. One night the hunters surrounded the house where he was sleeping: he buried himself in a heap of hay and they left him behind.² One day, whilst passing through a street, the hue and cry was raised—"Parsons! Parsons!" they cried; and in the universal rush of eager Jesuit-hunters you might see Parsons rushing too, and lustily crying—"There he is yonder," and slinking off quietly by a side-turn.³ They once besieged the house where he was: it was a sudden onslaught. Parsons boldly came forth and asked them what they wanted. "The Jesuit," they cried. "Walk in," said he, "and look for him quietly," and Parsons walked off without looking behind him.⁴ Nor were there wanting in his career, those lucky coincidences which served his turn by "attesting" the special providence over the Jesuit. He was once invited to supper by a priest, in order to convert some heretics: though he knew the place right well, though he walked the neighbourhood up and down three times in search of the spot, and inquired of the neighbours, still he could not find the house; and tired out at last, he went away. On the following day he learnt that during all that time the house was besieged by the heretics, waiting to seize him, and that they had carried off the priest and six Catholics to prison.⁵

Escapes of
Parsons and
his craft.

This is one of his own anecdotes, and so is the following. He had passed the night at the house of a priest; at break of day he was roused by certain very sharp

¹ Bartoli, 117.

² Ann. Litt. 1583.

³ A legend I heard related in the English novitiate.

⁴ Ann. Litt. 1583.

⁵ Ibid. 1583.

prickings—*stimulis quibusdam acerrimis*—so that he got up and went off as soon as possible, when the heretics came and seized the hospitable priest.¹

“By the pricking of my thumbs,
Something wicked this way comes.”

Wonderful was the fame that Parsons achieved by his dexterity, baffling the uttermost vigilance of his enemies, and their multitudinous traps and stratagems. He slipped through their hands like an eel, and glided through his ocean of adventure—ever on the watch—but feeling secure from his repeated escapes and evasions. There is no doubt that he had made friends even in the court of Elizabeth. There were Catholics around the queen who undoubtedly hated not Catholicism, but the treason with which the pope and his party chose to connect it: the very tenement that the English Jesuits now possess in Lancashire was built by a Catholic nobleman, high in favour with the queen. Parsons was the universal theme of conversational wonder. The queen shared the wonderment of her people. To one of her Catholic lords she said she “would so like to see the invisible Jesuit.” “You shall see him,” said the lord in question. A few days afterwards the queen and some company were at the palace window gazing into the street. There came staggering down the street a drunken fellow, making all manner of game for the crowd around him. When he was out of sight, the Catholic lord told the queen that she had
His portrait. seen Parsons in that drunken staggerer—
—one of the Jesuit’s *Dramatis personæ*, or tragi-comic characters, which he played to perfection.² Look at the man’s portrait: and should you ever see a pike lying in ambush just under the river-bank,

¹ Ann. Litt. 1583.

² One of the legends I heard related in the English novitiate.

where the water is deep, try and catch a glimpse at his eyes, and their expression will remind you of those of Father Parsons—awfully wide awake—keen and penetrating, yet not without a shade of anxious thought, universal suspicion. Falsehood and equivocation his desperate position compelled him to use without scruple ; but that position resulted from his “*vocation*,” which he had himself embraced ; and thus, without moral excuse, he daily perverted his own heart and mind, whilst he was teaching others unto salvation and orthodoxy, for which the downfall of Protestantism and its queen was the price awarded, with ulterior contingencies. It is besides curious to observe, that this professional stickler for *non-conformity* conformed in every possible way with every possible thing—except the wishes of the queen and her council, and their sharks, to entrap or fang the Jesuit—for which, however, he must be excused, though his general, himself, and Campion, are answerable for the immediate consequences of their presence and machinations in England. Their “apprehensions” of that doom which they would entail on the Catholics were speedily fulfilled.¹

¹ A Catholic contemporary thus writes of this Jesuit-expedition : “ These good Fathers (as the devil will have it) came into England, and intruded themselves into our harvest, being the men in our consciences (we mean both them and others of that Society, with some of their adherents) who have been the chief instruments of all the mischiefs that have been intended against her Majesty, since the beginning of her reign, and of the miseries which we, or any other Catholics, have upon these occasions sustained. Their first repair hither was Anno 1580, when the realm of Ireland was in great combustion, and then they entered (viz. Maister Campion, the Subject ; and Maister Parsons, the Provincial) like a tempest, with sundry such great brags and challenges, as divers of the gravest clergy then living in England (Dr. Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, and others) did greatly dislike them, and plainly foretold, that as things then stood, their proceeding after that fashion would certainly urge the state to make some sharper laws, which should not only touch them, but likewise all others, both priests and Catholics. Upon their arrival, and after the said brags, Maister

Campion's letter highly incensed the queen and her ministers. In spite of all that may be said against Elizabeth, it must be for ever impossible to deny that she was forced by the Jesuits to adopt severe and cruel measures against the Catholics. Her previous liberal toleration reacted bitterly against her feelings when she beheld the estrangement of her Catholic subjects, so evidently effected by the Jesuits. It is admitted that Catholics frequented her court: that some were advanced to places of high honour and trust: several filled subordinate offices; and though there was an act which excluded Catholics from the House of Commons, still they always sat and voted in the House of Lords.¹ To Allen's seminary-scheme and Jesuit-obtrusion must be ascribed the weight of calamity brought down upon the Catholics of England—though we are far from countenancing the horrible tortures and measures adopted to put down “Catholicism” when it was roused by Allen, Parsons, and Campion, to struggle for empire. Doubtless the partisans of religionism think all this human suffering, all these national calamities, bloodshed, deceit and craft of all kind, violence and rancour on all sides—nothing compared to the struggle for “the Faith”—for never was it more than a struggle in England: doubtless they think all these things light when compared to the “boon of the Faith:” but Providence has permitted better sentiments at length to prevail. We now feel

Parsons presently fell to his Jesuitical courses; and so belaboured both himself and others in matters of state, how he might set her Majesty's crown upon another head (as appeareth by a letter of his own to a certain earl), that the Catholics themselves threatened to deliver him into the hands of the civil magistrate, except he desisted from such kind of practices.”—*Important Considerations by Sundry of Us the Secular Priests*. 1601.

¹ Butler, i. 362.

convinced that this “boon of the Faith” was nothing more than the “bone of contention”—the cruel pretext of factions—and therefore was it doomed never to realise its “hopes”—never to effect more than bitter calamity for the unfortunate dupes who lent themselves to the will of the schemers. Roused to exertion in self-defence, the queen and her ministers issued a severe enactment against the offenders and their dupes. The Party in power, like Herod of old, involved the whole mass of Catholics in one indiscriminate proscription. Immediately after the entrance of the Jesuits into England the parliament had provided an act whose execution the proceedings of the Jesuits expedited with a vengeance. The motive principle of the enactment was that the Jesuits, under the cover of a corrupt doctrine, sowed the seeds of sedition :—therefore the dreadful laws to counteract that treason were as follows : All persons possessing, or pretending to possess, or to exercise, the power of absolving or of withdrawing others from the established religion, or suffering themselves to be so withdrawn, should, together with their procurers and counsellors, suffer the penalties of high treason. The penalty for saying mass was increased to 200 marks, about 130*l.*, and one year’s imprisonment : for being present at the mass, 100 marks (65*l.*), and the same term of imprisonment. For absence from church (*nonconformity*) there was a standing penalty of 20 marks per month (13*l.*) ; and if that absence was prolonged to a whole year, the recusant was obliged to find two securities for his good behaviour in 200*l.* each. Imagine an income-tax of 3380*l.* a year on your attendance at mass alone, instead of only having to pay from one to two shillings, as at present imposed

The laws
against
Catholics.

by your priests, who, for the sake of the music, make your mass-chapels “shilling theatres,” as a great duke called them, and rightly too! Here was a ravenous law—almost as bad as the enactments whereby

The penal laws and the pope’s spoliations. Pope Gregory XIII. plundered and ruined the nobles of Italy to raise funds for the destruction of the heretics, to fee the Jesuits’ and Allen’s seminaries—the two leading causes of Catholic calamity in England:—but there is a difference. England, or rather the party in power, cared nothing for the money:—they feared for their lives, liberties, and fortunes, menaced by the dreaded consequences of Catholic ascendancy; and thus, as usual with men, were cruel in their desperation. A horrible excuse was that: but Pope Gregory had not even that for his tyrannical proscriptions. Then open your eyes: trace events to their right sources: compare, perpend, decide that there is no difference between Catholic and Protestant selfishness when armed with power, and rendered inordinate by prescriptive abuses unchecked, unrebuked, and rampant as the raging lion. Finally, there was another enactment which corresponds exactly with the proposition made in the last congregation of the Jesuits, just given,—the proposition, you remember, to permit Jesuits to take *boarders* in the *northern* parts, in order to instruct them and “care for them entirely.” This was but another method of propagandism—in their rage for the cause which they embraced with all the energy of hungry monopolists, grasping speculators. So the act provided that to prevent the concealment of priests as tutors or schoolmasters in private families, every person acting in that capacity without the approbation of the ordinary, should be liable to a year’s imprisonment, and

the person who employed him to a fine of 10*l.* per month. It is plain, says Dr. Lingard, that, if these provisions had been fully executed, the profession of the Catholic creed must, in a few years, have been entirely extinguished.¹ But, for the great mass of Catholics, these enactments were only a scarecrow. To the heads of the growing faction they were a ravening tiger—and no one can wonder thereat, though we abhor with heart and mind the dreadful severity, *and* the reckless proceedings of the men who, as leaders, were the nucleus of determined opposition to the government—but of course, this was effected “solely by the exercise of the spiritual functions of the priesthood”—their own words, glibly advanced, as if this confession did not aggravate their guilt in abusing man’s religious sentiment, and making him wretched by the means of the very feelings which should constitute his happiness. Open violence would have been more honourable to the propagandists than this insidious undermining—this secret poison administered as by men who had not the courage to attempt assassination. Forsooth, treason was not the major nor the minor of the Jesuit syllogism : but it was the infallible conclusion. They reversed the usual method : for here the *end* was abominable, whilst the means, assuming their description, were “good”—for those who needed sacerdotal consolation. Now, you will be surprised to know that it was in reply to these severe enactments that Campion wrote those brave words to the queen and her council—following up the defiance with his *Ten Reasons* for Roman ascendancy.²

The chief
aim of these
laws.

In the midst of the universal excitement, the shout

¹ Hist. viii. 143 ; Stat. 23 Eliz. c. 1.

² Ling. *ubi supra*, 144.

and the cry for the Jesuits and traitors, Campion and Parsons, by their wonderful efforts at concealment, eluded the pursuit of their enemies ; but heavily Sufferings of the Catholics. fell, meanwhile, the cataract of persecution on the wretched Catholics. A bitter lesson it is for men, fooled by those who should be their guides—cruelly sacrificed by those whose presence should be the good tidings of peace and happiness. Think of the result : imagine the scenes enacted. The names of fifty thousand recusants have been returned to the Council. The magistrates are urged to the utmost severity. The prisons in every county are filled with persons suspected as priests, or harbourers of priests, or delinquents against the enactments. Whilst the Jesuits changed their garbs, and fashions, and names, every day, and thus scoured the land, untouched by the thunderbolts falling around, no other man could enjoy security even in the privacy of his own house. At all hours of the day, but mostly in the stillness of night, a magistrate, at the head of an armed mob, rushed amain, burst open the doors, and the pursuivants, or officers, dispersed to the different apartments, ransacked the beds, tore the tapestry and wainscoting from the walls in search of hiding-places behind, forced open the closets, drawers, and coffers, and exhausted their ingenuity to discover either a priest, or books, chalices, and priests' vestments at mass. Additional outrage was the result of remonstrance. All the inmates were interrogated : their persons searched, under the pretext that superstitious articles might be concealed among their clothes ; and there are instances on record of females of rank, whose reason and lives were endangered and destroyed by the brutality of the officers.¹

¹ Ling. viii. 144, *et seq.*

Mirabeau's simple valet was always wretched if his master did not thrash him every day ; and there are men who consider human suffering to be one of the gratifications of man's all-good Creator —men who actually believe that God delights in seeing his creatures plunged in misery,—each pang they feel being an acceptable tribute to Him who said, "Come to me all ye who labour and are heavily laden." Undoubtedly the Jesuits consoled the poor Catholics with the usual arguments, for the dreadful sufferings which their presence and their insolent manœuvres entailed upon the scapegoats. It was a bitter time for the human heart—a bitter trial for humanity. And in the midst of that fearful proscription, what heroic devotedness, heroic pity and commiseration, did the Catholics evince towards the Jesuits, though they knew them to be the cause proximate at least of all their calamities. A Catholic nobleman was visited by Parsons. Terrified by the edict, the nobleman sent a message to the Jesuit, requesting him to go elsewhere, for he did not approve of his coming. Parsons turned off : but the Englishman's heart got the better of fear : the nobleman suddenly relented, grieved for the seeming hardness of heart, ran after Parsons, and, with earnest entreaties, brought him back to his mansion, exposing his life and fortunes to imminent peril.¹

A reflection
and a fact.

It is but fair to listen to Elizabeth's historian, in his attempt to justify, excuse, or palliate the cruel severities inflicted on the Catholics and their leaders. "Such now were the times," says Camden, "that the queen (who never was of opinion that men's consciences were to be forced) complained many times

Exculpation
of Elizabeth.

¹ Ann. Litt. 1583 ; Miss. Angl.

that she was driven of necessity to take these courses, unless she would suffer the ruine of herself and her subjects, upon some men's pretence of conscience and the Catholic religion. Yet, for the greater part of these silly priests, she did not at all believe them guilty of plotting the destruction of their country : but the *superiors* were they she held to be the instruments of this villany ; for these inferiour emissaries committed the full and free disposeure of themselves to their superiours. For when those that were now and afterwards taken were asked, ' whether by authority of the bull of Pius Quintus, bishop of Rome, the subjects were so absolved from their oath of allegiance towards the queen, that they might take up arms against their prince ; whether they thought her to be a lawfull queen ; whether they would subscribe to Sanders's and Bristow's opinion concerning the authority of that bull ;¹ whether, if the Bishop of Rome should wage war against the queen, they would joyn with her or him : ' they answered some of them so ambiguously, some so resolutely, and some by prevarication, or silence, shifted off the questions in such a manner, that divers ingenuous Catholicks began to suspect they fostered some treacherous disloyalty ; and Bishop, a man otherwise devoted to the Bishop of Rome, wrote against them, and solidly proved that the Constitution obtruded under the name of the Lateran Council, upon which the whole authority of absolving subjects from their allegiance and deposing princes is founded, is no other than a decree of Pope Innocent the Third, and was never admitted in England ; yea, that the said Council was no council at all, nor was anything

¹ Dr. Sanders, Romish priest, who was one of the paladins in the pope's crusade against Ireland, led by Stukely and Fitzmaurice.

at all there decreed by the Fathers. Suspicions also were daily increased by the great number of priests creeping more and more into England, who privily felt the minds of men, spread abroad that princes excommunicated were to be deposed, and whispered in corners that such princes as professed not the Romish religion had forfeited their regal title and authority : that those who had taken holy orders, were, by a certain ecclesiastical privilege, exempted from all jurisdiction of princes, and not bound by their laws, nor ought they to reverence or regard their majesty.”¹ Thus spake rumour, thus believed the authorities ; and if facts did not bear out the assertions, the pope’s bull against Elizabeth was a sufficient attestation of the worst that could be rumoured or imagined. That bull was powerless, even ridiculous, before Allen’s priests and the Jesuits consolidated a Catholic party in the kingdom. Treason was not perhaps their direct inculcation ; but, in the existing circumstances, in the very proviso which the Jesuits demanded from the pope by way of explanation of the deposing bull, if treason was not a direct inculcation, it was undoubtedly the end of the scheme—the effect of a cause, so cleverly cloaked with “religion.” To all these circumstances we must add the infatuated excitement of the “religious” operators—the bellows of sedition and incendiary pharisees, who trusted to their own dexterity for escape, whilst the very sufferings

¹ Camden, Ann. 1581. In effect by one of the privileges given to the Jesuits, all kings, princes, dukes, marquises, barons, soldiers, nobles, laymen, corporations, universities, magistrates, rectors, rulers of all sorts and conditions, and of all sees whatever, are forbidden to *dare* (audeant) or *presume* (vel præsumant) to impose taxes, imposts, donations, contributions, even for the repairs of bridges, or other roads, on the Jesuits ; or to lay on them any burthens whatever, under penalty of *eternal damnation—maledictionis æternæ pœnis!*—*Compend. Priv. Exempt.* § 3.

they brought upon their dupes formed a new motive for resistance to the government, and for perpetuating religious rancour. "Some of them were not ashamed to own that they were returned into England with no other intent than, by reconciling men at confession, to absolve every one particularly from all his oaths of allegiance and obedience to the queen, just as the said bull did absolve them all at once and in general. And this seemed the easier to be effected, because they promised withal absolution from all mortal sin ; and the safer, because it was performed more closely under the *seal of confession*."¹ By the privileges conceded to

¹ Camden, Ann. 1581. "Our confessors," says a privilege of the Jesuits, "can remit or relax *any oaths whatever*, without prejudice to a third party—*quælibet juramenta sine præjudicio tertii, relaxare possunt*"—so that the only question was, what might be called "prejudice to a third party"—a salvo so vague that it stood for nothing.—*Compend. Priv. Confess.* § 6.

"The general, and the other fifty heads of the houses, and rectors, appointed by him for a time, can grant a dispensation to our men in all cases *without exception—nullo excepto*,—in the confessional only ; but the dispensation in the case of voluntary homicide is conceded, barring the ministry at the altar"—so that a Jesuit might commit murder, and all the penalty he would incur would be the prohibition of saying mass !—*Compend. Priv. Dispens.* § 4.

"The general can, in the confessional, grant a dispensation to persons of our Company, in all irregularities, even in those cases which the pope reserves to himself, namely in murder (*morte*), in the maiming of limbs (*membrorum obtruncatione*), and enormous spilling of blood (*enormi sanguinis effusione*)—provided, however, any of the three be not *notorious* [known to the world], and this provision is on account of the scandal [that might ensue]—*et hoc propter scandalum*."—*Ib.* § 5.

This does appear a most extraordinary privilege. Why should such a privilege be necessary to men calling themselves the Companions of Jesus—and by their profession totally precluded from all occasions where they might commit murder, maim limbs, and shed blood enormously ? In truth, there is no getting over the inferences so imperatively suggested by these privileges. A dispensation to commit murder seems indeed a horrible thing ; and yet here are the very words—*dispensare cum nostris in homicidio voluntario . . in foro conscientie*—under the *Seal of Confession*, as Camden has it. The words admit of no other interpretation. A dispensation means a permission to do what is otherwise prohibited—such as a dispensation to marry within prohibited degrees. Consequently the dispensations given above are *bonâ fide* permissions to do the

the Jesuits, it is evident that these charges are rather more than probable. In their inscription, so gratefully addressed to Pope Gregory XIII., the Jesuits failed not to state that the pope had "fortified the Company with mighty privileges," as we have read ; and all the privileges which I have just given were enjoyed by the Jesuits at the time of the English mission. Long before existing in manuscript, they were printed in 1635.¹

At length, thirteen months after his arrival, Campion was betrayed by a Catholic, and seized by the officers of the crown. He was found in a secret closet at the house of a Catholic gentleman. They mounted him on horseback, tied his legs under the horse, bound his arms behind him, and set a paper on his hat with an inscription in great capitals, inscribed—Campion the Seditious Jesuit. Of course he was racked and tortured—words that do not convey the hideous reality. Imagine a frame of oak, raised three feet from the ground. The prisoner was laid under it, on his back, on the floor. They tied his wrists and ancles to two rollers at the end of the frame: these were moved by levers in opposite directions, until the body rose to a level with the frame. Then the tormentors put questions to the wretched prisoner ; and if his answers did not prove satisfactory, they stretched him more and more till his bones started from their sockets. Then there was the Scavenger's Daughter—a broad hoop of iron, with which they surrounded the

Campion
taken—
description of
the tortures.

wickedness they name—voluntary homicide among the rest—only the Jesuit who undertook the thing was to be precluded from saying mass. It is this straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, which corroborates the actual existence of the iniquity. Expediency or a "good" end made the deed necessary, but the letter of the law was to be respected, so that these religionists might "think they had a good conscience!"

¹ Compendium Privilegiorum et Gratiarum Soc. Jesu. Ant. 1635.

body, over the back and under the knees, screwing the hoop closer and closer, until the blood started from the nostrils, even from the hands and feet. They had also iron gauntlets, to compress the wrists, and thus to suspend the prisoner in the air. Lastly, they had what they called "little ease"—a cell so small and so constructed that the prisoner could neither stand in it, walk, sit, nor lie at full length.¹ Rome's, Spain's, Portugal's Inquisitorial atrocities imitated by Protestants! Was it a horrible inconsistency, or a dreadful RETRIBUTION by Providence permitted to teach "religious" men that forbearance which was never spontaneous in their hearts, ever possessed by the fiend of persecution? We abhor these cruelties of England's ministers: but they must not be contemplated without refreshing the memory with their prototypes, the cruelties of Rome's Inquisition:—the Protestant party in England did not invent, they only imitated the horrible atrocities which the Catholic party, at that time at least, deemed imperative to protect and establish the religion of Rome. And we may ask what right had these leaders of Rome to complain of their treatment, when it was exactly what they were prepared to inflict on the heretics in the land of orthodoxy? Nor must the fact be passed over, that these leaders of Romanism based their base hopes of ultimate success on these very atrocities. Yes, they speculated with the blood of their slaughtered brothers. Listen to the Jesuit's remark on the persecution. It is probably written by the "fierce-natured" Parsons. After repeating the torments as above, he exclaims: "But in proportion as *her womanish fury*

¹ Lingard, viii. 424, quoting the Jesuit Bartoli, whose information came from the Jesuit Parsons.

was armed for the destruction of the Catholic name, so on the other hand, equally, the minds of the Catholics were excited to resistance, impelled by their valour, and their fixed obedience to the Pope of Rome, as also by the admonitions and persuasion of the English youths who were sent over from the seminaries at Rheims, and Rome ;—for these men, inflamed with the desire of restoring the Catholic religion, and prepared with the aids of learning, either confirmed many in their belief, or converted them to the faith.”¹

It is impossible to arrive at the exact truth from the conflicting accounts of Protestants and Catholics, with regard to the treatment, trial, and death of
 Trial and death of
 Campion.
 Campion.² The latter represent him as boldly declaring his allegiance to the queen, and his opposition to the papal bull : the former assert that after his condemnation he declared, that should the pope send forces against the queen, he would stand for the pope ;—after having refused to answer the question whether Elizabeth was “a right and lawful Queen.”³

¹ Sed quantum ex unâ parte muliebris furor ad Catholicorum nomen excidentum armabatur ; tantum ex alterâ Catholicorum animi ad resistendum excitabantur ; idque tum suâ ipsi virtute, insitâque genti Romani Pontificis obedientiâ, tum vero Anglorum adolescentium qui ex Remensi Romanoque seminariis in Angliam subinde mittebantur monitis et suasu.”—*Ann. Lit.* 1583. Miss. Angl. My reason for attributing this letter to Parsons is the fact that as the head of the mission it devolved upon him to write such letter ; and, secondly, in the same letter, he refers for more details to the well-known book (afterwards published) which he wrote on the Persecution in England—“sicut in eo libro, qui de persecutione Anglicanâ impressus est, copiosè exponitur : quo facilius excusari possum, si in hac missione exponendâ, brevior.”—*Ib.*

² Camden, Ann. 1581. Compare Butler, i. 406, *et seq.* ; Ling. viii. 146. Continuat. of Holingshed, p. 456 (hideous in truth), Hist. del glorioso Martirio di diciotto sacerdoti, &c., 1585 by Parsons. See also Hallam, i. 145.

³ Amongst the awful pious falsehoods concocted by the Jesuits, they say that one of the twelve judges who condemned Campion “saw blood running from his glove ; he took it off, and found no wound, and nevertheless all he did to stop it, could not prevent the bleeding until the end of that sanguinary and unjust

Unquestionably the charges of treason against Campion were not legally proven ; nor was there ever more justice in the condemnations of the Inquisition. Surely no man will say that the poor Calvinist whom Lainez tried to convert before they burnt him at Rome, was justly condemned to the flames. Let us therefore abhor both transactions equally as to the facts—but we may be permitted to award some excuse to the Protestant party of England, whose cruelties were in their own estimation justified by the direct consequences of the Jesuit's machinations, striking as they did at Protestant ascendancy, and the stability of Elizabeth's royal power, and perhaps, her very existence. Let me not be misunderstood. I pity the fate of this Jesuit. I abhor the persecution of the Catholics. But in like manner do I feel with respect to the heretics and Jews murdered by the Catholics for the faith. I look upon the mere facts in the case of the Catholics as a providential retribution: but at the same time, I cannot see anything in Allen's scheme, and that of the Jesuits, but a direct tendency to subvert the existing government in England. One of the prisoners, Bosgrave, a Jesuit, Rishton, a priest, and Orton, a layman, on being asked what part they would take in case an attempt were made to put the papal bull in execution, "gave satisfactory answers," says Dr. Lingard, and "they saved their lives." It seems to me that had Campion said as much, he would have

action!" They call this "a thing altogether prodigious—*tout prodigieuse*." Recueil de quelques martyrs, &c., in the Tableaux, p. 440. The same authority contradicts the statement of Parsons about the prediction of Campion's martyrdom given by a "youth" at "Prague." The author of the Tableaux locates it at Rome, just before Campion's departure, and makes the prophet a "man"—slight contradictions, perhaps, but meseems very significant of that glorious invention which ever characterised the Jesuits.

been spared—at least this is the inference. Dr. Lingard very properly observes : “ At the same time it must be owned that the answers which six of them gave to the queries were far from being satisfactory.¹ Their hesitation to deny the opposing power (a power then indeed *maintained by the greater number of divines in Catholic kingdoms*) rendered their loyalty very problematical, in case of an attempt to enforce the bull by any foreign prince.”² Liberty of conscience, offered to all Catholics who would abjure the temporal pretensions of the pontiff, would have been the proper remedy to be

¹ “ For amongst other questions that were propounded unto them, this being one, viz. If the pope do by his bull or sentence pronounce her Majesty to be deprived, and no lawful *queen*, and her subjects to be discharged of their allegiance and obedience unto her ; and after, the pope, or any other by his appointment and authority, do invade this realm ; which part would you take, or which part ought a good subject of *England* to take ? Some answered, that when the case should happen, they would take counsel what were best for them to do ; another, that when that case should happen, he would answer, and not before ; another, that for the present, he was not resolved what to do in such a case ; another, that when the case happeneth, then he will answer ; another, that if such deprivation and invasion should be made, for any matter of his faith, he thinketh he were then bound to take part with the pope. Now what king in the world, being in doubt to be invaded by his enemies,” &c. &c.—*Import. Consid. by us the Secular Priests*, 1601.

² Hist. viii. 150. Fuller says that Campion was a man of excellent parts ; though he who rode post to tell him so, might come too late to bring him tidings thereof ; being such a valuer of himself, that he swelled every drop of his ability into a bubble by his vain ostentation. And indeed few who were reputed scholars had more of Latin, or less of Greek, than he had. . . . His *Ten Reasons*, so purely for Latin, so plainly and pithily penned, that they were very taking, and fetched over many (neuters before) to his persuasion. . . . Some days after he was engaged in four solemn disputations, to make good that bold challenge he had made against all Protestants : “ he scarcely answered the expectations raised of him,” says Camden ; “ and in plain truth,” continues Fuller, “ no man did ever boast more when he put on his armour, or had cause to boast less when he put it off ”—but then consider that a dose of the *rack* was a very poor stimulant to the Jesuit's brain and tongue, although they say it was a mild one. “ Within a few days the queen was necessitated, for her own security, to make him the subject of severity, by whose laws he was executed in the following December, 1581.”—*Worthies*, i. 382. “ To Campion's *Reasons* Whitaker gave a solid answer,” says Camden.

applied by Elizabeth and her council, says Dr. Lingard;¹ and so it would, had there been no Allen's Seminary-priests, no Jesuits to uphold "obedience to the Roman pontiff—*Romani pontificis obedientiam*,"—and to inflame their deluded dupes with their "admonitions and persuasion—*monitis ac suasu*."² To the infamous bull of the sainted Pope Pius V., to Allen's misguided scheme, to the sworn fidelity of the Jesuits in the service of the pope and his royal colleague of Spain—to these historical plagues must be ascribed all the calamities which befel the deluded and pitiable Catholics of England. In writing of these transactions historians fail to draw attention to the main cause of these struggles on the one hand, and tortures on the other. The question was, which ascendancy there was to be—Protestant or Catholic? The Pope, Allen, and the Jesuits, were on one side,—Elizabeth and her Ministers on the other. The sufferings that ensued were the expected price of the struggle.

Averse to all manner of ascendancies, whether political or religious, yet I for one exult that the Protestant ascendancy was never utterly shaken, and that it has reached the present times; simply because under that ascendancy we have freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of action—which were never, and never will be compatible with Catholic ascendancy. By this freedom, time enables us to correct the abuses which came from Rome; so that even Catholics have reason to rejoice that those elements are essential to Protestantism, which is necessarily tolerant by *nature* (if the phrase be allowed) and which became a persecutor only by an impulse from Rome, the gigantic persecutor of the universe.

¹ *Ubi suprâ*, p. 150.

² Ann. Litt. as before.

Parsons did not wait to see Campion executed ; he “fled to the Continent,”¹—“preferring the duty of watching over the infant Church to the glory of martyrdom,” if I may borrow Lingard’s phrase applied to John Knox on his departure from Scotland to Geneva. Henceforth he will tempest his country by his writings and machinations ; and whilst he will be the cause of desperate unrest and suffering to others, he will keep his own skin perfectly whole—just as it should be for the comfort and consolation of all intriguers. Like a skilful general when baffled by an unsuccessful attack on the enemy’s van, he shifted his operations to the rear or flank,—casting his eyes towards Scotland. It was nothing less than an attempt to convert James VI. of Scotland, the son of Mary Queen of Scots, then imprisoned in England. Parsons sent an embassy to the young king, then in his fifteenth year. The Jesuit Creighton was the leader. Young as he was, James resolved to turn the affair to his own account. He promised to connive at the silent introduction of the Catholic missionaries ; he would even receive one at his court as his tutor in the Italian language ; he would co-operate in any plan for the deliverance of his mother : but unfortunately he was a king without a revenue ; and poverty would compel him at last, unless relieved by the Catholic princes, to submit to the pleasure of Elizabeth. Thus did the wily young Scot set a trap for the Jesuit—and he caught him easily. Forthwith Parsons and Creighton went to Paris, where they met the Duke of Guise ; Castelli, the pope’s nuncio ; Tassis, the Spanish ambassador ; Beaton, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and Mary’s resident in the

Parsons de-
camps to the
Continent.

His ma-
nœuvres.

¹ Butler, i. 373.

French court ; Dr. Allen, the President of the Seminary at Rheims ; and the famous Père Matthieu, the provincial of the French Jesuits. A long consultation ensued. The general opinion was that Mary should be associated with her son on the Scottish throne, and that the pope and the King of Spain should be solicited to relieve the present pecuniary wants of the young king. It is probable that other projects with which we are unacquainted were also formed in this secret consultation, says Dr. Lingard : whatever they were, they afterwards obtained the assent of the captive queen, of the Scottish king, and cabinet, consisting of Lennox, Huntley, Eglinton, and other deep-schemed politicians, who doubtless had schooled James into his first hints about money-wants, and were resolved to work out the adroit contrivance. Parsons went to Valladolid and induced King Philip to promise the Scotchman a present of 12,000 crowns ; and the other Jesuit, Creighton, got the pope to promise to pay the expenses of a body-guard for the king's defence, amounting to 4000 crowns per annum.¹ But the English cabinet was made aware of the secret consultation at Paris, and the Jesuits' manœuvres in Scotland : what the English spies dis-

¹ "Paga annouale d'una guardia di soldati sufficienti a diffendere la persona del Re Jacopo."—*Bartoli*, p. 255. It was the French Jesuit Samnier who was the ambassador from this secret consultation to Mary. He entered England *en militaire*, accoutred in a doublet of orange satin, slashed and exhibiting green silk in the openings. At his saddle bow he displayed a pair of pistols, a sword at his side, and scarf round his neck. Pasquier asserts this fact on the authority of those whom he says "were not far from the Company." His endeavour was to excite a secret revolt among certain Catholic lords, against Elizabeth. This may be one of the "other projects" alluded to by Dr. Lingard, as I have stated. He induced Mary to embrace the project : but, according to Pasquier, the fellow had ulterior views in favour of the Spaniard, and ceased not to promote them through the instrumentality of the captive queen. "You may conclude," adds Pasquier, "that she had no other forgers of her death than the Jesuits."—*Catéchis.* c. xv. p. 250.

covered, the English cabinet turned to account, and forthwith organised a new revolution in Scotland, the result of which was that the young king was thrown completely into the hands of the Protestant party ; and the Scottish preachers from the pulpit pointed the resentment of their hearers against the men who had sought to restore an idolatrous worship, and to replace “an adulteress and assassin on the throne.” Thus was Parsons once more baffled by Elizabeth and her men. Was it not enough to rouse the Jesuit to the utmost of his efforts, after biting his nails to the quick ? The announcement of these transactions, so fatal to his scheme, came whilst he was discussing the subject with Philip :—but he fructified his visit notwithstanding. He induced the king to give an annual pension of 2000 crowns for the support of more priests at the Seminary of Rheims ; and to promise to ask for a cardinal’s hat for Allen—by way of giving more dignity and effect to the scheme of conversion and all its machinations.¹

Again was a secret consultation held at Paris between the Guise, Beaton, the pope’s nuncio, and the Jesuit-provincial, Père Matthieu. The present object was to devise a plan for the liberation of ^{Machinations.} Mary : the duke was to land with an army in the south of England : James was to penetrate by the north with his Scottish forces ; and *the English friends of the Stuarts should be summoned to the aid of the injured queen.* This project was imparted to Mary by the French ambassador, to James by Holt, the English Jesuit.² Here, then, we have an admitted fact attesting

¹ Lingard, viii. 159, *et seq.* ; More, 113, *et seq.* ; Bartoli, 242—245.

² Ling. *ubi suprâ.* 164.

a political scheme against England ; a Jesuit provincial is one of the framers ; the pope lends his sanction by his nuncio ; and a Jesuit is the messenger to one of the prime agents. Assuredly it must now be evident that the English cabinet did not proceed against the Jesuits on unfounded rumours. The scheme failed in the issue : Mary refused her assent, being aware that her keepers had orders to put her to death if any attempt were made to carry her away by force. It was soon after these transactions that the Jesuit Creighton was captured and sent to the Tower, where, in the presence of the rack, he disclosed all the particulars of the projected invasion which had so long alarmed Elizabeth.¹

Numberless schemes and plots succeeded, and failed by the vigilance of Elizabeth and her council : but each was cruelly followed by redoubled persecution against the poor Catholics of England. The innumerable spies of the British government perpetually added harassments to the agitated debates, whose object was to frustrate the schemes of the enemy and fortify the throne of England. Poor Queen of Scots—unfortunate indeed, since she was made a misery to herself and to all who professed her religion in England. It is impossible to form an adequate idea of the condition of the English Catholics during that period, when the Jesuit faction exhausted all their resources to bring

¹ Ling. 172. Respecting the papers found with Creighton, Dr. Lingard says : “ Creighton had torn his papers and thrown them into the sea, but the fragments were collected, and among them a paper, written in Italian about two years before, showing how England might be successfully invaded.”—*Sadler*, ii. 401. “ I suspect,” continues Lingard, “ that a paper in Strype is a translation of it.”—*Strype*, iii. 414. In his confession Creighton detailed all the particulars of the consultation at Paris ; but added that the invasion was postponed till the troubles in the Low Countries should be ended.—*Sadler*, *ib.* See p. 363 of the present volume.

about her deliverance, by the invasion of England and the simultaneous rebellion of the partisans whom that faction continually fed with the hope of Catholic restoration. It is not the effort of Mary herself to effect her deliverance that I denounce. That was but natural. Her captivity was unjust, however expedient it might be thought by the British government : but nothing can justify the recklessness with which her partisans entered into the wildest projects, in spite of previous experience, and ever destined to fail in their objects, but sure to redouble the pitiless vengeance of the Protestant party in England. But, on the one hand, whilst “ Verily there were at this time some subtle ways taken to try how men stood affected ; counterfeit letters privily sent in the name of the Queen of Scots and the fugitives, and left in Papists’ houses ; spies sent abroad up and down the country to take notice of people’s discourse, and lay hold of their words ; reporters of vain and idle stories admitted and credited ; many brought into suspicion, amongst the rest the Earl of Northumberland ; the Earl of Arundel, his son, was confined to his house, his wife was committed to custody ; ”—whilst such were the proceedings on the one hand, still on the other we read, and from the same pen, that “ Neither yet are such ways for discovery, and easy giving credit, to be esteemed altogether vain, where there is fear for the prince’s safety. Certain it is, at this time a horrid piece of popish malice against the queen discovered itself : for they set forth books wherein they exhorted the queen’s gentlewomen to act the like against the queen, as Judith had done with applause and commendations against Holofernes. The author was never discovered, but the suspicion lighted upon Gregory

Defence of
the queen
and council.

Martin, an Oxford man, one very learned in the Greek and Latin tongues. Carter, a bookseller, was executed, who procured them to be printed. And whereas the Papists usually traduced the queen as rigid and cruel, she who was always careful to leave a good name and memorial behind her, was highly offended with the inquisitors that were to examine and discover Papists, as inhumanely cruel towards them, and injurious to her honour She commanded the inquisitors to forbear tortures, and the judges to refrain from putting to death. And not long after she commanded seventy priests, some of which were condemned, and others in danger of the law, to be transported out of England : amongst whom those of chiefest note were Jaspar Haywood, son to that famous epigrammatist, who was the first of all the Jesuits that came into England ; James Bosgrave, of the Society of Jesus also ; John Heart, the most learned of all the rest ; and Edward Rishton, that impious, ungrateful man to his prince, to whom, though he owed his life, yet he soon after set forth a book wherein he vomited out the poison of his malice against her.”¹

¹ Camden, Ann. 1584. There was one very remarkable exception to this large jail-delivery of confessors—the Jesuit Thomas Pond, whom Parsons visited at the Marshalsea, and who published Campion’s letter to the queen and council. The history of this poor fellow is most touchingly interesting : when we consider his calamities, we are almost compelled to excuse his conduct with regard to the publication of Campion’s imprudent letter. His early history also throws some light on the character of Elizabeth—in no favourable point of view, however. I shall follow Pond’s own narrative as given by the Jesuit Bartoli. He was a gentleman by birth and fortune : his mother was sister to the Earl of Southampton. Remarkable for manly beauty and stature, as well as mental accomplishments, he attracted Elizabeth’s attention at the College of Winchester, where, as a student, he had the honour of complimenting the queen with a Latin poem, which he recited on the occasion of a royal visit to the college. His father died, leaving the youth master of a fortune, which he resolved to enjoy to the utmost. The court of Elizabeth was the object of his ardent desire ; its splen-

At length the fate of Mary Queen of Scots was pronounced. There can be no doubt that the unfortunate queen went to great lengths in her declarations to the Spaniard Mendoza, Philip's ambassador, who, after his expulsion from England, never ceased

Mary Queen
of Scots.

dours and delights were his attraction. Thither he hastened : the smiles of his queen charmed away his religion : he conformed to that of his royal mistress. From Christmas to the Epiphany, a ceaseless round of amusements, balls, and musical entertainments, gave fresh animation to the English court ; and in the year 1569, no courtier figured with greater lustre than Thomas Pond. His expenditure was lavish, and he danced to admiration. It appears that his ambition was to excel in a feat, now exclusively confined to female opera-Camillas, namely, to rise, sustaining the body on one toe, and thus to perform a pirouette, or twirl round and round with great velocity, but without giddiness and a fall. Pond performed the feat with immense applause ; the courtiers shouted approbation ; the queen, by way of reward, gave him her hand ungloved, and turning to Leicester, her favourite, she took his hat and sent it to Pond to cover his head, as he was very warm after his feat, and in a profuse perspiration. Interludes succeeded whilst the dancer took rest. The Queen requested him to repeat his performance. He gladly assented. Gloriously he went through the preliminary steps, and came at length to the all-important and most expected pirouette. He made the effort, but alas ! his head swam round faster than his body—giddiness overpowered him—he fell to the ground with violence. Peals of bitter laughter resounded ; cutting sarcasms lacerated the courtier's heart ; but the cruellest cut of all was, that the queen did not give him her hand, nor take his part ; on the contrary, “ as if in revenge for his having thus disgraced the entertainment, brim-full of disgust she said to him, ‘ Get thee up, ox,’ and thus redoubled the laughter around, and the poor fellow's confusion. Pond got up, and with one knee on the ground, bending low, he muttered these solemn words :—‘ *Sic transit gloria mundi*—thus passeth away the glory of the world.’ ” He retired from the court, where he was never seen again, nor in London. Shame and inward disgust buried him in retirement at Belmont, his mansion. He then returned to his religion, and to God, practising great austerities. Some of the letters from the Jesuit-missionaries in India fell into his hands : the wonderful adventures, labours, and conversions there related inspired him with the wish to join the Company. He applied for admission ; and ere the answer came from Rome, he was imprisoned for the faith : but he was accepted by the general, and took the vows in prison in the year 1578. Long was his bitter, and as far as we are aware, innocent captivity. He was confined in ten different prisons during the space of thirty years, and “ in that space,” said he, in a letter to Parsons in 1609, “ four thousand pounds spoil suffered of my substance.” On one occasion, when brought before the Court, he says, “ laying my hand upon the breast of my cloak, I protested to them that I would not change it for the queen's crown.” He had a good esquire's estate, but it was so pillaged by fines

to machinate the destruction of Elizabeth. A catholic conspiracy—the deliverance of Mary Stuart—these were the projects uppermost with the stirring Philip of Spain. The Queen of Scots wrote to Mendoza, saying : “ The bearer is charged to impart to you certain overtures in my behalf, considering the obstinacy so great of my son in heresy, which I assure you I have bewailed and lamented night and day, more than my own calamity, and foreseeing on that score the great damage which thence will result to the catholic church by his succeeding to the throne of this kingdom, I have taken the resolution, in case my said son does not submit to the catholic church before my death, to cede and give by will my right to the said succession of the crown, to the king your master. I beg you again to keep this very secret, the more, because were it revealed, it would, in France, cause the loss of my dowry, in Scotland, the complete rupture with my son, and in this country, my total ruin and destruction. Marie.”¹

“ Certain English critics,” says the deep-searching Capefigue, “ have believed that many of the documents

and exactions, that even his enemies were ashamed of their cruelty. “ Yea, Salisbury himself upon my plaint, telling him that our gospel taught out of Christ’s own mouth, that it was more blessed to give than to take away, as they had taken so much from me, took so much compassion on me for his own honour, as to give me back £20 for my relief of £200, which from a ward that fell to me of one of my tenants, he had taken from me and given to his secretary.” Of course it was only by dispensation that Pond was permitted to retain his patrimonial rights, deemed expedient for the province. The good old Cavalier-Jesuit subscribes himself to *Parsons*, “ one of your most devoted children, although hitherto least beneficial.” At length James I. restored the venerable confessor to liberty ; and in 1615 he actually died in the very same apartment at Belmont, in which he was born seventy-six years before ! The queen and council must have had some good reason for keeping him so long in durance vile ; perhaps they feared his resentment. James probably knew nothing of his history.—Bartoli, lib. i. p. 51, *et seq.* ; Oliver, Collect.

¹ Archives of Simancas ; apud Capefigue, p. 40.

produced at the trial were forged by Elizabeth in order to destroy her rival : but there remain in the archives of Simancas, certain documents too decisive and too important to permit the possibility of still denying the participation of Mary in the grand projects of Philip II. against the Protestant crown of England.”¹ The Jesuits had stirred all Christendom, with Mary for their watchword : they had been her advisers : one of them attended her for some time during her captivity, in the quality of physician :—but all to no purpose : their address failed by the superior craft of the English cabinet ; and the Spaniard’s gold was as powerless as his armaments were destined to prove against Britain. Mary Queen of Scots was executed in 1587. Mary Her execu-
tion. could not escape her fate : she suffered like a strong woman ; as admirable in her death as she was beautiful and captivating in life.² Deep was the

¹ Capef. La Ligue et Henri IV. p. 38.

² After all that has been said for and against the conduct of Elizabeth in putting Mary to death, it is somewhat curious to find that the Jesuit Ribadeneyra ascribes her fate to a veritable judgment of Heaven, for having tolerated heresy against the opinion of good Catholics, and for not having “murdered the bastard Stuart, their chief—*tolerò las heregias contra el parecer de los buenos Catolicos, y no quiso que matassen al bastardo Stuard que era cabeça dellos*” (!) This is a quoted opinion expressed to Henry III., and sanctioned by this Jesuit-patriarch. He superadds his own as follows :—“In this example we see how different are the judgments of God and those of men. For the Queen of Scotland, when for reasons of state, she connived at the heretics of her kingdom, these were numerous and powerful, and she was a woman and young, and without experience, and she followed the advice of those whom she had by her side, and told her it was better to conciliate than endanger the loss of all, which are all reasons that may excuse her in our eyes. But the Lord, who is most jealous of his honour, and who does not wish that kings, whom he has honoured above all other men, should be careless of it, punished the Queen on one hand with justice, depriving her of her kingdom and liberty, and afflicting her with so long an imprisonment, and with a treatment unworthy of her royal person ; and on the other hand, ending her miseries with so glorious an end as was the sacrifice of her life for her *most holy faith* [which is decidedly a new view] and for the same religion which she had at first defended with less firmness.”—*Tradad. de la Relig.* c. xv. 91.

impression made by the fall of that royal head : all Europe shuddered at the tale—pity and indignation shared the feelings of humanity. Pope Pius IV. had put to death the nephews of Paul IV., on the flimsiest pretences, and unjustly : no indignant sound boomed forth : the very representatives of all the world's morality at the time, the Jesuits, kissed his guilty hands with as much fervour as before. There was now, however, in the case of the unfortunate Queen of Scots an important difference : she had been the nucleus of the Catholic movement in England, whilst England was connected with France, was an object of anxious desire to the papal party, and was the hope of the Spaniard, whose influence then, in the shape of gold, extended over Europe. It required all these considerations to enlist the sympathies of the Catholic world at that time in the fate of Mary Queen of Scots.

That event accelerated the glorious Armada which Philip was preparing to crush Elizabeth. The pope's approval was demanded by the Spaniard, who also suggested that Allen might be made a cardinal, for the purpose of coming to England as legate, with a commission to reconcile the country to the communion of Rome, and to confirm the conquest to the Spanish crown—should the expedition prove successful. Philip also demanded an aid of money from the pope. All the former requests were complied with readily by Sixtus V. ; but the subsidy—the money—a million of crowns—was to be paid when the invading army should have landed in England—a provision which at once shows the deep sagacity of the cunning Sixtus, who knew the value of money. If England were reduced to the dominion of Rome, the

Preliminaries
to the Spanish
Invasion.

million of crowns would be a very advantageous investment ; which however could never be said respecting its application to a mere attempt. Allen was ordered to prepare an explanatory address to be dispersed among the people on the arrival of the Armada ; and he complied. The result of his pious meditations was the famous *Admonition to the nobility and people of England and Ireland, concerninge the present warres, made for the execution of his holines' sentence, by the highe and mightie Kinge Catholicke of Spaine.*"¹ There can be but one opinion on this precious document ; and it shall be expressed by one of the most candid writers that ever honoured the church of Rome. "This publication," says Mr. Tierney, "the most offensive, perhaps, of the many offensive libels sent forth by the party to which Allen had attached himself, was printed at Antwerp, and, in a tone of the most scurrilous invective, denounced the character and conduct of the queen ; portrayed her as the offspring of adultery and incest, a lascivious tyrant, and an unholy perjurer ; and concluded by calling upon all persons, 'if they would avoide the pope's, the kinge's, and the other prince's highe indignation,' if they would escape 'the angel's curse and malediction upon the inhabitantes of the land of Meros,' to rise against a woman odious alike to God and man, to join the liberating army upon its landing, and thus to free themselves from the disgrace of having 'suffered such a creature, almost thirtie yeares together, to raigne both over their bodies and soules, to the extinguishinge not onely of religion, but of all chaste livinge and honesty.'" To increase the effect of this

The "Admonition."

A Catholic's opinion of the thing.

¹ Ling. viii. 271 ; Tierney (Dodd) iii. 28 (note) ; Strada, Ann. 1558.

address, its substance was, at the same time, compressed into a smaller compass, and printed on a broadside, for more general distribution. It was called, "A Declaration of the sentence of deposition of Elizabeth, the usurper and pretended Quene of Englande."

"Our said Holy Father," declared this broadside, "of his benignity, and favour to this enterprise, out of the spirituall treasures of his church, committed to his custody and dispensation, graunteth most liberally to all such as assist, concurr, or help in any wise, to the deposition and punishment of the above-named persons, and to the reformation of these two Countreyes, *Plenary Indulgence* and pardon of all their sinnes, being duly penitent, contrite, and confessed, according to the law of God, and usual custome of Christian people."

"The ostensible author of the Admonition," says Mr. Tierney, "was Allen, who inserted his name, as 'Cardinal of Englande,' in the title-page, and thus rendered himself answerable for its contents. Still, Watson and others constantly maintained that it was really Parsons is its author. penned by Parsons; a charge which Parsons himself, in his Manifestation, (35, 47), rather evades than denies. In another work, however, he notices the accusation of his having '*helped* the cardinal to make his book,' and to that replies at once, by denouncing it as a 'lie' (Answer to O. E., p. 2, apud Warneword)."¹ The underlining of the word "helped," with the delicate "lie," is not what Pallavicino, another Jesuit, would call a "solid lie," but it is an arrant equivocation notwithstanding,—as who should say, I did not *help*

¹ Dodd's Church History, iii. 29. See also Watson's *Important Considerations*, &c. for a comprehensive analysis of the book; Mendham's Edit. 57, *et seq.*; and for a systematic digest of the atrocious production, see Lingard, viii. 446, note Q.

him : I wrote it for him. And now it seems to me that this Admonition to which Allen lent his name, and which is brought home to the Jesuit Parsons, attests at once the opinions entertained in England, as expressed by Camden, respecting the sentiments and doctrines of Allen's seminary-priests and the Jesuit missionaries.¹ The forceful energy of these hideous sentiments declared by the Admonition and broadside declaration, could scarcely be inspired on the spur of the moment, when the Armada was ready to put the bull into execution. No other inference is admissible ; and therefore I appeal to this last demonstration, for the opinions I have all along expressed on the machinations of the missionary faction in England. History must be grateful to the Armada of Spain for this important elucidation. All who feel an interest in the veneration due to pure religion, must exult to find that the disastrous consequences of the missionary inculcations in England, resulted from the *abuse* of the religious sentiment in men, resulted as the terrible retribution awarded to crime by a superintending Providence. Those who represented themselves as the messengers of peace and salvation, were the roaring bellows of sedition

Pertinent
conclusions.

¹ Amongst the *Important Considerations of us, the Secular Priests*, we find as follows :—"In these tumultuous and rebellious proceedings by sundry Catholics, both in England and Ireland, it could not be expected but that the Queen and the State would be greatly incensed with indignation against us. We had (some of us) greatly approved the said rebellion, highly extolled the rebels, and pitifully bewailed their ruin and overthrow. Many of our affections were knit to the Spaniard : and for our obedience to the pope, we all do profess it. The attempts both of the pope and Spaniard failing in England, his holiness, as a temporal prince, displayed his banner in Ireland. The plot was to deprive her highness first from that kingdom (if they could) and then by degrees to depose her from this. In all these plots none were more forward than many that were priests. The *Laity*, if we had opposed ourselves to these designments, would (out of doubt) have been over-ruled by us. How many men of our calling were addicted to these courses, the State knew not."

and incendiary Pharisees. Had these priests and these Jesuits directed their efforts to conciliate rather than exasperate the queen and the government, far different would have been the result. But what was their practice must be evident from the sentiments expressed in this Admonition and declaration of the leaders. The man who penned those horrible and disgusting sentiments, had journeyed far and wide throughout the country, whilst the cruel measures of the crown against the scapegoat Catholics gave him the best opportunity for exasperating the people's rancour against their queen, preparatory to the Spaniard's invasion. Even that very persecution was made the means of stimulating foreign hatred against the queen and government of England. Parsons wrote an account of it, as I have stated, and it was translated into several languages, and scattered over Europe. Wherever there were Jesuits, hatred to the Queen of England was not wanting, if it depended on the representations of the Jesuits ; but none could equal the "Polypragmon" Parsons, whose monster-heart was at length gratified when the "bulky dragons of the grand Armada" sped forth from the dark, deep waters of Vigo.¹

Spain's mighty armament made sail. Eager were the hungry billows to swallow down the boastful and blaspheming Goliaths : they were denied their meal yet awhile ; and down upon Albion bore that gallant fleet which half the forests of Galicia

The grand
Armada.

¹ "The memory of which attempt," say the Secular Priests before quoted, "will be (as we trust) an everlasting monument of Jesuitical treason and cruelty. For it is apparent in a treatise penned by the advice of Father Parsons altogether (as we so verily think) that the King of Spaine was especially moved and drawn to that intended mischief against us, by the long and early solicitations of the Jesuits and other English Catholics beyond the seas, affected and altogether given to Jesuitism."—*Important Considerations*, 57.

had been felled to build, manned by all the sons of the Spanish seas, impressed from the thousand bays and creeks of the stern Cantabrian shore.¹ There were 8000 sailors and 19,000 soldiers. There were 135 ships of war : all the mysteries of heaven and the holy men of earth had their namesakes in the motley armament. There was the St. Louis, the St. Philip, the St. Bernard, the St. Christopher, the Maiden and She-Mouse, the Samson, the Little St. Peter, the Trinity, the Crucifix, and the Conception—all under the command of the Marquess Santa Crux, or the Holy Cross.² No lack of celestial patronage for Philip's glorious "idea." And whilst the indefatigable Jesuits stirred all Europe in the papal-Spanish cause, on every road were met bodies of volunteer-soldiers, noble or otherwise, hastening from Spain, and Germany, and Italy, to the place of the gathering—all impelled with one undoubted hope to crush the queen in her island-home.³ And what was the fleet that Elizabeth opposed to this awful visitation ? What the number of her men ? It were absurd to tell that computation against the Leviathans and myriads of Spain. Never was England less able to cope by numbers with the invader ; but the old age of Elizabeth was made youthful by an ardent heart and a vigorous mind, and she sought and she found a world-defying rampart in that *new* people whom the Reformation dashed into the political movement of the sixteenth century.⁴ Tough were the hearts that had defied Rome, with all her terrors—they might fear no other devilish foe—and they feared not the Spaniard and his invincible Armada. And the poor oppressed,

¹ Borrow's *Bible in Spain*, c. xxviii. 168.

² *Capefigue, La Ligue et Henri IV.* 42. ³ *Ling.* viii, 272. ⁴ *Capefigue*, p. 47.

persecuted Catholics—will they not now hail the mock sun of freedom, and rise in its deceitful blaze to crush their queen and country for the Spaniard? Some say they amounted to one half the population, which is very improbable; others raise the number to two-thirds, which is as absurd as it is improbable; still they were undoubtedly numerous; and if being two-thirds, as Allen and the Jesuits stated, they had still submitted to their queen, acknowledged her right to the throne, were *loyal*, why had they been stimulated to disaffection by their self-appointed teachers? By their own showing, have we not here a proof of that partisan-infatuation and downright treason which accompanied and motived the Catholic movement in England, impelled by the Jesuits and those seminary-priests who were managed by the Jesuits? And now, in the very teeth of the Spaniard's demonstration, contemptuously trampling on the base prospect of righting themselves by betraying their country, they stood forth to a man—loyal as God, as their country, as their own hearts imperatively willed—in utter defiance of that horrible abuse of religion, whereby their pope pretended to free them from their oaths of allegiance, and to justify the murder of their queen—the betrayal of their country.¹ *There*

¹ “And whereas, it is well known that the Duke of Medina Sidonia [the Spanish admiral after Santa Cruz] had given it out directly, that if once he might land in *England*, both Catholics and Heretics that came in his way should be all one to him: his sword could not discern them, so he might make way for his master, all was one to him.”—*Important Considerations by us, the Secular Priests*, 57. In effect, there is no doubt that Philip was the more easily induced to undertake this crusade against England, inasmuch as he had many things to avenge on Elizabeth. She had thwarted him as he deserved to be, on every occasion. Her ships had intercepted his ill-gotten treasures in the Indies; she had aided his enemies, the Netherlands, in their battle of freedom, civil and religious. The latter conduct was highly honourable to her, though the former and her dissimulation in both were reprehensible. Still, let it never

was the admitted end of the admitted machinations of the sacerdotal traitors. What a disappointment for these traitors—but how the heart of all humanity should exult to find that God, and nature, and our country's love, are infinitely more powerful, more influential in noble minds and hearts, than all the vile tricks, and craft, and machinations of sacerdotal iniquity. And thus it will ever be. Such will ever be the termination of sacerdotal abuses of man's religious sentiment : they will work out their own punishment amain : God and His providence, and humanity, will be justified—to the utter destruction of *all* sacerdotal pretensions, contrivances, machinations, and *influence* amongst men. *This* is the finality of that retribution which sacerdotal iniquity has deserved—and to this finality we are advancing—nay, half the providential work is already achieved. Bitter it is to record that the base fears generated by sacerdotal and Jesuitical machinations in England, suggested to some of Elizabeth's politicians the imitation of that Catholic monstrosity—the massacre of St. Bartholomew, whereat Philip so exulted, and the Pope of Rome gave holiday and sang *Te Deum*. These short-sighted politicians cruelly advised the queen to cut off the heads of the Catholic party in England. Such is the force of example. Henry VIII. had perpetrated a similar atrocity, when the pope instigated the emperor and the King of France to threaten invasion ; and the massacre of the French Protestants was still fresh in the memories of men. But Elizabeth rejected the barbarous advice. No trace

be forgotten, that was the very age of craft and roguery of all kinds, civil and religious ; in this respect, they were all nearly alike, if Philip was not worse than any.

of a disloyal project could be discovered : she therefore refused to dip her hands in the blood of the innocent, “ upon some pretence or other,” as they basely worded the infernal suggestion. Still she permitted the Catholics to be subjected to the severest trials. The “setters” ferreted more keenly than ever. Crowds of Catholics of both sexes, and of every rank, were dragged to the common jails throughout the kingdom. But no provocation could urge them to any act of imprudence. They displayed no less patriotism than their more favoured countrymen. The peers armed their tenants and dependents in the service of the queen. Some of the Catholic gentlemen equipped vessels, and gave the command to *Protestants* ; and many solicited permission to fight in the ranks as privates against the common enemy. But the Eternal seemed to interpose in behalf of Britain and her queen, and her loyal subjects, Catholic and Protestant. In truth, it could not be permitted that so crying an injustice as that of Rome and Spain should be crowned with success. Prodigies of valour were achieved by England’s pigmy fleet against the dragons of the invader. Fireships shot panic through the men of the flaming Inquisition—as by a judgment—and all was confusion ; then a mighty tempest undertook the battle of England. “Thou didst blow with thy wind—the sea covered them—they sank as lead in the mighty waters.” In a single night the invincible Armada sank in “the yeast of waves,”—a tribute to the *manes* of Loyola and the spirit of his legion. How the rejoicing waves exulted with the wrecks of that glorious armament—one hundred and twenty ships, with Spain’s best soldiers, her best trained mariners, down in the worrying waters, tearing them to pieces as the vultures

tear a carrion, and the gluttoned waves rejoiced and sported with the wrecks of that proud armament. Far along the coast of Scotland, Ireland, Denmark, Norway, the floating remnants sped and proclaimed Spain's downfall begun. England's destiny was developed, and the glorious prosperity and power of the persecuted Netherlanders dawned with that day when Spain was humbled. A single ship reached Spain—a crippled wreck—pierced on all sides, her masts shattered with shot, almost every man wounded, incapable of duty; from day to day they had flung their dead by sixes to the deep. Such was the end of Philip's gigantic enterprise—that project intended to establish Catholic unity *and* the immeasurable grandeur of *his* royal power. Pasquin, at Rome, announced that “The pope would grant, from the plenitude of his power, indulgencies for a thousand years, if any one would tell him for certain what had become of the Spanish Armada:—whither it had gone, whether it was lifted up to heaven or driven down to hell—or was somewhere hanging in the air, or tossing in a sea.”¹ What thought Philip when he heard the result? Heaven only knows: but he *said* these words: “I sent my army to punish the pride and insolence of the English, and not to fight with the fury of the winds and the rage of the troubled ocean. I thank God that I have still a few ships remaining after such a furious tempest;” and he forbade all public mourning, and among the survivors he distributed 50,000 crowns out of his Indian treasury.² Historians vary as to the *words* of Philip on this occasion: but most of them give him praise for the same; and

¹ Nares, iii. 385.

² Philip had a million of ducats yearly from Peru; and one-fifth of twenty millions brought from the other Indies yearly.—MS. *Bib. Cotton. Jul. F.* vi. 142.

Dr. Lingard, otherwise so shrewd, calls this “the magnanimity of Philip.” For my part, I perfectly agree with the Catholic Condillac, who says : “I would admire the sentiment, perhaps, if he had not had the imprudence to reject the advice of the Duke of Parma.¹ I say *perhaps*, because I do not think that the courage of a sovereign consists in evincing insensibility, whilst his subjects are perishing around him : especially, if he has not foreseen that there are winds and waves on the ocean. Whilst his generals were winning the battle of St. Quentin, he remained in his tent between two monks, with whom he was praying to heaven for victory ; and he did not go out until he was informed of the total defeat of the French. A king who watches over his own safety with so much prudence is willingly rash when he only exposes his soldiers ; and when he suffers loss, his seeming fortitude is only the mask of a vain mind, which will not admit its errors.”²

¹ Parma advised the reduction of Flushing before the invasion ; and Sir William Stanley, one of the Catholic traitors of England, in the king’s service, had advised the occupation of Ireland as a measure necessary to secure the conquest of England ; but the king would admit of no delay. Parsons had primed and loaded him—and he could not help going off. See *Lingard*, viii. 279.

² Hist. Mod. Ouvres, t. xxiv. p. 283. For the Armada and the catastrophe, see Ling. viii. 270—285 ; Capefigue, Ref. et Henry IV. p. 42, *et seq.* The Spanish clergy, who had prophesied the happy issue of this expedition to be certain, were much embarrassed, but at length laid the blame upon *the toleration afforded in Spain to the infidels*. All the Protestant powers rejoiced at the failure, for if England had fallen, they would scarcely have been able to resist ; but even the Catholic powers, who likewise dreaded the preponderating influence of Philip, did not much regret the issue. To Henry IV. of France it was of immediate advantage, and the independence of the Dutch was as good as decided. They, therefore, above all others, took part in the joy of the English, and struck medals in commemoration of the destruction of the Invincible Armada, with the inscription, *Venit, ivit, fuit*, (it came, it went, and was no more). Since that time, Spain has never recovered any decisive influence in the affairs of Europe. Some isolated moments of active exertion and bold enthusiasm have not been able to arrest the lamentable decay of the state and the people.—*Raumer, Polit. Hist.* i. 356.

Leaving England to follow up her advantages in the crippled condition of Spain—the Earl of Essex ravaging the coasts of Portugal, capturing Cadiz, advancing to Seville ; whilst Frobisher and Drake on the ocean winnowed the galleons of Spain, laden with Indian wares and virgin gold,—Lancaster pillaging Brazil,—Raleigh, Hawkins, Norris, and Cavendish, seizing the South Sea islands ;—and leaving the Jesuit Parsons and Allen still machinating in behalf of Spanish interests in England, amidst intestine bickerings and paper-warfare among the body of the still persecuted Catholics—let us contemplate the Jesuits in another field, and consider the religio-political opinions which, amidst the agitations of Europe, they advanced and defended. In France the Duke of Guise had reached the culminating point of his ambition, swaying the nation with higher prospects unconcealed. The stirring Spaniard, Philip II., was his master. The proud Guise vowed “a most faithful and most perfect obedience” to the golden monarch, whose design seems to have been universal sovereignty for himself, amidst Catholic unity for the pope, &c.¹ Orthodoxy, “religion,” were the pretences of Philip and all his humbled and obedient servants. The oath taken by all who joined the league, at once declares its nature and its aim. “I swear to God the Creator and under penalty of anathema and eternal damnation, that I have entered into this Catholic Association—according to the form of the treaty which has just been read to me—loyally, and sincerely, whether to command or to obey and serve ; and I promise, with my life and my honour, to continue therein to the last drop of my blood, without

The Catholic
league in
France.

¹ Capefigue, quoting a letter from Guise to Philip. Ref. et Henri IV. p. 51.

resisting it or retiring at any command, on any pretext, excuse, nor occasion whatever.”¹ Henry III., the King of France, finding himself circumvented by the Spanish or Catholic party, and made their tool, tore from them at once, and threw himself into the arms of the opposition, after causing the Duke of Guise to be murdered. This event roused the grand Catholic League or Association to open hostility, and bound it more closely to its motive head, the King of Spain. Pope Sixtus V. was its patron. He resented the fall of Guise : but when the duke’s brother, the Cardinal of Guise, also was assassinated, his indignation became religiously inexorable. Henry III. trembled not before the pope’s displeasure. His was not the resistance of manly vigour, but the petulant excitement of mental weakness, stimulated by the desperate position into which the machinations of party had thrown him. He thwarted the pope to the utmost. The Court of Rome made a prospective demand that he should declare Henry of Navarre (the future Henry IV.) incapacitated to succeed to the throne of France. Far from complying, the king struck an alliance with the Huguenot, whom he recognised as the lawful heir to the crown of France. This sealed his fate : —but many important events had led to the issue.

It is a striking fact that whilst the Protestant ascendancy of England maintained itself triumphant, and impregnable to the misguided efforts of the Jesuits and seminary-priests, the struggle against the Catholic ascendancy of France was most vigorous and determined —full of hope, and, in all appearance, driving to complete success in the accession of a Protestant king. It was this desolating prospect that inspired the oath

¹ Cretineau-Joly, ii. 388.

which the Leaguers swore to God Almighty. Catholic theorists amuse themselves with discovering in the League a grand result of religious reaction : and so it was, but let it be always understood as the religious reaction of a most despicably corrupt age—a most unchristian humanity. At the prospect of a Protestant—a Huguenot king, the Leaguers grew frantic ; and none were more desperate than the Jesuits. They joined and organised the insurrection.¹ It was favoured by Philip II. and the Pope—how could the Jesuits hold aloof ? The Jesuits were skilful negotiators ; the League gave them employment.² Samnier overran Germany, Italy, and Spain. Claude Matthieu won the title of the *League's Courier* by his indefatigable exertions in the cause. Henry III. complained to the pope respecting the ardour of the Jesuits in the agitation of which he had the good sense to disapprove, if not induced by fear for his own security. To their general, Aquaviva, he notified his wish that only French Jesuits should for the future be appointed to govern the houses and colleges of France.³ Now it happened that the famous Auger possessed the confidence of the king ; and it also happened that Père Matthieu was a kind of foreigner, although the provincial of Paris ; and so Matthieu accused Auger, his brother Jesuit, of jealousy and ambition—giving him credit for the move. He was nevertheless superseded in his office, and Odon Pigenat was named his successor.⁴ When Matthieu

¹ Cretineau, ii. 391.

² Id. ib. 392.

³ Id. ib. 393.

⁴ The council-faction of the *Sixteen*, so called because they ruled the sixteen wards of Paris, was sometimes graced by the presence of this Jesuit, for the purpose of moderating “the fury of that execrable tribunal,” if we may believe the Jesuit Richeome.—*Documents, ubi suprâ*. The Jesuit college in the Rue St. Jaques, was sometimes the rendezvous of these secret conspirators and traitors, in the service of the Spaniard. It was in the Jesuit houses that Mendoza, Aguillon, Feria, and other agents of Philip worked out their schemes and plots.—*Plaid. d'Arnaud, Les Jesuites Crim.* p. 200.

returned from Rome in 1585, the king ordered him to retire to Pont-à-Mousson, and menaced him with his anger should he disobey.¹ Aquaviva did not countenance the League, and the king resolved to put down its very active courier, Père Matthieu—the ring-leader of the Jesuit-section. The General of the Jesuits did more. He complained of Père Matthieu to the pope. It seems an extraordinary procedure for the general to appeal to the pope against his own subject: but it evidences the fact that Père Matthieu was under authority distinct from that of the Company and its Constitutions. Aquaviva earnestly requested the pope not to permit any Jesuit to meddle with combinations so foreign and dangerous to the Institute. “Give an order to confirm these words to Claude Matthieu,” said the general to the pope, “and permit me to send him into a country where he cannot be suspected of such negotiations.”² Pope Sixtus V. positively refused to accede to the petition. The Jesuit Leaguers Matthieu, Samnier,³ Hay,

¹ So far Cretineau and the Jesuits; but they do not state the object of his mission. He had been sent to Rome by the Leaguers in order to induce the pope to favour the rebellion and the enemies of the state. “We find,” says Mezeray, “by a letter of this Jesuit, which was given to the public, that the pope did not approve of the proposal to assassinate the king; but he advised the seizure of his person, so as to ensure the occupation of the towns under his authority.—*Abrégé Chron.* t. ii. 504, ed. 1755. *Annales*, t. i. p. 457, n. 3.

² Cretineau, ii. 395.

³ The facts which I have quoted from the last Jesuit-historian seem to prove all that the enemies of the Company lay to its charge in the troubles of the League. From Cretineau’s account, it is evident that the League owed much of its rapid development to the intrigues and doctrines of the Jesuits. The Jesuit Samnier was the first of the confraternity employed in the machinations. Pasquier styles him a man disposed and resolved for all sorts of hazards. He was sent in 1581 to all the Catholic princes to discover the prospects of affairs. A man better qualified could not be selected for the business. He could transform himself into as many forms as objects—sometimes dressed as a soldier, sometimes as a priest, at others, as a country clown. Games at dice, cards, &c. were as familiar to him as his breviary. He could change his name as easily as his garb. He visited successively, in his project, Germany, Italy and Spain. His

Commolet, the Rector of the Parisian House of the Professed, and other Jesuits enrolled under the banner of the League, "*only did their duty*," according to the pope's opinion.¹ Aquaviva forbade Matthieu to meddle with politics for the future, without his express permission. Nevertheless, soon after, he accepted a commission from the chiefs of the League, and set off for Italy. At Loretto he received a letter from Aquaviva, couched in the most respectful terms imaginable, according to the general's practice, but strongly and imperatively opposed to his return into France, "for a certain affair," which is not particularised (probably referring either to the seizure or the murder of the king); and expressly commanding him, in the most respectful terms, not to leave Loretto until further orders. He died in this exile, within fifteen months. "Inactivity killed him in 1587," says the historian of the Jesuits. Thus it appears that Aquaviva sided with the king, whose adviser was the Jesuit Edmond Auger.²

business was to represent to the sovereigns the danger of the Catholic religion in France, and the connivance of the king, Henry III., to that state of affairs, by secretly favouring the Huguenots.—*Pasquier, Cat. des Jesuites*, c. xi. In the alphabetical defence put forth by the Jesuits, touching the *Jesuit Leaguers*, *Samnier* is omitted; so we may suppose that nothing could be said in his favour.—*Documents*, i. ; *Jes. Lig.* p. 37.

¹ Cretineau, ii. 395, et Juvenc. Hist. Part V.

² At the moment of this his most exalted position, Edmond Auger becomes very interesting, particularly as we now find that the most determined adviser of heretic proscription is become indifferent, if not hostile, to the grand Catholic demonstration of France. Edmond Auger, when a youth, was a domestic or cook-assistant among the Jesuits at Rome. His disposition and apparent talents merited and won encouragement; the Jesuits set him to study, he advanced, figured in France as we have read, and finally became preacher and confessor to Henry III. This was a trying position, for Henry was one of the most profligate men of that most profligate age: still "he had principles of religion," as Father Origny the Jesuit, observes; and, we may add, that the same praise may be awarded to the worst men of the time—and its cause is to be found in the prevailing mania of the "religious" question on all sides. The confraternity of penitents invented by the Jesuits, or at least revived by them,

This Jesuit kept aloof, with the king, from the machinations of the League. Whether it was a clever stroke of policy in the general, the result of that calculation which computed the infallible catastrophe impending, is but a matter of conjecture: certain it is that though Aquaviva kept aloof, the Jesuit Leaguers in France were as active as ever, and even accused Auger of too great complacency towards Henry III., because he did not “throw himself into the League with his *habitual fervour*.” Aquaviva yielded or seemed to yield, and summoned Auger from the Court of France! Henry could not do without his father confessor, who “had felt the pulse of his conscience,” and appealed to the pope, craving his intervention. The pope complied, the general submitted, and Auger continued to feel the conscience-pulse of King Henry III. Meanwhile the Jesuit Leaguers, determined to achieve a triumph over heresy, had “fashioned themselves to a life half-religious, half-military, which the dangers, the predications, the enthusiasm of every hour rendered attractive to men of courage and men of faith.”¹ Many of the Jesuits were

pleased the king for some reasons unknown, and he took a part in them, dressed in a sack, and performed all the mummeries. Auger published, in 1584, a treatise on the subject, entitled “Metanoelogy [or, a discourse on repentance] touching the arch-congregation of penitents of Our Lady’s Annunciation, and all the other beautiful devout assemblies of the Holy Church.” The people objected to the practice, and branded it as hypocrisy; but the king liked these meetings, and the confessor humoured the disgusting fancy, for to suppose piety or devotion in Henry III. were absurd. He describes and boasts of these penitential coteries, and their practices, not forgetting their sacks, their girdles, the discipline or whipping, and fails not to be excessively severe on those ecclesiastics and laymen in great numbers who objected to the mummeries. Auger’s influence with the king was turned to the account of the Company; but he seems himself to have led an exemplary life in spite of his connection with the lewd and unprincipled king. His panegyrist, Origny, says that he appeared to several persons after his death. The same companion of Jesus tells us that Auger was the first Jesuit who had the *honour* to be confessor to the King of France.—*Vie du P. Edmond Auger, par Jean d’Origny*, p. 299, *et seq.* See also *Gregoire, Confess. des Rois*, p. 303, *et seq.*

¹ Cretineau, ii. 400.

massacred by the Huguenots : many of their colleges were sacked : but they received compensation in other numerous foundations,—when Aquaviva sent a visitor to investigate the state of the French provinces of the Company of Jesus. He also enjoined Auger to induce the king to permit his departure from that royal conscience whose pulse he had felt so deeply. The Jesuit left the king. He went to Lyons, and preached *against* the League. The people threatened to throw the Jesuit into the Rhone ; and he was ordered to leave the city within four-and-twenty hours. He went into retirement at Como.¹

It was immediately after the Jesuit's departure that Henry III. murdered the Duke of Guise. Then the pulpits blazed forth execrations, and heaped maledictions on the royal murderer. Seventy doctors of the Sorbonne released his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and called down upon his head all the wrath of heaven and earth ; and “a miserable little monk,” named Jacques Clement, plunged a knife into the stomach of the king ; and the wound was mortal. He had time enough, however, to make Henry of Navarre promise to punish those who had given him so much trouble, but, above all things, to get *himself instructed into a Catholic as soon as possible*,—and then he expired.² Henry was once before converted, we remember ; and as words cost him as little as deeds, he made the promise to the dying king who had acknowledged him for his successor. It seems to me highly probable, from the Jesuit narrative of all these transactions, that Aquaviva might have boldly “predicted” the murder of the

¹ Cretineau, ii. 401.

² Ranke, p. 172 ; Capefigue, c. ii. and iii. ; Cretineau, ii. 392, *et seq.* ; Cheverney, Mem. Ann. 1589, &c. &c.

Guises. It remains for us now to consider the curious doctrine of the Jesuits bearing at once upon the events both in England and in France, which have been just related.

The unlimited supremacy of the Church over the State was their aim—together with all the results of
 Papal supremacy and regicides. papal prerogatives. And how was that to be established? Not by kings, whose individual interests clashed with papal prerogatives—which in point of fact were the representatives, nay, the very substance of “the Church.” If not by the kings then, by whose overwhelming voice was the Supremacy of “the Church” or the Catholic Party to be established? By the *People*. Conscious of their growing influence and ability to govern and to direct the popular will, the Jesuits did not hesitate to advance the most sweeping democratic doctrines as a basis of their machinations. They deduced princely power from the people. They blended together the theory of the pope’s omnipotence with the doctrine of the people’s sovereignty. Bellarmine, their everlasting oracle, discovered that God had not bestowed the temporal authority on any one in particular:—whence it followed that he bestowed it on the masses. Therefore, the authority of the state is lodged in the people, and the people consign it sometimes to a single individual, sometimes to several: but the people perpetually retain the right of changing the forms of government, of retracting their grant of authority, and disposing of it anew. The Jesuits roundly asserted that a king might be deposed by the people for tyranny, or for neglect of his duties, and another be elected in his stead by the majority of the nation. Meanwhile the Catholic ascendancy was never for one moment out of view.¹ This salient motive everywhere

¹ Ranke.

dispels the illusion when a turbulent democrat brightens as he reads his justification by the Jesuit-doctors of the law. The Supremacy of the Church, or Catholic Ascendancy, must be the end of the people's enterprise. Kings are, indeed, responsible to the sovereign People : but the people are subject to the sovereign Pontiff. Such is the theory, but unfortunately the practice is totally distinct. Once rouse or justify, or countenance the revolt of a nation,—and then you must leave events and the human passions to work out the problem you have proposed. The only point on which you may count infallibly, is the fact of revolt : all beyond you must leave to the direction of events and the passions of men ; and all who pray will call upon Providence to avert or mitigate calamity. In the Jesuit doctrines on this interesting and most important subject, it is impossible to separate the ideal supremacy of the Church from the sovereignty of the People, which is merely the instrument of Church supremacy. Though the king is subject to the people, ecclesiastics are not subject to the king ; for “ the rebellion of an ecclesiastic against a king is not a crime of high treason, because he is not subject to the king.”¹ Thus taught the Jesuits by Emmanuel Sa, at the period in contemplation. Defending themselves by right divine, they decide the fate of kings and princes with a sweep of the pen. “ An infidel or heretic king endeavouring to draw his subjects to *his* heresy or infidelity, is not to be endured by Christians.” Passable enough ; but then who is to decide whether the conduct of the king comes under this ban ? “ It is the province of the sovereign pontiff to decide whether the king draws them into heresy or

¹ Emmanuel Sa, Aphorism. Confess. in verb. *Clericus*. “ Clerici rebellio in regem, non est crimen læsæ-majestatis, qui non est subditus regi.” — *Ed. Colon.* 1590.

not." This being assumed, the consequence is as follows :— "It is, therefore, for the pontiff to determine whether the king must be deposed or not.¹" What a wide field is here open to such a pope as Gregory XIII., who scrupled not to plunder so many barons on the pretence of musty parchments. And proclaimed in the very midst of the dreadful struggles for the religion of the sixteenth century, how powerfully such a doctrine must have operated to evolve the desperate "stirs" in Ireland and England, and in France—not without blood-guiltiness. It was, nevertheless, the doctrine put forth by Bellarmine—one of the most influential Jesuits—in 1596. Nay, "the spiritual power," *i. e.* the pope, may change kingdoms, and take them from one to transfer them to another, as a spiritual prince, if it should be necessary—for the *salvation of souls*."² What is the meaning of this proviso? I am unable to say—unless the doctrine was based on the Bull of Pope Alexander VI., who gave the Kings of Spain and Portugal the two hemispheres, dashing in a word for the "salvation of souls." But though we cannot understand the meaning of the proviso, we have but too plainly seen the result of the doctrine in the kingdom of England. Another Jesuit—and one of vast authority too—goes so far as to "wrench the words of Paul" to the destruction of regal or secular power. "The language of St. Paul," says Francis Tolet, in 1603, "is not opposed to it, who

¹ Non licet Christianis tolerare regem infidelem aut hereticum, si ille conetur protrahere subditos ad suum hæresim vel infidelitatem. At judicare an rex pertrahat ad hæresim necne, pertinet ad pontificem, cui est commissa cura religionis. Ergo pontificis est judicare, regem esse deponendum vel non deponendum."—*De Rom. Pontif.* lib. v. c. vii.

² "Potest mutare regna, et uni auferre, atque alteri conferre, tanquam princeps spiritualis, si id necessarium sit ad animarum salutem."—*Bellarmin.* ubi *suprà*, lib. v. c. vi.

means that all men should be subject to the *higher* powers, but not to the *secular* powers : for he does not deny to spiritual ministers the power of *exempting* whomsoever, and as far as they shall please, from the secular power, whenever they may deem it *expedient*.”¹ A mere quibble, of course : but the word “expedient” does sound better than “the salvation of souls.” Nor should this sweeping prerogative surprise us, since even the eternal is ruled by “the Church” or the pope, according to the Jesuit Maldonat, who affirms “for certain and immovable, that the Church has the power of excommunicating even the dead, that is, she may deprive them of suffrage,” or the benefit of prayers.² Then there is no wonder that the pope “can deprive princes of their empire and kingdom, or may transfer their dominions to another prince, and absolve their subjects from their allegiance which they owe to them, and from the oath which they have sworn, that the word of the Lord which he spake to Jeremiah the prophet, &c. &c.”³ And if the idea of the prophet Jeremiah’s giving a vote to this papal empire be painfully startling, you must summon all your patience to

¹ “Nec adversatur huic Pauli verbum, qui omnes vult esse subjectos potestatibus sublimioribus, non vero sæcularibus : non tamen negat potestatem ministris spiritualibus quando id expedire judicaverint, eximendi quos et quantum eis visum fuerit.”—*Comment. in Epist. B. Pauli, Apost. ad Roman. Annat. 2, in c. xiii.*

² “Duo tamen certa, fixaque esse debent : alterum, Ecclesiam potestatem habere etiam mortuos excommunicandi, id est, jus privandi suffragiis.”—*Comment. in Matth. c. xvi. p. 342, E.*

³ “Potest eos imperio et regno privare, vel eorum ditiones alteri principi tradere, et eorum subditos ab obedientiâ illis debitâ, et juramento facto absolvere. Ut verum sit in pontifice Romano illud verbum Domini dictum ad prophetam Jeremiam.”—Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth : See, I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant.”—*Comment. in Evangelic. Hist. &c. t. iv. P. iii. Tr. 4.^a Ed. Colon. 1602.*

hear that even Christ himself is made to subscribe to the article,—“for in commanding Peter to feed his sheep Christ has given him the power to drive away the wolves and to kill them, if they should be obnoxious to the sheep. And it will also be lawful for the shepherd to depose the ram, the leader of the flock, from his sovereignty over the flock, if he infects the other sheep with his contagion, and attacks them with his horns.”¹ A word or two from the redoubtable Parsons must be necessarily interesting. “The *whole school of theologians and ecclesiastical lawyers*,” says Parsons, “maintain—and it is a thing both certain and matter of faith—that every Christian prince, if he has manifestly departed from the Catholic religion and has wished to turn others from it, is immediately divested of all power and dignity, whether of divine or human right, and that, too, even before the sentence pronounced against him by the supreme pastor and judge ; and that all his subjects are free from every obligation of the oath of allegiance which they had sworn to him as their lawful prince ; and that they may and must (if they have the power) drive such a man from the sovereignty of Christian men, as an apostate, a heretic, and a deserter of Christ the Lord, and as an alien and an enemy to his country, lest he corrupt others, and turn them from the faith by his example or his command. This true, determined, and undoubted opinion of very learned men, is perfectly comformable and agreeable to the apostolic doctrine.”²

¹ “Nam præcipiendo oves pascere, dedit illi potestatem arcendi lupos et interficiendi, si infesti sint ovibus. Imò etiam arietem, ducem gregis, si alias oves tabe conficiat, et cornibus petat, licebit pastori de principatu gregis deponere.”—*Alp. Salmeron, Comment. in omnes Epist. B. Pauli, &c. Lib. i. P. iii. Disp. 12. Ed. Colon. 1604.*

² Responsio ad Edict. Reginæ Angliæ, sect. ii. n. 157 ; Ed. Romæ, 1593.

But this terribly practical Jesuit does not long amuse his readers with such spiritual notions, forsooth. Into the very pith of the matter he flings his mighty head and horns, driving all before him in the camp of the "*Navarrese Liar*," as he calls Henry IV. of France, then in his struggle with the Catholic League. Away to the winds with Henry IV.'s "heresy, his suspected illegitimacy—*suspectis natalibus*—his practices against the faith and other impediments—his deprivation of power by the sentence of the pope—his rebellion and other crimes against Charles X., *Cardinal and King of France*—(enough, however, to exclude him)—let all these impediments be no obstacle to him," cries Parsons, "but this one thing I believe, namely, that the most iniquitous judge of events will not deny that *the royal power is founded on civil right and not on the right of nature or the race*. But the civil right (according to St. Isidore and all other philosophers, lawyers and even divines) is known to be what every people or state has resolved upon for itself, by those conditions which the commonweal has laid down, and this, by its own will and judgment, according to the interest and arbitrament of each country—not by the necessity of nature, or by the decree and consent of all nations—by which two points, natural right, and the right of nations, are distinguished in the highest degree, and most properly, from civil right. That kings are not by nature, nor by the right of nations, is plainly evident from the fact that they were not at first necessary, nor have they always afterwards existed from the beginning, nor have they been received among all nations and people, nor have they always everywhere ruled on the same conditions. The agreement of the most learned men has decreed the conditions which are necessary to

establish the rights of nature and of nations. And certainly if we go back to the beginning, we shall find that the world held together without kings, for many ages ; and, besides the rest, that the Hebrew people of God, after the long lapse of three thousand years, at length received the power from God to appoint a king, not spontaneously, but reluctantly conceded. Among the Romans, for a very long time, there were no kings ; nor are there any among the Venetians, Genoese, and other republics. And where kings are in use—*in usu sunt*—it is manifest that they do not rule everywhere by the same right : for the kings of Poland and Bohemia succeed not by generation but by election, whose children and relatives lay no claim to succession at their death or deposition. Finally, the right and manner of royal rule are circumscribed by different limits in France to what they are in England or in Spain. From all this, it seems manifest that the royal dignity and power has proceeded from the free will and ordination of the commonweal, with God's approval, whilst it is bestowed by a Christian people on princes chosen by themselves, with this especial and primary condition, namely, that they defend the Roman Catholic Faith ; and they are bound to this by two oaths,—one in baptism when they are made Christians,—the other at their coronation. Who will be so absurd, or so blind in mind, as to affirm *him* competent to reign, who has neither of these rights ?”¹ This contemptuous treatment of right divine is not intended to favour republicanism, or democracy ; but merely to bring human motives to the exclusion of an obnoxious ruler, such as Elizabeth of England or Henry IV. of France. Nevertheless, the tendency of

¹ Ubi suprâ, n. 153—4.

such sentiments pronounced authoritatively in a time of agitation, must have added vast energy to the spirit of factions. Then the famous Mariana flung his strong and philosophical sentiments into the whirlpool of politics. His whole book is altogether on kings and their conduct. Full of striking and startling sentiments is this famous book of a famous Jesuit. His heart was brimful of hatred to tyranny: he did not spare his own general and government,—how could he be expected to mince matters with kings and their institute? “Many examples, ancient and even recent, might be unfolded to prove the great power of a multitude aroused by hatred of their king, and that the anger of the people is the destruction of the king. Lately in France,” continues Mariana, “a noble example was given. It shows how essential it is that the minds of the people should be soothed:—a splendid and pitiable attestation that the minds of men are not to be governed just like their persons. Henry III. of France lies low, felled by the hand of a monk, with a poisoned knife driven into his stomach—a sad spectacle which hath few equals: but it teaches kings that their impious attempts are not without punishments. It shows that the power of kings is weak indeed, if they once cease to respect the minds of their subjects.” Brave words unquestionably; and then he proceeds, from the summit of this glorious and popular notion, to the very depths of professional bigotry, much in the style of Parsons touching the intended succession of Henry IV.—denouncing the murder of the Guises, to whom he thinks no prince in Christendom is comparable—and then he exclaims: “but the movements of the people are like a torrent; soon the tide upsurges The audacity of one youth in a short time retrieved affairs which were almost

desperate. His name was Jacques Clement—born in the obscure village of Sorbonne, he was studying theology in the Dominican college of his order, when, having been assured by the theologians whom he consulted, that a tyrant may be rightfully cut off he departed for the camp with the resolution of killing the king After a few words had passed between them, pretending to deliver some letters, he approached the king, concealing his poisoned knife, and inflicted on him a deep wound above the bladder. Splendid boldness of soul—memorable exploit !¹ . . . By killing the king he achieved for himself a mighty name Thus perished Clement, twenty-four years of age, a youth of simple mind and not strong in body ; but a greater power gave strength and courage to his soul.”²

After this celebration of the regicide, Mariana proceeds to details respecting the method to be pursued in getting rid of a king. Admonition must first be tried :

¹ He was instantly wounded by the king and despatched by the attendants. Nor is Ribadeneyra's notice of this detestable murder less significant in his work professedly written against the principles of Machiavelli. He calls the murder “*a just judgment*”—*justo juyzio*, effected “by the hand of a poor, young, simple, homely friar, with the blow of a small knife, in the king's own apartment, surrounded by his servants and armed people, and a powerful troop with which he intended, in a few days, to *destroy* the city of Paris” (!) “*Por mano de un pobre frayle, moço, simple, y llano, de una herida que le dio cun un cuchillo pequeño en su mismo aposento, estando el Rey rodeado de criados y de gente armada, y con un exercito poderoso con el qual pensava assolar dentro de pocos dias la ciudad de Paris.*” “Has the world ever had an example like this, so new, so strange, and never before heard of by mortals,” exclaims this religious Machiavel, a thousand times more pernicious to humanity than the political Italian, because the wickedness which he substitutes for that of Machiavel is presented under the cloak of religion.—*Tratado de la Religion*, c. xv. p. 90. Ed. Madrid, 1595. He wrote before Mariana.

² “*Insignem animi confidentiam, facinus memorabile. . . . Cæso Rege ingens sibi nomen fecit. . . . Sic Clemens ille periit, viginti quatuor natus annos, simplici juvenis ingenio, neque robusto corpore : sed major vis vires et animum confirmabat.*”—*Mariana, De Rege*, c. vi.

“if he comply, if he satisfy the state and correct the errors of his past life, I am of opinion that it will be necessary to stop, and to desist from harsher measures. But if he refuse the remedy, and there remains no hope of cure, it will be lawful for the state, after sentence has been pronounced, in the first place to refuse to acknowledge his empire ; and since war will of necessity be raised, to unfold the plans of defence, to take up arms, and to levy contributions upon the people to meet the expenses of the war ; and if circumstances will permit, and the state cannot be otherwise preserved, by the same just right of defence, by a more forcible and peculiar power, to destroy with the sword the prince who is declared to be a public enemy. And let the same power be vested in any private individual, who, renouncing the hope of impunity, and disregarding his safety, would exert an effort in the service of the state . . . I shall never consider that man to have done wrong, who, favouring the public wishes, would attempt to kill him . . . Most men are deterred by a love of self-preservation, which is very frequently opposed to deeds of enterprise. It is for this reason that among the number of tyrants who lived in ancient times, there were so few who perished by the sword of their subjects . . . Still it is useful that princes should know, that if they oppress the state, and become intolerable by their vices and their pollution, they hold their lives upon this tenure, that to put them to death is not only lawful, but a laudable and a glorious action . . . Wretched, indeed, is a tyrant's life which is held upon the tenure that he who should kill him would be highly esteemed, both in favour and in praise. It is a glorious thing to exterminate this pestilent and mischievous race from

the community of men. For putrid members are cut off, lest they infect the rest of the body. So should this cruelty of the beast, in the form of man, be removed from the state, as from a body, and be severed from it with the sword. He who terrifies, must fear for himself; and the terror he strikes is not greater than the shudder he feels¹ . . . There is no doubt whether it is lawful to kill a tyrant and public enemy (the same decision applies to both) with poison and deadly herbs. The same question was proposed to me some years ago by a prince in Sicily, whilst I was teaching the theological schools in that island. I know that it has been frequently done—*et sæpe factum scimus*—nor do I think that any one resolved on the deed of poison would let slip the opportunity of destruction, if given, and wait for the decision of theologians, and prefer to assault with the sword—especially as the danger [for the poisoner] being less, his hope of impunity is greater, in order that the public rejoicing be not at all diminished at the destruction of the enemy, if the author and architect of public liberty be preserved. As for my part, I am not considering what men are likely to do, but what is permitted by the laws of nature; and, indeed, what matters it whether you kill by the sword or by poison? Especially as treachery and fraud are conceded in the faculty of action; and there are many ancient and recent examples of enemies cut off by that kind of

¹ “Miseram plane vitam, cujus ea conditio est ut qui occiderit, in magnâ tum gratiâ, tum laude futurus sit. Hoc omne genus pestiferum et exitiale ex hominum communitate exterminare gloriosum est. Enimvero membra quædam secantur si putrida sunt, ne reliquum corpus inficiant: sic ista in hominis specie bestię immanitas, à republicâ tanquam à corpore amoveri debet, ferroque excindi. Timeat videlicet necesse est, qui terret: neque major sit terror incussus quam metus susceptus.”—*Mariana, De Rege, c. vii.*

death . . . In my own opinion, deleterious drugs should not be given to an enemy, neither should a deadly poison be mixed with his food, or in his cup, for the purpose of destroying him. Yet it will be lawful to use this method in the case in question, if the person who is destroyed be not *forced* to drink the poison, which, inwardly received, would deprive him of life,—but let it be applied outwardly by another person without his intervention : as when there is so much strength in the poison, that if spread upon a seat, or on the clothes, it would have the power to cause death. Thus I find that the Moorish kings have often destroyed other princes by the [poisoned] presents they sent them, consisting of precious garments, napkins, arms, or *saddles*,¹ and it is

¹ By a striking coincidence, the alleged attempt at *saddle*-poison against Queen Elizabeth, by Squires, at the instigation of the Jesuit Walpole, occurred about the *same time* that Mariana was giving his curious suggestions to the heroes of the age. His book was published at Toledo in 1598, and Squires's alleged attempt took place in the *same year*, after having been concocted in Spain. The prominence which Mariana, then in Spain, and an authoritative theologian, gives to these strange cases of poisoning, which he actually suggests as *models*, must, I think, give some countenance to the affair, as an *attempt*, however absurd it may seem to our ignorance of such infernally potent concoctions. It is circumstantially related by Pasquier and by Camden ; and the facts are as follows : Squires was an English prisoner in Spain : he was set free at the intercession of the Jesuit Walpole, his countryman, who tried to convert him, but finding the heretic firmer than he expected, Walpole got him arrested by the Inquisition. Squires then turned Catholic. Thereupon the Jesuit began to practise on the fellow, and proposed the poisoning of the Queen as a fine offering to God, assuring him that he would run no risk by pursuing the method he would suggest. It was a very subtle poison, which he was to rub on the Queen's saddle, just before she mounted, so that her hands on touching the saddle should receive the venom. The chair of Essex was to be served in like manner. He found his opportunity, got into the royal stable just in time, and performed the operation, which, however, failed in the issue : "her body felt no distemperature, nor her hand no more hurt than Paul's did when he shook off the viper into the fire." His attempt on Essex was equally unsuccessful, although it deranged his stomach at supper. Many months elapsed, and Walpole, not hearing of the Queen's death, and supposing that Squires had played him false, resolved to be even with him, and sent over an Englishman, Stanley by name, to accuse Squires of the

generally known that certain elegant boots were wickedly given by a Moorish chief to Henry, the King of Castile, and as soon as he drew them on, his feet were infected with poison, whereby he suffered ill health to the end of his days. A purple garment, adorned with gold, was sent by another to the King of Grenada, and it killed him within thirty days. A third perished in a poisoned shirt.”¹

I need not inform the reader that the maintenance of these regicidal opinions forms one of the great charges against the Jesuits. They are conscious of the stigma : but instead of at once admitting the evil tendency of these doctrines, and instead of tracing the doctrines

project. Squires admitted that “Walpole had proposed the murder to him, but that he had never consented to it, nor even employed poison for that purpose.” Lingard states that he “died asserting both his own innocence and that of Walpole, with his last breath.” Camden and Speed are the authorities to which Lingard refers ; but Camden does not mention *that* fact, which, however, might have occurred without altering the features of the case, since it convicted him of falsehood. Stanley, the accuser, stated that he was sent by the Spanish ministers to ruin Squires in revenge for not killing the queen ; and on being racked, he said he himself was dispatched to shoot Elizabeth. Dr. Lingard treats the affair as a “ridiculous plot ;” and so it might be if disconnected from Mariana’s suggestions, rampant at the very time. Walpole strenuously denied the charge, as a matter of course, and vilified the character of Squires, in a pamphlet which he published in self-defence. It is the *preciseness* of the accusation which seems to give weight to the charge. Not that such poison was really possible, but *intended by the parties*, after the fashion of Mariana. Dr. Lingard says that Walpole was little known to Squires : but this is contradicted by Walpole himself, stating that he “*knew and dealt with Squire in Spaine.*” Such are the facts, however, and there we may leave them, with Camden saying, “A pestilent opinion had possessed the minds of some men, yea, some priests (I am ashamed to speak it) that to take away the lives of kings excommunicated, was nothing else but to weed out the cockle out of the Lord’s field,” which is, as we have seen, the veritable opinion of the leading theologians then influencing the age.—See Camden, ann. 1598 ; Rapin, ii. p. 148 ; Pasquier, Catéchis. p. 212, *et seq.* ; Lingard, viii. 341 and 453, note U. It is curious that the pamphlet by Walpole (anonymous) is directed against *Squires* and not against Stanley, though evidently the prime mover in the disclosure.—See its title in Lingard.

¹ Mariana, De Rege, c. vii. ed. Mogunt. 1605.

themselves to the peculiar exigencies of the times when two parties were striving for victory, the apologists for the Jesuit-regicides strive to mystify the minds of their readers with theological distinctions, and what is perhaps still worse, by enlisting the whole body of Catholic teachers, from the earliest times, into the lawless ranks of king-killers or king-deposers.

Like the blinded Samson, as they cannot escape, they shake ruin around them, and enjoy the suicidal triumph.¹

As many other Jesuits maintained the opposite doctrine, it becomes of importance to bear in mind that *expediency* which required their influential theologians to countenance and to suggest rebellion and murder. This expediency was the triumph of Catholic unity. These inflammatory doctrines were intended and issued by order or request, to promote that grand consummation.² Through numerous editions, these books circulated

¹ See their voluminous apologetic *Documents*, t. ii. p. 83, *et seq.*, for a list of "some of the Thomist and Dominican theologians, doctors of the university, &c., who have professed the doctrine of Tyrannicide." Such is the title at the head of the column, whilst opposite the same, there is a list of *all* the Jesuit-professors of the doctrine, amounting to fourteen only,—a fact which is most curiously illustrative of Jesuitism. The Jesuits expediently upheld the doctrine during the time it was needed by the cause they served, and as expediently held their tongues or their pens when the politico-religious question subsided or took a different turn—about the middle of the seventeenth century, Escobar being the last regicidal professor. The opposite list of other doctors and professors of regicide extends from St. Thomas in the 13th century, with rapid succession, down to the year 1762. There is something extremely unpleasant in seeing religious men so eager to exhibit the shame of their colleagues, for their own excuse or extenuation.

² Unquestionably Mariana's work is the most desperate on the subject, and yet "he composed it at the solicitation of several persons at the court of Spain, and it was printed at Toledo with the permission of the king and the approbation of the Inquisition."—*Documents*, t. ii. 62. His first chapter is a dedication or address to Philip III., who had just succeeded to his father, the "stirring" Philip II., A.D. 1598.

rapidly : they were the grateful, the savoury food of the party-spirits then tempesting the world of struggling heresy and ravenous orthodoxy. It must not, for one moment, be supposed that these denunciations of tyranny were meant as universal applications. They were directed pointedly and fixedly against *heretic* rulers, or such as did not go to the utmost extremes of the ultracatholic party. What greater proof can we need of this view than the fact of these opinions being advanced under the auspices of the ruthless Philip II. and his Inquisition ? Their Jesuit promulgators were either Spaniards and Portuguese, or the very pillars that supported the Spanish faction in England and in France. Subsequently, when the party which had changed sides in France, or who had reason to oppose the Jesuits, whom they also envied, raised a clamour against these regicidal doctrines, leading, as they believed, to the murder of Henry IV., the general, Aquaviva, issued a decree against any further promulgation of such doctrines, either privately or publicly, by advice or by writing. This was in 1614.¹ A Jesuit apologist hereupon exclaims :—"This decree was so well observed, that the search has been in vain to find in the four quarters of the world, a Jesuit, who, since then, has taught the doctrine of tyrannicide."² Not in *books* : but there can be no doubt that the Company was not cured of that disease by Aquaviva's first mandate. Another decree was deemed necessary, and issued in 1616, against the discussion "of papal power, and the

¹ Contrary to my usual practice, I must here stop to point out a voluntary misstatement—a misdate of this decree by the Jesuit of the *Documents*, t. ii. 64. He dates it the 6th of July, 1610 (the year of *Henry IV.'s* assassination), whereas it was issued on the 1st of August, 1614. See *Censuræ Collect.* c. v. ; *Corp. Instit. S. J.* t. ii. p. 251. Ed. Ant. 1702.

² *Documents*, t. ii. 64.

deposition, &c. of princes"—*de potestate Summi Pontificis super Principes, eos deponendi, &c.*"¹ And even a third was called forth from General Vitelleschi *ten* years after, in 1626.

But not the Jesuits alone must bear the blame of these horrible doctrines. They were too convenient not to serve as cloaks for the unscrupulous rebels of the sixteenth century, as they have served in every age, in every nation.² Nowhere were they promulgated with such furious violence as in France. It is impossible to meet with any thing more anti-royal than the diatribes thundered from the pulpit by Jean Boucher, successively Rector of the University of Paris, Prior of the Sorbonne, Doctor and priest of Saint Benoit, and one of the most ardent firebrands of the League. This preacher found centered in the estates of the nation, all public might and majesty—the power to bind and to loose—the indefeasible sovereignty and judicial sway over the sceptre and the realm. In the estates of the nation he found the fountain of these prerogatives: from the

¹ Sic in Orig. Censuræ Coll. c. v. 3. Such writings were first to be examined and approved at Rome. Ib.

² See the *Documents* again for a succinct and elaborate dissertation on the prevalence of rebellious or regicidal practices, from the earliest times, in Italy, Germany, Spain, England (which the writer scoffingly calls "the classic land of liberty," and quotes this title as "the language of the simpletons and charlatans of the Revolution," p. 111), and *France*, where "modern instances" were so rife. Fierce is the Jesuit's apostrophe to the modern enemies of his Company. He thunders forth: "Hypocritical friends of kings that you are, declared enemies of the Catholic religion, and its ready persecutors—apostles of toleration and liberty, presuming to do violence to consciences, and whose unexampled tyranny penetrates even into the bosom of families to assault the rights of paternity, which are respected even among the most barbarous nations! Brutally use the right of the strongest, if you have it—but go no further; or if a remnant of shame induces you to attempt a justification of your inconceivable excesses, try and have some gleam of common sense, and learn at least the *first elements of history*."—T. ii. p. 128. Such is a specimen of Jesuit-fire in their apologies for the proud Company of Jesus.

people he deduced the existence of the king—not by necessity and compulsion, but by free election—just as Parsons develops the glorious lever of machination. He takes the same view as Bellarmine of the relation between church and state, and repeats the comparison of body and soul. One condition alone, he says, limits the freedom of the popular choice : one thing alone is forbidden the people, namely, to accept a *heretic* king : they would thereby bring down upon them the curse of God.¹ “ Strange combination of ecclesiastical pretensions and democratic notions, of absolute freedom and complete subjection—self-contradictory and anti-national—but which still could cast an inexplicable spell over the minds of men,” exclaims Ranke : but there was really no spell at all in the matter. The Catholic party botched up a theory to put down the Protestant party ; and they contrived it so as to flatter the masses to put it into practice. It was a comparatively safe method in those times, and it menaced no reaction when the masses were completely dependent on the great. It is different now-a-days : and those who have stirred the masses will be the first to bleed for their pains—and at the hands of the masses themselves. In those days, as at the present time, it was easy to rouse the thoughtless multitude. The Sorbonne had hitherto constantly defended the royal and national privileges against these ultra-montane sacerdotal pretensions : but now, after the murder of the Guises, these doctrines were preached from the pulpits ; it was proclaimed aloud in the streets, and typified by symbols on the altars and in processions, that King Henry III. had forfeited his crown.²

¹ Jean Boucher, *Sermons*, Paris, 1594. Ranke, p. 177.

² Ranke, p. 178. *Peleus*, t. iv. livre xiv.

And “the good citizens and inhabitants of the city,” as they called themselves, turned, in their scruples of conscience,” to the theological faculty of the University of Paris, to obtain from it a valid decision respecting the legality of their resistance to their sovereign. Thereupon the Sorbonne assembled on the 7th of January, 1589 ; and “after having heard the mature and free counsels of all the magistri,” says their Decision, “after many and divers arguments heard, drawn for the most part *verbatim* from Holy Writ, the Canon Law, and the papal ordinances,—it has been concluded by the Dean of the Faculty, without any dissenting voice—first, that the people of this realm are absolved from the oath of allegiance and obedience sworn by them to King Henry. Furthermore, that the said people may, without scruple of conscience, combine together, arm themselves, and collect money for the maintenance of the Roman Catholic apostolic religion against the abominable proceedings of the aforesaid king.”¹ Seventy members of the Faculty were present ; the younger of them, in particular, voted for the resolution with fierce enthusiasm. “The general acquiescence which these theories obtained,” says Ranke, “was doubtless owing chiefly to their being, at the moment, the real expression of events. In the struggles of France, popular and ecclesiastical opposition had actually come forward from their respective sides and met in alliance. The citizens of Paris had been countenanced and confirmed in their insurrection against their lawful sovereign by the *Pope’s Legate*. Bellarmine himself had long been in the suite of the latter. The doctrines which he had wrought out in his learned solitude—and put forward with such logical consistency—

¹ Respons. Facult. Theol. Parisiens. ; apud Ranke, p. 178.

and with such great success, announced themselves *in the event which he witnessed, and in part elicited.*"¹ Meanwhile the King of Spain was linked in the efforts for the renovation of Catholicism—not with the priests alone, but also with the revolted people. The people of Paris reposed greater confidence in Philip than in the French princes at the head of the League. A new ally, as it were, now presented itself to the king in the doctrines of the Jesuits. There seemed no reason to foresee that he might have anything to fear from them: they rather afforded his policy a justification both legal and religious, highly advantageous to his dignity and importance even in Spain, and immediately conducive to the success of his foreign enterprises. The king dwelt more on this momentary utility of the Jesuit-doctrines than on their general purport and tendency."²

But to this papal theory of popular domination and omnipotence, there was an antagonistic resistance in Protestantism. The Catholics had accused Protestantism as essentially the spirit of lawlessness and revolt: in their opinion to be a heretic and a disloyal subject was one and the same. Such was Catholic opinion: but the fact to which it alluded was never anything else than the fixed determination in the Protestants to believe what they pleased—unfettered by popes, unterrified by papal kings. And now, in this anarchy of Catholicism—in the midst of this wild spirit of revolt—unscrupulous and regicidal—Protestantism upheld the rights of royalty. It was a physical and intellectual, a moral necessity. "The idea of a sacerdotal religion ruling supreme over all the temporalities of the world, encountered a mighty resistance in that national independence

¹ Ranke, p. 178.

² Id. ib.

which is the proper expression of the temporal element of society." Religion must be the safeguard of man's freedom—the shield of his physical, intellectual, and moral rights: if it cease to be such, it is the religionism of a selfish party striving by force or craft to achieve a lucrative domination. Short-lived must ever be such a triumph, whenever and wherever effected, because it is based on injustice, accompanied by the infringement of those moral and intellectual statutes which are the covenant of God with man. In the land of Luther the antagonism of that lawless casuistry, by monks, and doctors, and Jesuits defended, stood forth in defence of royalty. "The Germanic institution of monarchy diffused through the nations of Roman origin, and deeply rooted amongst them, has invariably triumphed over every attempt to overthrow it—whether by the pretensions of the priesthood, or by the fiction of the sovereignty of the people, which has always finally proved untenable." Sovereignty of the "People"! Tell me what is the "People," here alluded to, and I may understand its sovereignty. Half-a-dozen bewildered heads above, and ten thousand convulsive hands, arms, and legs below, may represent the thing in practice. Tell me of the sovereignty of physical, moral, and intellectual *Justice*, and I can understand the splendid theory of which it can be made the basis: but if you talk of the sovereignty of the "people," a hundred historical remembrances rush before me, and I find it impossible to believe its propounders aught else but calculating egotists—not even hot-headed fanatics. And in truth the end and aim of that theoretic sovereignty were not misunderstood at the end of the sixteenth century. It was spiritual monarchy for the pope, and it was temporal

monarchy for the King of Spain. None believed those leagues sincere: the designs of the Catholic princes were refined in the furnace of Rome, and worked to their object by the pope: the extermination of Protestantism was the grand finality.¹ The priesthood and the "sovereign people" were combined to overthrow that antagonism, by raising over Europe orthodox and persecuting tyrants, to supply the place of those whom the deposing power and the regicidal doctrines might effectually incapacitate. Then it was that the doctrine which upholds "the divine right of kings" found supporters. "God alone," the Protestants maintained, "sets princes and sovereigns over the human race. He has reserved to Himself to lift up and bring low, to apportion and to moderate authority. True, He no longer descends from Heaven to point out with his finger those to whom dominion is due, but through his eternal providence there have been introduced into every kingdom laws and an established order of things, according to which the ruler is chosen. If, by virtue of this appointed order, a prince is invested with power, his title is precisely the same as though God's voice declared, This shall be your king. Time was when God did point out Moses, the judges, and the first kings personally to his people; but after a fixed order had been established, those who subsequently ascended the throne were equally God's anointed as the former."² Such was, again, another compensating permission of Providence, to eventuate equilibrium in the affairs of men. When first I called your attention to the subject,

¹ Ph. de Mornay, *Mem.* i. p. 175.

² "Explicatio Controversiarum quæ à nonnullis moventur ex Henrici Borboni regis in regnum Franciæ constitutione," c. ii. ; apud Ranke, p. 179.

we beheld Ignatius rushing to the rescue of Catholicism—and effectuating something like an equilibrium.¹ We behold that very Protestantism, which he and his followers managed to hold in check, now presenting a rampart against that anomalous tide of opinions which threatened the physical, intellectual and moral freedom of mankind. It was a glorious destiny for Protestantism. In rallying round the banner of royalty and right divine, at that period of man's history, the angels that preside over empires sang—*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.* I allude to the effects of that reaction. The infatuated, senseless, ever abortive attempts of Rome and Spain against England's monarchy, served but to cement more strongly together the everlasting foundations of that essentially Protestant throne: the people's wisdom and loyalty helped them along towards that exalted destiny which has made, and will ever make, Great Britain the central power of the universe. And well had it been for France had faction not compelled Henry IV. to sacrifice to it that religion or theory, if you like, which, once established around the throne, might have utterly shut out those hideous abuses which festered and festered through his reign, and the reigns of his successors, until they were visited with their penalties in the great Revolution.²

¹ See vol. i. p. 204.

² It is indeed most remarkable that, from the Reformation down to the present time, national calamities have fearfully hung on the abuses of Romanism round about the thrones of Europe. Examine the subject—even beginning no farther back than Philip II., and Spain and Portugal—through Scotland and Mary—England and Charles I.—Austria, Poland, Bavaria, France—everywhere the remnants of that gangrene whose termination is death. It seems almost ridiculous to instance the last illustration in this interesting theory. I mean the late skirmish of the modern Jesuits in Switzerland. That event and its immediate results gave the initiative to the epidemic revolutions which are

Now, therefore, Protestantism was the spirit of peace and loyalty : Catholicism (with a fractional exception) was the spirit of war and revolt. The former “insisted on the necessity of submitting even to unjust and censurable sovereigns. No man is perfect. Now, if it were once deemed allowable to deviate from the order appointed by God, even trifling defects would be seized on to justify the deposition of a sovereign. Not even heresy on the monarch’s part could, on the whole, absolve subjects from their allegiance. The son must not indeed obey the impious father in what is contrary to God’s commands—in other respects, however, he continues to owe him reverence and subjection.”¹ As a contrast, take the following : “What is more execrable,” says a contemporaneous author, “the Sorbonne, formerly the honour of the Church, being consulted by the Sixteen, concluded, by a public act [already given], that Henry of Valois was no longer king, and that arms might be justly, and with good reason, raised against him : the Sorbonne approved the sentence of degradation fulminated against the king—whence ensued the attempts against his person. We may say in truth that it was the Sorbonne who killed him, since it excited and resolved the assassins to such madness and wickedness The Sorbonne compared the parricide of a great king, oh execrable blasphemy ! to the holy mysteries of the incarnation and the resurrection of our Lord.”²

now scattering dismay over Europe : revolutions whereat the thoughtless may exult, but the wise must forebode desolation. In the midst of this crisis—and ere these words are printed, war will be Europe’s occupation—in the midst of this crisis the *Pope of Rome* pretends to forfend retribution from his throne by those little Italian tricks which there is a party in England to cheer and applaud !

¹ Explic. Controv. *ut antea*, apud Ranke, p. 179.

² This extract from *Peleus* (t. iii. livre viii. p. 538), is triumphantly alleged by the Jesuit-apologist excusing the regicidal doctrines of his colleagues. Here is

The Jesuits were not content to applaud this execrable deed in their factious assemblies ; they celebrated it in writing ; and they did more. When the assassin's mother appeared at Paris, they told the people to go

the original, in the *quoted* form, the *capital letters and italics* being the Jesuits' : "Ce qui est de plus exécrable, la Sorbonne, autrefois l'honneur de l'Eglise, consultée par les SEIZE, conclut, par acte public, que Henri de Valois n'était plus roi, et que l'on pouvait justement et à bon droit prendre les armes contre lui ; la Sorbonne approuva la dégradation du Roi, fulmina contre lui ; d'où s'ensuivirent les attentats commis depuis sur la personne. Nous pouvons dire en vérité que C'EST LA SORBONNE QUI L'A TUÉ, puisqu'elle a INCITÉ ET RÉSOLU les assassins à telle forcenerie et méchanceté . . . Elle a comparé le parricide d'un grand Roi, oh ! blasphème exécrable ! aux saints mystères de l'incarnation et résurrection de notre Seigneur."—*Documents*, t. ii. Now it happens that the Jesuit college was one of the rendezvous of the *Sixteen* ! See Davila, i. 517, and the Jesuits themselves are forced to admit that at least one of them was "sometimes" present at the meeting of the Sixteen, namely, Pigenat, "at the request of Brisson," forsooth, who had nothing to do with the faction, for he "declared for Henry IV., and was hanged accordingly by the Leaguers in 1591," as the Jesuit Feller informs his readers. It was a secret, erratic assembly, and none could be admitted who were not sworn members ; and certainly not for the purpose of "moderating the fury of that execrable tribunal," as Richeome the Jesuit calls it, at the time when affairs had changed faces. It thus follows that one Jesuit, at least, voted for the blasphemy above given. I have before quoted this admission of Richeome (*De la Vérité défendue*, c. lvi.), and it is among the exceedingly sophistic *Documents* of the Jesuits, t. i. *Des Jesuites Ligueurs*, p. 35. Pasquier addresses the Jesuits as follows on the subject :—"Respecting what your opponents object to you, (namely, that your Father Odon Pigenat was the captain of the Sixteen who ruled in Paris, not only the ordinary magistrate, but even the king,) you admit the fact, in your pleadings, and also by the book of Montagnes (a Jesuit), chap. lvi. ; true, you say it was in order to moderate their actions somewhat. When we read these two passages we began to laugh, knowing that Pigenat, though by no means gifted with wisdom, burned with fire and anger : in fact, he has since then become so furiously mad, that he is confined in a room well bound and corded."—*Catéchisme*, p. 287, b. This Pigenat must not be confounded with his brother, Francis Pigenat, a famous preacher of the League, who signed the deposition of Henry III., pronounced the funeral oration of the Guises, whom he called martyrs, and declared that it was impossible for Henry IV. to be converted—moreover, that the pope could not absolve him—and, if he did, he (the pope himself) would be excommunicated."—*Feller, Biog. Univ.* They were *Arcades ambo*, as you perceive ; but the Jesuit of the *Documents* is not, of course, satisfied with the evidence against the *Jesuit-brother*, and would have us believe that the excesses of Francis have been ascribed to Odon !—*Ubi suprâ*, p. 34, et seq.

and *venerate that blessed mother of a holy martyr*. Thus in their pulpits they called the murderer a martyr, and they styled Henry III. a Herod. They placed the portrait of Jacques Clement over the altars of their churches ; and even proposed, it is said, to erect a statue to him in the cathedral of Nôtre Dame.¹ It is remarkable that the king was murdered on the very day he had appointed for their expulsion from Bordeaux. They had fomented the machinations of the Spanish faction and the League against the king in that city : he ordered them to quit the place quietly, to prevent “scandal and murmuring :” they retired to the neighbouring cities ; and in their annual letter celebrated the murder of the king as a vindicating judgment.² And no wonder that the servants exulted at the crime, when the master praised it to the skies. Pope Sixtus V., in full consistory, compared the murderer to Judith and Eleazar. “This death,” said he, “which strikes such astonishment and admiration, will scarcely be believed by posterity. A most powerful king, surrounded by a strong army, who had compelled Paris to ask mercy at his hands, is killed at one blow of a knife, by a poor monk. Certes ! this great example was given in order that all may know the force of God’s judgments.”³ “To nothing but the hand of the Almighty himself,” says Spain’s ambassador to Philip, “can we ascribe this happy event ; and it leads us to hope that it is now

¹ Hist. abrégé des Jesuites, i. 111 ; Fabre, Ann. 1589.

² Ann. Litt. Soc. Jesu. Ann. 1589. in tit. Coll. Burdigalense. “Quo die nos regis edicto Burdigalâ pellebamus, eo die rex ipse qui edixerat, è vitâ depulsus est. At nos compingebamur ad S. Macharii . . . ut simul opprimeremur omnes, seu hoc suspicio multorum, seu fama tulit, nisi antea oppressus ille unus fuisset.”—Apud *Les Jesuites Crimin.* p. 205. Hist. du Mar. de Matignon, livre ii. cc. xviii. xix. ; Coudrette, i. 185, *et seq.*

³ Hist. des Jesuites, i. 112 ; Ranke, 173 ; Dispaccio Veneto, 1 Settemb.

all over with the heretics."¹ The joy of the orthodox and Spanish and papal party was universal, and gushingly expressed.

Meanwhile, the immediate consequence of the murder proved that it was *not* all over with the heretics. Henry of Navarre, as Henry IV. assumed the title of King of France, being the next heir to the throne, and named successor by the murdered king. Strange had been the fortunes of the Huguenot Henry. In his infancy a conspiracy had been contrived to seize and deliver him, with his mother and other supporters of heresy, to King Philip and the Inquisition.² It failed ; and he lived to be frightened into abjuration by Charles IX., as we have read, during the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Henry III., on his death-bed, advised him to turn Catholic, if he wished to enjoy the crown. He was still a Huguenot, notwithstanding. The League, Philip II., and the pope, were resolved on no condition to suffer Henry to attain the enjoyment of his rights. Pope Sixtus had proposed his own nephew to succeed when Henry III. murdered the Guises :³ he had since excommunicated Henry of Navarre, and delivered him over to the rancorous animosity and hostility of the papal-Spanish faction in France. The Jesuits did not remain idle. Pope Sixtus, in order to foment the opposition, sent over Cardinal Gaetano as his legate, and associated with him the Jesuits Bellarmine and Tyrius—with orders to effectuate the election of a

¹ "Il a plus à Nostre Seigneur de nous en desliverer par un événement si heureux qu'on ne peut l'attribuer qu'à sa main toute-puissante, et qui faict espérer qu'on en a fini avec les hérétiques."—*Archives de Simancas, apud Capefigue*, p. 124.

² Thuan. l. xxxvi. Ann. 1564. Quesnel gives the plot to the Jesuits, ii. 105.

³ Ranke, 181.

Roman Catholic king for the people of France. At the head of the other Leaguers they led forth processions ; prescribed double fasts and vows to keep up the agitation in Paris ; kept watch in their turn as sentinels ; and made themselves “generally useful,” together with the *other monks*, according to the desires of their master the pope. Over the kingdom they spread with the same pious intention. They preached sedition in their sermons, scattered it by their written addresses, and infused it into their fanatical *congregations*—that powerful arsenal of Jesuit-machination.¹ The horrors of siege came upon the deluded people. Round about the rebellious city Henry IV. and his Huguenot army encamped in array : the Leaguers within — monks, doctors, and Jesuits—kept up the spirits of the deluded Parisians with potent doses of wild fanaticism : the pensioners of Spain administered a dose of their *Catholicism*, and their miserable dupes consented to suffer for what was called religion and orthodoxy. Through the streets they went, following a huge crucifix and image of the Virgin Mary, by way of standard, with the Bishop of Senlis for their captain—a motley crowd of priests, monks, Jesuits, and “devout and religious” citizens, resolved to defend their religion by force, like true Maccabees, or die in its defence. “And in that beautiful and devout assemblage, there were some whose bones pierced their skins by stress of fastings and abstinence, such as the begging friars of St. Bernard, eating only bread and raw herbs, or by way of a delicacy, boiled in salt and water. The sight of this beautiful and devout assemblage so inflamed the hearts of the people, and with a fire so ardent, that it seemed as

¹ Hist. des derniers Troubles, Ann. 1589 ; Coudrette, i. 188.

though the whole ocean would not be sufficient to quench the least spark of it—*que toute la mer ne fust pas bastante pour en estreindre la moindre estincelle.*¹ There was one slight drawback on all this gallant devotion—want of food—want of everything. The pope's legate, the Bishop of Paris, and the Spanish ambassador, Mendoza, proposed to convert the silver of the churches into money to pay the troops ; and the Spanish ambassador laid a premium on the duration of the miserable siege, by engaging to distribute to the poor dupes of their teachers and masters, a hundred and twenty crowns' worth of bread daily : and thus, in behalf of his master, the King of Spain, he prolonged the sedition so senseless and useless, at the paltry cost of 30*l.* per day, yielding a miserable subsistence to starving thousands.² Meanwhile, Henry IV. pressed vigorously the hopeless but fanatical city :—ever yearning for peace, ever pitying the deluded dupes of the faction, but still resolute in defence of his rights, and determined to enforce, if he could not conciliate, the surrender of the rebellious city. Vain were the vows of the deluded wretches to our Lady of Loretto in the dreadful hunger of the thousand mouths feeding on horseflesh, muleflesh, and bread made of powdered bones dug out of the tombs. Vain were “the very devout processions of people who went barefoot,” with long prayers and a thousand mummeries all the livelong day and the livelong night—whilst harrowing disease, like plague, made the spectres of famine more horrible to see. To reduce the swellings of their limbs, and the numberless maladies of the hunger-tortured wretches, the pope's legate distributed pardons and indulgencies amain ; and the monks, priests, and

¹ Pierre Cornejo, Ligueur, *Discours bref et véritable.*

² *Id. ib.*

Jesuits, gave them sermons “which so encouraged them in all their sufferings, that the sermons served them as bread—*que les sermons leur servoyent de pain.*” And when they falsely told them in these sermons that they would be relieved in eight days, they went away contented.¹ Poor, miserable dupes of priestcraft. Shall humanity never be rid of the heartless, fiendish iniquity—the true Moloch of earth. “Long live the King of Spain,” the miserable dupes were taught to shout within the walls of the city, pining in famine, wasting in disease. For a little crust of bread the poor wretches, “blind in their misery, sang songs to the praise of the League, and boasted of their good fortune in belonging to a Roman Catholic king, namely, the King of Spain.”² And Mendoza, his ambassador, to reward their fidelity, scattered among them a quantity of coppers stamped with the arms of Spain: “Long live the King of Spain,” more lustily they shouted.³ Still they starved: the coppers could not feed them. So desperate was the famine that eight thousand persons died in a few days; and frantic despair, with unavailing tears, called for pity and for food. “Give us bread; we die of hunger,” they now cried, when Mendoza flung them his Spanish coppers. And the people must be fed, if faction must endure: so it was proposed and resolved by the prelates that all the houses of the ecclesiastics should be visited and searched for food to feed the starving dupes of faction: a contribution from each house, according to the supply in hand, was demanded. The Jesuits were the first to refuse consent to the expedient, the charitable, the just demand; and Tyrius, the rector of the Jesuit

¹ P. Cornejo, *ubi supra*; Davila, ii. 154.

² P. Cornejo, *ubi supra*.

³ Id. *ib.*

college, petitioned the pope's legate to exempt him from this visitation. "Your request is neither civil nor Christian," said the sheriff of the merchants to the Jesuit. "Why should you be exempt? Is your life more valuable than ours?" They covered the Jesuit with confusion, and set to work with the visitation. It was all clover in the rack of the holy fathers. They found quantities of wheat, hay, and biscuit, enough for a year's consumption. They found also a large quantity of salted meat, which the Jesuits had dried to make it keep. In short, there were more provisions in their house than in the four best houses of Paris.¹ Hence you see how much better it is to be the leaders of a faction than its dupes; and here we see how the siege was prolonged. If Henry could have starved out the leaders, the Spanish ambassador would have been long before bowed out with his coppers. But is it not bitterly ridiculous to find out at last how these roaring bellows of sedition fortified their lungs to preach their falsehoods to their miserable dupes? And is it not disgustingly true in all times, that incendiary pharisees, whilst they preach up sacrifice to their dupes, take vast care not to be themselves the victims? Not a single house of the ecclesiastics was found without a supply of biscuits sufficient for a year's consumption at the least. "Even the house of the Capuchin monks, who are said to live on nothing but what is given to them day by day, reserving nothing for the morrow, but giving the remnants to the poor—even *their* house was found well provided. Whereat many were astonished"—and well they might be, if they were stupid enough to take them at their word.²

The provisions thus obtained, and sold to the hungry

¹ P. Cornejo, *ubi suprà*.

² P. Cornejo, *ubi suprà*.

people who had money, and given to those who had none, staved off the famine for a while—for the demand was only made for fifteen days ; and when that term expired the supplies stopped, and the second state was worse than the first. Dogs and cats had been boiled up in huge cauldrons, with herbs and roots to feed the poor. A bit of a dog or a cat, and an ounce of bread, had been the allowance—nay, it was a stipulated condition announced to the poor wretches that, before the distribution, they must bring all their cats and their dogs to a place appointed. And yet they made them pay, and very dearly too, for the bread at sixpence a pound, and the biscuit at eight pence—a nice little traffic for the Jesuits and other churchmen during that fair of the famine.¹ Henry IV. pitied the dupes of the heartless faction. Their cries reached his camp, and resounded afar : shrill were the pangs of agony. Dead bodies strewed the streets of the city. Night and day they buried them, and yet there were more to be buried.

¹ These churchmen sold the skins of the dogs and cats to the starving people. It is affirmed that this dog-flesh and cat-flesh were sold by some of these monks and priests to the amount of 30,000 crowns. “For these priests, foreseeing that the dogs and cats would be in demand, had set some poor people, whom they fed in return, to catch all the dogs that followed the persons who went to mass. Be that as it may, they managed so well, that soon after, not a cat nor a dog was to be seen in Paris.”—*Bref Traité des Misères &c.* annexed to the *Satyre Menippée* in the *Pantheon Litt.* The Jesuits even required the crown jewels as security for the cost of provisions which they supplied to the Leaguers ; and the crown jewels were delivered to them by the Duke de Nemours ! The turn which the modern apologists give to this affair is, that some of the jewels were “deposited” with the Jesuits “to prevent their entire dilapidation.” They were afterwards restored to the king by an order of the council—a sad necessity which is scarcely a matter for boasting, as the Jesuit-apologist makes the transaction. The other depositories of the crown jewels sold them, which shows, perhaps, that the other fat ecclesiastics were less wise in their generation than the Jesuits, who would have been seriously compromised by such a proceeding. Documents, *ubi suprâ*, p. 21, *et seq.* ; Cayet, *Chron. novenn.* t. i. livre vi. ; Meteren, *Hist. des Pays Bas*, livre xvi. p. 338.

Over the walls, into the ditch below, some of the wretches leaped, maddened by hunger, strong by despair, and reached the camp of the Huguenot. With tears they begged him to let some of their fellow-sufferers leave the city of the famine and the plague—and Henry consented. Four thousand escaped, and more would have followed had the soldiers not driven them back and compelled the Parisians to close their gates—shutting up the rest to famine and disease. Even the richest and the noblest of the great city now writhed in the fangs of horrible hunger. One lady, of rank and fortune, lost two of her children, who died of hunger. Famine hardened her heart, and made her inventive : she put weights in two coffins which were buried, and she kept the bodies of her poor children to feed her hunger : but never a morsel did she eat of that piteous food, which was not drenched with the tears of a mother ; and she died ere the death-feast was ended.¹

Still the Faction, the well-fed, comfortable Faction held out—in the midst of physical and moral desolation. The contact of the soldiers, and the Spaniards, *marrans Espagnols*, utterly corrupted all morals and decency. The suburbs were ruined, deserted. The city became poor and a solitude. All around it was desolation. A hundred thousand persons died in the space of three months, through hunger, disgust of life, and wretchedness—in the streets, and in the hospitals—without relief or pity. The University was deserted, or served as a refuge for the husbandmen ; and the colleges were filled with cows and their calves.² In the

¹ Bref Traité des Misères, &c., Sat. Menip.

² The Jesuits boasted that during these troubles they benefited the city of Paris by continuing to teach the young, as there was no other college in the university but theirs in full play. “Would you know the reason?” said some

palace, the *Leaguers and their party* had taken up their exclusive above. Grass grew in the streets. The shops were for the most part closed. Horror and solitude reigned where before was heard the sound of the cart and the coach. It was on the *lower orders* that the greater weight of the tempest fell bitterly—and on certain families which were well to do before the war. The well-provisioned ecclesiastics talked of nothing but patience. Roze, the ardent firebrand, Pigenat, Commolet,

one to Pasquier. “The reason is, that the principals of the other colleges had dropped their hands, deploring in their souls the calamities caused by the rebellion : whereas the Jesuits raised their hands to the skies as those who thought they had won the victory of the enterprise.” But, above all, I found a curious letter which was sent to Spain, but intercepted by Le Seigneur de Chaseron, the governor of Bourbonnois, of which *Père Matthieu*, Jesuit, was the bearer. This letter was put into my hands, and it was as follows : “Sire, your Catholic majesty having been so kind to us, as to give us to understand by the very religious and reverend Father Matthieu, not only your holy intentions in the general cause of religion, but especially your good affections towards this city of Paris We hope soon that the arms of his Holiness and your Catholic majesty united, will deliver us from the oppression of our enemy, who has to the present, for a year and a half, blockaded us on all sides, without anything being able to enter into this city except by chance, or by force of arms ; and he would strive to pass through were it not for the troops which your majesty has pleased to appoint us. We can certainly assure your Catholic majesty that the vows and wishes of all the Catholics are *to see your Catholic majesty* in possession of the sceptre of this crown, and reigning over us, likewise as we most willingly throw ourselves into your arms, as those of our father . . . The reverend Father Matthieu, the present bearer, who has much edified us, being well acquainted with our affairs, will supply the deficiency of our letters to your Catholic majesty, whom we humbly beg to give credence to what he will say.” The *Père Matthieu* here named is not the famous Claude Matthieu, the courier of the League, but either another Jesuit, or a Spanish monk. The Jesuit apologist of the Documents, in spite of the explanation given by Pasquier, falsely tells his readers that Pasquier or rather Arnaud meant *Claude Matthieu*. This is one of those mean tricks in which the Jesuits presume on the ignorance of their dupes. Compare Pasquier, *Catéchisme*, p. 289, *et seq.*, and the Documents, *ubi suprâ*, p. 32, *et seq.* Pasquier is of opinion that this Matthieu was *a Jesuit*, and gives his reasons ; but he does *not* say he was the famous *Claude*. But the main point here is the letter, with its *sentiments*—and these are not denied. Arnaud said, “The Father Matthieu of the same Order, but a *different person* to him of whom I before spoke,” &c. Plaidoyer, p. 38 ; Jesuites Criminels, p. 212.

Pelletier, Boucher, Garin, Christin, and other seditious preachers, incessantly thundered against the king and his people, and never delivered a sermon without promising succour from Spain. The Sixteen on one hand—the Forty on the other—and the supporters of the parliament shoved the wheels along—kept the machine of Faction in motion. The chiefs, amongst others the Duke de Nemours, who was contriving mighty projects, being well stocked with provisions for themselves, cared for the people only just as much as they thought necessary to prevent them from mutiny. Spanish gold was the cement of this misery, whilst they waited for the arrival of the Duke of Parma with his liberating army. If there were any priests, such as, amongst others, Benoit and Morenne, who exhorted the people to moderation, they expelled them : no man was a zealous Catholic if he did not transform the late king and the present into a sorcerer, devil, heretic damned. The miserable city was full of factions, all vomiting a perpetual fire of deadly hatred against the king. If he appeared gracious, they called him a hare and a fox ; if severe, all the tyrants in the world had been good people compared to *him* : and the more their necessities increased, the more wretchedly they bit the stone which was thrown to them from on high, as they evidenced in the first siege, and in the second which followed the retreat of the Spaniards. Thus, as in a diseased body, whilst the bad humours remain, there is no hope of health—so, whilst the chiefs of the League, namely, the Guise party, the pope's legate, the ambassador and agent of Spain, the Sixteen, the seditious preachers, were in Paris, and swayed the people, that body remained in a wretched condition : but in proportion as these humours were

evacuated, health returned to those who would have perished utterly, if the chiefs of the League had remained however short a time longer in Paris.¹

Still it cannot be asserted that the Jesuits did not share the dangers of the enterprise. On one occasion they saved the city for the Leaguers and for Spain. Henry had alarmed the city, but without effect, and the weary people had retired to their houses: "but these good fathers," says an admiring Leaguer, "either in order to give an account of the night's proceedings, or by divine inspiration for the salvation of the city, would not retire, and remained on the fortifications until four o'clock of the morning. They heard a noise and gave the alarm: but the enemy had time to plant six or seven scaling-ladders, and mounted the wall—the first invader rushed towards one of the Jesuits, who fetched him such a desperate stroke with an old halbert that it split in two on his head—and the soldier rolled head over heels into the ditch below. The good fathers served two others in like manner. One of the scalers had already thrown over his ladder inside, so as to get into the city, but the good fathers belaboured him so hotly with two halberts that they wrenched the ladder from his left hand, and did not give him time to use the cutlass he held in his right, though he struck at them lustily, but they aimed at his throat and knocked him into the ditch like the rest. At the noise, an Englishman, named William Baldwin, a lawyer, and one Nivelles, a bookseller, ran up and found these good fathers struggling with another Huguenot, whom they overpowered, dispatched, and flung into the ditch Soon the city was roused, a lot of straw was fired and hurled into the

¹ *Abrégé des Etats de la Ligue* (Pantheon Litt., Sat. Menippée).

ditch, so that the enemy, finding that they were discovered, sounded a retreat. It was the third and best opportunity these blinded people had for capturing the city ; for if instead of six ladders they had fixed six hundred, and in different places, as they might have done, having more than fifteen hundred, (the people and everybody being tired and fatigued) they would have succeeded in their enterprise, but God was pleased to blind them as on the other occasions,—and wished that these good fathers should have the glory of having defended this city, not only with their doctrine, but also with their arms, and at the risk of their lives. So that there are five things which preserved this people, without all of which it seems that it would have been impossible to preserve it—namely, the contrivance and valour of Monseigneur de Nemours, the governor, the presence of the pope's legate, the alms of the Spanish ambassador, the persuasion of the preachers, and the news sent by Monseigneur de Mayenne and published by the princesses ;—we can say that the sixth and most evident of all was the diligence and care of these good fathers.”¹

¹ Pierre Cornejo, *Discours bref et véritable*, &c. “The method of apology which the Jesuits have always adopted,” observes St. Priest, “has always led them to deny everything to serve a temporary purpose, even courageous and honourable deeds.” The deed just related was at least courageous—and yet the Jesuits deny it in the face of four authorities, Davila among the rest. The only argument they allege is the assertion of De Thou, that the assault failed on account of the shortness of the ladders—certainly a very improbable deficiency in such a veteran army as that of Henry IV., who had made the attempt twice before. De Thou actually quotes the fact from Cornejo, and the Leaguer's description of the famine ; though he introduces the man's name as one who in some respects did not write with exact diligence respecting those times—*illius temporis plerunque minus exactâ diligentia scripsit*. Still he quotes the fact, and there is no evidence to show that he saw reason to gainsay the Leaguer's account, which certainly has no appearance of a fabrication, as the man writes in admiration of the deeds of the “good fathers.” The apologist of the Documents

At length, after an important victory or two, and much skilful management to little purpose, or, at least, after the most conciliating conduct on his part, Henry IV. resolved to "take the perilous leap," as he wrote to his mistress, and turned Roman Catholic once more, to confound his enemies and secure the crown of France.¹ Henry IV. humbled himself to the pitiful ceremonial in order to consolidate his ascendant, to group round about him the cities of the League, to fling confusion and disorder amongst the powers which resisted his rights of inheritance and victory.² What a bitter thing it was for his faithful Huguenots! But he promised them complete protection—and they loved him so well that they let him "take the perilous leap," as he piteously

truncates De Thou in order to make the aspersion on Cornejo conclusive. The fact is, however, that the expedition was a blunder on the part of Henry, as many believed, according to Davila, and it remained for De Thou to account for the exceedingly curt manner in which he dismisses the transaction. See *Davila*, ii. 175. The affair is also given in the *Journal de l'Etoile*, and the *Brieve Histoire des Guerres civiles avenues en Flandres*. The denial is in vol. i. of the *Documents, Des Jesuites Ligueurs*, p. 21. In favour of Cornejo, it may be stated, that Capefigue quotes him, p. 152, *La Ligue et Henri IV.* It seems to me that the authority of Davila is far superior to that of De Thou. Davila served under the banners of Henry IV., and therefore knew the cause of the failure: he ascribes it to "a Jesuit," but, of course, leaves it to those within the city to describe the particulars, which the Leaguer Cornejo has done so graphically. Touching Davila, see *Sismondi, Historic View*, ii. 59.

¹ " 'J'arrivai hier soir de bonheur,' ecrivait-il à sa belle maitresse, 'et fus importuné de Dieu garde jusqu' à mon coucher. Nous croyons la trêve, et qu'elle se doit conclure aujourd'hui; pour moi, je suis à l'endroit des Ligueurs, de l'ordre de Saint-Thomas. Je commence ce matin à parler aux esveques, outre ceux que je vous mandois hier L'espérance que j'ai de vous voir demain, retient ma main de vous faire plus long discours. Ce sera demain que je ferai le saut périlleux. A l'heure que je vous escrit, j'ai cent importuns sur les espauls qui me feront hair Saint Denis comme vous faictes Mantes. Bon jour, mon cœur; venez demain de bonne heure, car il me semble qu'il y a desjà un an que je ne vous ai vue. Je baise un million de fois les belles mains de mon ange et la bouche de ma chère maitresse.' "—*Henri IV. à la Marquise de Mousseaux; apud Capefigue, ubi suprà*, p. 251, et seq.

² Capef. 247.

wrote to his mistress, just before he abjured his faith, made his confession, was otherwise humiliated—in fact did the thing completely, and heard a grand *Te Deum* sung over his fall from personal dignity, and his ascent to a golden crown of thorns. How Elizabeth of England bewailed that natural but too significant transaction. “Ah! what grief,” she wrote to the unscrupulous conformist, “and what regrets, and what groans I have felt in my soul at the sound of such tidings as Morlans has related! My God! is it possible that any human respect can efface the terror which Divine fear threatens! Can we even, by arguments of reason, expect a good consequence of actions so iniquitous? He who has supported and preserved you in mercy, can you imagine that He will permit you to advance, unaided from on high, to the greatest predicament? But it is dangerous to do evil with the hope of good from it. Your very faithful sister, Sire, *after the old fashion*—I have nothing to do with the *new one*. ELIZABETH.”¹ Doubtless Henry felt a momentary pang or misgiving at these earnest words of upright expostulation; but doubtless, too, he smiled it away when he thought of the results which the mummary promised. Indifferent to all creeds but that of Machiavel, Henry of Navarre mocked and made a jest of his abjuration, to which he so flippantly alludes in his love-letter to his mistress—by way of

¹ “Ah! quelles douleurs! et quels regrets et quels gémissemens j’ay sentis en mon ame par le son de telles nouvelles que Morlans m’a contées! Mon Dieu! est-il possible qu’aucun mondain respect dust effacer la terreur que la crainte divine menace! Pouvons-nous, par raison même, attendre bonne sequelles d’actes si iniques? Celui qui vous a maintenu et conservé par sa merci, pouvez-vous imaginer qu’il vous permist aller seul au plus grand besoin. Or, cela est dangereux de mal faire pour en espérer du bien. Votre très assurée sœur, sire, à la vielle mode, avec la nouvelle je n’ay que faire. ELIZABETH.”—*Bibl. du Roi, MSS. de Colbert, apud Capefigue*, p. 251.

a most dismal preparation for that general confession which he was to make on the morrow—with contrition—and absolution—and holy communion. His veritable motive was a political transaction—a purely worldly means for gaining a crown. The preliminaries were clap-trap : the finality was expedience : but the verbal abjuration of his Calvinistic creed was complete. He cloaked himself with popery—the charmed garment that could dazzle and win the blinking religionists of the realm. To the churchmen of St. Denis he swore every article of Roman Faith : to the Protestant princes he only said : “ That following the counsel of his friends and other princes, he had consented to hold a conference with the Catholic lords and ecclesiastics of the moderate party, and even to adopt *the papal ceremonies*, as the only means of avoiding a greater defection among his subjects,—to destroy that accusation of heretic relapse which served as a pretext of revolt,—to save his crown and wait for new succours from abroad : that Queen Elizabeth of England herself had already engaged to give him fresh assistance ”¹—*recognising the necessity in which he was placed*,—which was false, as we have seen by the queen’s afflicted letter.

Here now, however, was a Roman Catholic king to throw all rivals out of the royal field. Besides, there was valour, there was victory, there was force of arms still to advance his pretension. Henry’s “ conversion ”

¹ Correspond. de Henri IV. avec Maurice-le-Savant par M. de Rommel. p. 6. Henry’s sister, Catherine, afterwards Duchess of Lorraine, wrote about the same time as follows to the Prince Palatine John I. “ I beseech you, whatever you may hear, not to believe that I will change my religion : for with God’s aid, I shall make so exemplary a confession of it, that no one will doubt that I am resolved to end my days in it, that I would deem myself very unfortunate if I abandoned God for men. Do me the good, I beseech you, to assure all good people of this.” — *Ib.*

was ready money to the moderates ; though Spanish doubloons still stimulated the holy union of sedition. It was a moment of crisis—a time when public opinion was totally unsettled, and therefore might be swayed with dexterity in any direction, if skilfully handled. Pamphlets swarmed accordingly—biting ridicule—cutting sarcasm—stinging jokes fell thick upon the Spanish faction, so pious, so holy, so comfortable in the midst of starving thousands. In truth, the sixteenth century was the epoch of caricature and pamphlets. Luther, the German and Genevan school, and subsequently the Dutch and Flemish, had popularised those dashes of biting rage which went at once to the common sense of the multitude. They would seize whatever was ridiculous in a man, or a measure, or a cause, or a system, and fling it to feed the herd of mockers. So desperately given to horrible bloodshed—so often in the midst of hideous sights, that sickened the heart until it was made insensible as stone—the men of the sixteenth century needed farce, folly, burlesque, and masquerade—a mixture of religion and debauchery, so necessary to unite a dreadful earth to that heaven which, after all, those religionists felt was receding from them further and further for ever. They sang their mistresses and the holy confraternities together. Fantastic religionism and rampant licentiousness are the most unitable things in existence ; infinitely more so in times when dreadful crimes must be committed with the deliberation we commonly require to perform an act of heroic virtue. Hence the people then loved the excitement of vivid importraitures, whether tending to inspire grief, hatred, pity, or withering contempt. Never had the productions of caricature been more touching,—light, yet penetrating.

It pounced on all the emotions, all the creeds of the epoch. Had it to account for religious persecution? How naturally it fetched a devil, and showed him up blowing forth the infernal atrocity. Nor did it scruple to paint the great serpent lugging off to his quarters flocks of Huguenots and politicians. Intentions, characters, absurdities were perfectly reproduced, and assumed embodiment life-like, unmistakeable under the creative hand of the artist. The parliamentarians took hold of this powerful arm as soon as it favoured them. Paris was inundated with pamphlets, with caricatures, and striking suggestions. They represented the Spanish ambassador under the figure of a huge hen, her head covered with an enormous red bonnet and plume, carrying on her back a long broom, and holding up a little owl—evidently meant for Philip's *infanta*, the royal dream of the Spanish and Jesuit faction—for France or for England. This fowl ambassador is holding a parley with the pope's legate—a remarkably fine cock with long feathers, accoutred in a crimson episcopal roundabout, and armed with a cross-bow, at the end of which is a little fish, to represent Saint Peter's hook, which caught beautiful pence rather than the souls of the purgatorial caverns.¹ Disgusting and blasphe-

¹ Capefigue, *ubi suprâ*, 162, *et seq.* It were impossible to quote many of the fancies emitted in those days of "religious" excitement. Capefigue gives some of the worst. In French, horrible as is the meaning, much of the offensiveness is removed by that conventionality which makes "all things lawful" to that language. The same remark is applicable to all the *Roman* languages, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. Whence comes this? Is it not a striking proof of that mental debauchery which resulted from the licentiousness that accompanied the highest development of continental intellect? Words the most revolting to Englishmen are familiar to the French. Imagine the name of a thoroughfare to be "*Hell-street!*" And yet nobody shudders at hearing and repeating *Rue d'Enfer* in Paris. These remarks might be very

mous were many other thoughts and fancies of the hour—a terrible reaction, however, against the still more disgusting and blasphemous proceedings of the Leaguers and their sacerdotal bellows. When ridicule is overwhelmingly brought to bear upon a cause, nothing remains for it but to die,—and that was the doom which ridicule prepared for the selfish League, its selfish priestcraft and fanaticism. Cervantes has been awarded the merit of having ridiculed chivalry, or knight-errantry, out of fashion : but many other causes had already combined to direct men's thoughts to more profitable phantoms. It is, however, unquestionable that the authors of the famous *Satyre Menippée* killed the hydra of the League. This pasquinade tore the veil from men's eyes, whilst it laid bare the deformities of the monster which had preyed upon them so long, so recklessly, so cruelly. The original title was the *Satyre Menippée*, or *The virtue of the Spanish Catholicon, and the sitting of the Estates of Paris during the League*,—published in 1594.¹ It became a joint-stock composition, when it “took” with the public, and consisted of several parts by “different hands.” The first, or the *Catholicon*, was composed by Le Roi, chaplain to the young Cardinal de Bourbon ; the second part, or the *Farce* of the

largely extended through the whole range of French conversational expression and *literature*. One of the causes was the abuse of the *religious sentiment*, which the Roman teachers applied to the basest purposes, and made subservient to the vilest interests and expedience.

¹ The word *Menippée* is derived from Menippus, a Cynic philosopher of Phœnicia, originally a slave ; he purchased his liberty and became one of the greatest usurers at Thebes. He grew so desperate from the continual reproaches and insults to which he was daily exposed on account of his meanness, that he destroyed himself. He wrote thirteen books of satires, which have been lost ; “all full of salted witticisms, and peppered jeerings and jokes provocative of laughter, to exasperate the vicious men of his time.”—*Discours de l'Imprimeur, Sat. Menip.* (*Panth. Litt.*)

Estates of the League, was by many hands ; but Passerat and Rapin composed the poetry—some of the best specimens in the French language. The harangue put in the mouth of the cardinal legate was by Gillot, canon of the *Sainte Chapelle* of Paris, and a clerical member of the parliament. His house was the workshop of the whole satire ; and he it was who represented the burlesque procession of the Leaguers, as pictured among the cuts of the early editions. Florent, Chretien, and Pierre Pithon, other wits of the day, produced the curious and striking harangues of the other sacerdotal Pharisees.¹ It is thus evident that it was a systematic onslaught, with determined energy and resolution to put down the humbug, which was done accordingly. The opening at once gives a full idea of the entire performance. Two charlatans are represented, one as a Spaniard, the other as a man of Lorraine, stationed in the court of the Louvre—both “quacking” their drugs, and hocuspocussing all day long before all who would go and see their performance, which was *gratis*. “The Spanish charlatan (the Cardinal de Plaisance) was very merry, and mounted on a small scaffold, playing the virginals, and keeping a bank, as we see at Venice in the St. Mark. To his scaffold was attached a great skin of parchment, with inscriptions in several languages, sealed with five or six seals of gold, lead, and wax, with titles in letters of gold, as follows : —“Credentials of the power of a Spaniard, and of the wonderful effects of his drug, called *Higuiero de Inferno*, or Compound Catholicon.”² The sum of the schedule

¹ Henault, *Hist. de France*, ii. 600 ; Feller, *Biog. Univ. in voce*, Gillot.

² *Higuiero d’Inferno* means, in Spanish, *Fig-tree of Hell*. The drug was so called for many reasons. “First, the fig-tree is a wretched and infamous tree, whose leaves, according to the Bible, served to clothe our first parents after they had sinned, and committed high treason against their God, their father and

was, that this quack was the grandson of a Spaniard of Grenada, exiled into Africa for Mahometanism, physician to the high-priest of the Moors, who, from being a schoolmaster and preacher, made himself King of Morocco by a species of *Higuiero*, by dispossessing his master by degrees, and finally killing him, and taking his place. The father of this quack being dead, the son

creator, just as the Leaguers, in order to cover their disobedience and ingratitude against their king and benefactor, have taken the *Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman church to cover their shame and their sin*. Wherefore the *catholicon* of Spain is the pretext which the King of Spain and the Jesuits, and other preachers, gained over by the doubloons of Spain, have given to the seditious and ambitious Leaguers, to rise up and revolt against their natural and lawful king, and wage more than civil war in their country : the *Catholicon* can, therefore, be properly called the Fig-tree of Hell, whereas that with which Adam and Eve covered themselves, was the Fig-tree of Paradise. You know, also, that the ancients considered this tree a gibbet, as when Timon the Athenian wished to root up one which he had in his garden, and was somewhat in the way, but on which many persons had hanged themselves already,—he sent forth a trumpeter to proclaim, that if any one wished to hang himself, he must be quick, because the fig-tree was to be uprooted. Pliny tells us that this tree has no odour, neither has the *League* : also, that it easily drops its fruit, just like the *League* : thirdly, that it receives all kinds of graftings, just as the *League* receives all sorts of people : fourthly, that it is short-lived, just as the *League* : fifthly, that the greater part of the fruit which appears at first, does not reach maturity, exactly like that of the *League*. But what beseems it most, and which has more resemblance to the *League* than St. Francis has to our Lord, is the fig-tree of the Indies, which the Spaniards themselves have named Fig-tree of Hell [*Higuera Infernal*, the *castor-oil plant*] of which Mathiol says, that if you cut off only a leaf, and plant it half way in the soil, it strikes root, and then on that leaf another leaf sprouts ; thus, leaves sprouting on leaves, the plant becomes as high as a tree, trunkless, stemless, branchless, and, as it were, rootless, so that it may be placed amongst the wonders of nature. Is there anything so similar and apposite to the *League*, which, from a single leaf, that is, a small beginning, has attained by degrees, from one accession to another, that great altitude at which we have seen it, and yet, for want of having a good footing, and a strong stem to support it, has toppled over at the first wind ?” And so on, the writer follows up the curious allegory with wonderful and most amusing minuteness of similitude, diverging into the *cocoa-nut tree*, and the numberless uses to which it subserves ; “like the *League*, which from the first served the purpose of all sorts of people, with all sorts of hopes, with all sorts of means to cover all sorts of passions—hatred, avarice, ambition, vengeance, and ingratitude.”—*Discours de l’Imprimeur, Sat. Menip. (Panth. Litt.)*

came to Spain, got baptized, and put himself to service at the *Jesuits'* college of Toledo. Here, having learnt that the simple Catholicon of Rome had no other effects than the edification of souls, and caused salvation and beatitude in the next world only, and being rather annoyed at so long a delay, he resolved (in compliance with the testamentary advice of his father) to sophisticate that Catholicon,—so that, by dint of handling, stirring, refining, calcining, and sublimating, he had composed in that college of the Jesuits a sovereign electuary which surpasses every philosopher's stone, the proofs whereof were couched in five articles." Then follow the said articles, of which I shall translate the most striking. "What that great emperor Charles V. could not do with all the united forces and all the guns of Europe, his brave son, Dom Philip, by the help of this drug [compounded in the Jesuit college of Toledo, a city famous for magic], has been able to do sportively with a simple lieutenant of twelve or fifteen thousand men." "Let a retired king [Philip II.] amuse himself with refining this drug in the Escorial—let him write a word in Flanders, to Father Ignatius, sealed with the Catholicon, and the Father will find him a man who (*salvâ conscientiâ*) will murder his enemy whom he could not conquer by arms in twenty years," alluding to the assassination of the Prince of Orange at Delft.¹ "If this king proposes to secure his estates to his children after his death, and to usurp his neighbour's kingdom at small cost, let him write a word to Mendoza his ambassador, or to Father Commolet [Jesuit], and let him write at the bottom of his letter, with the *higuero de inferno*, 'Yo el Rey, and they will

¹ This murder by Baltazar Girard is ascribed to the instigation of the Jesuits by Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, livre viii. c. 20 ; *Catéchisme*, 202 b.

furnish him with a religious apostate [Jacques Clement], who will go, with a fine face, like a Judas, and assassinate, in cold blood, a great king of France for him, his own brother-in-law, in the midst of his camp, without fearing either God or men : they will do more—they will canonise that murderer, and will place that Judas above Saint Peter, and will baptize that horrible and portentous enormity, with the name of a *blow from heaven* [as did Mendoza], whose godfathers will be the cardinals, the legates, and primates”—the Cardinals Gaetano and Plaisance, legates, the Cardinal de Pelvé, and the Archbishop of Lyons. “Serve as a spy in the camp, in the trenches, at the cannon, in the king’s chamber, and in his counsels ; although you be known as a spy, provided you have taken in the morning a grain of *Higuiero*, whoever challenges you will be considered a Huguenot and favourer of the heretics.” In the harangue of the Archbishop of Lyons, composed by Rapin, the archbishop is made to speak appositely for *all* French revolutions, as well as the League. “O illustrious assistants, chosen and appointed at random for the dignities of this notable assembly—the pure cream of our provinces—the unpressed wine of our governments—who have come hither with so much toil, some on foot, others unattended, some by night, and most of them *at your expense* ! Do you not admire the heroic deeds of our Louchards, Bussys, Senaults, &c. [the Sixteen], who have made their way so well *by the pen* ? What do you think of so many heads [*caboches, noddles*], which have been called together, and which God has raised up at Paris, Rouen, Lyons, Orleans, Troyes, Toulouse, Amiens, where you behold butchers, tailors, knavish lawyers, watermen, cutlers, and other sorts of

the scum of the mob, possessing the first vote in the council and assembly of the nation, and giving the law to those who were before great by birth, by wealth, and by qualifications, who would not dare now to hem or mutter before them ? Is not that the fulfilment of the prophecy which says :—*De stercore erigens pauperem* ? Would it not be a crime to pass over in silence that holy martyr Jacques Clement, who, having been the most debauched monk of his convent (as all the Jacobins of this city know full well), and even after having been publicly reprimanded in the chapter, and whipped, several times, for his thefts and wickedness, is, nevertheless, to-day sanctified, and is now on high, disputing precedence with St. Jago de Compostella ? O blessed confessor and martyr of God, how gladly would I deliver an oration and eulogium in thy praise, if my eloquence could reach thy merits ! But I prefer to be silent rather than say too little ; and continuing my speech, I will speak of the strange conversion of my own person. Though Cato observes :—*Nec te laudaris, nec te culpaveris ipse*—neither praise nor inculcate thyself ; still I will confess freely to you, that, before this holy enterprise of union, I was not a great eater of crucifixes, *mangeur de crucifix*, [not very devout,] and some of my relatives, and those who have been most intimate with me, have thought that I smelt somewhat of the fagot, because, when a young scholar, I took delight in reading the books of Calvin, and at Toulouse had joined the nocturnal disputations with the new Lutherans ; and subsequently I have not much scrupled to eat meat in Lent, nor to commit ———, according to the example of the holy patriarchs in the Bible :¹ but

¹ “ L’archevesque de Lyon, lors irrité contre le Roi [Henri III.] pour des vers qu’il avait faits, et fait faire, en recriminant, et sous les noms de Philon et

since I have subscribed to the holy League, and the fundamental law of this estate, accompanied by doubloons and the hope of a cardinal's hat, no one has any longer doubted of my belief, nor made any further inquiries about my conscience, and my conduct You know, gentlemen, that our *pensions* are matters for serious consideration. But, above all, frequently see to the renovation of the oaths of unity, on the precious body of our Lord, and continue the *confraternities of the name of Jesus* and of the Order : for these are good collars for small folks—where-with we charge the honour and conscience of our good fathers the Jesuits ; and we also recommend to them our spies, in order that they may continue to expedite with certainty our news to Spain, and enable us to receive the secret commands of his Catholic Majesty, to ensure their being obeyed by the ambassadors, agents, curés, convents, churchwardens, and masters of the *confraternities* ; and in their particular confessionals, let them not forget to forbid, under penalty of eternal damnation, every one to desire peace, and still less, to talk of it—but to make the devout Christians stubborn and resolved on assault, blood, and fire, rather than submit to the Bearnese [Henri IV.], even should he go to mass,—as he has charged his ambassadors to assure the pope. But we well know the antidote should this happen, and we will take care to issue a command that his Holiness shall believe nothing of the kind, and even should he believe, he shall do nothing, and should he do anything, we will receive nothing, *if I am not made a cardinal*. Why should I not be made a cardinal, if Pierre de Frontac, being a simple advocate at Paris during the reign of King John, was

made a cardinal for having strenuously defended the cause of the church ?¹ And I—who have deserted my master, and have betrayed my country to support the grandeur of the holy apostolic see—must not be a cardinal ? Yes, I shall—indeed I will—I promise you—or my friends will fail me. I have spoken.”²

These extracts will serve to give some small idea of this whelming appeal to public opinion against the religious quackery of the League, by which this association managed to inflame the people to their own misery and destruction. The *Satyre Menippée* took effect ; and the good citizens of Paris laughed themselves into wisdom—unquestionably the best method of escape from irrational bigotry and political folly. At the present day, in the midst of our sympathetic stirrings, the British Pasquin of the world may prove himself the grand pacificator of England. It is only to be hoped that the minds and hearts of our governors will not stop short with the triumph of security—but will rather make the dutiful effort to reform abuses and forfend calamity by meriting no retribution.

In its last days the League had lost its primitive grandeur. The prestige—the leading idea—was no more. Its chiefs had let themselves down by the guilt of meanness in the eyes of the people. After so much treasure wasted on the part of Philip,—so much abominable roguery on the part of the pope, the priesthood, the monkhood, and the Jesuits,—after so much dreadful suffering on the part of the people by famine and disease—

¹ The allusion is to Pierre de Fretigny, advocate of the parliament and canon of the Church of Paris, who supported the party of the pope, or anti-pope, Clement VII., and was by him made cardinal in 1385, in the reign of Charles VI. —See Ciaconius (Clement VII.) ; and the *Mélanges d'Histoire*, t. i. ; *Vigneul Marville, Catholicon d'Espagne*.

² Harangue de M. de Lyon, Sat. Menip.

after *all*—the thing turns out to be a complete failure. It is so delightful to contemplate such a result, that we would do well to fix the antecedents in the memory of the mind and in the memory of the heart. Events and circumstances had antagonised two systems in Europe,—that of Philip and ultramontane Catholicism, whose end and aim were universal monarchy in unity of faith—which must be Roman Catholic :—that of Elizabeth and Protestantism, whose aim and end were simply self-defence in the destruction of the monster enemy. The Catholic League was, for the King of Spain, the principle of an universal policy. Under its influence, France succumbed under the domination of Philip : the Netherlands could scarcely escape the same fate : the fleets of the great king overshadowed England with their ten thousand sails—and fanned Catholic “stirs” or insurrections in the heart of the country and in Scotland. This glorious scheme was completely understood by Elizabeth. And she thwarted it to admiration. The alliances of “the poor old lady—*la pauvre vieille*,” as she called herself in her dispatches, tended to effectuate the dismemberment of the Spanish monarchy by the triple league of the Pyrenees, France, and Italy. To that end she enlisted into her service the Protestantism of the Huguenots wherever they existed on the Continent. Henry IV., the exponent of “religious indifferentism,”—if the expression be not absurd—placed himself exactly in the midst of the two grand systems. By his abjuration he did not abandon his alliance with England—nor the stronger friendship of his brave Huguenot chivalry. Still, a most dexterous politician, at the peace of Vervins, he satisfied Spain,—and yet without offending England. Henry IV. was, in politics, exactly what he was in religion—indifferent

as to persons—forgetful of services rendered him—placing himself between two systems in order to create one for himself alone, both in his personal interests and those of the crown he was assuming. Philip's constitutional indecision was an immense advantage to Henry IV. The Spaniard's prodigious activity was that of a doll effected by a string—totally irrational, and therefore easily “played off” by a politician as cunning and crafty as ever wore a crown. Consider the Spaniard's agents:—all of them small intriguers—in-capable of those large contrivances which take into consideration all the passions of men—their desires, their so-called best interests—driving each its own way, apparently, and yet eventuating the mighty result in contemplation. But there never was anything like a well-laid design in any of Philip's machinations. His agents “stirred” everywhere recklessly—thwarting each other, exasperating the princes, lavishing heaps of doubloons, which the insatiate avidity of the great vassals in France devoured, without promoting in the least the grand result contemplated—namely, the destruction of heresy as an obstacle to Spain's universal domination. In fine, there was needed in that revolution, as in all popular movements, a decided and resolute leader, capable of grasping the energies of the masses to apply them vigorously as he listed, and by a whelming will to necessitate achievement.¹

¹ See Capefigue, *La Ligue et Henri IV.* p. 271. It is this deficiency—this deficiency of a superior mind, that renders the present epoch of wild and desultory revolutions a crisis full of gloomy foreboding. All over Europe the revolutionary heads are as weak and shallow as the revolutionary members are wild and frantic. We may be sure that royalism on the continent will take advantage of this desperate deficiency. Counter-revolutions will follow. The scheme may now be machinating, which will render Russia the last but triumphant hope of exasperated royalism. Such a result will be disastrous to the freedom of Europe: the second state will be worse than the first. God forbid it!

In 1594 the good people of Paris opened their gates to Henry IV. "The reduction of the city to the obedience of his majesty was so sweet and so gracious, and with such contentment, that none of the citizens received harm in person or property, and the whole day was spent in thanksgivings for so many unexpected felicities, and bonfires blazed during the night for a sign of gladness."¹ Henry IV., in his turn, by way of attesting his precious adhesion to the Catholic mysteries, accompanied the processions and grand ceremonies which filled the streets of Paris in every direction. The rectors, deans, theologians, all the whole tribe of universitarians were foremost with their allegiance to the Roman Huguenot. They "swore with heart and mouth to the most Christian Henry IV., with all submission, reverence, and homage, to recognise him for their lord and prince temporal, sovereign, sole, and legitimate heir; renouncing all leagues and pretended unions, both within and without the kingdom; and we confirm the same," they said, "placing our hands, one after the other, on the holy gospels."² This was the finale of the grand Catholic League so glorious. And a most appropriate ending it was. No other could be expected from its beginning and its progress. Elaborate theories have been developed to explain the phenomenon: but after all, two words suffice to declare both the cause and the effect—*human nature*. How long must we continue to be fooled by names? The paltriest clique-skirmishes and feuds of the paltriest villages perfectly represent the contentions of kings and nations. Some petty jealousy, some thwarted selfishness, shall make two or

¹ Thus the event was recorded by the Parisian town-council in their registers. —See Capefigue, *ubi suprâ*, 311.

² Capefigue, *ubi suprâ*, 328.

more families desperate enemies to each other. Some unforeseen fortuitous incident shall bring them together once more ; hands will be shaken ; and the lips, which uttered erewhile words of implacable detestation, then fashion themselves to outpour exhaustless compliment. It is precisely thus with the little men of great rank and pretensions. A thousand theories may be invented to explain political events—but it is *human nature* after all. When historians shall cease to mount on stilts in order to instruct mankind respecting the doings of the kings and great ones of earth, then their tomes will be the archives of honest wisdom speaking truth and shaming the devil.

Poor human nature ! We should be ashamed of it were we not sure that, in spite of its baseness, it is called to a better destiny, which it can and would reach, were it not for our most defective indoctrination and conventionalities. The turn-coat University of Paris—every other would do the same—belied itself expediently. Thereupon, the League was confined, or rather, was thrown to the dogs or on a dunghill, to vanish by *eremacausis*—elemental putrefaction. Woe to the vanquished ! was the fact, and numberless caricatures and libels fixed their talons on the holy union of the holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church—even as “a violent cross wind from either coast,” the reaction “blew it transverse, ten thousand leagues awry into the devious air”—

“Then might ye see

Cowls, hoods, and habits, with their wearers, tost
And flutter'd into rags : then relics, beads,
Indulgences, dispenses, pardons, bulls,
The sport of winds : all these, upwhirl'd aloft,
Fly o'er the backside of the world far off,
Into a limbo large and broad, since call'd
The Paradise of Fools.”

Odes, sonnets, quatrains, stanzas, couplets, in laudation of the Bearnese, were the gushing productions of every pen in the turn-coat city of Paris. All the heroes of pagan mythology lent their attributes and jackets to the triumphant Huguenot. *Henri IV.* was Perseus, and *la France* was Andromeda. *La France* had been sacrificed, and *Henri IV.* delivered her from the monster who held her in his fangs. Such was the *reaction*—the like to which might at any time, in any revolution, be brought about by those who understand human nature and have “put money in their pocket.” Let me be perfectly understood—my firm conviction is, that the *originators* of all revolutions are invariably the worst specimens of human nature. No man who has a heart to feel for humanity will consign the physical, moral, and intellectual fortunes of millions to the arbitrament of a mob.

Henry IV., himself, was astonished at the issue of events. “Can I believe,” he exclaimed, “that I am where I am? The more I think of it, the more am I astounded.”¹ Surely this attestation is enough to silence all theories in explanation—except that of *human nature*. Some of the preachers continued to denounce the Huguenot king. Henry silenced them, —drove the most ardent into exile: but where he struck, the blow was inflicted with discernment: he was not a merciful king, but a deeply political sovereign.² By favour and money he continued vigorously to sap the foundations of the League. One of its great military heads, Brissac, had betrayed the Spanish cause: treason became contagious, or rather in fashion—for treason was, and ever is, a matter of example. All rushed to sell their allegiance

¹ Capefigue, *ubi supra*, 331.

² *Id. ib.*

to the Huguenot : they tried to outstrip each other in their desertion of the conquered cause. When a cause falls on evil days, the most desperate wound it has to endure is dissension amongst its defenders. The exultation of victory stifles the fermentation of internal discord : whilst the spring-tide of successful or offensive battle rushes onwards, there is neither time nor inclination for internal strife : but when the receding tide of adversity lays bare the unsightly mud-bottom of the cause, suggesting chilling reflections on the ghastly sights disclosed,—in that last winter of a cause erewhile so ardent, when defection from its ranks is bold and prominent, and the future darkens with despair—then is the time for mutual, unmeasured, and bitter recriminations amongst the members. This happened to the League, and Henry IV. exerted himself to the utmost to fan the flame of discord.¹ The League and Philip became contemptible. Narrowness of mind, — petty jealousies,—frivolous vanity supplied the grand motives of action. The Catholic question was sunk before the eyes of all the world, into the uttermost depths of desperate egotism, where it had always been in point of fact, though specifically raised to the surface by the bladders of vain promises and pretences. It now became a trade in corruption—hard gold being the circulating medium, and dastardly defection the marketable commodity. Henry IV. enticed away the chiefs of the League, whilst Philip II. bought up men and war-posts. It was no longer a royal contest of chivalry, but a subornation of the vilest sentiments of the heart. Day by day the strength of the Spanish faction in France vanished amain : the country was evacuated. The

¹ Capefigue, *ubi supra*, 336, *et seq.*

wonderful activity of Henry IV. reduced, one by one, all the war-posts bought over with doubloons, or acquired by craft. It was now a war of *nationality*—faction was no more. The Spaniards would have to measure their prowess with that of the French: the League was shattered for ever. The furies which had stimulated civil discord in France were now to direct their energies against the very nation whose king and whose gold had roused them to treasonable insurrection and their country's destruction. This was exactly as it should be—by way of retribution.

The Jesuits and the Jacobins had not acquiesced in this turn of affairs so glorious for Henry IV. Popular among their party, and beloved by a certain portion of the masses, the Jesuits and the Jacobins had not bent the knee before the victorious “heretic of Navarre,” as the Jesuit Parsons called him at the very time in question. When the king commanded these preachers to announce his power, and to justify his authority, the two corporations had disobeyed. In the secrets of the confessional, in that mysterious interchange of opinions, advice, and penance, the Jesuits had often recalled to remembrance the glorious days of Catholic power in the League—in the midst of grand processions, with incense and flowers, with endless oaths and infinite obtestations.¹

¹ Capefigue, *ubi supra*, p. 347. The university, the curés, all the orders of monks gladly submitted to Henry IV. The Jacobins and Jesuits were the only dissentients. The oath proposed to them by De Harlay, president of the university, was simple enough: “I promise and swear, that I will live and die in the Catholic, apostolic, and Roman faith, under obedience to Henry IV., most Christian and Catholic King of France and Navarre; and I renounce all leagues and assemblies made against his service, and I will undertake nothing against his authority.” Jouvenci, the Jesuit historian, says that this oath was framed purposely to destroy the Jesuits: but it is difficult to see what objection they could make to it, unless their party-spirit was by themselves admitted to be paramount

As long as these mighty men of influence remained opposed to the king, there could be no security for his rights or his life. The thought of assassinating the king was familiar with the people: the opinion of the corporations was, that a heretic not reconciled to the Church was without the pale of common rights—it was a meritorious deed to use the knife in order to rid the city of the anathema.¹ Private suggestions, religious insinuations, were not necessary to arm the hand of a fanatic: it was an article of faith, universally proclaimed, that a heretic king might be cut off, as we have heard from the Jesuit-schools: there was immortal glory (according to Mariana, *whose book was just published*,) for the assassin who would cut down an offensive tyrant—that is, a heretic king. Few believed in the sincerity of Henry's abjuration: the pope mistrusted the Huguenot. Sixtus V. was dead, but Pope Clement VIII. was disposed to carry out the papal policy. The inflammatory book of the Jesuit Parsons against Elizabeth, but including, as we have seen, strong argumentation against Henry of Navarre, had gone through several editions, with a wide circulation over France: an edition had just appeared, published under the pope's own eyes at Rome.² Until the king could be absolved

to all other considerations of allegiance to the accepted king of the country. This is, doubtless, the secret of the opposition. At Lyons, also, they refused to take the oath, although the mob threatened to storm their house, and overwhelmed them with abuse.—*Du Boulay*, &c. ; *Coudrette*, i. 194, *et seq.*

¹ Capefigue, *ubi suprâ*, p. 346.

² *Andreæ Philopatri ad Elizabethæ Reginae Edictum*, 29 Novembris, 1591, promulgatum responsio. In 1592 it was published at Lyons, and in the same year at Augsburg. The copy in my possession was printed at Rome in 1593. By the superscription on the title page, it belonged to the library of the Roman college of the Company; and there is also a Latin inscription stating the author to be Parsons; the inscriptions appear to have been contemporaneous, and the handwriting is that of the end of the 16th, or beginning of the 17th century.

by the pope, the abjuration was incomplete ; and the churchmen, who still were 'motived to resist Henry IV., made this deficiency the excuse for violent agitation or underhand machination. Henry was aware of this, and was anxious to get absolution from the pope. He sent the Duke de Nevers on the mission to the papal court : but the ambassador was met in Switzerland by the Jesuit Possevin, who presented him a brief from the pope, and informed him that he could not be received as ambassador from Henry IV. to his Holiness.¹ Nevertheless, the French ambassador pressed forward to Rome, and obtained an interview ; but the pope positively refused to acknowledge his diplomatic qualifications : all that passed between them must be considered mere private discourse ; and yet there was much public import in what he said to the ambassador of Henry IV. "Do not tell me that your king is a Catholic. I will never believe that he is truly converted, unless an angel come from heaven to whisper it in my ears. As to the Catholics who have followed his party, I look upon them only as disobedient deserters of religion and the crown, and no more than bastards and sons of the bondwoman. Those of the League are lawful children, the real supports and true pillars of the Catholic religion."² It is therefore not at all surprising that the pulpits of the faction, which still held out, resounded with appeals

¹ Mem. de Nevers, ii. p. 405 ; Cayet, Chron. Noven. ii. 251.

² Cayet, livre v. p. 251, *et seq.* ; Journal de Henri IV. ; Browning ; Ranke. It were tedious to detail the numerous conspiracies and attempts against the life of Henry IV., from the year 1584 to 1610, when he was murdered—all generated by the League, advised and sanctioned for the most part by the Court of Rome, inspired and directed by the King of Spain, and by the Jesuits with other monks. Some of Henry's escapes were curious and striking ; but I must refer to other writers for the details. See Cayet, Hist. de la Paix, p. 144, *et seq.* ; Chronol. Noven. p. 228, *et seq.*, and the Annales des Soi-disans Jesuites, t. ii. p. 161 to p. 289, including authentic letters and extracts from many historians of the times.

calculated to excite any violent enthusiast to undertake the deliverance of the Church from its pretended dangers. The Jesuit Commolet, in one of his sermons, enlarged upon the death of Eglon, King of Moab ; applauded, like Mariana, the assassination of the late king, and described Jacques Clement as sitting among the angels of heaven. Having thus applied the text, he exclaimed :—" We must have an Ehud—we want an Ehud—be he a monk, a soldier, or a shepherd, it is of no consequence—but we must have an Ehud—this blow is all we want to put our affairs in the situation we desire."¹ It is further stated that at the end of his sermon he exhorted his audience to look forward, saying :—" You will soon behold a miracle sent express by God—yes, you will see it—and consider it already done."² Such sermons were preached at Lyons and other towns, as well as at Paris. They were sanctioned by the Company's theologians, and certainly not discountenanced by the pope's opposition to the king. In

¹ The Jesuit of the Documents denies this apostrophe of his brother Commolet, stated by Arnaud in his pleadings against the Jesuits in 1594 ; and boastfully says that he had read 500 volumes written at the time or immediately after, without finding the fact—which, however, is given in the *Journal d'Henri IV.*, which the Jesuit quotes for other purposes. He says, " let the magistrates anti-jesuitical tell us in what historian, in what monument, in what source Arnaud found an anecdote which no one knew before him"—but surely as Arnaud delivered his charge so early as 1594, there is no wonder that the fact had not as yet become historical : the king had only just entered Paris. The anecdote was therefore as yet a *tradition*, which Catholics venerate next to Scripture, at least. This frothy apologist takes good care not to tell his reader *when* Arnaud delivered his charge. Again, the alleged services of Commolet subsequently in favour of the king are brought forward by the apologist : but again he fails to state that it was when the tide was setting against the Company, that Commolet made a show of " good service"—just as all the Jesuits, when subsequently patronised by Henry, vied with each other in the same show of " good service." See *Documents, i. Jesuites Lig.* p. 25, *et seq.*

² Arnaud, *Plaidoy.* p. 50 ; *Les Jesuites Criminels*, p. 210, *et seq.* Arnaud says that more than 300 persons were able to attest the fact that this sermon was preached by the Jesuit Commolet. See also Pasquier, *livre iii. c. vi.* De Thou attests the seditious sermons of the Jesuits, *lib. cvii.*

effect, one Pierre Barrière was seized, and confessed his resolution to murder the denounced heretical king. When he had resolved to devote himself to the attempt, he applied to the vicar of the Carmelite monks for his opinion : the friar praised his courage. A Capuchin likewise pronounced such a deed meritorious : but a Dominican, who happened to be attached to the royalist party, being consulted by the assassin—an ignorant man of the lower orders—deferred giving his opinion till the following day, and notified the fact to a royalist, who seized the fanatic. Barrière confessed that he had applied to a priest at Paris, who assured him that the king was not a Catholic, though he went to mass ; and introduced him to Varade, the rector of the Jesuits. Varade, he said, assured him that to kill the king was a great action ; but it required courage, and he must previously confess himself and perform his Easter devotions. He then gave him his benediction, and intrusted him to another Jesuit for confession. Thus encouraged and fortified spiritually, he purchased a double-edged knife, which he had pointed and sharpened, and then set out to kill the heretic king, when he was arrested. According to Pasquier, the criminal confessed all these facts without being subjected to the torture, and affirmed them on the scaffold, and even on the wheel on which he was hideously broken—“always full of sense and presence of mind,” says Pasquier, who had interviews with the wretch in prison.¹ His confession was very simple, and he mentioned the names of his advisers, who were all priests or doctors in theology : “indeed,”

¹ Cayet, lib. v. ; Thuan. lib. cvii. ; Pasquier, livre iii. c. vi. ; Id. Lettres, livres xxi. et xxii. ; Browning, p. 188.

says Browning, "there is not the least room to doubt their complicity on this occasion."¹ It was this event which hastened the mission of the Duke de Nevers to Rome for the pope's absolution, by way of a shield for the king against the regicidal preachers of France.² Meanwhile the king marched into Paris, amidst cries of *Vive le Roi*, and all manner of gratulations, as I have stated, from an immense majority of the people, monks, priests, and the universitarians. Then the gallant university put forth the oath of allegiance to Henry IV., which I have given, but which the Jesuits resolved not to swear. Doubtless, the great animosity against the Jesuits still existed in the universitarians: but, even if we give to this motive the greatest possible weight, it must be evident that the determination of the Jesuits to refuse allegiance to the acknowledged king of the realm was sufficient to hold them up as public enemies, bellows of sedition, incendiary Pharisees. To say that they could not take the oath until the king was absolved by the pope would have been reasonable enough, if they had decamped from the kingdom; but to remain at

¹ Hist. of the Huguenots, p. 188. The Jesuit Juvenci (Hist. Soc. Jesu. lib. xii.) denies the share of Varade in this affair; but the Jesuits deny everything. It does indeed seem most preposterous in the Jesuits to utter their denials in the face of all acknowledged opinions of their theologians, then so rife, in the face of the undoubted resistance of the pope to Henry's accession. How much better it would have been to admit the fact, and to lament it as an abuse of the religious sentiment. But such is the perversity of all partyism, that it pre-supposes a mental blindness in others as great as the moral obliquity which guides its own proceedings.

² Henry permitted the Cardinal de Plaisance, who had strenuously opposed him, to leave Paris without molestation; he even allowed him to take with him the Jesuit Varade and the priest Aubry, the accomplices of Barrière. *Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. An. 1594*; *Du Boulay*, p. 813. Henry's forbearance was, of course, purely political; it was his interest to connive at the iniquity whilst his fate seemed to depend on the *master* of the cardinal and the Jesuits, namely, the Pope of Rome.

their posts, and yet refuse allegiance to the reigning monarch, was scarcely a resolution likely to meet with toleration in any age—not excepting the present. The unreasonableness of the Jesuits is enhanced when we consider their known influence with the people—in their famous confraternities which, at that period, belted all Europe, which the Company aspired to move as she listed, by her application of the Archimedean screw to the hearts and minds of humanity. It was therefore not to be wondered at that the University of Paris passed a decree, a month after the king's triumphant entry, to summon the Jesuits to trial, with a view to their expulsion from the kingdom. The parochial clergy joined the University against the Jesuits, and the cause was tried by the parliament of Paris in 1594. The Jesuits were found to have been, one and all, so deeply interested in the Spanish party, that their expulsion from the kingdom was considered necessary. It was futile to say that the whole Company should not be punished for the active exertions of certain members. There was a bad principle, which the whole Company was sworn to defend and to promote—the deposition of heretical kings, together with Philip's grand idea: it was therefore perfectly impossible to make exceptions for the sake of the "Company," whilst all its members were under the influence of that principle, so hostile to the interests of the French government, and to every other.

This question lasted for a long time: endless machinations confused, protracted, exasperated the minds of the debaters. The decree of the University, ordering the proceedings for the banishment of the Jesuits, was signed by the Faculty without any objection. This affair has become memorable by the constant reference

made to it on every occasion which has brought the Jesuits into collision with the parliaments. The charges then advanced against the Company have been always renewed whenever the public mind has been excited by the Jesuits. Antoine Arnauld was advocate for the University ; Louis Dolé for the curés of Paris : and Claude Duret pleaded on behalf of the Jesuits. Arnauld's speech contained much violent declamation ; that of Dolé was more argumentative. The defence of the Jesuits was comprised under two heads—one, that the accusation against the Company was inadmissible—the other, an answer to the accusation, if admitted.¹ Public feeling was so much against the Jesuits, and the assertions made by Arnauld entered so deeply into the experience of the nation at large, that the proscription of the Company was fully expected. The doctors of the Sorbonne had joined in the clamour against the Jesuits, and it was principally in consequence of their demand that the trial had been instituted : but by their intrigues and cabals, the Jesuits obtained a partial document from some of the Faculties, withholding their assent to the prosecution. They also produced a “conclusion” under the name of the Faculty of Theology, against their expulsion from the kingdom : but of this pretended document no trace was ever found in the registers or other books of the Faculty. The fact is, that it was “got up,” like modern petitions, for party-purposes. As the Jesuits became the sole teachers of Paris during the League—when the University was converted into an asylum for cows and their calves—they had time to form the young doctors of theology, and of

¹ Cayet, livre v. p. 379, *et seq.* ; Plaid. de M. Ant. Arnauld ; Coudrette, i. 202, *et seq.* ; Browning, p. 190.

course won them over to the interests of the Company.¹ This did not succeed : they tried other means—patronage. The nephew and *successor* of their old friend the Cardinal de Bourbon, Archbishop of Rouen, was their resource in their time of trouble. This cardinal was the old gentleman whom the Leaguers had raised to mock royalty under the name of Charles X., in opposition to Henry IV. The nephew took the Jesuits under his family wings, and petitioned the parliament, as a party in the litigation, opposing the expulsion of the Jesuits. And the Duke de Nevers (the late ambassador), who saw the danger of exasperating the Jesuits, and, consequently, the pope, by these severe measures, and being otherwise friendly to the Company, gave in a protest against the contemplated expulsion : he said that the Company should not be made responsible for the faults of its members,—though he admitted that the Jesuit-rector at Nevers was *less wise and less prudent than he ought to be in his office*—in other words, that he was a good Leaguer.² The vacation came on : the prosecution was deferred. There was evident machination among the members of parliament : it seemed “that the bad party prevailed,” although Henry, from the camp at Laon, had written to the parliament, requesting and commanding them “very expressly to pass on to the judgment of the process,” because he had heard that “under colour of certain con-

Henry IV.
against the
Jesuits.

¹ Juvenci (lib. xii. p. 41) states the fact of the “conclusion,” but of course omits to explain how it was “got up.” See D’Argentré, Collect. Judic. ii. p. 503; Coudrette, i. 200.

² Du Boulay, p. 819, *et seq.* ; Coudrette, i. 201.

hinder the judgment.¹” These sentiments attested that Henry was well acquainted with the machinations of the Jesuits, and that he was by no means disposed to show them favour. The result was, an attempt on his life. In the following December, whilst Henry was arriving at the Louvre, from the provinces, a young man glided through the crowd unobserved, and, with a knife, aimed a blow at the king’s throat. At that moment two gentlemen had approached, making their salutation on bended knee ; and the king, having stooped to raise them up, received the blow on his mouth. The assassin threw away his knife, and, at first, protested his innocence ; but afterwards he confessed the attempt :—his name was Jean Chatel. Eight days afterwards Henry wrote to Du Plessis, saying :—“ I am quite cured of my wound. These are the fruits of the Jesuits. But they shall evacuate my kingdom.”²

At his examination, Chatel showed that his fanaticism was a sort of inspiration. He stated that he had studied

¹ See the letter in Du Boulay, p. 866. “Many of the magistrates were keenly afflicted to see that the bad party prevailed. Augustin de Thou, president of the parliament, a man of inflexible uprightness, said he saw well enough that, by leaving such a process undecided, they left the king’s life in uncertainty : that this was not what he ought to expect from the parliament : that it would have been better to secure the life of the king by a memorable punishment which might be expected from them : that, as for himself, he was so old that he must expect to see the end of his life sooner than the termination of that process, —but, that he might not die without having declared his sentiments on the subject, he was of opinion that the Jesuits ought to be expelled from the kingdom.” This speech is given by the president’s nephew, the celebrated historian of the same name. *Thuan. Hist. Lib.* 110. Ann. 1594.

² Mem. de Du Plessis, t. ii. p. 495. “Je suis du tout guari de ma blessure. Ce sont là des fruits des Jesuites. Mais ils vuidront mon Roiaume.”—*Lettre du 5 Janv.* 1595. When Henry was first told that Chatel was a pupil of the Jesuits, he said, “Was it then necessary that the Jesuits should be convicted by my mouth ?”

philosophy at the college of the Jesuits ; that in that house he had often been in the *Chamber of Meditations*, whither the Jesuits introduced the worst sinners. In that chamber, said he, are seen the portraits of many devils of divers frightful shapes, to terrify sinners unto repentance, as they pretended, but in reality to shake their minds, and drive them by admonitions to some mighty perpetration.¹ He affirmed that he had heard the Jesuits say it was lawful to kill the king,—as a tyrant and a heretic, as long as he was not approved by the pope ; and that the act of delivering France from his sway offered, as he thought, the best chance of preserving himself from some part of the torments to which he fancied he was doomed.² The miserable wretch suffered the dreadful punishment awarded to regicides at this period.

The Chamber of Meditations.

It was with difficulty that the populace were restrained from taking vengeance on the Jesuits. Their colleges were surrounded by soldiers : several Jesuits were taken into custody, and the rest removed to other houses. Amongst those arrested

The Jesuit Guignard hanged.

¹ In the *Praxis Exercitiorum Spiritualium*, published by the Jesuit Isquierdo, we have some idea of these monstrous pictures—devils without end of horror and absurdity. Nothing could have exceeded the horror inspired by the picture of Hell, at page 72, when enlarged and coloured for the Chamber of Meditations. But the most hideous of all is entitled the *Puteus Abyssi*, the bottomless pit. It is a naked man sitting in a chair somehow suspended over the mouth of the pit. There are seven swords stuck into him, at different parts of the body—each sword being named after one of the passions. The sword of Idleness is stuck betwixt his thighs, Gluttony in his stomach, Lust just above, Anger on a level with the last, but opposite, Envy in his back, Pride in his breast, Avarice between his shoulders, whilst the sword of Vengeance hangs over his head.—P. 43. All these bloody images must have had a strange effect on the minds of devotees in those days of political and religious excitement.

² Cayet, livre vi. p. 432, *et seq.* ; Coudrette, i. 216 ; Browning, p. 191 ; Juvenci, lib. xii.

were Guignard, the rector of the college ; Gueret, who had been Chatel's confessor and adviser ; and Hay, a Scotchman, who had been remarkable for his zeal against the king. On examining the papers found in the college, there were found, in Guignard's handwriting, some propositions to the following effect : " That if some royal blood had been shed at the St. Bartholomew, they would have been spared the evils under which they laboured ; that the act of Jacques Clement was heroic and glorious ; that the crown of France could, and must, be transferred to some other family than that of Bourbon ; that the Bearnese, although converted to the Catholic faith, would be treated more mildly than he deserved if he were confined in some severe convent, there to do penance ; that if he could not be deposed without war, let war be carried on against him ; and if that could not be done, he should be put to death. Shall we call him a Nero," said the writer, " the Sardanapalus of France, a Fox of Bearn ? " Guignard admitted the writing to be his, but the Jesuit apologist insinuates that the treasonable papers had been composed four or five years before, and that Guignard had " forgotten " to burn them !¹ Guignard was condemned to be hanged—protesting to the last moment his innocence and allegiance. It was a curious and wonderful retribution, that the judges who condemned this Jesuit were the very men who had, as Leaguers, voted the late king to destruction.² The Jesuits were now banished the kingdom—as Henry promised in his letter—banished in " perpetuity." By way of a memorable example, the house belonging to Chatel's father was razed to the

¹ Documents, De l'attentat de J. Chatel, p. 39 ; Coudrette, i. 219.

² L'Etoile, Journal, ii. 155, *et seq.*

ground, and a pillar was raised on the site. This famous pyramid had four sides, with appropriate inscriptions. On the first, it was written that “a detestable parricide (imbued with the pestilential heresy of that most pernicious Sect [of the Jesuits], which, lately covering the most abominable crimes with the veil of piety, has publicly taught men to kill kings, the Lord’s anointed, the living images of his Majesty)—undertook to assassinate Henry IV.”¹ It seems ridiculous to hear the Jesuits alone accused of these “abominable crimes,” by these Leaguers turned royalists “for a consideration.” The Jesuits were not innocent: but there were many others quite as guilty: the great difference was, however, that it was impossible to make exceptions as to particular members who might be innocent, in a Company so universally sworn to uphold a bad principle. The monks acted as individuals, or as cliques: the Jesuits machinated always as one man—united ever by unity of purpose. Hence there was no necessity for banishing the Capuchins who continued to attempt the life of the king, after the expulsion of the Jesuits. Among the seven or eight wretches who sought the king’s life, three were Capuchin monks. On this fact the “impartial” Linguet observes: “A Carthusian tried to kill Henry IV.: two Jacobins followed his example, and three Capuchins imitated the two sons of St. Dominic: nevertheless, neither the Carthusians, the Jacobins, nor the Capuchins were banished: why then were the Jesuits banished on account of Chatel’s attempt, who was not even a Jesuit?”² “To this question,” says Adolphe Boucher, “the answer seems easy enough. They hanged the Carthusians, the two Jacobins, and

¹ Coudrette, i. 220.

² Hist. Impartiale des Jesuites, ii. livre x., c. xxvi.

the three Capuchins: but they did not banish their brethren, evidently because the crime committed was that of the Carthusians, the two Jacobins, the three Capuchins, and not that of all the Carthusians, Jacobins, Capuchins: whereas, in the crime of Chatel, they beheld the work of the whole Company of Jesus united. Besides, who, at the time when Chatel struck Henry IV., flung the regicidal pages of their Bellarmines, and Marianas, at the thrones of kings? Were they Carthusians? No. Were they Jacobins or Capuchins? No. They were Jesuits. Now the Jesuits were always too clever to play with knives themselves: they were generally content with forging, sharpening, and placing them into good hands.”¹ Linguet observes, however, that “they did well in banishing the Jesuits: but they would have done better in never receiving them:” still, in point of fact it was as impossible really to banish the Jesuits as it was not to receive them at first: in all manner of disguises they remained in France, steadfastly machinating as usual, and taking all the means in their power to effectuate their return.² Henry seemed to breathe freely after the expulsion, especially when numerous inquiries were made respecting the Jesuits in every part of the kingdom; and it was found that those connected with the Company were generally in expectation of the

¹ Hist. Dramat. et Pittoresque des Jesuites, ii.

² Hist. Abrégé des Jesuites, i. 140. Millot, *ex-Jesuit*, observes very appositely: “It is certain that most of the other bodies in Paris, ecclesiastical and monkish, might be reproached with a blind zeal for the court of Rome, a criminal attachment to the King of Spain, and to those detestable maxims which led to regicide. But it was deemed necessary to make an example with men more attached by their profession to ultramontane opinions, and more capable, by their intrigues, their talents, and their employments, by their very regularity, of spreading and upholding those opinions. The Company had too much contributed to the birth and progress of the League, for the fall of the one not to be disastrous to that of the other.”—*Elém. de l’Hist. de France*, iii. 132.

attempt upon the monarch's life. A few days before the act was committed, two Swiss were met by some Jesuit at Besançon, on his road to Rome, who told them that, very soon, the King of Navarre would be killed or wounded. The event was also looked for by the Spanish troops in Bretagne, who were sent to aid the expiring League; and from informations taken at Bourges, it appeared that one Francis Jacob, a scholar of the Jesuits in that town, boasted that he would kill the king if it were not already done by another.¹ The evident rancour displayed against the Jesuits would lead us to believe these assertions were "idle tales" invented to precipitate their downfall, were we not convinced by what we have read, that their unconcealed doctrines at the time led directly to any and every attempt against an excommunicated king. To discuss the merits of the oft-renewed dispute, not only between the Jesuits and the Parliaments, but also their quarrels with the Secular clergy, would be tedious beyond endurance. They form the staple commodity of the French histories of the Jesuits. It is, however, remarkable that the declaration published by the Jesuits, in answer to the decree for their banishment, contains an observation, which completely proves the danger and confusion that must attend their establishment in any country, where the people have made the least advances in civilization. After arguing upon the bull of Sixtus V., which deprived the king of his right to the crown, and declaring that the Court had usurped the authority of the Church, in stigmatising as impious and heretical the doctrines which Chatel had imbibed, the Jesuits added, "that lay-judges condemning ecclesiastics, and

¹ Hist. des Derniers Troubles, ii. 53.

particularly ‘religious men,’ [*i. e.*, Jesuits or monks], the *immediate subjects of the pope*, were [*ipso facto*] excommunicated.”¹ It was indeed a harsh expulsion, and, in other circumstances, would have been an unjustifiable decree: but consider the case in all its bearings—consider the conduct of the Jesuits everywhere—their forceful ejectments of nuns at Rome, pagans in India, heretics in Bavaria—consider all that you have read, and if we frankly despise the universitarians and the *new* royalists, we cannot, on that account alone, exonerate the Jesuits, or regret their retributive calamity. On the other hand, surely there was infinitely more reason for the king to expel the Jesuits from Paris in those days, than the present Pope Pius IX. could possibly have for expelling them from Rome, at the present time;—and yet Pius IX. *has* expelled them—on the 1st of April, 1848—as memorable a Fool’s Day as ever was, as far as the pope is concerned—for perhaps on that offence against the machinators may hinge the ruin of his house. . . . The Jesuits have always had friends—have always found or made sympathisers in the hour of ruin. In effect, the expulsion of the Jesuits threw fresh obstacles in the way of Henry’s absolution, so necessary to prevent his assassination. When D’Ossat waited on the pope, after the news reached Rome, Clement enlarged upon the proceedings of the French Parliament; and concluded by saying: “See if this be the method of accommodating matters!”²

Meanwhile, the king was more urgent than ever for the absolution; however ridiculous it seems to the enlightenment of the nineteenth century, it was abso-

¹ Browning, p. 192; Cayet, livre vi. p. 438.

² D’Ossat, *Lettres*, part I. p. 36, Jan. 31, 1595.

lutely necessary in those times of sanguinary fanaticism, and influential monkhood, and stirring Jesuitism. The Spaniards menaced the pope if he consented : but the League was no more ; the cause was broken : the pope at length yielded—when he heard that the king was advised to establish a patriarch at the head of the Gallican Church. The idea of this schism frightened the pope : they told him that Clement VII. lost England for wishing to please Charles V. ; and Clement VIII. would lose France if he continued to seek the pleasure of Philip II. ;¹ the Cardinal Tolet, a Jesuit and a Spaniard, joined in the supplication ; Henry's messenger, D'Ossat, was urgent, and the pope gave the precious absolution, inflicting the requisite penitential blows on the backs of the king's representatives, D'Ossat and Du Perron, whilst the *Miserere* psalm was entoned by the assisting priests. Thus was the royalty of France humiliated in deference to the despicable and detestable abuse of man's religious sentiment by the Moloch of Rome.² You will smile when you hear that Henry IV. agreed to perform the following penances : he was to rehearse the chaplet (five Our Fathers, and fifty Hail Marys) every day, the litanies every Wednesday, the rosary (fifteen Our Fathers, and one hundred and fifty Hail Marys) every Saturday, to hear mass every day. He was to confess his sins, and receive communion publicly, at least four times a year ; he was to build a convent, &c.³ There

¹ Millot, iii. 134. There is another version of the anecdote in Davila, lib. xiv.

² See Browning, *Huguenots*, p. 193, for the affair of the absolution and the accompanying verberation.

³ Millot, *ubi suprâ*, 135. He says that "these penances were very little in comparison with the humiliating ceremony which Henry's ambassadors endured for him, in receiving, on their knees, strokes of a whip from the hand of the pontiff."

are strange specimens of humanity now-a-days, who yearn for all such proofs of ecclesiastical domination. Poor, flimsy, miserable sentimentalists who are even unworthy to be named with the *Jesuits* whom they publicly pretend to oppose, but whose slaves they are, and perfectly worthy to remain such for ever.

END OF VOL. II.

LONDON :

BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.