Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/concerningjesuit00gera

CONCERNING JESUITS

LONDON
CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.
1902

BX
3702
G31

CONTENTS

THE JESUITS. By the Comtesse de Courson.

THE JESUITS. By the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J.

THE JESUIT OATH. By the Rev. John Gerard, S.J.

THE "MONITA SECRETA." By the Same.

BOGEYS AND SCARECROWS. By the Same.

"THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS." By the Same.

JESUIT OBEDIENCE. By the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J.

THE JESUIT LIBEL CASE: VAUGHAN *v.* "THE ROCK."

THE 'JESUIT PLOT FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF OUR LIBERTIES.' By the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J.

Pres Wheeler Lib 1931

160481

PREFACE

So much is said and written about the Jesuits that information concerning them should be much in demand. Unfortunately, however, the majority of speakers and writers who undertake to provide instruction for the public do not deem it necessary first to obtain it for themselves, but, allowing prejudice to take the place of knowledge, repeat old fables, or invent new ones, with such persistence and assurance as to induce readers to believe that what is so confidently asserted must needs be true.

The aim of the present little volume is to furnish some means of learning what manner of men Jesuits actually are, under what obligations they bind themselves to their Order and its chief—obligations commonly spoken of as shocking and wicked—what kind of stories are told and believed concerning them, and on what kind of foundation such stories when investigated are found to rest.

Undoubtedly the Jesuit as here portrayed will be found a far less romantic and picturesque person than he is in the hands of various popular authors, but it is no less certain that he is far more like the reality.

J. G.

THE JESUITS.

BY THE COMTESSE R. DE COURSON.

I.

THEIR FOUNDATION AND THEIR CONSTITUTIONS.

On the 15th of August, 1534, seven men in the prime of life, students at the university of Paris, assembled in an underground chapel on the hill of Montmartre, sanctified by the martyrdom of St. Denis and his companions. Here the only one among them who was a priest celebrated Mass, and the seven took solemn vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, to which they added a promise to put themselves at the immediate disposal of the Pope, to be employed by him for the greater glory of God.

The leader of the little band was a Spanish gentleman from Biscay, Don Ignacio de Loyola, once a soldier of determined courage and some renown, eager in the pursuit of martial glory. He had been converted by a sudden stroke of grace, and had then conceived the desire of founding an Order of men devoted to the service of God and the Church. His design had ripened during the years that followed his conversion — years of penance and prayer, of close communion with God, of ceaseless self-conquest and voluntary humiliation. Gradually there gathered around him a little group of

men, students like himself, all of whom he had met at the University of Paris, where the once brilliant warrior, unskilled in book learning, came to learn the elements of literature and science. They were: Francis Xavier, James Laynez, Alphonsus Salmeron, and Nicolas Bobadilla, Spaniards like Ignatius himself; Peter Faber, a peasant from Savoy; Simon Rodriguez, a Portuguese. All were young, and possessed of remarkable gifts of intelligence; they had an ardent wish to devote their lives to the glory of God and the salvation of souls, and an implicit confidence in him whom they had chosen as their leader. Among them Xavier was perhaps the most remarkable for his unbounded generosity of soul and his power of winning the hearts and convincing the minds of men; Laynez for his splendid intellect; Peter Faber for his childlike innocence and angelic piety.

Six years later we find Ignatius and his followers, whose numbers had by this time increased, settled in Rome, where they devoted themselves to the service of the sick and poor. At the same time Ignatius was occupied in laying before the Holy See the plan and constitutions of his Institute, with a view of obtaining the Pope's approval and blessing on the new foundation. After some delay the Pope, Paul III., by the bull "Regimini militantes Ecclesiæ," gave the new-born Society of Jesus the solemn sanction of the Church, September 27, 1540.

It is said that when he saw the plan of the Society and realized its object, the Pope exclaimed, "The finger of God is here!" and truly it seemed as though the Order of Jesus had been providentially called into existence at that special moment of the world's history. Only twenty years before, Martin Luther had raised the standard of rebellion against the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and his baneful influence had already spread throughout England, Sweden, Norway, and a portion of France and Germany. It seemed consistent with God's watchful providence that, in presence of the pressing dangers that threatened the Church, a new body of trained soldiers should be raised to fight her battles.

The Pope evidently realized to the full the providential use of the new Institute; only two years after he had given it his solemn approbation we find him sending its members as his representatives to Ireland and Scotland. A little later, in 1545, he gave them a still greater proof of confidence by appointing Fathers Laynez and Salmeron theologians of the Holy See at the Council of Trent. Other members of the Order were, about the same time, employed in Germany to defend the Catholic Faith against the so-called reformers.

It is easy to understand, after perusing the constitutions of the Society of Jesus, that the idea of St. Ignatius was to place at the service of the Church a body of soldiers always under arms and ready to be employed, according to circumstances, as missionaries, writers, theologians, teachers of youth, controversialists, preachers, or directors of souls. He was careful not to impose upon them the long vigils, fasts, and corporal penances, or even the recitation of the Divine Office in common, that form so distinctive a feature in the legislation of contemplative Orders; these practices would have been impossible to men whose duties were necessarily active and varied, but if he obliged his sons to few corporal penances he required from them absolute obedience and self-sacrifice.

The constitutions of the Society were drawn up by St. Ignatius with great deliberation, accompanied by fervent prayer; they give us a high opinion of the legislative and organizing capabilities of the soldier-saint. Each article was the subject of long and serious thought; we may mention as an example of this that he was in the habit of writing down on a piece of paper the different reasons for or against each resolution, and among his papers there was found one containing eight reasons written down in support of one particular view, and eighteen in support of another. After weighing calmly and dispassionately the different motives that presented themselves to his mind, he used to recommend the matter to God, "as though," says one of his biographers, "he had nothing to do but to write down what God

should dictate."[1] In one instance we are told that he prayed unceasingly during forty days for light upon one particular point.

Let us now briefly examine the different stages through which the holy founder of the Society leads its members. He begins by telling us that whoever desires to enter the Society should be ready to renounce the world and all possession and hope of temporal goods, to embrace any employment his superiors may think fit, to obey his superior in all things where there is no sin, and to "put on the livery of humiliation worn by our Lord." The noviciate of the Jesuits lasts two years, during which study is completely set aside; the novice devotes his time to the practice of poverty, humility, and self-denial. Then he makes his first vows, after which, continues St. Ignatius, "the foundations of self-denial having been laid, it is time to build up the edifice of knowledge." Hence the years that immediately follow the noviciate are employed in the study of literature, rhetoric, philosophy, natural sciences, history, and mathematics. This course of study is generally followed by five or six years of teaching boys in the colleges of the Society, and towards the age of twenty-eight or thirty the young Jesuit is sent to prepare for the priesthood. From a busy college life, with its daily routine of manifold duties and care for others, he is plunged into a course of study that lasts about four years, and during which all the powers of his intellect are called into play; towards the age of thirty-three, when his theological formation is completed, the Jesuit scholastic becomes a priest.

St. Ignatius is, however, not yet satisfied; a few years later, when the religious of the Society is still in the full strength of manhood, about thirty-six years of age, a priest, well grounded in study, trained to solid virtue, and having acquired a certain experience of men and things, he is sent to a second noviciate, where, just as in the first days of his religious life, he puts aside every kind of study and gives himself up solely to prayer and to the conquest of self.

[1] P. Bonhours, *Vie de St. Ignace*, p. 299.

During this "third year of probation," or second noviceship, he again goes through the spiritual exercises for thirty days, and at the close of this period of trial he pronounces his solemn vows, either as a professed Father or as a spiritual coadjutor. These two classes are on a footing of perfect equality in the Society; but the professed Fathers, having passed through full four years of theology and undergone certain examinations on the subject, may be said, in a certain measure, to constitute the very soul of the Society of Jesus, and a few posts of trust and responsibility are reserved to them alone.

With the same attention to details, St. Ignatius and his immediate successors regulated the number and length of the exercises of devotion to be performed by members of the Society. They imposed upon them a daily meditation of one hour, the celebration of, or the assistance at, Mass, a quarter of an hour's examination of conscience twice a day, a visit to the chapel after dinner, and in the evening a certain time to be spent in spiritual reading. These practices, short and simple, are suited to men whose occupations are necessarily varied and absorbing—men whose lot may be cast in a college, on a mission, among pagans or heretics, and to whom long hours of contemplation, or even the recitation of the Divine Office in common, must needs be an impossibility.

The same practical and legislative spirit reveals itself in the constitutions of the Order. It is governed by a superior or general, elected for life by an assembly called the General Congregation, to which belong the different provincials of the Society and two professed Fathers, who are elected by each province. The general is surrounded by councillors called assistants, belonging to different nationalities, and he also has an admonitor, whose duty it is to advise him on matters regarding his private conduct. The most implicit obedience is due to the General by all the members of the Order, who are free, if they desire it, to communicate directly with him. In his turn the General of the Society promises entire submission to the Pope.

The Society of Jesus is divided into provinces, each of which includes a certain number of houses and is governed by a provincial, assisted by consultors and an admonitor. Each house has a local superior, who likewise has his consultors and his admonitor, with whom he shares his responsibilities. At stated times the general received from the different provincials and also from the local superiors a detailed report of the province or house committed to his charge. The mainspring of the whole organization of the Society is a spirit of entire obedience: "Let each one," writes St. Ignatius, "persuade himself that those who live under obedience ought to allow themselves to be moved and directed by Divine Providence through their superiors, just as though they were a dead body, which allows itself to be carried anywhere and to be treated in any manner whatever, or as an old man's staff, which serves him who holds it in his hand in whatsoever way he will." [1]

This absolute submission is ennobled by its motive and should be, continues the holy founder, "prompt, joyous, and persevering; . . . the obedient religious accomplishes joyfully that which his superiors have confided to him for the general good, assured that thereby he corresponds truly with the Divine Will."

If the constitutions, so carefully drawn up by St. Ignatius, are in fact the code of laws that govern the Society, the book of the Spiritual Exercises may be justly regarded as its very soul, the fountain-head of the spirit that vivifies the whole body. It is, strictly speaking, a manual for Retreats, a collection of precepts and maxims, destined to help and guide the soul in the work of its sanctification and in the choice of a state of life. St. Ignatius composed it at Manresa, where, in the deep solitude of that wild retreat, he went back in thought over the struggles that had preceded his own conversion and recorded his personal experiences for the assistance and enlightenment of other souls. Thus it happens that, as its name tells us, the book of the Exercises is one to be practised, not merely read through; the spirit

[1] Const., p. vi. c. i.

that breathes through its pages is an essentially active one, yet methodical and deliberate; only here and there, as in the meditation of the Two Standards, we are reminded that the writer was a soldier.

The Spiritual Exercises were carefully examined at Rome and formally sanctioned by a Bull of Pope Paul III., who declared the book to be "full of piety and holiness, very useful and salutary, tending to the edification and spiritual progress of the faithful." [1]

One of the first acts of St. Ignatius was to forbid his sons to accept any ecclesiastical honours, unless compelled to do so by a special command of the Pope. In heathen countries only, where the episcopal dignity is often a stepping-stone to martyrdom, we find now, as in the past, several Jesuit bishops. Nevertheless the soldier-saint had his ambition: if he raised a barrier between his children and ecclesiastical dignities, he desired for them another gift, and it is a fact that he prayed that persecution and suffering might be their portion. On one occasion his favourite child, Peter Ribadeneira, met him coming from a long meditation, and, struck by his radiant look, questioned him familiarly, as was his custom. At first the saint smiled without answering; then, Ribadeneira having insisted, he said, "Well, Pedro, our Lord has deigned to assure me that, in consequence of my earnest prayer to this intention, the Society will never cease to enjoy the heritage of His Passion in the midst of contradictions and persecutions."

We may safely add that this petition of the founder of the Society of Jesus has been, and is still, fully granted.

[1] P. de Ravignan, *De l'Existence et de l'Institut des Jésuite*, p. 37.

II.

THE JESUITS AS TEACHERS OF YOUTH.

Although their founder destined them to embrace every form of apostolic work, the Jesuits, from the outset, considered the education of youth as one of the chief objects of their foundation.

During the lifetime of St. Ignatius, Simon Rodriguez, one of his first companions, founded the college of Coimbra, in Portugal; the Duke of Gandia, the future St. Francis Borgia, established another in his ducal town of Gandia, and colleges were likewise founded at Messina, Palermo, Naples, Salamanca, and other towns.

St. Ignatius himself, with that attention to details we have already noticed, regulated the organization of the colleges of the Society, to whose prosperity he attached great importance. In Rome he took an active part in the foundation of the Roman and German colleges; the first, which was raised by the Popes to the rank of a university numbered 200 pupils from every part of the world in 1555; about thirty years later, in 1584, their number had increased to 2,107.

The professors of the Roman college were selected among the ablest members of the Order, and their classes were attended, not only by the Jesuit scholastics, but also by the students of fourteen other colleges in Rome. Seven Popes and many canonized saints may be numbered among the pupils of the Roman college; among its professors were men like Suarez, Bellarmine, Cornelius à Lapide, &c.

The German college in Rome also owes its origin to

St. Ignatius—a fact recorded in the inscription on his altar: "Sancto Ignatio, Societatis Jesu fundatori, Collegium Germanicum auctari suo posuit." He had been deeply impressed on hearing of the ignorance of a large portion of the German clergy, who, being exposed to the continual attacks of the heretics, needed, more than any other, a solid religious and intellectual training. Supported by Pope Julius III., he founded in Rome a seminary for ecclesiastical students from Germany. It was inaugurated in October, 1552, and two centuries later 24 cardinals, 1 Pope, 6 electors of the Holy Empire, 19 princes, 21 archbishops, 221 bishops, and countless holy confessors were numbered on the roll of the German college, whose favourable influence over the German clergy it is impossible to estimate too highly.

The interest shown by St. Ignatius in the training of youth was continued by the generals who succeeded him in the government of the Society. Under Father Claudius Aquaviva, fifth general of the Order, a fresh impulse was given to the work of education. In presence of the injury caused to souls by the progress of heresy, the leaders of the Church deemed it doubly necessary to give the minds of the young a thoroughly Catholic training, and the Council of Trent, in one of its decrees, recognizes the ability of the Jesuits to fulfil this mission: "And if Jesuits can be had, they are to be preferred to all others,"[1] are the terms used in the decree.

In a few brief and simple rules, St. Ignatius himself laid down a programme for the intellectual formation of the young religious of the Society, who could only be fitted to teach others if adequately prepared to do so. He displayed a keen interest in the progress made by his sons in all branches of science and knowledge, and as at that time the Society had no house of its own in Paris, he sent a group of young scholastics to follow the courses of the university, under the direction of older and more experienced Fathers. Other Jesuit

[1] "Et si reperiantur Jesuitæ, cæteris anteponendi sunt," *Declarationes Congregationis Concilii*, ad sess. xxii. *De Reformatione*, c. xviii. No. 34. *Crétineau*, vol. iv. p. 211.

students were sent in the same way to Coimbra, Padua, and other learned centres; and we find the holy founder, with that attention to details we have already noticed, insisting that these young men from whom an arduous course of study was demanded, should, during that time, be particularly well fed and not overburdened with prayers and practices of penance. At the same time he reminds them that their motives in the pursuit of knowledge should be wholly pure and supernatural, as befits future apostles.

However, while laying down certain rules for the organization of the colleges of his Order, St. Ignatius had wisely refrained from making these regulations too numerous or irrevocable. He purposely left to his successors the task of completing them when time and experience should have tested the value of his method.

It was Father Claudius Aquaviva who undertook the achievement of the "Ratio Studiorum," or programme of studies, which was regarded at the time as the summary of the most excellent method of education of the day. The rare mental abilities and great personal holiness of Father Aquaviva, who governed the Order from 1581 to 1615, rendered him peculiarly fitted for a task which, under his direction, was accomplished with much prudence and care.

The "Ratio" was drawn up by six Fathers, who were chosen of different nationalities, in order that each one might bring the peculiarities of his national character to bear upon a method destined to be practised in every land. Their labours lasted about a year, after which the plan of studies compiled by them was submitted by Aquaviva to the examination of twelve Fathers of the Roman college, men of learning and experience. It was then sent to all the colleges of the Society to be tested by actual trial, three Fathers being appointed to remain in Rome in order to receive the observations which were forwarded from the different colleges where the "Ratio" was tried; the modifications and changes suggested by these observations were then discussed in presence of the general and his assistants, and after they

had been duly accepted or dismissed the "Ratio" was again thoroughly revised and put into practice for another space of three years. At last, when every means had been used to make it as perfect as possible, every proposed change scrupulously examined, it was sent by Aquaviva to all the colleges of the Society where henceforth it was strictly observed.

Thus, with much thought, care, and wisdom, was compiled the "Ratio Studiorum," or plan of studies, of the Society of Jesus, a compilation of which Bacon has said, "Never has anything more perfect been invented."[1]

It would take us too long to enter into a detailed account of the system enforced by the "Ratio"; let us only mention that the salient features distinguishing it from other methods in use at the time are the importance attached to the study of the classics and to the habitual use of the Latin tongue, the considerable place given to the professor's *vivâ voce* explanations, and the stress laid upon the necessity of developing a spirit of piety among the students at the same time as their mental powers are cultivated to the utmost. A modern French historian of the Society gives a spirited picture of the labours that the Jesuits, guided by the "Ratio Studiorum," have successfully accomplished in the cause of education.[2] He tells us that the quantity of grammars, syntaxes, and books of education composed by them is "something marvellous." To the testimony of Bacon, which we have quoted, let us add that of d'Alembert, a most bitter enemy of the Order. "Let us add," he says, "in order to be just, that no religious society can boast of having produced so many celebrated men in science and literature. The Jesuits have successfully embraced every branch of learning and eloquence, history, antiquities, geometry, serious and poetical literature; there is hardly

[1] *De Augmentis Scientiar.*, lib. i. ad. unit et 1. vi.; *Etudes sur l'enseignement litteraire et le Ratio studiorum de la Compagnie de Jésus*, par le P. Monneret, S.J. (*Etudes*, October, 1876.)

[2] *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. iv. pp. 189–194, Crétineau-Joly.

any class of writers in which they do not number men of the greatest merit."[1]

Cardinal Richelieu, who in many instances opposed the Jesuits, possessed too keen an intellect not to value them as a body, and in his "Testament Politique" he pronounces their system of education to be superior to that of the university. More convincing still than these testimonies, to which many more might be added, is the enumeration of some of the great men educated by the Society of Jesus, among whom we find Popes like Gregory XIII., Benedict XIV., Pius VII.; saints like St. Francis of Sales; prelates like Bossuet, de Berulle, Flèchier, Belzunce; poets and scientists such as Tasso, Corneille, Descartes, Cassini, Buffon; generals like Tilly, Wallenstein, Condé, and Don Juan of Austria; besides the Emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian of Austria and many princes of Savoy, Bavaria, and Poland.

Under Louis XIV. the famous Jesuit College of Clermont in Paris numbered from 2,500 to 3,000 scholars, and was regarded by the literary world of the day as one of the most brilliant centres of literature and science. The "Ratio Studiorum" has, as our readers may imagine, gone through many modifications since the days of Aquaviva; it was again revised under the direction of Father John Roothan in 1832, in order to bring it more in harmony with the necessities of the times, and since then, while preserving the spirit of the organization so carefully drawn up by their Fathers, the Jesuits of the present day have continued to make the different changes demanded by the ever-varying tendencies of our age.

[1] d'Alembert, *Sur la Destruction des Jésuites.*

III.

THE JESUITS AS MISSIONARIES.

FROM their origin the Jesuits regarded missionary work as an essential part of their vocation, and the most popular of St. Ignatius's first companions, St. Francis Xavier, sailed for India a few months only after the solemn approbation of the Society by Pope Paul III. The history of his wonderful career is well known. In the brief space of ten years he preached the Faith throughout India and Japan, converted and baptized thousands of infidels, performed countless miracles, and died at last, in 1552, in sight of the shores of China, where he longed to plant the Cross.

With his extraordinary power over the minds and hearts of men, his sweetness, his charity, his devotion and courage, Xavier remains the very ideal of an apostle; Protestants, sceptics, and infidels have openly expressed their admiration for one whose spotless character commands their respect, while his extraordinary success as a missionary excites their wonder and admiration. Following on the footsteps of the "great Father," as he was commonly called in the East, a number of eminent missionaries of the Society spread the Faith far and wide, and many among them gained the martyr's crown.

During the lifetime of St. Ignatius, while Father Barzeus, Mesquita, and Cosmo de Torres were completing Xavier's work in India, another group of Jesuit missionaries proceeded to Brazil. One of these was Father Emmanuel Nobrega, a man of illustrious birth and eminent holiness, who, when he came in sight of the

New World where he was to labour for Christ, raised his hand to bless the distant shore and intoned the Te Deum. Like St. Francis Xavier, he endeavoured, before converting the natives, to reform the morals of the European colonists whose vices impeded the progress of the Faith. Then, when this first result had been obtained, he set forth on foot and alone in search of the Indians, and, at the cost of much labour, he succeeded in forming Christian colonies where the hitherto wandering and lawless tribes were trained to habits of industry and virtue. More famous still was Father Joseph Anchieta, the "Thaumaturgus" of Brazil, who for more than forty years devoted himself to completing the work begun by Father de Nobrega. It was he who established the following rule of life in the Christian colonies, or reductions, as they were called: At daybreak the Angelus was said by the whole population, who afterwards assisted at Mass; this was followed by a brief explanation of the Catechism; then all dispersed to their different occupations till five, when a short instruction was given at the church, followed by a procession of the children. Like Xavier, Father Anchieta possessed the gift of miracles; he cured the sick and raised the dead. Like St. Francis of Assisi, he exercised an extraordinary power over the birds of the air, who used to perch fearlessly on his breviary or on his staff, and over the tigers and panthers, who came and went at his command. Father Anchieta died in 1597, but his work in Brazil was continued by his brethren. It is to be noticed that the Jesuit missionaries invariably proved themselves the defenders of the natives against the tyranny of their European conquerors. At the end of the seventeenth century Father Anthony Vieyra, an orator, diplomatist, controversialist, and scholar, was expelled from Brazil by the Portuguese on account of his courageous defence of the Indians. A Protestant writer describes Vieyra as holding a place "not only among the greatest writers, but among the greatest statesmen of his country,"[1] and the King of Portugal, Alfonso VI., fully recognized his merits. Not

[1] *Southey* (Marshall), vol. ii. p. 151.

only was the exiled Jesuit favourably received at the Court of Lisbon, but he obtained from his sovereign an edict forbidding the Portuguese in Brazil to reduce the Indians to slavery.

The crowning glory of the Jesuit missionaries in South America is the foundation of the famous reductions of Paraguay, the organization of which has excited the warm admiration of Catholic, Protestant, and even infidel historians.

It was Philip III. of Spain who first authorized the Jesuits to organize Christian colonies in Paraguay, where, since the discovery of the country by the Spaniards in 1516, the unfortunate Indians had been cruelly oppressed. Thus supported by the king against the jealousy and ill-will of the Spanish officials, the Jesuits began, towards 1610, to found a certain number of colonies, each of which formed a miniature republic, whose civil chief was a "corregidor," named by the governor of the province and chosen among the Indians themselves. Except the missionaries, no European could reside within the reductions, but at the head of each colony were two Jesuits, nominally its spiritual chiefs; owing, however, to the peculiar organization of the reductions "they were," says Voltaire, "at once the founders, the legislators, the pontiffs, and the sovereigns of the missions."[1] In all matters of spiritual jurisdiction they paid the utmost deference to the bishops in whose dioceses the colonies were situated, and with whom, as a rule, they lived in peace and harmony..

Although the Indians were capable of enduring great fatigue, they had an instinctive aversion from regular labour; the Jesuits had to teach them the first elements of agriculture: while some of the Fathers ploughed the ground, others might be seen sowing maize, barley, beans, and other vegetables, others cut down trees, others took long journeys to buy flocks of sheep, goats, cows, and horses for the use of the colony. The rule of life in the reductions of Paraguay was much the same as that established by Father Anchieta in the Christian colonies of Brazil;

[1] *Essai sur les Mœurs*, p. 65, edit. de Genève.

the day was divided between exercises of devotion and manual labour, but into this somewhat austere life the Jesuits, with a true knowledge of human nature, threw elements of brightness and gaiety. They took care that the churches should be adorned with pictures and prints that pleased the childlike taste of these primitive people; they carefully cultivated the Indians' taste for music, and taught them the use of the musical instruments then common in Europe; they celebrated the feasts of the Church by processions, illuminations, fireworks, banquets, games and tournaments, where the missionaries acted as umpires and distributed the prizes.

In order to enable their neophytes to repulse the not unfrequent attacks of the savage tribes that surrounded them, the Jesuits were authorized by the King of Spain and by the Pope to form the Indians into regular troops, on condition, however, that they were never to take up arms without the Fathers' permission. In a short time they succeeded in forming excellent troops, who at different times rendered valuable services to the royal armies of Spain. The Jesuits were at once the fathers, protectors, physicians, and teachers of their neophytes, and testimonies abound to prove the innocence and happiness enjoyed by the Indians under the rule of those who, during many years after their departure from Paraguay, remained enshrined in the hearts of a grateful people. The memory of their government has been handed down with loving gratitude, says a French traveller;[1] and Buffon does not hesitate to say that "nothing ever honoured religion so much as the fact of having civilized these nations and founded an empire with no arms save those of virtue."[2] Voltaire, a bitter enemy of the Society, as our readers know, owns that the settlements of the Spanish Jesuits in Paraguay "appear in some respects the triumph of humanity;"[3] and Robertson, an equally impartial witness, recognizes that it is in the New World that the Jesuits "have exhibited the most

[1] d'Orbigny, *Voyage dans l'Amérique Méridionale*, tome ii. p. 47.
[2] *Hist. Naturelle*, tome xx.
[3] *Essai sur les Mœurs*, (Euvres Complètes, vol. x. p. 59.

wonderful display of their abilities, and have contributed most effectually to the benefit of the human species."[1] Mr. Howitt, another English writer, is loud in his praise of their devotion, patience, benevolence, and "disinterested virtue;"[2] and Chateaubriand considers that under their wise administration "the Indians might boast that they enjoyed a happiness without example on earth."[3]

In North America, under circumstances somewhat different, the French Jesuits imitated the zeal of their Spanish brethren.

Henri IV. had committed to their care the missions of Canada, or New France, and the history of the apostles of the country, Fathers Lejeune, Bressani, de Jogues, Lallemand, de Breboeuf contains heroic examples of devotion. The wandering habits of the Indians made it extremely difficult to approach them, and the Fathers were obliged to follow them across the forests and plains, at the cost of unspeakable fatigue. Father Bressani, who landed in Canada in 1642, was made prisoner by the Iroquois, who cut off his fingers, hung him up by the feet, and burnt his hands: "I felt the pain keenly," he writes to his superiors, "but I had such interior strength to bear it that I was myself surprised at the power of grace." A similar fate awaited Father de Jogues, who in 1643 was also taken prisoner by the same wild tribe. During his captivity he contrived to baptize a large number of Indians; at last he was delivered, and, broken by the torments he had gone through, he returned to France. But his heart yearned for his beloved mission, and having returned to Canada, he was put to death by the Iroquois in 1646.

"The Catholic priest," writes Washington Irving, "went even before the soldier and the trader. From lake to lake, from river to river, the Jesuits pressed on, unresting."[4] Their self-sacrifice had its reward, and

[1] *Charles*, book vi., vol. vi. p. 203.
[2] *Colonization and Christianity*, chap. x. pp. 121–141.
[3] *Génie du Christianisme*, vol. ii. p. 175.
[4] Marshall, *Christian Missions*, vol. ii. p. 290.

even among the savage Iroquois we meet with heroic examples of sanctity; their native courage and endurance displayed itself in the extraordinary patience with which they suffered for the Faith. A neophyte named Stephen was taken prisoner by a heathen tribe, his fingers were cut off one by one, a lighted torch was thrust down his throat, and finally he was slowly roasted alive. He kept his eyes raised to heaven, and from time to time was heard to say, "My sins deserve yet more suffering; the more you torture me the greater will be my reward." This example is but one of the many traits of heroism that prove how deeply the Jesuits' teaching had sunk into the souls of their Indian converts. All through the American continent we find traces of the sons of St. Ignatius. The Jesuits landed in California in 1697. A Protestant writer observes that they not only "covered the sterile rocks of Lower California with the monuments of their patience and aptitude, . . ." but that they also bequeathed to their successors "the invaluable lesson that nothing is impossible to energy and perseverance."[1] One of the first missionaries in California was Father Salvatierra, an Italian, who, in hopes of gaining the Indians, ventured alone into their district with no weapon save a lute, on which he played with much skill. He used to sing, "In voi credo, o Dio mio," accompanying himself on his instrument, and by degrees the Indians would issue from their hiding-places and gather round him. When he had accustomed them to his presence, he began to explain the meaning of the words he had just been singing, and thus gradually he taught them the elements of the Christian Faith.

If from America we pass to Africa, we come across traces of Jesuit missionaries at an early date. During the lifetime of St. Ignatius, Father John Minez was sent to Ethiopia at the request of King John of Portugal, and in 1580 other Jesuits were dispatched to complete the work he had begun. One of these, Father Paez Caslettan, converted Atznaf Seghed, Emperor of Ethiopia, but under

[1] Sir George Simpson, *Journey Round the World* (Marshall), vol. ii. p. 250.

the successors of this prince a violent persecution broke out against the Christians, and several members of the Society were put to death. In 1640 only one Jesuit remained in the country—Father de Noguera—but at the end of the same century, Louis XIV. sent Father de Brevedent to Ethiopia, and Father Claude Sicard was appointed superior of the Jesuit mission at Cairo. Father Sicard was a man of remarkable talent, and the French scientific academies requested him to pursue his researches upon the antiquities of Egypt. With the full approval of the father-general, he made several most interesting journeys in the interior of the country, visited the cataracts of the Nile, Memphis, Thebes, and the Red Sea, and explored the deserts of Sceté and Thebaid. The result of these journeys were voluminous memoirs upon the antiquities of Egypt, which were to be followed by a complete work on the subject; but death prevented Father Sicard from achieving an undertaking eagerly desired by the scientific world. In the midst of his labours in the cause of knowledge, he never forgot that he was a missionary; he devoted himself especially to the conversion of the Copts, whose language he had thoroughly mastered, and he died, a martyr of charity, while nursing the sick during a pestilence that had broken out at Cairo, in 1726.

In the meantime, on the western coast of Africa, in Senegambia, Guinea, and Congo, other members of the Order were engaged in apostolic labours; at Angola and Congo, they founded colleges, and at Loando they established an association for the assistance of shipwrecked sailors.

From the time when St. Francis Xavier first planted the Cross in India, numbers of missionaries of the Society devoted themselves to complete his work. It is impossible to mention them all, but among them let us notice Father Robert de Nobili, whose strange and touching story is an example of the facility with which the Jesuit missionaries adapted themselves to every sort of custom in order to gain souls to Christ. He was of an ancient family, closely related to the Popes

Julius II. and Marcellus II., and when, at the age of twenty-eight, he arrived in India he found the missionaries greatly distressed and perplexed at the fruitlessness of their efforts to convert the Brahmins, or priests, and the members of the learned classes among the Hindoos. As our readers know, the different castes in India were, and are still, in a certain measure, divided by almost invincible barriers, and the Jesuit missionaries of the seventeenth century who devoted themselves chiefly to the Pariahs and Choutres, or lower classes, were thereby debarred from all possible communication with the Brahmins, or priests, and learned men. Frequently it happened that the Brahmins, although anxious to learn more of Christianity and even inclined to embrace its teachings, refused to do so because its preachers associated with those whom they regarded as degraded. Father de Nobili was moved with pity for the proud race, whom their hereditary prejudices shut out from the blessings of faith and knowing well that time and patience could alone destroy the institution of castes, he determined, in the meantime, to become a Brahmin himself, and to renounce all intercourse with Europeans and with members of the lower castes.

Convinced that by this means alone could he hope to reach the Brahmins, Father de Nobili announced his project to his religious and ecclesiastical superiors, and having obtained their approval he adopted the dress and manners of a Brahmin and separated from the other Jesuits, who had lost caste by mingling with the Pariahs. He lived, like the native doctors and learned men, on rice, herbs, and water, prayed and studied all day, and received no visits save from the Brahmins. By degrees his sacrifice was rewarded, and at the end of a few years his church was too small to contain the converts he had made. Father Anthony Vico writes thus to the Father-General Aquaviva after visiting Father de Nobili and his converts: "However exalted was the opinion I formerly entertained of Father Robert's capacity for the work of converting the heathens, it was far below the reality." In the space of a few

years Father de Nobili and his colleagues baptized over 100,000 idolaters, belonging to the hitherto inaccessible caste of the Brahmins. Like many heroic souls, whose vocation lies apart from the beaten track, Robert de Nobili had to encounter the suspicions and attacks of his fellow-Christians, who accused him of tolerating superstitious practices among his disciples. In 1618 he was summoned to Goa to present his defence. Strange to say, some of his own brethren received him harshly, while the Archbishop of Craganore, his ecclesiastical superior, stood by him throughout. He came out of the ordeal with flying colours: his modesty, humility, and gentleness convinced his opponents of his sanctity; his clear defence of his conduct successfully asserted his innocence; and, in 1623, a Bull from Pope Gregory XV., to whom the matter had been referred, authorized him to pursue his mode of life.

The history of the Jesuit missions in China present incidents scarcely less interesting.

Nature and art had alike contributed to render China difficult of access to strangers; its coasts were defended by a multitude of shoals and rocks, while on the land side it was guarded by the famous wall. At different times the missionaries of the Society made vain attempts to penetrate into a country whence strangers were jealously excluded; for many years their efforts were useless, and they had to remain at Macao, on Portuguese territory. It was Father Ruggieri, an Italian, who first succeeded in penetrating into the province of Canton; his companion was a young religious, named Ricci, of whom an English writer has said that he united "prudence, constancy, and magnanimity of soul; profound genius, cultivated by the most famous master of the age; delicacy and refinement of taste, unwearied industry and habitual mortification."[1]

A pupil of the famous Jesuit mathematician, Father Clavius, whom his contemporaries surnamed the "Christian Euclid," Father Ricci's learning was the means of obtaining for the Jesuit missionaries a firm footing in

[1] Marshall, *Christian Missions.*

China. By degrees his knowledge of astronomy and of mathematics excited the admiration of the Chinese literates; he was able to found a mission at Tchao-tcheon, then at Nan-tchang, whose inhabitants were entirely devoted to study and science. But these first results were not attained without months and years of struggle, difficulty, and danger, and the story of Ricci's perseverance in face of almost insuperable obstacles, reads like a romance. His great desire was to reach Pekin, the residence of the emperor, for he felt that until they were formally authorized to settle in China by the sovereign the missionaries were at the mercy of the fanaticism or jealousy of any petty official. After several fruitless attempts, one of which ended in six months' close captivity, Ricci at last succeeded in reaching Pekin. The emperor's curiosity had been aroused by the reports he had heard of the stranger's mathematical knowledge. In January, 1601, Ricci and his companions arrived in the imperial city, and obtained the emperor's permission to remain there and to open a chapel, around which soon gathered a flourishing Christian community.

Father Ricci died nine years later, in 1610, and on him were bestowed the honours of a public funeral; he was the first stranger to whom this mark of esteem had been given. Among Christian missionaries there are few who accomplished such great things as this man, who, says Chateaubriand, "watched over the infant Church in China, gave lessons in mathematics, composed Chinese controversial works against the literates who attacked him, cultivated the friendship of the emperor, and retained his place at court, where his courtesy made him beloved."[1] Let us add that to his mental gifts Father Ricci joined the virtues of a model religious, and that his death was that of a saint.

Among the missions undertaken by the Society of Jesus, that of Japan possesses, more than any other, a pathetic and thrilling interest. It was founded by St. Francis Xavier himself, and enjoyed, during the first years of its existence, comparative peace and prosperity.

[1] *Génie du Christianisme*, vol. ii. p. 158 (edit. 1854).

Colleges, seminaries, and even a noviciate, were established in the country, and under the inspiration of Father Valignani, who in 1580 landed in Japan as visitor of the missions of Asia, four Japanese ambassadors were sent to Rome, where they were received by Pope Gregory XIII. with great honour and affection.

Matters changed towards 1590. One of the petty princes of Japan, having conquered his rivals, assumed the title of emperor, or Taicosama, and though at first, from policy, he seemed favourable to the Christians, his despotic instincts and evil passions made him at heart an enemy of the Faith. There were at that time 200,000 Christians in Japan, and when, in 1597, Taicosama began openly to persecute those whom he affected to look upon as political enemies, they faced danger and death with heroic courage. In 1597 six Franciscans, three Jesuits, and seventeen laymen, gained the martyr's palm at Nagazaki; but the following year the death of the emperor put a stop to the persecution for the time being. It broke out again with still greater fury under the emperors Daifusama and his son Xogun; priests, laymen, women and children laid down their lives with joy. During the year 1590, 20,570 persons had suffered for the Faith; nevertheless, during the following years the Jesuits made, says a Protestant historian, 12,000 converts.[1] In 1619 fifty-two martyrs were burnt at Meaco, among them a woman named Tecla, who was surrounded by her children, for whom she had prepared festive garments in sign of joy. In 1622 fifty-two martyrs were executed at Nagazaki; among them were Dominicans, Franciscans, and a Jesuit of noble birth and eminent holiness, Father Charles Spinola, who had spent four years in a wooden cage. He walked to his death surrounded by seven novices of the Society and by a number of native Christians, women carrying their children and singing the "Laudate pueri Dominum." A few days later another Jesuit, Father Constanzo, was burnt to death on the same spot, and his martyrdom was speedily followed by that of a number of other religious

[1] Kaempfer, *Hist. du Japon*, t. ii. p. 166.

of the Society. One of them, Father Carvalho, was thrown, with some of his converts, into a frozen pond, where one by one they expired, the Jesuit encouraging them to the last, and dying the last of the heroic band.

In 1626 only eighteen Jesuits remained in Japan, the others had died under torture or from fatigue and exhaustion. Thus Father de Couros, the provincial, remained for many months hidden in a pit, and expired at last, worn out by the sufferings he had endured in his place of concealment.

New and horrible torments were daily invented. Sometimes the missionaries were roasted on gridirons or thrown into pits filled with serpents; others were slowly hacked to pieces, others again taken to the mountain of Oungen, where they were suspended by their feet over craters, out of which arose putrid vapours, and the pestilential waters that issued from the crater were poured over them, laying their bones bare in a few minutes.

The heroism with which the missionaries and their converts endured torments so horrible excited the admiration of the Christian world, and in a Brief addressed to the Japanese Christians, Pope Urban VIII. renders homage to the devotion of the sons of St. Ignatius: "priests of rare wisdom and virtue." The very violence of the persecution seemed to draw them to a land which they considered as a legacy bequeathed to the Society by St. Francis Xavier. In 1632 Father Sebastian Vieyra landed in Japan. He had the title of provincial and the privileges of a bishop, and during a few months he succeeded in escaping the search made for him. At last he was arrested and put to death. About the same time twenty-four of his brethren gained the martyr's crown; but the year 1633, sanctified by these glorious sacrifices, was saddened by the fall of Christopher Ferreyra, once provincial of Japan, who, after enduring during five hours the torture of the pit, yielded and apostatized.

The fall of Ferreyra created a feeling of consternation among his brethren. From the day when it was known incessant prayers and penances were offered on his

behalf, and the last martyrs, whose sacrifice we have to relate, were stimulated by the hope of winning him back to Christ. So intense, however, was the violence of the persecution, that in 1634 Ferreyra was the only Jesuit left in Japan! Three years later Father Marcellus Mastrilli succeeded in effecting a landing, but he was arrested almost immediately, tortured during four days, and finally beheaded. Nothing daunted, nine years later, in 1643, Father Anthony Rubino and four other Jesuits landed on a solitary spot near Nagazaki. They too were discovered, confronted with Ferreyra—who, it is said, fled like a madman from their presence—tortured on alternate days during seven months, and executed at last. These repeated attempts to force an entrance into the jealously guarded empire prove the tenacity with which the Society of Jesus clung to the Japanese mission, but if its efforts to maintain the mission proved vain, the ultimate conversion of the apostate Ferreyra proved that the sacrifices offered on his behalf had borne their fruit. At the age of eighty the renegade was seized with remorse. In 1652 he boldly confessed himself a traitor to his Order and to his God. Sixty-eight hours of torture were unable to shake his fortitude, and, no priest being left to assist him, he died, purified by his repentance and suffering.

From that hour a veil falls over the remnants of the Christian Church in Japan. Stringent laws were put into force against the missionaries, and the surviving Christians were shut out from the Catholic world by insuperable barriers. Only within the last few years have missionaries been able to penetrate where for two hundred years no Catholic priest had set his foot. The Faith planted by Xavier, and for whose sake thousands of martyrs died in torments, must have cast deep roots in the soil of Japan, for, to their inexpressible emotion, the missionaries of the nineteenth century found villages inhabited by Christians, where, during long years of isolation, the chief truths of religion and the practice of baptism have been preserved.

In modern times the Society of Jesus has remained

faithful to the missionary work, which, from the first, was considered an essential part of its vocation.

In the Rocky Mountains Father de Smet's successful apostolate towards 1840 reminds us of the most illustrious missionaries of the Society. In California, San Francisco, Jamaica, South America; in the East, at Scutari, Beyrouth, Syra; in Madagascar and India, the Jesuits of the nineteenth century have founded missions and colleges. In China, where their predecessors achieved so glorious a work, they have two important missions, both of which form dioceses governed by Jesuit bishops, and the books of instruction and devotion composed by Father Ricci and his companions are still used by the apostles of our day.

Let us mention before concluding this imperfect sketch the heroic apostolate exercised by the French Jesuits among the convicts of Cayenne, and the mission of Zambesi which is at present served by the English Jesuits. In this brief account of the missions of the Society from the days of St. Ignatius to our own time nothing has been said of the missions nearest and dearest to our hearts—that of England, where, during the cruel ages of persecution, the sons of St. Ignatius worthily held their place. Our readers know how from the day when Blessed Edmund Campion and Robert Parsons landed in England, in June, 1580, they are to be found at the post of peril, preaching the Faith amidst difficulties and dangers, in prison, in the torture chamber, on the Tyburn gibbet, and the names of Campion, Southwell, Garnet, Ireland, and many others are now household words among English Catholics.

In the annals of the Order of Jesus, there are few pages more glorious than those where are recorded the labours and sufferings of the English Jesuits. Many recent publications on the subject have made their history a familiar one to the descendants of those whom they once encouraged and strengthened in their upward path.

IV.

SAINTS AND SCHOLARS.

It would require more space than that at our disposal to give our readers a full account of the learned and holy men belonging to the Society, who have left their mark in the history of the Church. A brief sketch of the chief Jesuit saints and scholars is all we can hope to attempt.

After St. Ignatius, its founder, and St. Francis Xavier, its first apostle, we find among the canonized saints of the Order St. Francis Borgia, whose life is divided into two distinct parts. Descended from the kings of Aragon, closely related to his sovereign, the Emperor Charles V., Francis Borgia, Duke of Gandia and Viceroy of Catalonia, seemed to possess all the best gifts that Providence can bestow. Happily married, rich in worldly honours, universally beloved, he led a pure and useful life in the midst of almost regal splendour. A few years later, his wife being dead and his children provided for, Borgia laid aside the honours he had so worthily borne, to embrace a life of obedience and poverty under the rule of the Society of Jesus.

In 1565, at the death of Father Laynez, second General of the Order, he was elected to succeed him, so great was his reputation as an exemplary religious. He was then fifty-five years of age, a pale, fragile-looking man, very unlike the splendid courtier of other days. Since he had laid aside his ducal coronet he had five times refused the Roman purple, and his election as General of the Society filled him with sorrow and dismay. He

occupied the post that had caused him such grief during seven years; under his prudent and able government the Order developed and prospered.

A saint was then on the Papal throne, and the esteem of the Dominican, St. Pius V., for the General of the Jesuits was so great that he begged him to accompany the Papal legate on an important embassy to the courts of Spain, Portugal, and France. St. Francis returned from this long journey in September, 1571, exhausted by illness and fatigue, and three days after his arrival in Rome he peacefully breathed his last. Only a few months before his friend, St. Pius V., had been called to his reward, and, during the conclave that followed, the name of Francis Borgia had been frequently put forward as that of his most worthy successor—a proof of the universal veneration that surrounded the princely Spaniard, who had renounced all things for the love of Christ.

While by his influence and labours the third general of the Society was serving the Order committed to his charge, the pure spirit of a boy-saint was, in a narrower sphere, shedding around the sweet fragrance of its holiness. In October, 1567, St. Francis Borgia had received into the Society a Polish youth of eighteen, Stanislas Kostka, who, only ten months later, on the 15th of August, 1568, breathed his last at the noviciate of St. Andrea. During those short months the wonderful holiness of the boy novice had become known, in spite of the humility in which he shrouded his rare gifts, and when his death was announced, by a common impulse, rich and poor, laymen and religious, flocked in crowds to venerate his remains.

A contrast to the brief life and peaceful end of the young Pole is the laborious apostolate and violent death of his contemporary, Blessed Ignatius Azevedo, one of the most successful missionaries of the Society in Brazil. He had returned home for the affairs of the mission, and in June, 1570, he started for Brazil with thirty-nine companions. The ship that carried them was attacked on the high seas by a Calvinist pirate; the Jesuits were

offered life and liberty if they consented to apostatize, but all, even the youngest novice, remained firm. A fearful butchery followed. Ignatius Azevedo, the leader of that glorious band, fell mortally wounded, with the words, "Angels and men are witness that I die on behalf of the holy Church, Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic."

About thirty years after the death of St. Stanislas, the Roman college was edified by the presence within its walls of another youthful saint, a scion of the great house of Gonzaga, who crowned a life of angelic innocence by dying when nursing the sick in the Roman hospitals, where a dangerous fever was raging. The holiness of Aloysius Gonzaga was so universally recognized that only fourteen years after his death he was beatified, his mother, Martha de Tana, being present when her child was raised to the altars of the Church.

About the same time lived in Germany another saintly Jesuit, Blessed Peter Canisius, who, during half a century successfully stemmed the rising tide of heresy in the German Empire by his preaching, his controversial writings, and untiring labours for the salvation of souls. In the archives of Ingolstadt, where he was rector of the Jesuit college, there is still to be found the public tribute of admiration paid to him whom his contemporaries called "the incomparable Canisius." The Catechism, in which he condensed the chief truths of religion, has been translated into every European language, and is regarded as a masterpiece for its brevity and clearness. This able controversialist, whose advice was sought for by kings and emperors, was a model religious; over and over again he refused the purple and his humility breaks forth in his last letter to the father-general. "I confess," he writes, "that I have failed in many respects as a provincial, a preacher, and a writer. . . . I have become idle, indolent, and useless, unworthy of the charity of my brethren, who bestowed all their care on one so ungrateful." Canisius died in 1597, at the age of seventy-three; he seemed to greet an invisible and beloved visitor, and a radiant look of

joy overspread his features as he exclaimed, "Ave Maria!"

Very like St. Stanislas in his youth, sweetness and precocious holiness is Blessed John Berchmans, a native of Brabant, who died in Rome in 1621. His brightness and winning disposition were as lovable as his sanctity was admirable; his professors and companions agreed that they never saw him commit an action or utter a word that was the least imperfect, and when he lay on his deathbed the venerable Fathers of the Gesù, the professors of the Roman college and the father-general himself surrounded the boy-saint, who, gifted with a power of reading men's secret thoughts, gave to all words of advice and consolation.

After the Polish St. Stanislas, the Italian St. Aloysius, the Belgian Berchmans, we have, among the canonized saints of the Order of Jesus the French missionary, St. Francis Regis, who, early in the seventeenth century, evangelized the towns and villages of Languedoc with extraordinary success. He sometimes heard two thousand confessions in the course of a month, and, in the mountain regions of the Cevennes, "I have often seen him," writes a priest, "standing on a block of frozen snow, distributing to the people the Word of God." On foot and alone he went from village to village during the space of ten years, undaunted by fatigue or danger, until, worn out at the early age of forty-three, he died at La Louvesc, a lonely mountain village, where his tomb is still surrounded by great veneration.

While Francis Regis was evangelizing his own country one of his brethren across the Atlantic was engaged in labours no less arduous and certainly more trying to human nature. Peter Claver, of a noble Spanish family, felt himself irresistibly drawn towards the negro slaves, thousands of whom were yearly brought to South America to be sold. He gave himself up heart and soul to the service of these unfortunates and habitually signed himself, "Peter, the slave of the negroes." At Cartagena, where he was stationed, he was present whenever a slave ship entered the port, ready to claim its passengers as

his children. His favourite resort was the leper hospital, where he strove to brighten the lives of those on whom the curse of leprosy weighed so heavily. When he grew too infirm to walk he used to have himself carried to the hospital and to the plantations, where his negro children pressed around him, kissing the hem of his garment and shouting with joy. By degrees he had succeeded not only in improving their material condition but also in reforming their morals. He died in 1654, and was buried at the expense of the city, in acknowledgment of the services he had rendered to the cause of humanity.

Let us add to these names those of Blessed Andrew Bobola, an heroic Polish missionary, who, in 1657, was put to death by the Cossacks amid circumstances of peculiar horror; the Venerable Claude de la Colombière, who has a special claim upon us (in 1676 he was sent to England as chaplain to the young Duchess of York, Mary Beatrice of Este, and spent some time in the "land of crosses," as he called the country where the Catholic Faith was cruelly persecuted); St. Francis Girolamo, the apostle of Naples; Blessed John of Britto, a Portuguese of illustrious birth, martyred in India in 1693 after baptizing thousands of infidels. We read that when the news of John of Britto's death reached Lisbon, his mother, Doña Beatrice Pereyra, put on her court dress and repaired to the palace, where, by order of the king, she held a solemn reception and was treated by the nobles of the kingdom with the honours and homage paid to the queens of Portugal.

Added to these martyrs and missionaries are the hundreds who, less known, but perhaps no less holy, have spent their lives in God's service throughout the world; among them our own dear English martyrs, whom a recent decree of the Holy See has raised to the altars of the Church.

Fruitful in saints, the Society of Jesus has been no less plentiful in scholars, and we have seen how, from the first, St. Ignatius attached much importance to the mental development and culture of his sons.

Among the theologians of the Society we have men like Laynez, who at the age of thirty-four was chosen, with another of St. Ignatius's first companions, Salmeron, to take part in the deliberations of the Council of Trent, in 1645, as theologians of the Holy See. This extraordinary mark of confidence, bestowed by Pope Paul III. on his sons, seems to have dismayed rather than gratified the founder of the Society. He gave them much wise advice, which reveals to us once more the practical sense of the soldier-saint. He bids them be slow, deliberate, and charitable in the public discussions within the council, and during their free time to devote themselves to works of mercy, such as nursing the sick in the hospitals and teaching catechism to children. He evidently wished by these practices of charity to guard his disciples against temptations to pride and vainglory.

In the midst of the solèmn assembly, which numbered 36 ambassadors, 11 archbishops, 69 bishops, 6 mitred abbots, 7 generals of religious Orders, and more than 80 doctors and theologians belonging to different congregations, the Jesuits appeared in their well-worn cassocks and with their grave and humble bearing; so worn, indeed, were their cassocks that some of the bishops complained that it seemed a want of respect to the Holy See that its theologians should appear in such shabby garments, and the Fathers were told to buy new cassocks. The mere appearance of James Laynez with his fragile figure, ascetic countenance, and extraordinary theological science used to provoke a hush of admiration, and, by a singular exception, he was allowed to speak for three hours, whereas one hour was the utmost allowed to the orators in general. It was he who was commissioned to recapitulate the discussions with commentaries of his own; these were inserted word for word in the Acts of the Council, and once, when he fell ill, the deliberations were by common consent suspended until his recovery.

Among other Jesuit theologians, scarcely less eminent than Father Laynez, was Toletus, the contemporary of St. Francis Borgia; Father Robert Bellarmine, called,

on account of his diminutive height and great learning, "the greatest and the smallest man of his day"; Francis Suarez, called by Pope Paul V. and Benedict XIV. the "doctor eximius" (the eminent doctor); Cornelius à Lapide, the famous commentator on the Scripture of the seventeenth century: Emanuel Sa, the professor of St. Francis Borgia, whom Pius V. employed to revise the Vulgate.

Among the historians of the Society we must mention several French Fathers of the seventeenth century: Father Daniel, whose history of France is of great value; Father Bonhours, the historian of St. Ignatius; Father de Jouvency, whose remarkable editions of the classics were adopted by many educational bodies throughout Europe; Cardinal Sforza Pallavicini, a Jesuit well known for his history of the Council of Trent; Father Henry More, the historian of our English province; and Father John Bollandus, a Belgian, who in 1643 began the stupendous work to which he has given his name. Assisted by several other Fathers, known as the Bollandists, he undertook to publish the Lives of the Saints, an enterprise which was continued until the suppression of the Society, and which has been resumed in the present century by members of the Order, under the patronage of the Belgian Government.

Among the orators of the Society, one of the most eminent is Bourdalone, whose eloquence excited the enthusiasm of the literary and fashionable world of Paris in the seventeenth century. During Holy Week, in 1671, all the places in the church where he preached were secured two days beforehand. More admirable, however, than his eloquence is the apostolic spirit of the great orator, who fearlessly reproved the vices of the all-powerful Louis XIV.

The list of the scientific men trained by the Order of Jesus is a long one. Among the mathematicians let us mention Father Christopher Clavius, a Bavarian, born in 1537, surnamed the "Christian Euclid," who was appointed by Pope Gregory XIII. to direct a commission

for the reform of the Calendar; his most celebrated pupil was Father Matthew Ricci, the apostle of China, of whom we have already spoken. Father Athanasius Kircher, born in 1602, was a universal genius, whose vast stores of knowledge included physics, natural history, philosophy, mathematics, theology, antiquities, music, ancient and modern languages. He was among the first to study the Coptic tongue and to attempt to decipher the hieroglyphics of Egypt; he invented the magic lantern, and a musical instrument on the principles of scientific acoustics, and he also made a valuable collection of antiquities, called the Kircher Museum, which was at the Roman college and has now been seized by the Italian Government.

Father Schall, a German, born in 1591, was, like Father Ricci, a zealous apostle and an eminent mathematician. The Emperor of China commissioned him to reform the Chinese Calendar. Father Verbiest, his colleague, established a cannon foundry in China, and taught the natives the manufacture and use of artillery.

Many discoveries and inventions are due to the Jesuits. Let us mention Father Fritz, who in 1707 published the first map of the river Amazon; Father Allonez, who first made known Lake Superior; Father Marquette, who discovered the mouth of the Missouri; Brother Goës, who, after five years' wanderings, discovered the route from India to China through Tartary. It was the Jesuits of Peru who first discovered the medicinal properties of quinine, long known in England as "Jesuits' bark." Other members of the Order discovered the use of india-rubber; others brought from Turkey the rhubarb plant, and from China the turkey, still, it appears, called "the Jesuit" by the peasants in certain parts of France. The camellia was introduced into Europe in 1739 by a Jesuit, Father Camelli, and the art of dyeing and printing cottons was brought to France by the Jesuit missionaries in the East. A Portuguese, Father Gusmao, invented balloons; he made a linen balloon and offered to ascend in it from Lisbon, but the Portuguese Inquisition took fright at so strange an invention, and Father Gusmao, having

suggested that the Grand Inquisitor himself should take a place in the balloon, got into still further trouble by this harmless joke. We will conclude this incomplete sketch by Father Terzi, born in 1631, who invented signs to be used by the blind to communicate their thoughts; and by two learned Jesuits of our own times —Father Secchi, an eminent astronomer, and Father Perry, an Englishman, who died a few years since, and whose scientific observations rendered service to his country, while they reflected glory on the Order to which he belonged.

V.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE SOCIETY IN PORTUGAL, FRANCE, SPAIN, NAPLES, AND PARMA.

THE destruction of the Society in these countries towards the latter part of the last century was the natural result of the infidel and freethinking spirit which had spread throughout Europe. The enemies of the Church aimed their first blows at the Order, which they considered as its bodyguard, and in order to render its destruction more complete, they spared no means to wrench from the Sovereign Pontiff a decree that should complete their work. Hence the destruction of the Order of Jesus is a testimony rendered to its value in the service of the Church. Its members had the honour of exciting the hatred and terror of the freethinking philosophers, whose spirit had penetrated among the political men of the day.

The storm that, for a time, was to overwhelm the Society of Jesus, arose in Portugal, where, in 1750, Joseph I., a prince of weak character and depraved morals, ascended the throne. It was at the instigation of a Jesuit, Father Moreira, that he named to the post of Secretary of State, Sebastian Carvalho, Marquis of Pombal. "Never," says a Jesuit writer, "was meddling with things outside the sphere of duty more terribly punished."[1] The new minister was a man of iron will, whose hatred towards the Church was deep-seated. He desired nothing else than to establish a national and schismatic Church in Portugal; the Jesuits stood in the way of his projects, hence he resolved to destroy them.

[1] Rev. A. Weld, S.J., *Suppression*, &c. p. 10.

He proceeded with great caution, gradually poisoning the mind of the king by giving him books to read against the Society, while he caused the same to be spread throughout the country. Then he began a system of petty vexations against the Fathers, and succeeded in exiling from Lisbon those whose influence he had cause to fear. In the colonies he pursued the same line of policy, and under his patronage an apostate monk named Platel published a memoir wherein they were accused of making their apostolic mission a pretext for commercial transactions. The book was condemned by Benedict XIV. in 1745, but, nothing daunted, twelve years later, in 1757, Pombal sent the Pope a long list of accusations against the Society, and petitioned that a visitor might be named to reform the Institute. Had the wily minister openly betrayed his hatred towards the Jesuits, it is probable that, aged and sick unto death though he was, Benedict XIV. would have summoned energy enough to defend those whom over and over again he had warmly praised, but, deluded by Pombal's affectation of zeal, overpersuaded by Cardinal Passionei, an adversary of the Society, exhausted by a mortal illness, the Pope yielded, and entrusted Cardinal Saldanha, a *protégé* of Pombal, with the task of reforming the Institute in Portugal. He died a month later, on the 3rd of May, 1758, after earnestly requesting Saldanha to act with discretion, to be on his guard against the undue influence of the enemies of the Order, and, above all, to take no decision regarding the Jesuits, but simply to address a report of his mission to the Holy See.

Saldanha's conduct was in direct opposition to the injunctions given to him by the dying Pontiff. He proceeded with unheard-of violence and publicity, and without supporting his assertion by a single proof he declared that the Fathers of the Society in Portugal were guilty of carrying on commercial transactions contrary to canon law. The Jesuits' papers were given up to be examined, but not a single indication was discovered that could substantiate Saldanha's assertion.

The same year, 1758, the General of the Society,

160181

Father Centurioni died in Rome. A new pilot took his place at the helm of the tempest-tossed bark of the Order of Jesus about the same time as a new Pope ascended the Papal throne. The two were very different. Lorenzo Ricci, the new General of the Society, was a man of illustrious birth, of cultivated mind, great personal holiness, and a gentle disposition that made him little fitted for the stormy scenes, where even the high courage of Ignatius or the genius of Aquaviva might have succumbed. Ricci had the patient endurance that suffers without a murmur rather than the militant energy that struggles to the end.

The new Pope, Carlo Rezzonico, a Venetian, who took the name of Clement XIII., was, like Ricci, a holy and mortified priest; he had a warm heart united to an inflexible courage whenever his principles were at stake, and the story of his stormy reign is at once pathetic and admirable. He had to defend the Society of Jesus against the combined efforts of Pombal in Portugal, Choiseul in France, d'Aranda in Spain, Joseph II. in Austria, Tanucci in Naples, who, all united by a common spirit, had sworn to destroy the Order, whose chief crimes were its influence over the minds of men and its devotion to the Church.

In this formidable league of the courts of Europe against a religious order, Pombal led the way. An attempt having been made to assassinate the King of Portugal, he strove to implicate the Jesuits in the plot, and though no proof, even the slightest, was ever brought forward against them, they were imprisoned, several of them tortured, and finally, in 1759, they were in a body banished from the kingdom, amid circumstances of peculiar cruelty. In vain Clement XIII., who had already written to the Catholic bishops of the world to praise "the religious, who have deserved so well from the Church and the Holy See,"[1] appealed to the king's sense of justice. Joseph was only a tool in the hands of Pombal, and the Jesuits of Portugal and the colonies were huddled on board ship like the vilest malefactors,

[1] P. de Ravignan, p. 84.

and after enduring untold tortures were thrown on the coast of Italy.

In spite of the efforts made by Pombal to ruin the Society in the minds of the people of Portugal the cruel and arbitrary measures used against the Fathers excited the popular indignation, and, in hopes of casting still further discredit upon those whom he hated, Pombal caused Father Malagrida, a venerable missionary, to be publicly executed at Lisbon as a heretic. The tribunal that condemned him was composed of men chosen by Pombal; the books upon which the accusation rested were not the work of Malagrida; and the charge against one so venerable and holy was universally disbelieved, even by the freethinking philosophers themselves.

Thus the Society of Jesus was destroyed in the country where, since the days of John and Francis Xavier, an unbroken friendship had existed between the sovereigns and the sons of St. Ignatius. In the year following the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1760, the king withdrew his ambassador from Rome and expelled the Papal nuncio from Lisbon.

In France the Society of Jesus had to face not only the enmity of one man, but that of the Jansenists and of the philosophers, who combined to bring about its destruction. A Protestant writer, Ranke, attributes their hatred to the fact that the Jesuits were "the most formidable bulwark of Catholic principles,"[1] and therefore most hateful to men who, like Voltaire and d'Alembert, wished to destroy the Church itself, and who felt that to attain this end they must first crush those whom d'Alembert styles "the grenadiers of fanaticism." The plans of the Jesuits' enemies were served by the weakness of Louis XV., whose sense of right and justice was blunted by a life of shameful immorality and by the influence of Madame de Pompadour, who hated them because, as d'Alembert himself confesses, she resented their "extraordinary severity" in refusing to admit her to the Sacraments as long as she continued her evil life. Unfortunately, also, just at a moment when the position

[1] *Histoire de la Papauté*, vol. iv. p. 480.

of the Society was most delicate and dangerous, Father de Lavalette, superior of the Jesuit house of la Martinique, directly violated the rules of his order by embarking in various speculations which failed. He was declared a bankrupt, and some of his creditors brought an action against the French Jesuits.

Although Lavalette publicly testified that he had acted without the knowledge of his superiors, who protested against his conduct, expelled him from the Society and refunded the money he had caused others to lose, it cannot be denied that this unfortunate occurrence was made use of by the enemies of the Order.

The Parliament of Paris, who had always been more or less hostile to the Jesuits, now began to examine their constitutions with a view to modify them, in spite of the remonstrances of the Pope. In 1761 an assembly of the clergy took place, in order to deliberate upon the doctrines of the Society, which the Parliament, thereby exceeding its attributes, had condemned. Out of the fifty-one bishops present, all, with one exception, demanded that the Jesuits should be maintained in France, and the solitary prelate who voted against them—the Bishop of Soissons—declared them to be regular and austere in their morals.

Here, again, we have to note a fault on the part of one member of the Society. In order to conciliate the bishops and the Parliament, and also to please the king, Father de la Croix, provincial of the Paris Jesuits, consented, in 1761, to sign an act of adhesion to the four articles of the declaration of the clergy in 1682. The spirit of these articles was hostile to Rome. Louis XIV., under whose inspiration they had been drawn up, had never obliged the Jesuits to sign them, and after his own reconciliation to the Holy See he had even repealed the decree that made them obligatory.

Father de la Croix's act of weakness, of which Père de Ravignau writes, "I deplore and condemn it,"[1] was blamed by the Pope, the general, and the Jesuits of the other provinces, and so little did it ensure to the Paris

[1] *Clément XIII. et Clément XIV.*, p. 135.

Fathers the king's protection that a few months later—in April, 1762—Louis XV. allowed the Parliament to close the famous college of Louis le Grand. In vain, in the month of May following, did the French bishops and clergy present to the king an eloquent appeal in favour of the Society. Louis was governed by Madame de Pompadour and Choiseul, and henceforth, in spite of the warm friendship of the queen and the dauphin for the Jesuits, the work of destruction proceeded rapidly. On the 6th of August, 1762, the Parliament of Paris declared the doctrines of the Society to be blasphemous and heretical, and decreed that its members should be expelled from the kingdom, that their churches and libraries should be confiscated.

Out of the four thousand religious who were struck by this extravagant decree, only twenty-four consented to leave the Order; the rest remained faithful to the rules of the Society and prepared for the worst.

The Protestant historian Schoell has observed that this decree, drawn up under the influence of blind prejudice, "cannot fail to be condemned by all honest men."[1] It was declared null and void by Clement XIII., and excited the indignation of all that was best in France.

The Archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont, in a splendid protest, triumphantly refuted the charges brought against the Society—an act which caused him to be exiled, while his pastoral was publicly burnt. In November of the same fatal year, 1764, Louis XV. gave his sanction to the decree, and in the month of January following Pope Clement XIII., who till then had made use of every means of persuasion to strengthen the king's vacillating will, gave vent to his just indignation, and in the Bull "Apostolicum" publicly proclaimed that the Institute of Jesus was "pious and holy."

Through the influence of the dauphin the French Jesuits, although reduced to poverty, narrowly watched and forbidden to live in community, continued to remain in the kingdom with that tenacity which is one of the

[1] *Cours d'Histoire des États Européens*, vol. xi. p. 51.

characteristics of the Order ; but in 1765 their protector, the dauphin, died, and in 1767 a new edict of the Paris Parliament obliged them to leave the country.

After witnessing the destruction of the Society in Portugal and in France, it remains for us to witness the same mournful spectacle in the native land of the soldier-saint.

Charles III. of Spain, unlike the sovereigns of France and Portugal, was religious and moral, but his morbid disposition and narrow intellect rendered him easily accessible to the influence of his minister, d'Aranda, the close ally of the French freethinking philosophers and of the minister Choiseul, who, says the historian Sismondi, made a personal affair of the destruction of the Jesuits.[1]

In dealing with a sovereign religious, timid, scrupulous, and credulous as was Charles III., d'Aranda had to adopt other means than those employed in France and Portugal by Choiseul and Pombal, and he involved the king in a series of mysterious misrepresentations which it is hard even now to unravel. However, historians like Ranke, Coxe (in his *Spain under the Bourbons*), Sismondi, Schoell, Adam (in his *History of Spain*), agree in their version of these dark machinations, and the traditions of the Society point the same way. It is believed that a letter supposed to be written by Father Ricci, but which was really the work of Choiseul, was laid before Charles III. In this letter the General was made to say that he possessed documents that proved Charles III. to be illegitimate, and therefore unlawfully in possession of the crown. The king, proud and reserved, morbidly sensitive and suspicious, fell into the trap, and allowed his ministers to take their measures for the suppression of the Jesuits throughout Spain. These measures were surrounded by the deepest mystery: secret despatches were sent by the king to the authorities in Spain and in the colonies; on the 2nd of April, 1767, in all the Spanish possessions the Jesuits were arrested, led to the nearest port, placed on board ship, and their

[1] *Histoire des Français*, vol. xxix. p. 369.

possessions confiscated. No attempt was made to give even an appearance of legality to these violent measures; the king simply stated that he had secret and pressing motives to act as he did.

The scenes of anguish that followed are heartrending to read. The six thousand Spanish Jesuits scattered throughout the country and its colonies were torn from their missions and colleges, without being suffered to ask for an explanation or offer a defence. Their resignation is commented on by all the historians; in Paraguay, where a word of murmur coming from their lips might have brought about a revolution, they displayed, says Sismondi, "a calmness and firmness truly heroic."[1]

A few days later Clement XIII. wrote Charles III. a beautiful letter, every line of which breathes righteous indignation, united to a spirit of justice and paternal affection. In it he entreated the king to reveal to him the secret of his conduct, and touchingly reproaches "the most Catholic king" with adding to the sorrows that already saddened his old age! Charles III. having refused an explanation, even to the Pope, Clement XIII. then issued a brief in which, after condemning the treatment of the Jesuits, he solemnly warned the king that he thereby imperilled his own salvation.

Choiseul, having obtained from Charles III. the expulsion of the hated Jesuits, now proceeded to exercise a similar pressure upon the sovereigns of Naples and Parma. At Naples Ferdinand IV., young and weak, was persuaded to sign the decree of expulsion by his minister, Tanucci, a man of the same stamp as Aranda and Choiseul. The duchy of Parma was governed by an Infant of Spain, whose minister, Felicio, an open freethinker, succeeded in obtaining a similar concession from his sovereign; but Clement XIII., in virtue of his long established rights, was liege lord of Parma, and he now claimed a right long fallen into disuse, and, by a Bull dated January 20, 1768, he annulled the edict of the Duke of Parma against the Society.

[1] *Histoire des Français*, vol. xxix. p. 372.

This courageous act was punished by the seizure of Avignon by France, and of Benevento, also a Papal possession, by Naples, and, ere long, a formal petition was addressed to the Pope from the courts of Portugal, France, Naples, Parma, and Spain, demanding the utter suppression of the Society. The Jesuits' enemies knew the vitality of the Order, and they felt that the work of destruction would be incomplete if not sanctioned by Rome.

The Pope remained firm, his heart was torn with sorrow, and we read that he frequently shed tears over the misfortunes of those whom he loved and valued as the trusted soldiers of the Church, but his will was undaunted and the threats and pleadings of the Bourbon sovereigns and their ministers were unable to shake his determination.

But if his brave spirit remained firm, his physical strength broke down under the pressure of anxiety and sorrow: on the 2nd of February he died almost suddenly, and its last earthly defender was taken away from the Order of Jesus.

VI.

SUPPRESSION OF THE SOCIETY AND ITS SUBSEQUENT RESTORATION, 1773–1814.

THE Jesuits now stood defenceless before their relentless foes: the one arm that had ever been stretched out to defend them was chilled by death.

Their fate evidently depended upon the choice of a new Pope as the Bourbon courts had resolved to spare neither threats nor promises to ensure the election of a Pontiff on whose docility they could count. The story of the Conclave of 1773 is a mournful one enough, with its intrigues and machinations, the vain efforts of a small group of cardinals to resist the formidable pressure exercised from without, the weakness of the rest in yielding to that same pressure.

The struggle was a long one, but at last, on the 19th of May, a Franciscan, Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli, was elected to the Papal throne.

He was a man of blameless life, an exemplary religious, and had never shown himself otherwise than friendly towards the Jesuits, who, on their side, have dealt pitifully with the memory of a Pontiff more sinned against than sinning. It seems clear that Ganganelli yielded to a temptation of ambition when he accepted the Papal tiara and, in order to obtain it, tacitly consented to suppress the Society of Jesus.

He probably did not realize the full meaning of the promise he then made, and hoped that, by small concessions and an able policy, he might save the Society without forfeiting the favour of the Bourbon sovereigns.

Later on he understood the meaning of the engagement he had taken, and, convinced at heart of the innocence of the Jesuits with whom he had always been on good terms, he suffered a moral agony before perpetrating an act which his conscience reproved but which his weakness of character prevented him from resisting.

The Pope tried from the first to conciliate the sovereigns, hoping to gain time and to elude the fulfilment of his fatal promise, but Pombal, d'Aranda, and Choiseul were not to be deceived, and they persisted in demanding the destruction of the Institute, without any compromise. He defended himself with a pathetic helplessness: "I cannot," he urges to Choiseul, "blame or destroy an Institute, which nineteen of my predecessors have praised and the Council of Trent has approved." [1]

He proposed to assemble a general council, where the affair should be examined and, at least, begged for a delay before proceeding to the suppression.

To these pleadings and proposals the sovereigns replied by demands that became every day more imperious. Spain threatened a schism, and sent as her envoy to Rome Florida Blanca, whose interviews with the Pope were a source of terror to the latter. Sometimes driven into his last retrenchments, the unhappy Pontiff, after pleading his failing health, piteously begged to be spared from committing a deed of iniquity; now and then he seemed to recover his dignity, and once, Florida Blanca having promised him that Benevento and Avignon, which had been taken from the Holy See, should be restored if he yielded, he indignantly exclaimed: "A Pope governs the souls of men, but does not buy or sell them!" [2]

But these flashes of energy were short-lived, and when Maria Teresa of Austria, who till then had supported the Society, joined the league against it, at the instigation of her son Joseph II., the unfortunate Pontiff bowed his head. He was alone against the crowned

[1] *Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 301. Crétineau-Joly.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

heads of Europe, to whom by his fatal promise he had given a weapon which they unmercifully used against him.

While these events were passing, the Jesuits, who fully realized the deadly peril that threatened their Order, maintained an attitude absolutely passive. They were forbidden to enter the Pontifical palace, and the proceedings against them were surrounded by secrecy.

As the Pope steadfastly refused to admit them into his presence, they had no means of presenting a defence or an appeal to his sense of justice, and Father Garnier, Assistant for France, writes that even if they had drawn up a petition, no one would have dared present it for them.[1]

The silence observed by the doomed Order on the eve of its destruction contrasts strangely with the remarkable vitality of its members in past times. For two hundred years they had borne a conspicuous part in every religious discussion and in many political events throughout the Christian world. The Institute that had furnished writers, controversialists, theologians, learned and holy men in such numbers, still possessed many eminent subjects, but not a line was written, not a voice was raised among them in defence of their Order. Respect towards the Holy See obliged the sons of the soldier-saint to a passive resignation, little in accordance with the militant spirit of their Society.

At length the end came. On the 21st of July, 1773, just as at the Gesù the bells were ringing in honour of the annual novena preparatory to the feast of St. Ignatius, Clement XIV. signed the Brief: "Dominus ac Redemptor noster," suppressing the Jesuits throughout the Christian world. It is said that, having completed the fatal act, the Pope fell senseless on the floor; the next day he kept repeating, in despairing tones: "My God, is there no remedy!"

On the 16th of August, 239 years and one day since the foundation of the Society in the crypt at Montmartre, the Brief was carried into execution in Rome, the houses

[1] *Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 528. Crétineau-Joly.

and papers belonging to the Jesuits were seized, the Fathers removed to different religious houses, and the general imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo.

As the Protestant historian Schoell observes, the Brief of Suppression is especially remarkable because it condemns neither the doctrine, nor the morals, nor the discipline of the Jesuits. The complaints of the courts against the Order are the only motives alleged for its suppression.[1] The Pope enumerates the accusations brought forward against the Order without either denying or confirming them, and he lays stress upon the disturbance caused by the existence of the Society and upon the demands addressed to him to obtain its suppression: in this last paragraph lies the keynote to the Brief.

The courts of Spain and Naples considered the tone of the document as too lenient and moderate; in Rome it excited the disapproval of those cardinals who were not the tools of the Bourbon courts, and the indignation of the people who despised the Pope for his weakness. In France the Archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont, declined to accept a Brief, which, he argued, had been issued by compulsion, and which directly contradicted other Pontifical documents which declared the Order of Jesus to be holy and useful to the Church. As for the Jesuits themselves, they one and all submitted with unquestioning obedience, Father Ricci giving them a noble example of silent resignation.

On the 2nd of September, 1774, a year after the suppression, Clement XIV. breathed his last. His two immediate successors, Pius VI. and Pius VII., expressed their conviction that his brain actually gave way under the weight of sorrow and remorse; he had himself been heard to say that the suppression of the Society would cause his death, and it is touching to note the pitying respect with which the historians of the Order handle his memory.[2]

The Conclave that followed was very different from

[1] *Cours d'Histoire des États Européens*, vol. xliv. p. 83.

[2] See *Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 390. Crétineau-Joly. *Clément XIII. et Clément XIV.* By the Père de Ravignan.

the one that had raised him to the Papal throne, and the cardinals, instructed by experience, no longer allowed themselves to be unduly influenced by the courts. On February 15, 1775, they elected Cardinal Angelo Braschi, who took the name of Pius VI. Although the jealous watchfulness of the sovereigns hampered his freedom of action, Pius VI. mitigated, as far as he was able, the captivity of Father Ricci, who was still a prisoner, but rest and comfort such as the world could not give him were soon to be the lot of the suffering general of the once mighty Society. On the 24th of November, 1775, Father Ricci expired, after having read, in presence of his jailors and fellow-prisoners, an admirable protest, at once submissive and dignified, resigned and high-minded, full of forgiveness and charity, yet breathing a spirit of heroism which proved that its author, in spite of his natural meekness, was the worthy successor of the soldier-saint of Loyola.

Meantime, the Bull of Suppression was carrying sorrow and dismay throughout the Christian world. Cardinal Pacca tells us that in Germany it caused an immense injury to religion and lowered the Holy See in the minds of the people[1]; in Poland and Switzerland the Jesuits themselves were, for some time, the only ones to accept it. The English Jesuits, driven out of St. Omer by the French Government, continued, as secular priests, to direct a college at Liege, where the prince-bishop was their friend; at Lucerne, Fribourg, and Soleure they were forced by the inhabitants to do the same. At Fribourg they assembled to pray for Clement XIV. on hearing of his death, and publicly requested those who had loved the Society to abstain from irreverent comments on his memory.

The result of the Brief in the missions was even more disastrous than in Europe. The Jesuits immediately submitted, but their neophytes' indignation was painful to witness and difficult to calm. In India and in China they relinquished without a murmur the missions that had been watered by the blood of so many martyrs of their

[1] *Mém. Hist. du Card. Pacca.*

Order, and that seemed almost to them like a family heritage. The Lazarists, who were sent to take their place, bear witness to the resignation and simplicity with which old men, grown white in missionary labour, abdicated their post with the simplicity of children.

In two countries of Europe only was the Brief of Suppression absolutely rejected, and strangely enough the sovereigns who forbad its publication were the Protestant Frederick II. of Prussia and the schismatical Empress Catherine of Russia. Clement XIV. could not exact the obedience of monarchs outside the pale of the Church, and the Prussian bishops sheltered themselves behind their sovereign's desires and declared themselves powerless to enforce the Bull. The Jesuits themselves were ready to submit, but Pius VI. removed their scruples, and in 1775 we find Frederick II. informing the Jesuits of Breslau that the new Pope had yielded to his request, and that he authorized the Fathers to go on living in community.

Catherine II. went still further, and as the Jesuits in Russia persisted in obeying the Bull in spite of her orders to the contrary, she obtained from Clement XIV. himself in June, 1774, a decree authorizing the Jesuits in White Russia to remain in *statu quo* until further orders; in 1779 they were even allowed to establish a noviciate at Mohilon. When Joseph II. visited Russia, he expressed his surprise at finding the Jesuits flourishing, and received from the Bishop of Mohilon the following laconic reply: "Populo indigente, imperatrix jubente, Roma tacente."

Both Catherine and Frederick were infidels and in constant correspondence with the freethinkers of France, but they were keen-sighted politicians, powerful enough to care little for the opinion of other sovereigns, and, having recognized that the Jesuits were of use to their subjects, they resolved not to deprive them of their services.

A few years later, in 1783, the empress obtained from Pius VI. a verbal approbation of the Russian Jesuits; the Pope dared not do more, for Charles III. of Spain

continued to exercise a jealous watch over the remnants of the hated Society, but the verbal approbation was sufficient to enable the Jesuits of Russia to elect a superior, who, with the title of vicar, governed his brethren according to the rules of the Society.

As time went on, after the great storm of the French Revolution had swept across Europe, shattering the thrones of the Bourbon kings, who had destroyed the Society, the restoration of that same Society became the dream and the desire of many holy souls, whom Providence gradually drew together to accomplish the same work. The "Pères de la Foi" in France, and a certain number of English members of the former Society, were anxious to join the flourishing group of religious who had continued, in a remote corner of Russia, to practise the rules of the Order.

Pius VII. was then on the Papal throne. Struck by the perils and necessities of the times, and impressed by the ardent desire manifested by many priests of great virtue and merit to enter the Order of Jesus, he resolved to restore it throughout the world. On the 7th of August, 1814, by the Bull, "Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum," the Pontiff yielding "to the unanimous demand of the Catholic world," called forth from the tomb, where it had been laid for forty-one years, the Society of Jesus, whose sons took up once more the place they had so worthily held among the defenders of Christ's Church. This solemn act caused general rejoicing throughout the city of Rome: the Bull was read in the Gesù in presence of one hundred and fifty members of the former Society, who, having wept over its destruction, hailed its resurrection with tears of joy. In Europe and in the distant missions old priests might be seen coming, after forty years' separation, to end their days under the rule of St. Ignatius, while new recruits flocked in such numbers that in the course of a few years the Jesuits possessed houses and colleges in all the chief cities of Europe. When they returned to Portugal, in 1829, the first pupils confided to their care were the four great grandsons of Pombal!

Since its happy restoration by Pius VII., the Order of Jesus has pursued its career, often persecuted and exiled, frequently misunderstood and attacked, but flourishing in spite of difficulties, and seeming to attract generous spirits for the very reason that its sons are more exposed to persecution.

While we write these lines the Jesuits in France and Italy are exposed to endless vexations, and in the latter country in particular they have been driven out of their houses and robbed of their libraries and collections.

Among the eminent Jesuits who have flourished since the restoration of the Order, let us mention Father de Rozanen, a controversialist of talent and a religious of rare wisdom and influence; Father de Ravignan, a preacher; Father Gury, a theologian of renown; Father Franzelin, whom the Pope obliged to accept a cardinal's hat; the Fathers De Buck and Van Hecke, who have resumed the labours of the Bollandists, and Fathers Secchi and Perry, well known in the world of science.

The most remarkable of the generals who have been called to govern the Institute since its insurrection is, doubtless, Father John Roothan, a Dutchman, whose powers of organization were equalled by his great personal holiness, energy, and prudence. He ruled the Order from 1829 to 1853. Its present general is Father Martin, a Spaniard, whose election took place, only two years ago, at Loyola, the birthplace of St. Ignatius.

VII.

ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

It would carry us far beyond the limits of the present sketch to go thoroughly into the many accusations which, at different times, have been brought forward against the Society of Jesus. We can only pass them in review, briefly giving a few lines to each. Some are utterly unfounded, and are the result of hatred and malice; others have a certain foundation, but have been exaggerated by party spirit; others again may be just and well founded, showing the human and imperfect element that mingles here below with the noblest works. It often happened that the accusations against the Society had their origin in the favour shown towards it by great personages, and if this kind of patronage appeared to invest the Order with a certain honour, it was more than compensated by the jealousies and ill-will it invariably excited. Thus the favour with which St. Charles Borromeo treated the Society, and the austere life he had embraced under the direction of his confessor, Father Ribera, a Jesuit, attracted the attention and aroused the jealousy of the enemies of the Order. They spread the report that the Fathers were endeavouring to monopolize the saint's great wealth for the benefit of the Society, and even went so far as to bring the gravest charges of immorality against Father Ribera and his brethren. Time and researches have victoriously proved the Father's innocence; but this did not prevent the Jansenists, with their usual bad faith, from repeating accusations whose falseness had been abundantly proved. Pius IV., the reigning Pontiff, never

believed the charges of immorality against the Order, but for a moment he allowed himself to think that the Jesuits were endeavouring to entrap his nephew, St. Charles, and, in deference to his wishes, Father Ribera was removed from Milan. Later on Pius IV. regretted the step he had taken, and in a Brief, dated September 29, 1564, addressed to the Emperor Maximilian, he publicly condemned the libels, "full of impostures and lies," that had been spread against the Order of Jesus. A few years later, a difference having arisen between St. Charles and the Spanish Governor of Milan, Father Mazarini, the latter's Jesuit confessor, had the indiscretion to allude to the matter in the pulpit and violently attacked the archbishop. St. Charles, the warm friend of the Jesuits, was naturally wounded at this uncalled-for interference, the Jesuits themselves were indignant, and Mazarini, after being reprimanded by the general and forbidden to preach for two years, was required to ask pardon of the saint. This incident in no degree altered the close friendship that continued to exist between the Society and the holy archbishop, who, in 1584, breathed his last in the arms of a Jesuit, Father Adorno, whom he had chosen as his confessor.

The Society of Jesus has, unjustly enough, been made responsible for the rashness of Don Sebastian of Portugal, who, at the age of twenty-four, insisted on undertaking an expedition against the Moors of Africa; the enterprise proved a failure, and the young king perished, with the flower of his nobility, at the fatal battle of Alcazar. Yet, strange to say, while certain writers accuse Father Gonzales, the young king's tutor, with having inspired him with an inordinate love for war and adventure, Etienne Pasquier, a French lawyer of the day, whose hatred to the Society amounted to a mania, brings forward a very different charge, and asserts that the Jesuits wanted to make Sebastian enter their Order. Both accusations seem groundless. We have a letter from Father Laynez to Queen Catherine, Sebastian's grandmother, proving that from the outset he dreaded the post of confidence thrust on one of his subjects;

other letters from Father Gonzales himself to St. Francis Borgia show us how difficult he found it to train a spirit so rash and turbulent as that of his pupil, and how all his efforts tended to moderate his impulsiveness; finally, far from seeking to entrap the young king, we find St. Francis Borgia endeavouring to negotiate the marriage of Sebastian with a French princess.

The Jesuits have been reproached with their enthusiasm in the cause of the Holy League, the object of which was to exclude a Protestant prince from the French throne. It is true that several among them entered warmly into the interests of the cause which bishops, priests, and religious of various Orders had embraced as the cause of religion. Father Claude Mathieu, provincial of Paris, was surnamed "le Courier de la Ligne," from his frequent journeys to Rome on behalf of his party, who wished to obtain the open adhesion of the Pope. Father Aquaviva, who was then general, endeavoured to prevent his subjects, as much as possible, from being carried away by politics, and his letters on the subject are brimful of prudent wisdom, and by his desire the "Courier de la Ligne," Father Mathieu, eventually retired from the camps and councils where he had played a part. Let us add that if as a rule the Jesuits sided with the Ligne, where Mathieu, Henry IV.'s historian assures us that "they preached with more moderation than other religious,"[1] yet some few among them may be found in the ranks of the opposite party. Henry III. chose as his confessor Father Auger, who remained faithful to him, thereby exposing himself to be misjudged by those of his brethren who had become ardent "Ligneurs." Another Jesuit, Father Possevinus, was the principal means of bringing about Henry IV.'s reconciliation with the Catholic Church. We will mention, without taking the trouble to refute them at length, the accusations of regicide brought against the Society under the reign of that same Henry IV.—accusations absolutely baseless, and which ably made use of by the

[1] *Les Jésuites Ligneurs*, par le d'Colombier, S.J., Etudes, Mai, 1874.

Paris Parliament, always hostile to the Society, caused the execution of a Jesuit, Father Guignard, among whose papers certain documents attacking the king's authority were said to be found. Sismondi calls the conduct of the Parliament on this occasion "a scandalous iniquity."[1] The Father's execution was followed by the expulsion of his brethren from Paris; they were recalled, however, by Henry IV. in 1603, and on this occasion the king's sensible and spirited defence of the Society reduced the members of the Paris Parliament to silence. Henry IV. never wavered in his attachment to the Order, and his friendship for one of its members, Father Coton, is well known. Under Louis XIII., his son, the Jesuits were involved in various difficulties. Cardinal Richelieu, the young king's all-powerful minister, regarded a body so influential with fear and suspicion. He caused the book of an Italian Jesuit, Father Santarelli, to be publicly burnt, in 1626, as containing doctrines that might lead to rebellion and regicide. Santarelli's treatise stated that the Pope had the power to depose kings who were guilty of certain crimes: it was one of those treatises full of high-flown doctrines, impossible and dangerous in practice, and the French Jesuits were obliged to sign a protestation disowning it.

An accusation, which has perhaps a certain foundation, has been brought forward against the French Jesuits during the reign of Louis XIV. In the zenith of his pride and power the king caused the prelates of his kingdom to adopt what was called the Declaration of the Four Articles; these articles, which savoured strongly of heresy, tended to diminish the authority of the Pope, and have since been condemned by several Pontiffs. The Jesuits never adhered to the declaration, but they have been accused of having maintained a neutral attitude, and their efforts tended certainly to conciliate the opposite parties rather than to take a decided part in favour of Rome. Like many others, they yielded to the fascination exercised on his contemporaries by "Louis le Grand," and the efforts of Father Lachaise to obtain

[1] *Hist. des Français*, vol. xxi. p. 323.

from the Pope certain concessions to meet the king's wishes, irritated Pope Innocent XI., who reproached the French Fathers with rendering their loyalty to the Holy See subservient to their allegiance to the sovereign. In a previous chapter we have spoken of the errors of Father de Lavalette, who, contrary to the rules of his Order, embarked in commercial transactions; and of Father de la Croix, who, in a moment of weakness, signed the Declaration of the Four Articles, in the vain hope of propitiating the Paris Parliament.

One word now, before ending this brief sketch, upon the question of the Chinese and Malabar rites—a question which gave rise to long discussions, and which was fraught with grave consequences to the missions in the East.

Both in China and India the Jesuit missionaries allowed their neophytes to practise certain ceremonies, after having ascertained, as they thought, that no idolatrous meaning was attached to these rites, which consisted principally in certain honours paid to ancestors, in the wearing of certain cards. That the Jesuits did not exaggerate the importance attached by the natives to these practices, is proved by the fact that Christianity begun to decrease from the moment when they were prohibited.

The Fathers, let us add, regarded these concessions as temporary, and hoped that with time and an increase of Christian knowledge, the inveterate prejudices of the natives would gradually disappear. In a letter to Pope Clement XI. they express their conviction that at no very distant period, even those practices which were "purely civil," and therefore innocent, might be replaced by ceremonies having a Christian character, but they likewise express their fear, lest, by hastiness or undue severity, they may unwittingly close heaven to a large number of souls. The matter was discussed in Rome. Pope Clement XI., after long hesitation, sent as legate to China and India the Cardinal de Tournon, who exercised his mission with an imprudent hastiness that

irritated the natives, alarmed the secular clergy and bishops, and placed the Jesuits in a position of extreme difficulty. They wrote to Rome for instructions and were allowed, for the time being, to continue their former line of conduct, the Holy See considering Tournon's hasty and wholesale condemnation of the rites as wanting in due knowledge of the question. In 1710, however, certain rites were condemned; the Holy See urging, which was probably the exact truth, that though, in the eyes of the literates, these rites were merely civil forms, in the eyes of the uneducated they had a religious meaning.

The Jesuit missionaries loyally accepted the decision, while continuing to represent that the abolition of the ceremonies would inflict a serious blow upon the Catholic Church in the East. Nevertheless, in March, 1715, Clement XI. issued a decree ordering the missionaries to forbid *all* the ceremonies and rites; but the patriarch Mezzabarba, who was sent to China to enforce the execution of the decree, was so struck by the dangers and drawbacks it involved, that he refrained from carrying it out to the letter, and made another appeal to Rome. It was only in 1735 that Pope Clement XII. confirmed his predecessor's decree, and to this the Jesuits, according to the order given to them by their general, obeyed "promptly and exactly."

Much has been said of their efforts to elude the Papal sentence. True it is that, as long as any latitude was left to them, they availed themselves of it; that they strained every nerve to obtain the sanction of the Holy See for their line of conduct; that they perseveringly upheld their views as long as those views were tolerated; but their obedience after Rome had spoken is proved by their private letters and their public acts; and if, in their desire to gain souls to Christ, they erred on the side of condescension, their loyalty to the Holy See remains entire.

Of the charges brought against the Society by Pombal and the French Parliament at the time of the destruction of the Order of Jesus, nothing need be said except that

they were, in the judgment of all impartial witnesses, brought forward to serve a special purpose.

That the Order had in no way degenerated from its former fervour is proved by the Bulls and Briefs in which different Popes, Benedict XIV. in particular, praised its members: "who give to the world examples of religious virtue and great science."[1] A proof, still more striking and evident of the worth of the Society, is the deadly hatred with which at the end of the last century it was attacked by the enemies of God and the Church. D'Alembert, one of the prominent members of the infidel party in France, the contemporary and correspondent of Voltaire, unconsciously awarded to the Jesuits the highest possible praise when he wrote to Frederick II.: "To ask the Pope to destroy this brave army is like asking your Majesty to disband your regiment of guards."[2]

[1] Rev. A. Weld, S.J., *The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions*, p. 116.

[2] *Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 292.

THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J.

I.—Life in the Society of Jesus.

WHOEVER enters the Society of Jesus, or any other Religious Order, does so of his own free will. There is no conscription, we are all volunteers. The intending novice of the Society is examined by four priests appointed for the purpose. They report separately to the Provincial, whose approval is necessary for his admission. The usual age of admission is from about eighteen to twenty-five. Some are admitted as laybrothers. They are put through no course of studies, and are entirely employed in domestic duties. But they are not servants: they are religious equally with the rest, and wear the religious habit. The proportion of laybrothers to other members of the Society in 1901 was about 26 per cent. In England and Scotland it is somewhat less. The laybrothers, notwithstanding their name, do not wander about in lay society, but live in the religious house with the rest of their brethren: they are only called "laybrothers" because they will never be priests. In the Society of Jesus their official name is Temporal Coadjutors. A person admitted to the Society to study for the priesthood is called a Scholastic Novice. The noviceship lasts two years. When the two years are over, he becomes a Scholastic, and is known as such up to the date of his ordination to the priesthood. Thus, in a large house of the Society there are priests (or Fathers), scholastics, and laybrothers. It is a mistake to call all who are not priests "novices." The novices are not scattered through the various houses, but are all kept together in one house, under a superior called the Master of Novices. The house is called the Novitiate. The Novitiate for England and Scotland is Manresa House, Roehampton, S.W. Little or no study is done in the Novitiate. The rules of the Society are explained to the novices. Their obedience and humility is tested by the performance of menial offices in the house, and manual labour in the garden. They are encouraged to

put every confidence in their Master, to tell him of their difficulties and dislikes.

He studies them individually, and advises them to leave or continue in the Society. But they are free to leave at any time, even against his advice; as the Society also is free to dismiss them, even against their will. Every care is taken not to admit to their vows either the unfit or the unwilling. Nor is there any attempt to put old heads on young shoulders. The novices are allowed reasonable recreation and exercise, and are well fed. They are made to perform the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius in full. This is called the Long Retreat, and lasts a month. When the two years are elapsed, the novice, who is satisfied with the Society, and with whom the Society is satisfied, is admitted to his simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. The first vow binds him to have nothing of his own, and only to use things with the explicit or tacit permission of his Superior. Thus one who has taken the vow of poverty can have neither money, food, nor clothes, except what his Superior allows him. At the same time his Superior is bound in justice to supply him with all bodily necessaries and decencies according to his state, and would speedily be removed from office if he failed in this duty. The practical effect of the vow of poverty is that the religious has not money about him to spend as he pleases. In taking the vow of chastity, the novice engages not to marry, and to observe in all things what Catholics call the sixth, and Protestants the seventh commandment. The vow of obedience binds one to do what the Superior commands according to the rule and custom of the Order, yet so that nothing ever be commanded that is sinful, contrary to the law of God, or the just law of the State. Thus no vow of obedience can ever bind anyone to steal a sixpence, to tell even a small lie, to plot against the Civil Government, or to smuggle contraband goods, such as spirits and tobacco, into the country without paying duty. If a Government were absolutely to forbid the importation of breviaries and crucifixes, or the landing of missionaries, a religious might be commanded to contravene that prohibition, for the law would not be just - the Church would consider it beyond the competence of the civil legislator. Happily such laws are not now made in England, but they were made 250 years ago, and then Jesuits broke them with a good conscience.

By these simple vows the Scholastic is tied to the Society, so that he cannot now go away without a dispensation. The power of dispensation, or even of dismissal, rests with the chief Superior of the Society, called the General. A Scholastic is not dismissed except for gross misconduct, or faults of character such as to disqualify him for the Society. If he and his Superiors otherwise think that he is not in the right place, a dispensation from his vows is granted. Illness does not involve dismissal, unless the invalid himself wishes it. Practically, a Scholastic is never retained against his own fixed will.

After the vows, the noviceship being now ended, the Scholastic goes through two years study of literature and elementary mathematics. At this time, if possible, the Society affords him the benefit of some University training. The Society has a liking for Universities. Its first ten members were Masters of Arts in the University of Paris. In England the Society held by the London University for many years; it now sends its best students to Oxford. After literary studies, come three years of philosophy, diversified by mathematics and physical science. The house of philosophy in England is St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst, near Blackburn. There are 53 students of philosophy in the house at present, all Scholastics of the Society of Jesus. When they leave this house, they are sent to teach boys at some of the schools or "colleges" of the Society. There are seven such schools in England and Scotland: they are Stonyhurst, near Blackburn; Mount St. Mary's, near Chesterfield; Beaumont, near Windsor. These three are boarding schools: also the following day schools: St. Francis Xavier's, Liverpool; Wimbledon College, Wimbledon; St. Ignatius', Stamford Hill, North London; St. Aloysius', Garnethill, Glasgow. A Scholastic who does well as a teacher will be kept at the work for six or seven years. Then he goes to commence his course of four years theology. At the end of the third year he is ordained priest, at which time he may be about thirty-four years of age. At the end of each year of philosophy and theology an oral examination is held of half an hour or an hour, and finally of two hours. These examinations are of increasing difficulty. Failure in any of them involves removal from or abridgement of the course of studies, as also inability to hold the offices of Provincial, General, or Lecturer in philosophy or theology. The house of theology for this

country is St. Beuno's College, near St. Asaph, which contains at present 44 students. When the studies are at length over, the young priest is sent to what is called the "tertianship," namely, to spend a third year in the exercises in which he was engaged as a novice. This is intended to counteract any loss of religious spirit which he may have contracted in the ardour of study. When that is over, he makes what is known as his "Last Vows," or "Solemn Vows of Profession." These vows are in matter the same as before, poverty, chastity, and obedience, along with a fourth vow to go anywhere at the Pope's bidding, even though His Holiness does not provide travelling expenses. These vows are called "solemn" because they are less easily dispensed from than "simple vows." A "Professed Father" cannot be dismissed from the Society except for the gravest cause, and by authority of the Holy See. Those who have taken their Last Vows are employed either on home missions (in which case their work is not unlike that of the secular clergy in England and Scotland), or on foreign missions, or in teaching in the Society's schools, or in government. The cardinal point in this final phase of life is that the subject may be sent to live in any house of the Society within the "Province" at the discretion of the "Provincial." Higher Superiors excepted, a Jesuit has no fixity of tenure.

It may as well be remarked that there are no "crypto-Jesuits," no "Jesuits in plain clothes," or "Jesuits in disguise." A Jesuit house is known all over the town, and Jesuits all live in their own houses, unless the Government shuts up the house and disperses the inmates. A Jesuit never goes in disguise, except in countries where he is threatened with the gallows or imprisonment, if recognised; in that case he is fain to imitate the persecuted Saints of old, of whom St. Paul says "*They walked about in sheepskins.*" (Heb. xi. 37). Out of doors a Jesuit priest or scholastic in this country is dressed like a secular priest; a laybrother in the same way but without the Roman collar. Indoors the priests and scholastics wear a gown with wings; the laybrothers, a similar gown without wings. There are no female Jesuits anywhere. There is no affiliation to the Society except in this sense, that sometimes a person is given a special participation in the prayers of the Society, without being a member or living in its houses, or being subject to its control. Every Jesuit is of course a Catholic. All authority within the

Society is derived from the Pope. A Pope approved the Society in 1540: a Pope suppressed it in 1773: another Pope restored it in 1814. Secular priests and Jesuits say Mass at the same altar, and preach the same faith.

II.—Government of the Society.

THE supreme authority in the Society of Jesus is the General Congregation. That alone can make laws. There are, however, fundamental points which the Congregation cannot alter, but only the Pope. The General Congregation does not sit permanently. It meets for the election of the General, and may meet at certain other times, as presently to be explained. In practice, the Society is not ruled by Congregations, or Committees, but by individuals. The supreme individual ruler is the General, who is elected for life, and resides ordinarily in Rome. The present General is the Very Rev. Louis Martin, a Spaniard, elected in 1892. Resident with the General is a Council of five Assistants, also elected by the General Congregation. They are his advisers, but not his colleagues. The General governs by his own sole authority. He appoints the Superiors of Provinces and of Colleges, and is in regular correspondence with them. All extraordinary issues are decided by him. He is bound, however, to rule according to the Constitutions of St. Ignatius Loyola, Founder of the Society, the decrees of General Congregations, and the traditions of the Society. Next to the General in authority are the Provincials, one in each Province, appointed by the General, but not for life, and removable at his pleasure. The usual tenure of a Provincial's office is from three to eight years. The Society at present consists of twenty-three Provinces: five in Italy, five in Spain, five in Germany with Belgium and Holland, four (now "dispersed") in France, and four in English-speaking countries, namely, England (with Scotland) Ireland, Maryland, Missouri, besides the "Missions" of Canada and New Orleans. The grand total of members of the Society, according to official returns for the 1st of January, 1901, is 15,115. The returns for the English Province for the same date show a total of 668—the population of a large village, men of all ages from eighteen to eighty. To the ordinary Jesuit the Provincial is much the most important of Superiors. The General he never sees, and rarely hears of: but the Provincial he has an interview with every year, at the

annual visitation, and for all important and unusual affairs has recourse to him. It is also by the Provincial that he is moved from place to place in the Province, and has his office assigned. Each Province is divided into "Colleges." There are fourteen Colleges in the English Province. The arrangement in the English Province is peculiar in this, that a "College" in England is not necessarily a building, or indeed a place of education at all: it may mean a group of missionary residences. Each College is normally presided over by a Rector, who holds his appointment from the General for periods of from three to nine years. The Rector's second in command, appointed by the Provincial, is called the Minister. As the General has his Assistants, so every Provincial and every Rector has his Consultors, who aid him with their advice, which he takes or not as he sees fit. Unlike the older Religious Orders, the Society of Jesus has no Chapter Meetings, and does not sing the Divine Office in Choir. Nor has it any statutory corporal austerities, such as fasting and abstinence, beyond what is enjoined by the Church on all the faithful.

Every three years there meets what is called the "Provincial Congregation." This consists of the Provincial, the Rectors, and the senior Professed Fathers of the Province, up to the number of forty in all. This Congregation has no legislative authority, but elects two proctors, whom it sends to Rome with any petitions which it may wish to present to the General. Likewise it signifies to him whether it wishes the General Congregation to be convened or not. If the majority of the Provincial Congregations wishes it, the General is obliged to convene the General Congregation. That body consists of the Provincial and two deputies of each Province, the deputies being elected in a Provincial Congregation in which fifty Fathers sit. When assembled, the General Congregation is supreme, even to the deposing of the General, as was nearly done to Father General Thyrsus Gonsalez some two hundred years ago. That, however, is an extreme and unlikely proceeding. Usually, the General Congregation meets only when the General is dead, its meeting being then a necessity for the election of his successor.

Financially, the Society may be described as built in watertight compartments. Each house is a financial unit, and one house is not responsible for the debts of another. Nor is it usual to transfer a member from one Province to another. To

nearly every Province is attached some foreign mission. Thus to England are attached missions in South Africa and the West Indies.

The important thing in government is not the paper theory but the traditional working. The following remarks appeared in *The Month* in 1898, and apply particularly to the government of the Society of Jesus. "What saves individual liberty in a Religious Order, and keeps the members of the body supple and elastic in their work, is not so much the machinery of the constitution as the spirit in which the constitution works. The Heads of the Order have ample powers of command, but are very slow to draw upon them. They hardly ever put out all their authority. They tread softly, handle gently, and are loth to proceed *pro imperio*. Rules are not applied without the unction of charity and what theologians call ἐπιείκεια (epieikeia) or regard for circumstances. Superiors and their elder subjects have grown up together from early youth, and know one another's ways better often than brothers of the same family. They have common interests, common ideals, and are on the easiest of speaking terms. No government is at once so gentle and so firm, so considerate towards the individual, and at the same time so attentive to the general good, as the government of a healthy Religious Body."

III. Idea of the Society.

"Jesuit," like "Christian," was originally a nickname. (Acts xi. 26; I Pet. iv. 16). The Church has adopted the name "Christian" and received it as an official designation. Not so the name "Jesuit." It may be used without offence, and is used by members of the Society speaking of themselves, but in all official documents the only name for the Body is *Societas Jesu*; and the individuals are *socii* (thus S.J. is *socius Jesu*, "companion of Jesus"): or if the document is the Society's own, they are called *Nostri* ("Ours"). The expression "The Order of Jesus" betrays one who is a stranger to the Society. Jesuits do not speak of the "Order," but of the "Society." In France, Spain, and Italy, they call it the "Company," the name being taken in a military sense. And so St. Ignatius understood it. This leads us to the "Spiritual Exercises" of St. Ignatius. These embody the fundamental idea upon which the Society of Jesus was originally founded and is still based. No one knows the inner

mind of the Society of Jesus who is a stranger to the Spiritual Exercises: they are a continuous course of meditations, lasting properly for thirty days, but usually shortened to eight. They are divided into four "weeks." In the first "week" the great truths of the end of man, sin, hell, death, and judgment are considered. The remaining three "weeks" answer to the triple division of the mysteries of the Rosary, Joyful, Sorrowful, and Glorious. The core of the Exercises is in the second "week," notably in two famous meditations, one on the Kingdom of Christ, the other on the two Standards of Christ and Lucifer. The upshot of these meditations is that the "exercitant" is led, not necessarily to join the Society, or any Religious Order, or to become a priest, but anyhow to resolve on a chivalrous following of Christ, to advance His Kingdom, *not of this world* (St. John xviii. 36) with *arms of warfare not fleshy* (II. Cor. x. 5; Eph. vi. 11-17), and to turn those arms in the first place against himself, to the overthrow of self-love, self-will, and self-interest, so far as worldly comforts and worldly reputation are concerned. It is possible to serve a great cause in such a way as to make the cause, at least at times, secondary to one's own gain, and one's own fame, and one's own advancement and position. Many men have served their country in this spirit, and so have sometimes injured her. And St. Paul complains of men who *seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ* (Phil. ii. 21). The Society, founded on the Spiritual Exercises, endeavours to serve Christ in quite another spirit, a spirit of detachment and disinterestedness: hence the accusation of her enemies, that the Society crushes the individual. It is not for one moment pretended that every deliberate choice of every Jesuit is guided by the principles of the Spiritual Exercises, but every member of the Society owns to those principles, and more or less makes them the rule of his life. No Jesuit has notably swerved from them and prospered in his vocation. To the carrying out of those principles is to be attributed all the spiritual success which the Society has achieved; nay, under the blessing of God, whatever temporal success may have been vouchsafed to it.

Every member of the Society of Jesus is bound by obedience under mortal sin to take no active part in secular politics. It is undeniable that in the sixteenth and seventeeth centuries some Jesuits were greatly involved in political designs, in the interests of religion, as they conceived it. These efforts gave

great disatisfaction to other members of the Society, and on the whole were not crowned with success: hence the stringent prohibition, which has been mentioned, was issued. It is still binding, and at the present day is well observed. When a General Election comes off in this country, no one thinks of enquiring on which side the influence of the Jesuits is thrown. Neither Liberal nor Conservative leaders, nor any of their numerous agents, ever apply to the Society for its support. They recognise that the Society of Jesus is a cypher in politics throughout His Majesty's dominions. A Jesuit will often have his political sympathies, derived not from the Society but from his parentage. But when Jesuit is conversing with Jesuit, politics are hardly ever mentioned, except for amusement. Mercutio's "A plague o' both your houses" is a usual Jesuit sentiment towards the Montagues and Capulets of the political arena. The "political priest," whatever his merits, is not a Father of the Society of Jesus.

The following "Sum and Scope of our Constitutions" is printed in the Rule of the Society. It is an ideal; like other ideals, but imperfectly realised; still, recognised and reverted to. "Men crucified to the world, and to whom the world itself is crucified, such does the plan of our life require us to be: new men, I say, who have stripped themselves of their own sentiments to put on Christ: dead to themselves, to live to justice: who, as St. Paul says, in labours, in watching, in fasting, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in sweetness, in the Holy Ghost, in charity unfeigned, in the word of truth, show themselves the ministers of God, and by the arms of justice on the right hand and on the left, through glory and ignominy, through evil fame and good fame, through prosperity and adversity, hasten by forced marches to their heavenly country themselves, and urge others thither by every means and effort in their power."

IV. Unpopularity of the Society.

In speaking of the odium that has gathered round the name "Jesuit," it must be borne in mind that the Society always has had many kind friends and warm admirers. We must not treat of "the winter of our discontent" as though there were no "glorious summer" to set it off. It is impossible to set down any one circumstance, as though that were the whole cause or the chief cause of the unpopularity of the Society. Nor is it possible to enumerate all the circumstances which

together make up the cause, nor to appreciate the relative weight assignable to one circumstance or another as elements in this causation. Sufficient to say that some of the concurrent circumstances seem to be the following.

(a) The Society was founded in the sixteenth century, an age of religious animosities. From the martyrdom of Edmund Campion to Oates's plot, that is for a century, the Jesuit traversed England and Scotland in fear of his life. He acted the "artful dodger:" poor man, what else could he do? The evil name has clung to him; and the cloud, under which he was born, has never dispersed. *(b)* Englishmen are intensely disliked in many quarters of the world. They flatter themselves that this dislike is the penalty of their commercial success. There may be some analogous reason operative in the dislike for Jesuits. *(c)* It would be hard to maintain that nothing has ever been done by Jesuits, reasonably to breed dislike. In a Society that is now more than three centuries old, and once numbered 22,000 members, no wonder if argus-eyed searchers of records find some over-clannishness, some forgetfulness of the proper subordination of the Society to the common good of the Church, some bitter resentment of wrong, some unhappy excess of timidity, for they who fear all often come themselves to be feared and suspected. The fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer is for the use of all individuals and all corporate bodies of Christians, even the Society of Jesus. *(d)* There is a tradition that the Founder of the Society prayed that it might never be without persecution. St. Ignatius thought that the close following of Christ, and the active maintenance of His cause in the world, necessarily entailed persecution. He was moved by texts like the following.—*Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another. The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household.* (St. Matt. x. 22-25). *Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and banish you, and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.* (St. Luke vi. 22). *If the world hate you, know ye that it hated me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own: but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. If they have persecuted me, they will persecute you also: if they have*

kept my word, they will even keep yours. (St. John xv. 18-20). *And all who wish to live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution.* (II Tim. iii. 12).

V. Doctrine of the Society.

And not as we are spoken ill of, and as some say that we teach, let us do evil that good may come of it: whose condemnation is just. (Romans iii. 8).

The article on Jesuits in the Encyclopaedia Britannica is untrustworthy in its statements, full of misrepresentations, and ought to be re-written.* To aid the re-writing of it, I will briefly consider the allegation, that the Society of Jesus teaches the maxim that the end justifies the means, or that we may do evil that good may come of it, St. Paul notwithstanding. The maxim is nothing short of heresy, being in manifest contradiction with Holy Scripture. The allegation then amounts to this, that in the Catholic Church a large religious body, absolutely subject to the Holy See, has been teaching for centuries and still teaches a gross heresy. The allegation is an insult, not merely to the Society of Jesus, but to the Holy See and to the whole Catholic Church.

A foreigner gets hold of some maxim of English law. He puts his own construction upon it. He will consult no living English lawyers. He is heedless of their reclamations and repudiations. The law absolutely must be and shall be according to the foreign ruling of it; and having ruled the point in his own peremptory, unauthorised way, this foreigner rounds upon the English bench and bar, and cries fie upon them for their wicked pronouncement. This is Cardinal Newman's parable of the Russian lecturing on the axiom of the British constitution, that the King can do no wrong. Similar is the treatment of the maxim, that "to whom the end is lawful, to him the means are lawful," at the hands of the writer in the Encyclopaedia. The maxim is not a very common one in the Jesuit schools, not very common and not very wise, being open to misconstruction; and when it is brought out, it is immediately guarded by distinctions manifold to prevent abuse. Really it is a very harmless maxim, when explained as we are careful to explain it. It means that there is always (at

* The scholar and critic will turn from these pages of the Encyclopaedia Britannica to Chambers's Cyclopaedia, where under the heading Jesuits he will find a sober, accurate, and trustworthy account of the Society.

least in the abstract) a right way of doing a right thing: when the thing is right, you may take the right, proper, and pertinent way of doing it, if that way is open to you. Thus, if it is right to eat beef, it is right to kill oxen and cook them. If it is right to swim, it is right to go into the water with due observance of decency. If it is right to hang a murderer, it is right to bring him to trial in a competent court. If it is right to have children, it is right to beget them in lawful wedlock. If it is right to shoot an enemy in war, it is right to manufacture gunpowder and exercise oneself at the rifle butts. This is the way that Jesuits and all men (except the writer in the Encyclopaedia) understand the maxim.

In every Catholic treatise on morals, Jesuit or otherwise, there is laid down at starting a certain *thesis*, founded upon St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I-II, qq. 18, 19, 20. The *thesis* is this: "The morality of a human act is determined by its object, its end, and its circumstances." As soon as the beginner has mastered this *thesis*, —and the *thesis* is fundamental in our system —he has mastered the truth, which the *thesis* explicitly contains, that the end does not justify the means. There are two books extensively used in English-speaking Jesuit schools at this date, both by the same Jesuit author. The one is entitled *Aquinas Ethicus*, being, so far as it goes, a translation of St. Thomas Aquinas. The other is the volume on *Moral Philosophy* in the series of *English Manuals of Catholic Philosophy* (Longmans). In the Index to *Aquinas Ethicus* (vol. ii. p. 449) I find: "End does not justify the means." Following up the reference, I find these statements, translated from St. Thomas, and evidently accepted by the translator (vol I, pp. 75, 76).

> We must further observe that, for a thing to be evil, one single defect suffices; but for a thing to be absolutely good, one single good point suffices not, but there is required an entirety of goodness. If therefore the will be good both in point of having a proper object and of having a proper end in view, the exterior act is consequently good. But for the exterior act to be good, the goodness of will, which comes of the intention of the end, does not suffice, but if the will be evil either from the intention of the end or from the act willed, the exterior act is consequently evil. A good will, as signified by a good tree, must be taken as having goodness at once from the act willed and from the end intended. Not only does a man sin by the will when he wills an evil end, but also when he wills an evil act.

Let us hear the translator speaking in his own person. At p. 31 of his *Moral Philosophy*, he lays down the *thesis* above

mentioned, which he puts in this form: "*The morality of any given action is determined by three elements, the end in view, the means taken, and the circumstances that accompany the taking of the said means.*" At p. 32 he explains what is said of the means taken:—

If morality were determined by the end in view, and by that alone, the doctrine would hold that the end justifies the means. That doctrine is false, because the moral character of a human act depends on the thing willed, or object of volition, according as it is or is not a fit object. Now the object of volition is not only the end in view, but likewise the means chosen. Besides the end, the means are likewise willed. Indeed, the means are willed more immediately even than the end, as they have to be taken first.

He adds some further explanation on pp. 47, 48:—

Thus an end entirely just, holy, and pure, purifies and sanctifies the means, not formally, by investing with a character of justice means in themselves unjust, for that is impossible,—the leopard cannot change his spots,—but by way of elimination, removing unjust means as ineligible to my purpose, and leaving me only those means to choose from which are in themselves just. With means in themselves indifferent, the cause is otherwise. A holy and pious end does formally sanctify those means, while a wicked end vitiates them. I beg the reader to observe what sort of means are here in question. There is no question of means in themselves or in their circumstances unjust, as theft, lying, murder, but of such indifferent things as reading, painting, singing, travelling. Whoever travels to commit sin at the end of his journey, his very travelling, so far as it is referred to that end, is part of his sin: it is a wicked journey that he takes. And he who travels to worship at some shrine or place of pilgrimage, includes his journey in his devotion: the end in view there sanctifies means in themselves indifferent.

Finally, at pp. 207, 208, the author attempts a sort of mathematical demonstration, of which I give only the conclusion.

When the distance, difference, or distinction between the evil circumstances and the means comes down to nothing at all, and the evil thing actually is the very means taken, then an infinite urgency of end in view would be requisite to the using of that means: in other words, no end possible to man can justify an evil means.

There is a Greek drama in which the hero complains: "My crimes are the things done to me rather than the things I have done." May not the Society of Jesus use this quotation in reference to this matter of the end justifying the means? No calumny seems to be too monstrous, no call on credulity too vast, no thrice-convicted error too impudent in re-asserting itself, provided these wicked means serve the pious end of putting down Jesuits and Jesuitry.

A scarcely less obnoxious name than Jesuitry is Casuistry. Jesuits hold no monopoly of casuistry. Every priest who

hears confessions must be a casuist: nay, in a certain sense, every lawyer is a casuist. Casuistry is the study of cases of law. The lawyer studies the law of the State: the confessor studies all law, divine and human, in so far as it is binding upon consciences. Not that he expects to forecast every case that may arise: for cases are inexhaustible. He must have knowledge of law, principles, common sense, and experience. All these are exercised in the study of cases of conscience. When a new case arises, the confessor meets it, arguing from like to like, from cases something like it to this particular case now before him, which he has not met with before, ever keeping a hold upon principles and common sense.

Men do not commonly consult their lawyer to find out a heroic and generous line of conduct, but a line which will be safe, within the letter and practice of the law. This the lawyer has studied, and this he points out. No man blames him for that. A confessor has many grades of penitents. Some are full of ardour and generosity: these he trains in the path of self-sacrifice, to do far more than they are bound to do, to wait on God's will of good pleasure, rather than on His will of absolute command. Other penitents he gets, who will barely consent with much pressing and urging to do as much as they are bound to do under grave and serious obligation, obligation which cannot be neglected without mortal sin. It is the confessor's duty to be able to lay down accurately the lines of such obligation. Upon these he takes his stand, and says to this man of little good will: "This I must absolutely require; short of this I must refuse you absolution, and forbid you to approach Holy Communion; this is the extreme boundary line, which you cannot transgress without becoming an enemy of God, or within which you must re-enter to be restored to the friendship of God." To be able to draw that boundary line is part of the art of casuistry. When a casuist says: "This is barely permissible:" he does not invite you to it. When he writes: "This is the least you can do:" he does not advise you to do no more.

Moreover, books of casuistry are like books of medicine. They are not meant for the reading of the general public. Malicious persons may cull extracts from them, and publish them, and do harm thereby: but that harm is chargeable, not on the professional man, be he medical man or priest, but on that malicious circulator of what is not written for the many.

Dirt has been defined "matter out of place." What is not dirt in the pages of a pathological or casuistic treatise, because there it is in its right place, becomes dirt in these prurient and malicious reprints, unfit matter for the untrained mind.

VI.—General History of the Society of Jesus.

The Society was founded in the University of Paris in the year 1534, and was approved by Paul III. in a Bull dated 1540. The ten first Fathers, all Masters of Arts in that University, were St. Ignatius Loyola, Founder and first General, St. Francis Xavier, the celebrated missionary, Blessed Peter Favre, James Lainez, the second General, Alphonsus Salmeron, Simon Rodriguez, Nicholas Bobadilla, Claude Le Jay, John Codure, Paschase Brouet. The last three were Frenchmen, the others Spaniards, with the exception of Favre, a Savoyard. The first intention was to live in the Holy Land. A war with the Turks having made this impossible, they turned their eyes to the organisation of the Society as it still exists, according to the written Constitutions of the Founder. The Bull *Regimini* of Paul III. in 1540 gave the Society existence as a Religious Order. St. Ignatius died in 1556. By that time, the members of the Society were numerous in Italy, where it continued to flourish, almost without a check, till the suppression. In Spain the Society found a powerful support in Francis Borgia, third duke of Gandia, a member of the family to which Popes Calixtus III. and Alexander VI. belonged. He joined the Society himself, became its third General, and was afterwards canonised. The Jesuit Schools of Theology in Spain attained to celebrity, producing men of the stamp of Suarez, Vasquez, and Molina, who are still recognised theological authorities. In Portugal the Society found a protector in King John III. The College of Coimbra made a great name for itself. The works of the Coimbricenses, Commentators on Aristotle, make part of the vast literature that has gathered round the name of that philosopher. The Society flourished most in Italy, Spain and Portugal, Belgium, and Southern Germany. The College at Louvain was ennobled by the name and teaching of the theologian Leonard Lessius. Blessed Peter Canisius was the first Provincial of Germany, appointed by St. Ignatius. It may be doubted whether the Society has rendered any better and more lasting service to the Church than the preservation of the Faith in Central and Southern Germany. In France, down to the

present day, the Society has had a chequered career. At its first entrance into that country it was vehemently opposed by the very institution which had given it birth, the University of Paris. The University regarded it as an educational rival. The Parliament of Paris also was its implacable enemy. It was also an objection that so many of its members were Spaniards. But it found favour with the first three Bourbon Kings, Henry IV., Louis XIII., and Louis XIV. Its bitterest enemies were the Jansenists, a sect who started in France a heresy not unlike Calvinism, condemned by Clement XI. and other Popes. The struggle of Jansensist and Jesuit went on for a century and a half. Both combatants perished in the crisis that culminated in the first French Revolution. In the hearing of confessions and the assigning of penances the Jansenists were exceedingly severe, and reproached the Jesuits with laxity in those matters. From that contention emanated the Provincial Letters of Pascal, a sword of keen satire and misrepresentation, under the keen edge of which the Society still bleeds.

Away from the acrimony of theological controversy, the Society found a happy field of labour in the foreign missions, principally in India, Japan, China, Canada, and Paraguay. Francis Xavier, the chief companion of St. Ignatius, laboured ten years in India and Japan with results hard to parallel in the annals of missionary enterprise. In Southern India in the century following, Robert de Nobile lived the hard life of the Brahmins, to gain souls to Christ. Rudolph Aquaviva (brother of Claude Aquaviva, fifth and most celebrated of the successors of St. Ignatius in the Generalship of the Society) lived for years at the court of the Great Mogul, and was subsequently martyred. The first quarter of the seventeeth century witnessed in Japan the opening of one of the most systematic and cruel persecutions which the Church has ever endured. The persecution burst with exceptional fury upon the Society of Jesus in that country, and there were many martyrs. In Canada, many French Jesuits were martyred with horrible torments by the Iroquois and other wild tribes of Indians. Nor was persecution wanting in China. There however at one time the Society met with a singular measure of success, imperial favour, honour, and distinction. Fathers Ricci (died in 1610), Schall, and Verbeest, by their astronomical lore delighted the Emperor, and lived with the honours of man-

darins. The last years of the Society's work in China, previous to the suppression, were clouded with an unhappy dispute among the Catholic missionaries, about what were known as the Chinese Rites. It was thought that the Jesuits had been too complacent in allowing the Chinese to pay honour to their departed ancestors, even, it was said, beyond the verge of idolatry. The most wonderful of all Jesuit missions was that of Paraguay in South America. The lives of the Europeans out there were so scandalous, that, to save the natives from corruption, as also from being reduced to slavery, the Jesuits obtained leave from the Crown of Spain to have the missions of Paraguay (a land where there is much water and no gold) given over to their sole charge, European traders being excluded. The natives were gathered into what were called Reductions. The Bishop and the Royal Inspectors retained the right of inspecting the Reductions. In every Reduction there lived two Jesuits. Each Reduction was self-supporting and autonomous. This system worked until, in the eighteenth century, Paraguay was ceded by Spain to Portugal. The Society was thereupon suppressed, and since that date neither Christianity nor civilisation among the natives of Paraguay has been what it was in the days of the Jesuits.

In the British Isles, until the nineteenth century, the Society had usually no large houses of its own, and no settled footing in the country. Its members wandered as persecuted missionaries, in danger of their lives: or later, lived quietly as chaplains to Catholic county families. The only gleam of sunshine in their fortunes was for a few months under James II. The first two Jesuit missionaries, Blessed Edmund Campion, the Martyr, and Robert Parsons, landed in England in 1580. Campion was hanged, drawn, and quartered at Tyburn, 1st December, 1581. Parsons escaped to the Continent. The Venerable Henry Garnet was put to death in 1606, on a false charge of being accessory to the Powder Plot. Five or six Jesuits were executed under Charles II. for that tale of imposture and credulity, Oates's Plot. No Jesuits have been put to death in this country since. In Ireland, Salmeron, one of the first ten Fathers, went as Papal envoy. The wanderings and persecutions of the Irish Jesuits have been similar to those of their English brethern. As was to have been expected, Jesuits found no mercy from Cromwell. Fathers Hay, Creighton, and other Jesuits went as secret envoys to the

Court of Mary Stuart, in the days when Mary in Scotland was the one hope of Catholicism. It does not appear that they effected much: certainly they harmed none: some of their reports remain, and are valuable historic evidence. The cruel martyrdom of the Venerable John Ogilvie S.J., in the reign of James I., for no other cause than that of the Catholic Faith, is one of the glories of the Scottish Church.

The Society of Jesus was suppressed by Pope Clement XIV., in the Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor*, 21st July, 1773. It had already been expelled from Portugal in 1759, from France in 1764, from Spain and Naples in 1767. Previously to these calamities the Society had numbered 22,589 members, residing in 24 professed houses, 669 colleges, 176 seminaries, 61 novitiates, 335 missionary residences in Catholic countries, and 275 missionary stations in infidel countries or in the Protestant States of Europe. A "professed house," it may be remarked, is a house where professed Fathers live and no scholastics. It is founded on a basis of severe poverty, and depends for its whole support on alms. At the present day the Society finds it impossible to maintain any "professed house." Till recently, there was one at Rome and one at Naples. The Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* is, as the Society might have said in Shakspeare's words to the Pope who issued it: "A heavy sentence, my most sovereign liege, and all unlooked for at your gracious hands." It reduced the Society and its works for the time being to dust. It contains a long enumeration of complaints that had at various times and places been made against the Society of Jesus. At the same time, a careful reader will observe that the Brief rehearses these complaints historically, as complaints that in point of fact have been made, and by no means so clearly pronounces, if indeed it pronounces at all, that these complaints, all or most of them, were justified in fact. The Brief has nothing whatever to do with doctrine: it is a disciplinary and administrative measure: papal infallibility does not enter into it. All that a Catholic, reading the Brief, needed to believe was that the Society was truly and canonically suppressed in all countries where the Brief was promulgated. It was never promulgated in Russia, whither the Jesuits flocked under the protection of Catherine II. Pius VII formally recognised the existence of the Society in Russia in 1801; in Sicily in 1804; and finally by the Bull *Solicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, 7th August, 1814, he restored the Society

of Jesus throughout the world; that day is regarded as the birthday of the "New" Society, as 27th September, the date of the Bull *Regimini*, is of the "Old." "Old" and "New" together make one Society of Jesus.

The halo of romance has not surrounded the brow of the "New" Society. Its members have been and are for the most part either quiet scholars, keeping school, or authors writing books that are not generally read, or missionaries doing the uneventful work of a Catholic priest on the mission, whether at home or abroad. Martyrdom has not been plentiful, as of old in the days of Elizabeth and James, and Iroquois Indians, and infuriated Bonzes and Brahmins. In the Paris Commune, and in the Chinese massacres, some Jesuits lost their lives. There has not been room for a theologian of the celebrity of Suarez and Molina, mankind having gone in quest of other lore. Still the New Society has produced theologians of mark in Rome, as Perrone, Franzelin, Mazzella. Paraguay Reductions are of the number of modern impossibilities, but something of the Reduction system may some day be found practicable where Jesuits are at work on the banks of the Zambesi. Christian and Catholic Majesties have become a rare species, and I do not know that any of those who survive has a Jesuit confessor. Pères Lachaise and Le Tellier are no more at the ear of Kings. No General of the Society in the nineteenth century has attained the European reputation of Claude Aquaviva. There are no Jansenists, happily, left to wrangle with, except in Holland, some few, quiet and obscure. There is no Elizabeth for any modern Robert Parsons, on religious grounds, to seek to dethrone. English, Scotch, and Irish Jesuits no longer live in hiding-holes, or say Mass with closed doors and sentinels posted, at early hours in the morning. The Jesuit of the nineteenth century is, I hope, not a vulgar, but certainly a prosaic and matter-of-fact sort of person. His politics are of the commonplace order, and little enough of that: he touches no secret springs of information: he tells you that he has not read even the whole of last week's "Tablet." Plain, prosy natures of this sort are the despair of the historian. With a world clamouring for history, yes, veracious modern history of the doings of the Jesuit, whither shall the conscientious chronicler betake himself? There is legend enough to be sure, thrice confuted legend (neither legend nor confutation to be entered

here), but even that legend touches chiefly the Old Society, and finds less matter of invention in the New. There remains a history of petty persecutions of the Society in various European countries during the nineteenth century—persecutions painful and vexatious, but not exalted into the regions of the visibly heroic by the rope and knife of Tyburn, the dungeons of His Majesty's Tower, or the watering-can sprinkling the live Jesuit's bare skin with the sulphureous burning waters of Japanese Ungen. From Spain, then, the Jesuits were expelled for five years, 1820-1825; for nine more, 1835-1844; again, 1854-1858; again in 1868; and their position there to-day is none too secure. In Portugal, the New Society has never attained a firm footing, though there is a Portugese Province of 317 members. The vicissitudes of the Society in nineteenth century France are too numerous to record: who to-day takes interest in the doings of the Government of Louis-Philippe? There was an expulsion in 1880, inconvenient enough, yet somewhat of the nature of a farce; but the recent drastic measures of M. Waldeck Rousseau have struck the Society in France a blow, grave as that which it received under the ministry of the Duc de Choiseul in 1764. The invasion of Garibaldi in 1860 drove the Society from Naples and Sicily: then followed the proceedings of the Italian Government in the years succeeding the capture of Rome in 1870,—spoliation and expulsion, though not so complete as in France. At this day the Italian Assistancy, with its five provinces, Rome, Naples, Sicily, Turin, Venice, is the weakest of the five Assistancies, numbering only 1914 members in all; while the English-speaking Assistancy, the next above it in numbers, counts 2628. The next is the French, 3085, a number that it may be difficult to maintain: above that the Spanish, 3298; and, strongest of all, the German, 4220 members. This last includes the flourishing Belgian Province of 1097 members. It is to be observed that not all these men are in Europe, many are out on foreign missions, in India, China, and America.

The position of the Society in Germany, or rather about Germany, is peculiar. Directed by Prince Bismarck, the Government of the German Emperor took alarm at the definition of Papal Infallibility by the Vatican Council. Considering the Jesuits to have been main advisers of that measure, Bismarck by law in 1873 broke up all their houses in the territory of the Empire, and forbade their corporate existence,

and indeed their doing any work as Jesuits there at all. Since then, Jesuits have worked in Germany only as individuals, and more or less by stealth. They have no schools in Germany, but a large school at Feldkirch, in Austrian territory, which draws many German boys, and another school in Holland. They keep houses of study for the scholastics of the Society on Dutch territory, close to the German frontier. They have flourishing colleges and missions in North America, and in the Bombay Presidency of India, in Brazil, and in Denmark. The German Province is the largest in the Society, 1410 members. The situation is something like that of the English Province in the eighteenth century, with its novitiate and its one college in Flanders. That college is now Stonyhurst. Though the German Province has prospered greatly, thanks to the strength of Catholicism in Westphalia and on the Rhine, the Province is still hampered by the suppression of its corporate life in the Fatherland, and aspires to a more free existence. For many years the German Fathers at Ditton Hall were widely known in the North of England, and welcomed for the aid they were ever ready to render to the secular clergy. They have since removed to Holland. In Austria, a Province by itself, the Society has many houses, notably one at Innsbruck.

Further to enter into the fortunes of the Society in the twentieth century, belongs not to history but to prophecy. An idea is entertained in some quarters that the Society of Jesus is an old-world institution, a machine that has served its time but is now antiquated, incapable of adaptation to modern requirements, something therefore that ought to be broken up, as impeding the progress of the Church and the world. The Society is the servant of the Holy See; and to the Holy See finally it belongs to decide whether the Society of Jesus shall be maintained in place or discharged. *To its own master it standeth or falleth*, and, continuing the Apostle's words, its children will say in hope: *and it shall stand, for God is able to make it stand.* (Rom. xiv. 4). Like other large bodies, the Society may be expected to contain timid and over cautious men, also impetuous and rash men, besides some men of discretion. Like other large bodies, it is also slow to move and averse to change. The division into Provinces, however, enables changes to be made according to local needs. In England and America, and no doubt elsewhere too, the Society shows by its deeds no slight readiness to keep up with the

times. An educational body must ride with the time. For a contemplative Order there is no time; it rests with gaze fixed upon the eternity of God.

Ever and anon the word "suppression" is borne on whispering winds to the Jesuit's ear. But he does not fear it. Only the Pope can canonically suppress him. As a bone once broken and set again is said to grow stronger, so the Society is in some measure more secure for having been once suppressed. The years in which the Society lay in abeyance were not happy years for the Church. The corrupt monarchies, mainly instrumental in that suppression, have perished or have changed. The Society has no quarrel with the advancing force of democracy. Nowhere does it flourish better than under the free institutions of Great Britain and America. When the breath of true liberty inspires the French Republic, it will flourish there also. The individual Jesuit, — at least the English-speaking variety of the species, — is cheery and confident of the future. The mutter of the storm occasionally reaches his ear: but things are very different in England and Scotland under Victoria and Edward from what they were under Elizabeth and James; and those old times can scarcely be brought back by any recrudescence of bigotry. Besides supernatural considerations of the Divine protection, which never failed his ancestors, though it spared them not the conflict, the Jesuit has, from an earthy standpoint, some of the proverbial vivacity of the cat with nine lives. *O passi graviora, dabit Deus his quoque finem.*

Harder struggles in the past;
Present ills not come to last.

"THE JESUIT OATH"

BY THE REV. JOHN GERARD, S.J.

THERE has recently been presented to the British public the Form of Oath which, as we are informed, "all Jesuits are accustomed to take." A large portion of the public have in consequence been exceedingly shocked, and a large majority of Jesuits equally astonished, never having had a suspicion that they had taken anything of the kind, till they learned their own iniquity from the public prints. The "Oath" is, in fact, a hoary-headed impostor, accustomed to come forward from time to time and harrow the souls of simple-minded folk; though it never ventures to stay with us long, depending, as it largely does, upon obscurity for its efficacy, and even for its existence. On the present occasion it seems to have made a greater sensation than usual. It obtained a conspicuous place in a magazine[1] conducted by Persons of Quality, as exalted in social position as they are undoubtedly "Low" in their theology. It likewise managed to capture a journal usually so sober and sensible as the *Standard* newspaper, which not only printed in full the preposterous document, but made it the text of some

[1] *The Ladies' League Gazette.*

very sage and solemn observations in a leading article. As a specimen of the nonsense readily credited by men otherwise sensible, when there is question of anything derogatory to the Catholic Church or her clergy, this wonderful production must be cited at length:

I, A.B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael, the Blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the Saints and the Sacred Host of Heaven, and to you my Ghostly Father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that His Holiness Pope Leo is Christ's Vicar General, and is the true and only Head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth, and that, by the virtue of the Keys of binding and loosing given to His Holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical Kings, Princes, States, Commonwealths, and Governments, all being illegal without his Sacred Confirmation, and that they may be safely destroyed. Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and His Holiness's rights and customs against all usurpers, especially against the new pretended authority and the Church of England and all adherents in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the Sacred Mother Church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical King, Prince, or State, named Protestants, or obedience to any of their inferior Magistrates or officers. I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and of others of the name Protestants to be damnable, and they themselves are damned and to be damned that will not forsake the same. I do further declare that I will help, assist, and advise all or any of His Holiness's agents in any place in which I shall be in England, Scotland, and Ireland, or in any other territory or Kingdom I shall come to, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended power, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare that, notwithstanding I am dispensed to assume any religion heretical for propagating of the Mother Church's interests, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels from time to time as they interest me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all what shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto

me, by you, my Ghostly Father. All of which I, A.B., do swear by the Blessed Trinity and Blessed Sacrament, which I now am to receive, and on my part to keep inviolably; and do call the Heavenly and glorious Host of Heaven to witness these my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof I take this holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further with my hand and seal this day Ann. Dom., &c.

It might be supposed that the patent absurdity of this ridiculous document would, in these enlightened days at any rate, effectually preclude all danger of its being taken seriously. Should, however, anything more be required, we have not to go far to find it. As has been said, given proper intervals to refresh itself, the Oath seems able to "run" indefinitely on its native soil; but having incautiously ventured, about ten years ago, on a trip to Germany, it there met with experiences of a most unfortunate character. Though, at first, eagerly taken up, it was presently dropped and denounced by the most bitterly anti-Catholic organs as an utter fraud which no well-informed person could swallow. The details of its rebuffs may be read in Father B. Duhr's *Jesuiten-Fabeln*. Here it will be enough to say that the *Evangelische Bund*, the German equivalent of our Protestant Alliance, styled it a "clumsy fabrication" (*eine plumpe Fälschung*); while the official organ of this body, the *Täglische Rundschau*, implored Protestants not to give themselves away by accepting such rubbish, thus playing into their enemies' hands, and "drawing water to the Ultramontane mill."

But it is not sufficient to be sure that such a document is a forgery; we naturally desire to learn

something of its real history; to discover whence it came, and to whom we owe it. Fortunately it is possible to satisfy such wholesome curiosity. We are able to determine the stock of which it comes; to trace the stages of its development; to identify the grub that has produced the butterfly; and, best of all, the brain in which the grub was hatched. Considered merely as an example of evolutionary progress, the history is both interesting and instructive; while the personality of the author of it all, when he unexpectedly enters upon the scene, imports a sense of assurance that now we have got down to the bed-rock of falsity, beneath which it were as useless to seek farther as to look for coal below granite.

Starting backwards from the Form of Oath as given above, the first link in the chain which I have been able to examine is a little pamphlet printed at Cheltenham, in 1847. The form which this gives differs from ours in one particular only, which, however, is by no means without importance. Instead of "Pope *Leo*," the earlier edition reads "Pope *Urban*," a variation to be considered presently.

Our next step backwards is a long one; to the palmy days of mendacity, when Titus Oates ruled the roast. Here our friend the Oath turns up again, its guise somewhat altered, as well as its character; but its identity unmistakable in spite of all. It is now no longer a Jesuits' but a Conspirators' Oath; —"The Papists' Oath of Secrecy, administered to those who engage in the present Plot." It is "discovered" by Robert Bolron, gentleman, described

in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as "Robert Bolron, Informer," to whom it was said to be given by a priest, William Rushton, out of whose Breviary he transcribed it. Bolron had certainly been a Protestant most of his life; it does not appear certain that he ever became or professed to become a Catholic. He got into trouble for embezzlement of money; and his accomplice, Maybury, who corroborated his stories, was convicted of theft. What is still more significant—when we regard the temper of the time—old Sir Thomas Gascoigne, against whom these worthies gave evidence as a Papist plotter, was acquitted by a jury. Such was Robert Bolron, who took the Oath which the House of Commons (December 16, 1680) ordered him to print. It runs as follows:

I, Robert Bolron, being in the presence of Almighty God, the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, the Blessed Michael the Archangel, the Blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles Saints Peter and Paul, and all the Saints in Heaven, and to you, my Ghostly Father, do declare and in my heart believe the Pope, Christ's Vicar General, to be the true and only Head of Christ's Church here on earth, and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his Holiness by our Saviour Christ, he hath power to depose all heretical Kings and Princes, and cause them to be killed. Therefore, to the uttermost of my power, I will defend this doctrine, and his Holiness's rights, against all usurpers whatever, especially against the now pretended King of England, in regard that he hath broke his vows with his Holiness's Agents beyond seas, and not performed his promises of bringing into England the Holy Roman Catholic religion.

I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to the said pretended King of England, or any of his inferior officers and magistrates, but do believe the Protestant doctrine to be heretical and damnable, and that all are damned which do not forsake the same, and to the best of my power will help his Holiness's Agents here in England to extirpate and root

out the said Protestant doctrine, and to destroy the said pretended King of England, and all such of his subjects as will not adhere to the Holy See of Rome, and the Religion there professed.

I further do promise and declare that I will keep secret and private, and not divulge directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance, whatever shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered to me, by you, my Ghostly Father, or any other engaged in the promotion of this pious and holy design; and that I will be active, and not desist from the carrying of it on; and that no hopes of reward, threats or punishments, shall make me discover the rest concerned in so pious a work, and, if discovered, shall never confess any accessories with myself concerned in this design.

All which I do swear by the Blessed Trinity, and by the Blessed Sacrament, which I now purpose to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolable; and do call all the Angels and Saints in Heaven to witness my real intention to keep this Oath.

In testimony whereof, I do receive this most Holy and Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist.

In spite of the remarkable variations which it contains, this oath is unquestionably our old friend, adapted to special circumstances. The exact character of its relationship with the "Jesuit Oath" is a question full of interest. Though stamped so strongly and unmistakably with the family lineaments, Bolron's Oath, as for distinction' sake it may be styled, shows evident signs of having been affected by external influences; and, as we shall see, departs from the genuine type of its race in very important particulars.[1]

[1] Bolron's edition of the Oath is printed as a broadsheet, headed, *The Papist's Oath of Secrecy*, by Randal Taylor. Also in Bolron's own narrative, to which is added a Papist's Litany, containing nothing objectionable, though some of the Saints invoked are little known. The narrative is to be found in the *Harleian Miscellany*, vii. 293.

It must doubtless be considered a very uncanny circumstance

But we have not yet run our quarry to earth, although our chase has led us to the spot where this appears to become possible. Titus Oates had a worthy ally in the person of Robert Ware, although the pair took different lines in their common work. While Oates perjured himself, Ware forged. The former, it is true, did more harm at the time, causing innocent blood to be shed like water ; but the work of his colleague the penman has been far the more enduring. It is simply appalling to think of the mischief which this one scoundrel has been able to effect in the way of poisoning the sources of our history, and investing malignant slanders with the semblance of respectable authority. His performances do not appear to have been for the most part even suspected, till, a few years ago, the late Father Bridgett, in his *Blunders and Forgeries*, tracked them out and ruthlessly gibbeted them. To this admirable specimen of historical work I must refer those who desire to know more about the villain of the piece. Here let it suffice briefly to say how Robert Ware contrived to practice his deceptions so effectively. His father, Sir James Ware, having transcribed many genuine documents, the son interpolated his fabrications amongst the transcripts, wherever he found a sufficient space left blank, thus

connected with Bolron's revelations, that the evidence by which most of them were supported was discovered at *Stonyhurst* ; evidence "which was found in the closet of Edward Cottam, a Jesuit, in the house of Richard Sherborne, Esq., of Stonyhurst, in the county of Lancaster." Thus does history anticipate herself. It should be added that at this period there was no Jesuit of the name of Edward Cottam. (See *Stonyhurst Centenary Record*, p. 67, note.)

sowing his tares among the good grain and trading upon the reputation of his parent.

His consistent object was to vilify and traduce the Catholic Church. As Father Bridgett writes : "The forgeries of Robert Ware began in 1678, contemporaneously with the revelations of Titus Oates, and continued for some years. Ware did not appear as an accuser or a witness in a court of justice ; his forgeries in books and pamphlets were not directed against living men ; yet by his historical lies he helped to win credit for the monstrous stories of the 'Popish Plot,' as being in harmony with former events and past discoveries, and there are several of his baseless fabrics repeated in the publications, even of the last few years, by writers to whom the name of Robert Ware is almost or entirely unknown." It is in fact impossible to say when history will be entirely purged of his slime, and in studying the genesis of our Oath we come upon his trail once more.

Various of his fabrications were decanted for popular use in books bearing picturesque titles,—*The Hunting of the Romish Fox*, and *Foxes and Firebrands*. In the former is given a form of Oath required to be taken by all who entered the Catholic Seminaries beyond the seas, which is said to have been drawn up in 1580, a century before Bolron's time. In this may be detected the rudimentary but unmistakable features of the more developed article :

I, A.B., do acknowledge the ecclesiastical and political power of his Holiness and the Mother Church of Rome, as the chief head and Matron above all pretended Churches throughout the whole earth ; and that my zeal shall be for

St. Peter and his successors, as the Founder of the true and ancient Catholique Faith, against all heretical Kings, Princes, States, or Powers repugnant to the same. And although I, A.B., may pretend (in case of persecution or otherwise) to be heretically disposed, yet in soul and conscience I shall help, aid, and succour the Mother Church of Rome, as the ancient and Apostolic Church. I, A.B., further do declare not to act or contrive any matter or thing prejudicial unto her, or her sacred Orders, doctrines, or commands, without the leave of her supreme power or its authority under her appointed, or to be appointed; and when so appointed, then to act or further her interest more than my own earthly gain or pleasure, as she and her head, his Holiness and his successors, have, or ought to have, the supremacy over all Kings, Princes, Estates, or Powers whatsoever, either to deprive them of their crowns, sceptres, powers, privileges, realms, countries, or governments, or to set up others in lieu thereof, they dissenting from the Mother Church and her commands.

Although this document certainly does not date from the period claimed for it, there can be no doubt that it has much the appearance of a first experiment towards the elaboration of such an Oath as is now forthcoming. We find in it, in embryo, the main ideas which evidently governed the composition of the others, in which these elements have been expanded and rearranged. But of one thing there appears to be no doubt—the "Seminary Oath" and the "Jesuit Oath" issued from the same mint. Both are earmarked with Robert Ware's characteristic token. First, we have the phrase *Mother Church* occurring in each more than once. Of this he seems to have found it as impossible to steer clear as it was for Mr. Dick to keep King Charles's head out of his memorial. "He puts it," says Father Bridgett, "in every document, which is supposed to emanate from Popes or Jesuits, whether composed in Latin or English." Moreover, we find in both

these forms a clause about pretending to be of another religion, which is no less characteristic. The idea that Catholic priests, especially Jesuits, were allowed, and even enjoined, to simulate heresy for Catholic ends, which every Catholic knows to be utterly absurd, was a dominant note of Ware's, and regularly figures in his concoctions. It is, in fact, embodied in the very title of his book, *Foxes and Firebrands;* the Foxes being the Jesuits, and the Firebrands denoting the insidious havoc which, after the manner of Samson's foxes, they wrought in the standing corn of the Evangelical Philistines.

It is not a little remarkable that in Bolron's version, the general features of which resemble the Jesuit Oath so closely, these particular birthmarks are wanting: which is what was meant by saying that it shows more traces of another hand, retouching and adapting the original work, than either of the other versions. It is, however, impossible to avoid the conclusion that all three versions are radically one, and have been variously dished up and flavoured at various periods as the change of circumstances suggested.

Though we have not as yet tracked the Oath as we first saw it to its original lair, it is evident that, as children say, we are getting "hot." We can, moreover, make a near guess as to the direction in which it is to be sought. It will be remembered that the Cheltenham edition above mentioned spoke of Pope *Urban*, and was therefore evidently taken from an original purporting to date from the pontificate of a Pope so named. This can only be Urban VIII., who reigned from 1623 to 1644, a

period for which Robert Ware furnished a good deal of history.

There is likewise another point to note. The modern reproducers of the Jesuit Oath invariably tell us that it rests on the highly respectable authority of Archbishop Usher, though they never give any indication as to where in all his voluminous works it is to be found. Needless to say, we shall not find it anywhere, nor anything like it.

"Archbishop Usher" means, in fact, neither more nor less than "Robert Ware." Once more we strike the scent of what Father Bridgett calls "this literary skunk." How he came to achieve the feat of annexing so respectable name is a curious, if not very edifying, story, which the topic engaging our attention well illustrates.

As voucher for the information he gives about the Seminary Oath, Ware cites *Cecil's Memorials*, p. 196. What man he means, or what document, would be a puzzle, but for information supplied by his friend Nalson, who wrote the first part of *Foxes and Firebrands*, Ware contributing the second. There we read the story of a Dominican who feigned to be a Protestant, "being an extract out of the Memorials of the Lord Cecil, an eminent statesman in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; from whose papers it was transmitted to the Reverend Bishop Usher. . . . These papers of the Lord Primate coming to the hands of Sir James Ware, Knt., his son, Robert Ware, Esq., has obliged the public by the communication of them." Of course, Robert Ware, Esq., further obliged the public by the manufacture of them; but the fraud not being

detected, and Usher's being a good name, Strype and others freely, but most inexcusably, quoted as having Usher's authority what they found only in Ware's books; saying little or nothing of Ware himself. They were thus led, as Father Bridgett shows, to accept and publish many gross forgeries.

The truth of the matter proves to be exactly as these various indications lead us to anticipate. We find the Oath produced by Robert Ware, assigned by him to the very period mentioned above, and fathered in very express terms upon Usher. Evidently, Ware took great pains with his work, which accounts for its extraordinary staying-power, but a proud man would he doubtless have been could he have known that among the captives of his long-bow and spear were to be numbered journalists of the twentieth century.

In the third part of *Foxes and Firebrands* (1689), which is entirely by Robert Ware (though catalogued in the British Museum only under the pseudonym *Philirenes*), we read (pp. 171, *seq.*) as follows:—

"Having a collection of Romish policies, contrived by the Clergy and Orders of that Church, to nullify the Reformation of the Church of England, as they were collected formerly from and among the papers of the Most Reverend James Usher, sometime Archbishop of Armagh; and finding them useful, especially for these perilous days, to be divulged, and put forth to public view, I shall place them according to the copy, after this manner following:

"Anno 1636. *The Oath of Secrecy devised by the Roman Clergy, as it remaineth on record at Paris,*

amongst the Society of Jesus; together with several Dispensations and Indulgences granted to all Pensioners of the Church of Rome, who disguisedly undertake to propagate the Faith of the Church of Rome, and her advancement. Faithfully translated out of French.

"*This Oath was framed in the Papacy of Urban the 8th.*

"*Note how the Pope and Rome dispenses with her Emissaries, to assume outwardly any Religion.*"

Having thus introduced it with due pomp and circumstance to impress his readers' minds with the genuine nature of the document, Ware proceeds to print it in Gothic characters, thus investing it still further with the semblance of antiquity. It is exactly the same as the Oath from which we started, differing from what may be called the Standard Version—over and above a few clerical errors in the latter—only in the substitution of Pope Urban for Pope Leo.

This then is the true history of the Oath, which, in spite of common-sense, many people will persist in believing to be taken by all Jesuits, none of whom would do anything of the sort for any consideration whatsoever. It is the malicious and slanderous fabrication of a notorious scoundrel, the worthy ally of Titus Oates, one of the most disreputable villains recorded in history.

APPENDIX

As a pendant to the above history it appears advisable to give in full the form of the vows actually taken by Jesuits, according to the various grades within the Order to which they are admitted; these being the only sort of oath of which they know anything. It is frequently supposed that these vows are kept profoundly secret from all the world, and must therefore contain horrible things. As a matter of fact, they are to be found in the book of the Institute, of which every considerable library has a copy—that of the British Museum has several. Upon the nature of these Vows, readers will form their own opinion. At present it will suffice to observe that "Solemn Vows" bind the Order to the individual, as well as the individual to the Order; that such Vows must always be taken *publicly*, or they are not valid; that the Professed of Four Vows, in whose hands is the supreme executive and legislative power, are bound by the special obligation peculiar to themselves (the Fourth Vow), to start at a word from the Pope to preach the Faith to any nation however distant or barbarous.

I.—*Vows taken by "Scholastics" on the conclusion of their Noviciate.*

Almighty and Eternal God, I, NN., though altogether unworthy of Thy Divine Presence, yet relying upon Thine infinite mercy, and impelled by the desire of serving Thee, in presence of the most holy Virgin Mary and of all the Court of Heaven, do vow to Thy Divine Majesty perpetual Poverty,

Chastity, and Obedience in the Society of Jesus; and I promise that I will enter the said Society to spend my entire life therein—all things being understood according to the Constitutions of the same Society. Wherefore I suppliantly beg of Thine illimitable goodness and clemency, by the Blood of Jesus Christ, that Thou wouldst deign to accept this Holocaust in the odour of sweetness, and as Thou hast given me grace to desire and make this offering, wouldst also give it abundantly so to perform.

II.—*Solemn Vows of "Spiritual Coadjutors."*

I, NN., promise to Almighty God, in presence of His Virgin Mother and the whole Court of Heaven, and to you, Rev. Father A. B., Superior-General of the Society of Jesus holding the place of God, and to your successors (*or*, to you, Rev. Fr. C. D., representing the Rev. Fr. A. B., . . . and his successors), perpetual Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience in the Society of Jesus, and, moreover, special care of the instruction of youth, according to the tenour of the Apostolic Letters and the Constitutions of the said Society.

(*Place and Date.*)

III.—*Solemn Vows of "Temporal Coadjutors"* (*Lay-brothers*).

I, NN., promise to Almighty God, in presence of His Virgin Mother and the whole Court of Heaven, and to you, Rev. Father . . . perpetual Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience in the Society of Jesus, according to the tenour of the Apostolic Letters and the Constitutions of the said Society.

(*Place and Date.*)

IV.—*Solemn Vows of the Professed.*

I, NN., make my Profession, and promise to Almighty God in presence of His Virgin Mother and the whole Court of Heaven, and all here present, and to you, Rev. Father . . . perpetual Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience in the Society of Jesus, and, moreover, special care of the instruction of youth, according to the mode of life contained in the Apostolic Letters of the Society of Jesus and its Constitutions. I also promise special obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff regarding Missions, as is set forth in the same Apostolic Letters and Constitutions.

(*Place and Date.*)

V.—*Simple Vows taken by the same after Profession.*

I, NN., Professed of the Society of Jesus, promise to Almighty God, in presence of His Virgin Mother and the whole Court of Heaven, and before the Rev. Father A. B. . . . that I will never in any manner contrive or consent that the ordinances of the Constitutions of the Society concerning Poverty should be altered; unless at any time there should appear to be just cause for further restriction.

I likewise promise that I will never so act or devise, even indirectly, as to be chosen for or promoted to any prelacy or dignity within the Society.

Likewise I promise that I will never strive for any ambition or prelacy or dignity outside the Society, nor consent to my election to such, so far as I am able, unless I be compelled by obedience to one who has power to command me under pain of sin.

Also, should I know that any one is seeking or ambitioning dignities of either kind, I will forthwith inform the Society or its General.

Moreover, I promise that should I ever be thus forced to undertake the charge of any Church, I will, in respect of the care to which I am bound both of my own soul and the right discharge of the duty laid upon me, show such deference towards the General of the Society as never to refuse to hear what advice he may deign to give me, either directly or through another. And I promise that I will act upon such advice should it appear to be better than what has occurred to myself; all things being understood according to the Constitutions and Declarations of the Society of Jesus.

(*Place and Date.*)

THE "MONITA SECRETA,"

OR, SECRET INSTRUCTIONS OF THE JESUITS

BY THE REV. JOHN GERARD, S.J.

THE chronic dread and hatred so widely excited by the very name of Jesuit having recently worked itself up to one of its more vigorous periodical outbursts, it was only to be expected that amongst the thunderbolts levelled at the Society, and very particularly counted upon to give its death-blow, would be found once more the *Monita Secreta*, or code of secret instructions, supposed to have been drawn up by Father Claudius Aquaviva, the fifth General, for the benefit of Superiors and others who are considered fit to be initiated in the full mystery of iniquity. Assuredly, if only there were any possibility of supposing this document to be genuine, nothing more should be required than a perusal of it to prove that Jesuits are all their worst enemies allege, and more, and that they ought not to be tolerated in any well-ordered community. Nothing more shocking and revolting can be conceived than the frank and unblushing cynicism

breathed by this code of instructions which, as the world is asked to believe, governs the policy of a body professing to direct all its efforts to the service of God and the sanctification of mankind.

According to the *Monita*, the one object to be kept in view by Jesuits is the advancement and aggrandizement of the Society, and this is to be relentlessly pursued by every base and crooked device which unprincipled cunning can suggest. Directions are accordingly given as to how the Society must ingratiate itself with men of position and influence, cautiously and covertly seeking to undermine the credit and influence of other religious bodies so as to draw all water to its own mill; how those of its members appointed to preach or hear confessions at Court are to manipulate their royal and noble auditors and penitents, so as to make them tools for the same end; how rich widows are to be wheedled and cajoled, they themselves being dissuaded from second marriages, and their children being persuaded to embrace a religious life, that so the Society may come into possession of all their fortune; how young men of promise are to be coaxed and inveigled into joining the Order; how those who quit it are to be ruthlessly pursued with calumny and abuse, till their character be wholly ruined; and how, finally, riches are to be acquired by the pretence of contemning them.

Such in outline is the purport of these famous instructions, and it need hardly be said that their very iniquity is taken in some quarters as proof sufficient of their authenticity, so that, by a singular

process of reasoning, we find it argued (1) that the Jesuits are a race of miscreants, as is shown by the revelations of the *Monita Secreta*, and (2) that the *Monita* are undoubtedly genuine, as is shown by their exact agreement with the well-known principles of the Jesuit Order.[1] But those who desire something more in the way of proof will, as has already been insinuated, speedily discover the work to be a known and admitted forgery which no self-respecting scholar can affect to take seriously.

As evidence for this assertion, there is no necessity to call any witness to whom exception can be taken on the score of his being jesuitically inclined. We may pass over in silence, not only the many Jesuit writers who have repudiated and denounced the work, as for instance, Bembus, Contzen, Gretser, Tanner, Forer, Masen, Huylenbroucq, and van Aken,[2] but, likewise, the judgments of ecclesiastical commissions appointed at Rome or elsewhere to examine into the matter.[3] It will be sufficient to cite a few authorities who can be suspected of no possible bias, or whose bias would naturally be all the other way.

Even so violent and unscrupulous a partisan as the notorious historian of the Council of Trent,

[1] See for example the Preface to an English translation of the *Monita Secreta*, published in 1850, and specially quoted more than once by Dr. Wylie in his *History of Protestantism*. The Preface is signed H. M. W——r.

[2] See Duhr's *Jesuiten-Fabeln*, 2nd edit., p. 47. To this well-known work readers must be referred who desire fuller information on the subject of this and other anti-Jesuit legends.

[3] Published by Gretser, *Contra libellum famosum*. . . .

Fra Paolo Sarpi, found the *Monita* too much for his belief. "I have received," he wrote,[1] "a small work concerning Jesuit Secrets, which I shall show only to such as I can trust. Looking through it I find such extravagances that I cannot make up my mind to credit them. The Jesuits are rascals, no doubt, but I am unable to conceive that such an amount of villainy should ever have existed upon earth. Of this at least am I certain, we have no such men in Italy."

With this avowal may be classed the silence of one who would certainly not have failed to quote the *Monita* had he seen any possibility of holding them for genuine. Pascal, as bitter and determined an enemy as the Jesuits ever had, does not even mention the name of a work of which he cannot possibly have been ignorant.

Another Jansenist, Henri de Saint-Ignace, affords evidence of a more positive character. His *Tuba Magna*, published in 1713, and virulently anti-Jesuit, in its first issue assumed the authenticity of the *Monita Secreta*, and commented upon the pretended instructions accordingly. But two years later, in a new issue of the work,[2] he frankly admitted that he had been convinced to the contrary, owning that the Jesuits had nothing to do with the authorship.

The Jansenist Arnauld, and a leading organ of his party, the *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, in like manner

[1] *La Compagnie de Jésus en France au temps du P. Coton*, par le P. Prat, iij. 133; cited by "Saint-Helier," *Les Monita Secreta des Jesuites devant l'Histoire*, p. 7.

[2] *Tuba Altera*, 1715, pp. 188, *seq.*

acknowledged the falsity of this particular charge against their most bitter enemies; while von Lang, a virulent anti-Jesuit, pronounced the *Monita* to be "a manifest and fraudulent squib." [1]

Not less hostile to the Society than the Jansenists of old, have in our own days been Dr. Döllinger and his associates. Yet both he himself and the more notable amongst his disciples have confessed that the *Monita* must be given up. Thus Professor Friedrich, of *Janus* notoriety, though it is clear that he would fain fix this stigma upon his antagonists, is obliged to admit that there is no sufficient evidence to connect them with the work.[2] Huber, a still more pronounced enemy, is even more explicit. "For my own part," he writes,[3] "with Döllinger and the Protestant historian Gieseler, I consider the *Monita* as spurious and a lampoon on the Order." The same judgment is delivered by another leader of the "Old Catholic" movement, Reusch.[4]

With such witnesses may unquestionably be ranked in our own country the thorough-going partisan, Dr. Littledale, who in his notorious article, "Jesuits," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, describes the *Monita* as an "ingenious forgery," which did more than anything else to injure those against whom it was devised.

At an earlier period, when the Bill for Catholic Emancipation was before the House of Commons, two members, Messrs. Frankland Lewis and Leslie Foster, did not hesitate to stigmatize the *Monita*

[1] Duhr, p. 62.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Der Jesuitenorden*, p. 100.
[4] *Der Index der verbotener Bücher*, ii. p. 281.

Secreta as a document got up for the purpose of inflicting an injury, by falsifying the rules, institutions, and ordinances of the Jesuits, and unworthy of any credit. What is more, this description appears to have passed unchallenged, even Sir Richard Vyvian, who cited it as an authority, being content to describe it as a work "in which an ex-Jesuit gave an account of the Order." [1]

To the same effect is the verdict of that most dispassionate of authorities the Catalogue of the British Museum,[2] which describes the work as "apocryphal," the same epithet being employed by the French bibliographer, M. Barbier.[3]

The history of the work is quite in keeping with the character thus assigned to it. Having first been circulated in MS. as a Latin translation from the original Spanish,[4] it was published with the place-name on the title-page as "Notobrigæ," and the date 1612. In reality it was first printed at Cracow in 1614.[5] Its author was presently known to be one Jerome (Dr. Littledale calls him John) Zaorowski, or Zahorowski, who having been a member of the Society had been discharged from it in 1611, or 1612; but a variety of stories were told as to the manner in which these secret instructions were supposed to have been brought to light. According to one account, they were found in the College at Paderborn when plundered by Duke Christian of

[1] Hansard, March 27, 1829.
[2] *Jesuits* (Appendix), *Aurea Monita*.
[3] *Dictionnaire des Anonymes et Pseudonymes*, t. iii. No. 20985.
[4] Judgment of Bishop Lipski, of Cracow, August 20, 1616, printed in *Documents concernant la Compagnie de Jésus*.
[5] Duhr, p. 45.

Brunswick. According to another, the same Christian came upon them at Prague. According to others, they had been seized at Liege, Antwerp, Glatz, or Padua, or finally, on board a captured East Indiaman.[1] None of these stories will bear investigation. There was, for example, a Duke Christian, a Brunswicker, though not Duke of Brunswick, who took the town of Paderborn and plundered the Jesuit College there. But this was in 1622, eight years after the *Monita Secreta* had appeared in print, and six years after they had been publicly condemned as spurious by the Archbishop of Cracow.[2] But whencesoever

[1] Huber, *Jesuitenorden*, p. 104.

[2] A writer in the *Family Churchman* (August 23, 1901), signing himself "A Protestant," undertakes to give the history of "the real discovery" of the *Monita Secreta*. This is so very remarkable as to deserve quotation in full :—

"This [the *Monita*] was brought to light by that great enemy of the Jesuits, the warrior, Bishop Christian, Duke of Brunswick, when he seized the Jesuit College of Taderhorn (*sic*), Westphalia. . . . The above Christian, Duke of Brunswick, Luneburg, Bishop of Abbertstadt (*sic*), born in 1599, was one of the most determined enemies the Jesuits ever had. He died at Wolfenbultel (*sic*), in 1626, of a virulent poison."

It would certainly appear that a man born in 1599 could hardly have captured a town in time for a document found there to be published in 1614, or according to its own titlepage in 1612. But besides this "A Protestant" has fallen into blunders at every step, which show his utter unacquaintance with the facts of which he undertakes to give the "real history." The person of whom he speaks was not Duke of Brunswick and Luneburg. This was at the period in question another Christian, who was born in 1566 and died in 1633, and who never captured "Taderhorn," by which presumably Paderborn is meant. The taker of Paderborn and "great enemy of the Jesuits," was a bishop in the sense in which the Duke of York, son of George III., was Bishop of Osnabruck; that is to say, he occupied the principality and the revenues attached to the bishopric of Halberstadt (not Abbertstadt), the Abbey of Michelstein and the provostry of St. Blaise.

they might come, they speedily acquired European fame, and were published and republished in every language of Christendom, though attempts were constantly made to enhance their attractiveness by representing them as something altogether new. Thus an edition issued in 1663 boldly declared that the shocking documents which it contained had never before been printed, but had recently, by the mercy of God, fallen into the hands of certain priests, formerly pupils of the Jesuits, whose eyes they had opened and by whom they were now given to the world.[1] Even so late as 1783 an edition published at Rome bore the inscription "now first printed." It would thus appear that throughout their history truthfulness has not been supremely regarded by their patrons.[2]

This ecclesiastical pluralist was in fact a freebooter on a very large scale, who under pretext of upholding the Protestant cause, plundered cities, exacting large contributions from their inhabitants, carrying off church plate and ornaments, and rifling the monuments of the dead. In the words of the historian of his native country, he swept through districts like a conflagration. As to his death at Wolfenbüttel (not Wolfenbultel), it was undoubtedly very sudden, and as a matter of course some attributed it to poison. But whilst there was no evidence whatever to support such a theory, or connect the supposed crime with any one in particular, others were of opinion, and amongst them Christian's ally, the King of Denmark, that his death was the natural result of the excesses in which he indulged. (Heinemann, *Geschichter-Braunschweigs u. Luneburg*, vol. ii.) It is interesting to learn that "A Protestant" intends to give us the "real history" of the Jesuit Oath.

[1] Duhr, p. 46.

[2] It would also seem that the *Monita* have frequently been reprinted by men who could have had but a very dim and hazy idea of their meaning, there being so many misprints in the Latin of various editions as to make many passages almost unintelligible, and to show that those who put them

In spite, however, of all this acknowledged falsity, the case of the *Monita* is by no means given up, the only plea worth considering on its behalf being that which Dr. Littledale shall be allowed to state.

> The truth [he writes] seems to be that, although both caricature and libel, [the work] was drafted by a shrewd and keen observer, who, seeing what the Fathers actually did, travelled analytically backwards to find how they did it and on what methodical system, conjecturally reconstructing the process, and probably coming very near the mark in not a few details.

As to such an explanation, it is in the first place obvious to ask how it would be stigmatized were it offered by a Jesuit writer in defence of his brethren. Would it not be considered a particularly fine example of jesuitical special pleading? And is this not rather like the vicious circle in which, as we have seen, defenders of the *Monita* are apt to involve themselves? The document being pro-

through the press were incompetent for the task. A specially bad instance is the Paris (?) edition of 1657.

An edition, which is sometimes cited as affording incontrovertible evidence that the *Monita Secreta* must be genuine, professes to issue from the Propaganda press, bearing the imprint, "Roma tipografia della Propaganda. Con permissione." (No date.) [See Fr. Auguste Carayon's *Bibliographie historique de la C. de J.* Part V. 3837.] This imprint is an undoubted and transparent fraud, a lie in support of a lie, which has never imposed upon any but the prejudiced and ignorant. The merest common-sense should make it plain that if it be the essence of the "Monita" to be *secret*, only an enemy would publish them. But reason counts for little with those who can declare, firstly, that the Jesuits keep their *Monita* so dark as to make it almost impossible to procure a copy; and secondly, that the same Jesuits had an edition officially published through the Propaganda press, for the information of all the world.

duced as evidence that Jesuits must be knaves and hypocrites, because these rules of theirs breathe nothing but knavery and hypocrisy, it is then suggested that although it is not what it pretends to be, we may assume it to be a sketch from the life, and should take for granted that the rascality which it affects to prescribe it did in fact but photograph.

One thing seems clear. If the authenticity of the *Monita* be thus given up, some proof has to be found that the Machiavellian principles inculcated bear any resemblance to those on which, openly or covertly, the Society of Jesus has ever moulded its policy. Whence is such proof to come?

Not, most assuredly, from the official Constitutions and Rules of the Order. These have, longer than the *Monita Secreta*, been open to the inspection of all the world, and as a plain matter of fact on every single point they prescribe the exact opposite of what these secret instructions lay down. Moreover, in the Jesuit houses which have at various times been suppressed by the civil power and their goods appropriated, there have been discovered various genuine letters of instruction addressed by Generals of the Society to Provincials and other Superiors on matters of unusual moment. Here again it is found that invariably the course prescribed is directly contrary to that which, as we are asked to assume, was the Jesuit rule. Again, certain facts of Jesuit history can nowise be made to square with the idea that it was observation of how things were actually done which supplied Zaorowski with his materials. A few examples must suffice.

We have seen how, according to the *Monita*,

Jesuits are to wheedle and cajole rich widows and their children, so as to secure for the Society all their property; and amongst all the directions which the work contains there is probably none which has been more frequently cited, or commented upon with more horror. It happens, however, that Aquaviva, the reputed author, did really address a private instruction on this very subject to a Superior of the Order in Germany. The latter had informed the General that certain pious ladies, having bound themselves by vow so to do, had bequeathed to the Society their whole fortune, but that he had refused to accept such a legacy. Aquaviva replied:

> It is long since anything has so pleased me as your information that you had declined the bequest so improperly offered. You have acted as you should have done, both in accordance with our Institute, and for the edification of our neighbour. As for the vow which has been made, you need have no scruple; for although we have no power to annul it, we are free to refuse what comes to us in consequence of it, and thus the person who made such a vow will indirectly be set free.[1]

According to the *Monita*, Jesuit Fathers who are chosen by princes as their confessors are to use all their influence for political objects which may in any way tend to the advantage of the insatiable body to which they belong, and are to be ready to do any dirty work by which royal favour is to be gained; though they are likewise to foment rivalries and jealousies between princes to their mutual detriment. But on this point again we find all genuine evidence telling a very different story. In

[1] Quoted by Duhr, p. 55, from the original in the Archives of the German Province, S.J.

the first place, a General Congregation, the supreme authority within the Society, in 1593, by a formal decree peremptorily forbade all its members to take any part in political affairs under any pretext whatsoever, and this prohibition was farther inserted, at the General's request, in a Bull issued shortly afterwards by Pope Paul V.[1]

In addition to this, the same Father Aquaviva, ignorant as ever of the policy he was supposed to have prescribed, issued in 1602 a special instruction for the confessors of Kings, in which, after recalling this prohibition of the Congregation, he goes on to enforce in detail and with much emphasis, the duty of total abstinence from all but purely spiritual work.[2] Twenty-two years afterwards, Vitelleschi, who succeeded Aquaviva as General of the Society, having occasion to write to a Father Lamormaini, who had been appointed confessor to the Emperor Ferdinand, bade him scrupulously observe the instructions thus given, and refrain from all meddling with politics in accordance with the same.[3] In 1634, Vitelleschi strongly opposed himself to the Prince-Bishop of Augsburg, who desired to make use of his Jesuit confessor's literary skill in a political correspondence. His successor, Caraffa, in 1648, wrote to the Provincial of Upper Germany, that as the circumstances of the time threatened danger on this head, he must enforce with special rigour the prohibitions against any kind of political

[1] Cong. Gen. V. Dec. 47. Const. Apost. *Quantum Religio.*
[2] Inst. S.J. Ordinationes Præp. Gen. XI. *De Conf. Principum.*
[3] Quoted by Duhr, p. 55, from the Archives of the Austrian Province, S.J.

action on the part of his subjects. A few months later, the same General wrote to Maximilian, Elector of Bavaria, conjuring him by his regard for the Society not to thrust upon his confessor business of this nature, so absolutely prohibited by the Institute. Father Nickel, the tenth General, twice wrote to the Superiors in Germany that, despite all efforts of princes to the contrary, they must resolutely hinder all interference in matters of State by any member of the Society without exception.[1]

These are genuine "private instructions," intended for no eyes but those of the Superiors charged with the actual administration of the Society. It would not be difficult to multiply examples of the irreconcilable discrepancy between them and the pretended *Monita Secreta*.

So obvious is it, indeed, that the latter are absolutely at variance with the official Institute, as to have made it necessary to attempt some sort of explanation. Thus in Dr. Wylie's wonderful *History of Protestantism* we read as follows:[2]

> These private directions, says M. l'Estrange, are quite contrary to the rules, constitutions, and instructions which this Society professeth publicly in those books it hath printed on this subject. So that without difficulty we may believe that the greatest part of their governors (if a very few be excepted especially) have a double rule as well as a double habit—one for their private and particular use, and another to flaunt with before the world.

[1] Duhr, pp. 57, 58, quoting Stieve, *Bayerische Politik*, and *Ursprung des dreissigjährigen Krieges;* Aretin, *Maximilian der Erste;* Wittman, *Die Jesuiten und der Ritter Heinrich von Lang.*

[2] Book xv. c. vii.

After what we have seen, it will be sufficient to observe upon this passage that the learned writer appears to suppose "M. l'Estrange" to be the same person as Titus Oates. Certainly it is Oates whose name appears on the title-page of the work whence this quotation comes,[1] though Dr. Wylie twice attributes it to Sir Roger L'Estrange, the relentless enemy of Oates and all his works.

One more point may be examined. According to the *Monita Secreta*, an object to be ever kept in view is the acquisition of ecclesiastical dignities and emoluments. Every effort is to be made, we are told, to supplant the monastic orders in the possession of abbeys and monasteries, and to procure the election of Jesuit bishops, so that if possible they may furnish the whole episcopate, and finally occupy the Papal Chair.

But if such were their aim, it must be allowed that the astute Order adopted the strangest of all methods for its attainment. To say nothing of the fact that it binds all its members by vow to accept no such dignity, and to denounce any one who shall be known to aspire to anything of the kind, we again find from historical records open to no suspicion that from the first the Society has struggled with might and main to carry this prohibition into effect. Thus in the very earliest days, bishoprics were pressed upon Bobadilla, Le

[1] *The Cabinet of the Jesuits secrets opened: in which are many things relating to the Church and Clergy of England. . . . In part begun by Dr. Oats from an Italian copy; but now more largely discovered from a French copy, printed at Colon (Cologne), 1678. Made English by a person of quality.*

Jay, and Canisius, and strenuously rejected by themselves and their Superiors alike, notably by the Founder, St. Ignatius himself,[1] and that the same line of action has been consistently pursued ever since may appear sufficiently plain from the fact that in spite of the power and influence with which the Order is credited it has come to be universally recognized as the one in whose ranks candidates for such office must *not* be sought.

So transparent indeed is the falsity of the *Monita* on the slightest inquiry seen to be, that but for the inconceivable and unreasoning credulity of a large section of the public it would be unnecessary to undertake the wearisome task of arguing against what makes not the slightest pretence of resting upon anything which resembles argument. This deficiency, however, nowise interferes with the perennial popularity of this malignant libel. In 1863, it was reprinted in Paris, by M. Sauvestre, and in eighteen months 22,000 copies had been sold; whilst by 1879, the thirteenth edition of this issue had been reached. Even in learned Germany, the Protestant Pastor Gräber, in 1886, did not hesitate to publish an edition and to avow his belief in the authenticity of the work; while in our own less critical land, Dr. Wylie adopted the simpler plan of ignoring all doubts and difficulties and giving the *Monita* simply as a part of his "History," which at the close of the nineteenth century a firm so well known as that of Messrs. Cassell is not ashamed to

[1] See Boero's *P. Cl. Jaio*, and St. Ignatius' letters to this Father and King Ferdinand, *Cartas* i. 306; Duhr, p. 59.

re-issue. In view of the widespread delusion thus created it is necessary to say something for the information of readers who are willing to listen to reason.

We may conclude with two obvious considerations which have suggested themselves to students of the *Monita*.

How came it, asks Huber,[1] that the ex-Jesuit who published the *Monita Secreta* was in a position to know anything of these secret instructions? Is it likely, or consonant with the supposed prudence and circumspection of the Society, that to men like him would have been confided all these mysteries, including the unworthy devices to be employed for the ruin of those who, as he actually did, should quit the body, thus forearming such persons against the machinations so carefully devised? This, in Huber's judgment, is proof sufficient that the work is spurious.

Still more to the purpose are the reflections of a Catholic layman half a century ago.[2] We are to suppose, he writes, that in spite of the undisguised injunction of wickedness, and the contempt manifested in the *Monita* for the professed Institute of the Society, no member has shrunk back from the gang of miscreants, or rather of fiends, amongst whom he has found himself when thinking to be enrolled in the Company of Jesus; that not one has felt impelled, that none has had the courage, to reveal to the rulers of the Church these abominations

[1] *Jesuitenorden*, p. 106.

[2] *Die geheimen Verordnungen der Gesellschaft Jesu.* Paderborn, 1853.

and mysteries of iniquity. Were they all without exception bewitched by the contents of the *Monita*, perchance by the very sight or touch of the volume, and transformed from virtue to vice, even as the companions of Ulysses were turned to swine? Were preachers and missionaries so zealous for the salvation of their neighbour's soul, utterly regardless of their own, so as to barter it for temporal advantages to their Order of the basest kind? Moreover, they must all have remained hardened in their iniquity to the end; none having his eyes opened in the hour of death; none whispering a word of warning to a youthful friend not yet drawn into the toils; none blurting out an incautious acknowledgment; no old man in his dotage letting slip a fatal admission; no Superior deposed from office manifesting his chagrin by a disclosure? How has the cause of iniquity been able to enlist service so faithful that to the present day no direct evidence has been forthcoming to fasten this stigma on the Society, and no single Jesuit has come forward to testify against her, even the supposed author endeavouring to conceal his connection with the work? How is it that, on the contrary, one and all, they have constantly upon every occasion denounced the *Monita Secreta* for a fraud?

In fact, no one can possibly accept so much absurdity who has not already fallen under the spell of a nightmare in which Jesuits replace the creations of a fevered brain. Such a one, with Dr. Wylie, finds no difficulty in believing anything, and considers that "overwhelming evidence"

for the authenticity of the work is furnished by such an argument as this[1] :—

> The perfect uniformity of the methods followed by the Jesuits in all countries favoured a presumption that they acted upon a prescribed rule ; and the exact correspondence between their methods and the *secret advice* showed that *this* was the rule.

But then Dr. Wylie had already drawn this marvellous picture of the being whose history he was studying[2] :—

> Let us survey the soldier of Loyola, as he stands in the complete and perfect panoply his General has provided him with. How admirably harnessed for the battle he is to fight! He has his "loins girt about him with" mental and verbal equivocation ; he has "on the breastplate of" probabilism ; his "feet are shod with the preparation of the" *Secret Instructions*. "Above all, taking the shield of" intention, and rightly handling it, he is "able to quench all the fiery darts of" human remorse and divine threatenings. He takes "for an helmet the hope of" Paradise, which has been most surely promised him as the reward of his services ; and in his hand he grasps the two-edged sword of a fiery fanaticism, wherewith he is able to cut his way, with prodigious bravery, through truth and righteousness.

Is it not clear that those who can swallow stuff like this will swallow anything? But, as the Protestant historian Whitaker has observed, forgery appears to have been from the beginning the peculiar disease of Protestantism,[3] and the virulence

[1] *History of Protestantism*, ii. p. 411.

[2] P. 404.

[3] "Forgery, I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it, seems to have been peculiar to the Reformed. . . . I look in vain for one of these accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery." Rev. John Whitaker, B.D., *Mary Queen of Scots Vindicated*, vol. iii. p. 2 (ed. 1797).

of the malady does not as yet seem to have spent itself. To ordinary common-sense nothing is stranger and more unaccountable than the frantic tenacity with which some Protestant controversialists cling to their belief in such fables, for which there is not a rag of evidence to show, and their furious wrath when any attempt is made to open men's eyes to the falsity and absurdity of fabrications of this nature, the all-sufficing merit of which is, in their eyes, that they bear false and calumnious witness against their Catholic neighbours.

BOGEYS AND SCARECROWS

BY THE REV. JOHN GERARD, S.J.

Quousque tandem? How long is every assertion, however ridiculous, to be at once accepted, or at least tolerated, if only it tends to discredit the Catholic Church? How long in regard of her, and of her alone, are all rules of criticism and of common sense to be cast to the winds? How long shall the well-meaning and usually not unintelligent multitude be scared away from her by clumsy calumnies which proclaim themselves as frauds far more clearly than do the tatterdemalion figures set up by farmers with the vain purpose of keeping the crows out of their cornfields?

Questions such as these must constantly rise in the mind of any one who observes the attitude of so many of our countrymen towards the Church of their forefathers. Nothing is more heartbreaking than to find how impotent is Reason in a province wherein she ought to be supreme, and how slanders that have been exposed and refuted time out of mind seem never to be one penny the worse, coming forward again and again to court public attention, and being

each time warmly received, as though nothing had ever been heard to their disadvantage.

A signal illustration is furnished by the appearance of "Henry Seton Merriman's" latest romance, *The Velvet Glove*.[1] It is true that nothing in the field of religion from the pen which gave us *The Slave of the Lamp* is likely to exhibit anything very novel or calculated to arouse much interest on its own account. Stage villains and villainies afford little opportunity for artistic variety of treatment, and were it otherwise, our author's grotesque ignorance of the matters with which he elects to deal would still tie him down to his one dreary and impossible theme of a crafty and scheming priesthood acting consistently like idiots, and invariably baffled by the manly straightforwardness of those against whom they devise their fatuous wiles. But if it is not wonderful that such a writer should produce another silly book to foment prejudice and bigotry, it is far more noteworthy that his production should be received with favour and commendation by an enlightened Press, and that successive editions should be bought up by an intelligent public.[2]

[1] Smith, Elder & Co. This first saw the light, suitably illustrated, in the pages of the *Queen*, July—Dec., 1901. The author's name, according to the British Museum Catalogue, is H. S. Scott.

[2] An advertisement appearing in the *Athenæum*, March 22, 1902, after announcing that the second impression of *The Velvet Glove* is almost exhausted, and that the third will be ready immediately, goes on to quote some Press opinions concerning the book, amongst which are the following:

"A good story told in the author's best manner. . . . We have nothing but praise for the skilfully interwoven plot, and the artistic development of character" (*Athenæum*).

The story, it must be clearly understood, is one with a purpose of the most definite and determinate character. Its object is to hold up to obloquy and contempt, if not to mark out as proper objects of violence, the representatives in Spain of the Catholic Church, more particularly the members of religious orders, most particularly, it need not be said, the Jesuits. All of these are represented as loathsome and pestilent scoundrels whose one idea is to suck the blood of the nation for their own profit, and who for this end habitually practise every species of trickery, and resolutely endeavour to keep the minds of their countrymen in a state of gross ignorance, in order that they may remain superstitious.

Were such allegations made concerning any other sort or condition of men—were a French "nationalist" writer, for example, to deal in a similar fashion with the Jews—what kind of attitude might English critics be safely expected to assume? Would they not eloquently insist, and most properly, on the iniquity of bringing such charges against any body of men, unless it can be proved up to the hilt that they are deserved, and that those branded as pests to society

"From the murder in the first chapter to the pretty love matter in the last, the interest is artistically and naturally sustained" (*Academy*).

"*The Velvet Glove* is the very essence of good romance" (*Sketch*).

"A more brilliant trial of wits has never furnished the plot of a novel, and the tale is charmingly told" (*Scotsman*).

"A strong story well told and full of interest, containing many passages that will grip the reader's attention and send him hurrying on through the thirty chapters, absorbed and gratified" (*Daily News*).

have earned the character beyond dispute? Would there not be admirable reflections in abundance upon the evils wrought by bigotry and prejudice, and upon the duty of approaching such questions in a judicial and impartial spirit? Can we suppose that journalists of repute would be found to assume at the outset that concerning the character of the parties accused no man could be expected to trouble himself?

Be it remembered that they are no shadowy or impalpable personages against whom our author's impeachment is directed, but the Catholic clergy of Spain of our own days, for his plot is laid during the Franco-German War of 1870. In regard of this historic conflict, we may note in passing, he gives a most instructive indication of his ideas concerning the method of writing history, and confidently pronounces upon a matter of prime importance, as to which—as at the same time he lets us know—evidence is not at present forthcoming. "History," he writes, "will undoubtedly show, when a generation or so has passed away, that the latter stages of Napoleon's declaration of war were hurried on by priestly intrigue. It will be remembered that Bismarck was the deadliest and cleverest foe that Jesuitism ever had."

At this period, then, there comes back to his native Saragossa a man who has made a large fortune in Cuba. He returns cautiously and stealthily in the dusk, but before he has reached the house he is making for, enter to him three murderers and stab him to death. The object of the crime is to secure that his fortune shall pass forthwith to his son, "a pale and bloodless man—food for the cloister," which

he is resolved to enter. The money will thus be at once available to subsidize the Carlists, whose rising has been determined upon. For "the Jesuits know that it is Don Carlos or a Republic, and all the world knows that all Republics have been fatal to the Society." The assassins are found, however, to have blundered and failed to do their work clean, as is reported by a monkish scout who presently appears upon the scene, and like others of his cloth is facetiously spoken of as "the holy man." The said holy man is "large and heavy of face, with the narrow forehead of the fanatic. With such a face and head, he could not be a clever man." When commended by his employer "the friar's meek face was oily with that smile of complete self-satisfaction which is only found where foolishness and fervour meet in one brain." This worthy discovers that the victim is not dead, though mortally hurt, and as, for some reason or other, it seems not to be deemed expedient to finish him off there and then, he is carried indoors, and insists upon making a will. Finding what his degenerate son means to do with himself, the indignant father refuses to leave him a a groat, and bequeaths the three million pesetas to his daughter, Juanita.

Thereupon the interest of all the clerical harpies turns upon this fortunate or unfortunate girl. She is an inmate of a convent school, kept by the Sisters of the True Faith. "The Sisters of the True Faith," we are told, "are a Jesuit corporation, and their convent school is, now a convent, now a school, as the tide may rise or fall. Here, history has surged to and fro, like the tides drawn hither and thither, rising

and falling according to the dictates of a far-off planet. And the moon of this tide is Rome." It is determined by the schemers that the new heiress must at once be made a nun and induced "to sign the usual testament made by nuns, conferring all their earthly goods upon the Order into which they are admitted." So urgent is the necessity felt to be, that application is made to Rome to allow her to be admitted without the tedious preliminary of a novitiate, for "the sanction of the Vatican is necessary to the remittance of the usual novitiate in the case of a young person who is in a hurry to take the veil: once that is obtained, the money is set at liberty and all goes merrily." With three million pesetas it is known that various generals and the army corps under their command will easily be convinced that Don Carlos is their rightful Sovereign, and things will be quite as they should be, for as the wire-puller in chief sagely observes, "The Church does not want her Kings to be capable—remember that." The said wire-puller is a mysterious person yclept "Evasio Mon." No priest himself, he is known to every priest in what our author calls the Peninsular, and runs all the pilgrimages, besides conducting all the plots. He has, of course, all the qualities and characteristics proper for such a vocation. "He was," says the author, "a man of perfect self-control." His features habitually wore a smile—"not a smile of amusement, or of contempt—not even a deep smile such as people wear in books. It was merely a smile, and could not be construed into anything else by any physiognomist. The wrinkles that made it were deeply marked, which suggested that Evasio

Mon had learnt to smile when he was quite young. He had, perhaps, been taught." "His face was rather narrow and long. It was not the face of an easy-going man as God had made it. But years had made it the face of a man that nothing could rouse." "His eyes were a bluish-grey, and looked out upon the world with a reflective attention through gold-rimmed eye-glasses." The world did not find it so easy to return his inspection. "I have known Evasio all my life," says one of the good people who baffle him. "I have stood at the edge of the pit and looked in, I do not know to this day whether there is gold at the bottom or mud." "Which, perhaps," adds our author, "was as good a description of Evasio Mon as any man has given." To treasons, stratagems, and spoils, this formidable person devotes his existence,—and by no chance does any of his crafty devices ever succeed.

He is, of course, only the local agent for the world-wide conspiracy which we have heard likened to a tide whose moon is Rome, and the crisis now to be dealt with is so grave as to require a select conclave of experts to consider it. They muster at Montserrat, in the famous monastery, but repair for their meals to a restaurant outside, where Evasio Mon found them, for "it was the hour of the *table d'hôte*, and the still evening air was ambient with culinary odours." There were four of them at a small table, at which he took his place. "They were obviously gentlemen, and obviously of a thoughtful and perhaps devout habit of mind." There was a subtle resemblance amongst them all that would have made it a hard task to determine their various nationalities, even for the

most practised of observers. "These were citizens of the world, and their likeness lay deeper than a mere accident of dress. In fact, the most remarkable thing about them was that they were all alike studiously unremarkable." One of them had come from Italy, one from France, a third from Poland. More worthy of note than any of these was the remaining member of the party,—clearly the head-centre of the whole concern,—"a little, wizened man, doubled up in his chair, who ate sparingly and bore on his wrinkled face and bent form the evidence of such a weight of care as few but kings and ministers ever know. So absorbed was he that after one glance at Evasio Mon he lapsed again into his own thoughts. The very manner in which he crumbled his bread, and handled his knife and fork, showed that his mind was as busy as a mill. He was oblivious to his surroundings; had forgotten his companions. His mind had more to occupy it than one brief lifetime could hope to compass. Yet he was so clearly a man in authority that a casual observer could scarcely have failed to perceive that these devout pilgrims had come to meet him and were subordinate to him." When they rose from table, "it became at once apparent that this was a great man. For all stood aside as he passed out, and one opened the door as to a prince; of which amenities he took no heed." Though we are not told who this mysterious personage may have been, the majority of readers will no doubt easily identify him with the General of the Jesuits. Nothing comes, however, of him and his conclave. They are seemingly introduced only to have their portraits thus taken, and promptly disappear again from the story

which they nowise influence, and in which they are not again mentioned.

Such are the leading villains of the piece. On the other side, standing almost alone, are two exemplary noblemen, the Count de Sarrion, and his son Marcos. "Ramon de Sarrion," says our author, "was one of those good Spaniards and good Catholics who lay the entire blame for the downfall of their country from its great estate to a Church which can only hope to live in its present form as long as superstition and crass ignorance prevail." As for Marcos, having been trained in the best school, that of Nature, as a wolf-hunter and trout-fisher, he has no difficulty in getting the better of the most subtle schemer of them all.

How these loyal spirits rescue the distressed damsel, and foil the machinations of her persecutors, need not be told in detail. Suffice it to say that their masterstroke is to marry Juanita to Marcos, purely as a piece of strategy, and without any pretence of love on either side. She is stolen for the purpose through the window of a convent at Pampeluna where she is confined, and for some reason is put back again before morning, the knot having meanwhile been tied at midnight in a remote country chapel by a mysterious Bishop who luckily becomes available: — "a political Bishop, who was no Carlist, and was ever a thorn in the side of the churchmen striving for an absolute monarchy."

When the enemy, not recognizing this union as legitimate, proceed to ignore it, and to compel Juanita to take the veil in approved traditional fashion, her champions force their way in at the

dramatic moment, nearly killing our unfortunate acquaintance, the holy man with the large, heavy face, who endeavours to stop them, and carry her off in triumph under the very nose of Evasio Mon himself. Finally, after a good deal of not very intelligible intriguing and misunderstanding, the young couple really fall in love, and agree to take their union seriously.

Such, in brief, is the story ; but far more important than its incidents is the atmosphere in which they are set and by which they all are coloured. The one conviction which the book tends to produce is that the Church is a upas-tree beneath the shadow of which nothing good can flourish, and that there can be no hope for the country till she be rooted up and cast into the fire. Everything which has on it, in however slight a degree, the taint of ecclesiasticism, is represented as loathsome and repulsive. The seminarists we meet are "depressing-looking youths with flaccid faces and an unhealthy eye." Monastic religion is a mere varnish. "It is of cowards that nuns are made." Juanita's unworthy brother "lived," we are told, "in an atmosphere of æsthetic emotion, which he quite mistook for holiness." The young man's servant, who aped his master's piety, "had the air of a murderer, or a Spanish Cathedral chorister," and a cathedral choir affords "a living study in evil countenances." A priest usually possesses qualities which are "small and feminine." And so on. For the rest, the cause thus served is described as eminently worthy of its servants. We have already heard the Church stigmatized as conscious that she must cease to exist whenever superstition and igno-

rance are expelled from the land. This is always and everywhere the dominant note. Church services, we are told, are moving and impressive, "especially for those who think that the Almighty is better pleased with abject abasement than a plain common-sense endeavour to do better, and will accept a long tale of public penance before the record of simple daily duties honestly performed." The story of Spain is that of a nation "torn hither and thither in the hopeless struggle of a Church no longer able to meet the demands of an enlightened religious comprehension, and endeavouring to hold back the inevitable advance of the human understanding."

But beneath the lowest deep there is a lower still, and this, of course, is the Jesuit Order. In fact, despite all we have hitherto seen, they are the real exclusive villains of the piece. "Why did Evasio Mon want me to go into religion?" asked Juanita, of her father-in-law. "My child, you have three million pesetas." "And if I had gone into religion—and I nearly did—the Church would have had them?" "Pardon me," said Sarrion, "the Jesuits—not the Church. It is not the same thing; though the world does not yet understand that. The Jesuits would have had the money, and they would have spent it in throwing Spain into another civil war, which would have been a worse war than we have seen. The Church—our Church—has enemies. It has Bismarck and the English; but it has no worse enemy than the Jesuits. For they play their own game."

This game, it is needless to say, they are ready to play with any amount of knavery, marking down the objects of their hatred or suspicion, tampering with

confessors, and not sticking at homicide when required. This as a matter of course. It is better worth our while to consider the following information given us concerning them, which will probably be new to many readers :—

> Sarrion, like all who knew their strange story, was ready enough to recognize the fact that the Jesuit body must be divided into two parts, of head and heart. The heart has done the best work that missionaries have yet accomplished. The head has ruined half Europe. . . . The great days of Jesuitism are gone, but the Society still lives. In England and other Protestant countries they continue to exist under different names. The "Adorers of Jesus," the Redemptionists, the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, the Brothers of the Congregation of the Holy Virgin, the Fathers of the Faith, the Order of St. Vincent de Paul—are Jesuits. How far they belong to the heart and not to the head, is a detail only known to themselves. Those who have followed the contemporary history of France may draw their own conclusions from the trials of the case of the Assumptionist Fathers.

They are, we are further assured, not a progressive but a retrogressive Society, inasmuch as their statutes still hold good, the said statutes laying down various immoral maxims, which are championed by "St Liguori and other Jesuit writers." Finally, the founder of the Society constituted himself one of the pests of the human race, of "a world all stirred about by a reformed rake of Spain, who, in his own words, came 'to send fire throughout the earth;' whose motto was *ignem veni mettēri* (sic) *in terram, et quid volo nisi ut accendatur.*" Ignatius de Loyola solved problems "with that unbounded assurance which almost always accompanies the greatest of human blunders. . . .

Loyola wounded in the defence of Pampeluna—wounded, alas! and not killed."

Such is the tissue of absurdities which not only can "H. S. Merriman" compose, but which our critics take seriously, and a large portion of the reading public welcomes, in the name of "enlightened religious comprehension." The phenomenon is instructive if not edifying, yet it is not on its account alone that readers are invited to wade through so much that is too extravagant to be even amusing. In one notable passage, the author of *The Velvet Glove* descends to the prosaic but risky regions of facts, and exhibits as a crushing argument against those whom he denounces a catalogue of their misdeeds, as vouched for by his acquaintance with history. We find here collected by him various old familiar friends, stock specimens of erudition which constantly make their appearance in the columns of ultra-Protestant journals, and a convenient opportunity is thus afforded for putting on record some particulars concerning them. Our author shall first be allowed to tell his own story, in listening to which we must not forget that we have to do with one whose righteous indignation is aroused against those who disseminate anything but the truth, or trade upon the ignorance of others. He writes as follows[1]:—

> The political Jesuit has a record in history which has only in part been made manifest.
>
> William the Silent was assassinated by an emissary of the Jesuits. Maurice of Orange, his son, almost met the same fate, and the would-be murderer confessed. Three Jesuits were hanged for attempting the life of Elizabeth,

[1] P. 150.

Queen of England, and later, another, Parry, was drawn and quartered. Two years later another was executed for participating in an attempt on the Queen's life ; and at later periods four more met a similar just fate. Ravaillac, the assassin of Henry IV., of France, was a Jesuit.

The Jesuits were concerned in the Gunpowder Plot of England, and two of the Fathers were among the executed.

In Paraguay the Jesuits instigated the natives to rebel against Spain and Portugal ; and the holy fathers, taking the field in person, proved themselves excellent leaders.

Pope Clement XIV. was poisoned by the Jesuits. He had signed a Bull to suppress the Order, which was to " be for ever and to all eternity valid." The result was "Acqua tofana of Perugia," a slow and torturing poison.

Down to our own times we have had the hand of the Society of Jesus gently urging the Fenians. O'Farrell, who in 1868 attempted the life of the Duke of Edinburgh, in Australia, was a Jesuit, sent out to the care of the Society in Australia.

It is obviously unnecessary to sift every item of this strange medley. The vain attempt shall certainly not be made to identify the eight mythical Jesuits, arily declared to have suffered for attempting Queen Elizabeth's life, but for whom our author cannot even provide names. Neither need we dwell on the case of Parry, who, we are told, "was drawn and quartered," as if this was something which distinguished his fate from that of those who were " hanged." That Parry was a Jesuit is an absurd idea, which " H. S. Merriman " is not the first to entertain, but in support of which there is nothing whatever to be said. He was a Member of Parliament, and, says Camden, though his learning was small, a Doctor of Laws, a consequential, curly-pated dandy.[1] That he was a

[1] " Titulo Juris Doctor, licet semidoctus, homo elate tumidus, comptus, et calamistratus " (*Elizabetha Anglicæ Regina*, sub an. 1585).

Catholic at all is not certain, but whatever faith he may have professed, there can be no question that he acted as a tool of the Government to work ruin upon Catholics. As we learn, on the authority of Mr. J. S. Brewer, "he acted as a spy and informer on the Continent for the English Government, and entrapped English priests and others into treasonable discussions against the Queen, with the purpose of betraying them."[1] He was, it is true, hanged (as well as drawn and quartered) on a charge of high treason; and it may be, as Queen Elizabeth was led to believe, and as would be quite consonant with his character, that he was a double-dyed villain who had sold his services to both sides. But it may also be, as he himself declared, that he had powerful enemies at Court who wished to get rid of him when their dirty work had been done. In any case, his guilt towards the State is far less clearly established than that against the Papists.[2]

It does not seem necessary to say more about the thrice-told tale of the "Gunpowder Plot of England" than that the author with whom we are dealing would

[1] *Students' Hume* (1884), c. xviii.

[2] See Lingard, *History of England*, Edit. 1883, vol. vi. 381. A Protestant author writes: "Parry had been a lawyer, but had recently returned to England, having been employed for some years on the Continent as a Government spy. He was a man of vile character, and had treacherously discussed the question of assassinating the Queen with several priests and others on purpose to betray them. He was admitted to interviews with the Queen, but not being rewarded as he expected, he resumed his practices, was informed against by one of his intended victims, condemned, and executed" (*Annals of England*, p. 355, note, James Parker and Co., 1876).

not appear to have brought his knowledge up to date. Two Jesuit Fathers, Garnet and Oldcorne, were, it is true, put to death in connection with it, but the latter was never even accused of any participation in the conspiracy. He suffered only for having abetted Garnet's attempted escape. As to the guilt of Garnet, which has been fiercely debated from that day to this, suffice it here to say that the latest historian of eminence who has given attention to the question, Dr. S. R. Gardiner, finds the evidence insufficient to condemn him. Professor Gardiner's last utterance upon this subject may be commended to the attention of "H. S. Merriman," who may without offence be presumed to have studied it less deeply. The Catholic clergy, he tells us,[1] were subjected to a persecution, borne with the noblest and least self-assertive constancy, simply in consequence of what is now known to all historical students to have been the entirely false charge that the plot emanated from or was approved by the English Roman Catholics as a body.

And what shall we say of Ravaillac, the assassin of Henri IV.? He once, it is true, entered a monastery of the "Feuillants" (an offshoot of the Cistercian Order), by whom he was presently dismissed because he professed to have visions of such a character as to prove him to be of unsound mind. As to any connection of his with the Jesuits, we are variously told that he applied to be admitted amongst them as a lay-brother and was refused;[2] that he once went to confession and recounted his

[1] *What the Gunpowder Plot was*, p. 2.

[2] *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, sub nom.

visions to a Jesuit, who told him to put them out of his head as delusions, to feed well, and go home to his native town ;[1] and finally that on one occasion he obtained alms at the door of a Jesuit church.[2] That his crime had any accomplices, lay or clerical, is an idea rejected by those historians who have given special attention to the question.[3]

It is no less difficult to discover any evidence which may be supposed, however remotely, to connect the would-be murderer of the Duke of Edinburgh with the Jesuits, or to furnish a basis for the statement—made here by no means for the first time—that he was "sent out to the care of the Society in Australia." Referring to the newspapers of the period,[4] we learn that along with the rest of his family, O'Farrell had arrived in Australia many years previously—that a brother of his after long practice as a solicitor had left the colony long before—that the criminal himself had studied for the priesthood, for which, however, he was not judged a fit subject, and so returned to the world ; that his antecedents seemed to point to lunacy, and that he was abnormally excitable ; that he was for some time in the corn trade, in which he made a good deal of money, which he lost again in mining speculations ; that he took to drinking—and had attacks of *delirium tremens ;* and, finally,[5] that in a declaration which he wrote

[1] *Biographie Universelle*, sub nom.

[2] Poirson, *Histoire du règne de Henri IV.* (1867), vol. iv. p. 183.

[3] *E.g.*, Poirson, *op. cit.*, and Henri Martin, *Histoire de France.*

[4] *Times*, May 18th and 19th, quoting *Melbourne Argus*, March 30, 1868.

[5] *Times*, June 18, 1868.

immediately before his execution, he uttered this protestation, "I wish moreover distinctly to assert that there was not a single human being in existence who had the slightest idea of the object I had in view." As to his consignment to the care of the Society in Australia, having no conception what is meant, we must wait till those who profess to be better informed shall vouchsafe some particulars.

The cases remaining to be dealt with, even should they prove on investigation to be no more substantial than those already mentioned, yet as wearing some semblance of historic gravity, demand rather more formal treatment. In the interests alike of clearness and of brevity, it will be convenient to recapitulate the charges one by one, appending in each case what appears to be called for in the way of comment.

(i.) *William the Silent was assassinated by an emissary of the Jesuits.*

This question brings us into contact with historians of some repute.

William of Orange, named the Silent, having taken the leading part in the revolt of the Netherlands against Philip II., of Spain, to whose ancestral dominions they belonged, this monarch, in 1580, put him under the ban, issuing a sentence of outlawry against him, and setting a price of 25,000 golden crowns upon his head. Attempts upon his life immediately followed, and on the 10th of July, 1584, he was assassinated by one Balthazar Gérard, who as a native of Burgundy was a subject of King Philip. The assassin was beyond doubt a fanatic of the most

extreme type. That Jesuits were implicated in his crime has been asserted by some few historians, who reproduce the narrative officially published at the time by the Dutch authorities. The charge against the Jesuits is given in its most compromising form by Mr. Motley, who, speaking of Gérard writes thus[1] :—

Before reaching man's estate, he had formed the design of murdering the Prince of Orange, "who, so long as he lived, seemed like to remain a rebel against the Catholic King, and to make every effort to disturb the repose of the Roman Catholic Apostolic religion." . . . As soon as the ban against Orange was published, Balthazar, more anxious than ever to execute his long-cherished design, left Dôle and came to Luxemburg. . . . He took models of Mansfeld's official seals in wax, in order that he might make use of them as an acceptable offering to the Orange party, whose confidence he meant to gain. At last, in March, 1584, Balthazar came to Tréves. While there, he confided his schemes to the regent of the Jesuit College—a "red-haired man," whose name has not been preserved. That dignitary expressed high approbation of the plan, gave Gérard his blessing, and promised him that if his life should be sacrificed in achieving his purpose, he should be enrolled among the martyrs. Another Jesuit, however, in the same College, with whom he likewise communicated, held very different language, making great efforts to turn the young man from his design, on the ground of the inconveniences which might arise from the forging of Mansfeld's seals —adding, that neither he nor any of the Jesuits liked to meddle with such affairs, but advising that the whole matter should be laid before the Prince of Parma.[2] . . . Balthazar came to Tournay, and held council with a third—the celebrated Franciscan Father Géry by whom he was much comforted and strengthened in his determination.

[1] *Rise of Dutch Republic*, vol. iii. c. 7.

[2] Then Governor of the Spanish Netherlands.

Such is the story so far as it at present concerns us. When, however, we examine for ourselves the sources of this history, things assume a somewhat different aspect.

The principal document dealing with the subject is the original confession of Gérard himself, written in French. It is only within the last half-century that this has been given to the world,[1] and historians were previously dependent on the official Dutch version to be presently described. In the original confession, *one* Jesuit alone is mentioned, namely, the one who endeavoured to turn the intending murderer from his purpose, and of his endeavour we hear a good deal more than the account quoted above might lead us to suppose. In Gérard's own words:—

> The said Jesuit strove hard to put this my intention out of my head, on account of the dangers and incommodities which, as he declared, might thence arise, to the prejudice of God's service and that of the King, through these false seals. Saying, moreover, that he would not meddle with such affairs, as likewise all the members of their said Society.[2]

At the time, however, and for nearly three centuries after, the assassin's confession was allowed to see the light only in a specially prepared official version,

[1] Published by M. Gachard, *Correspondance de Guillaume le Taciturne, Prince d'Orange*, Brussels, 1857, vol. vi. pp. 163, seq.

[2] "Et s'efforça ledict père jesniste de m'oster de teste ceste mienne délibération, pour les dangers et inconvéniens qu'il m'allégoit en pourroient survenir, au préjudice du service de Dieu et du Roy, par le moyen desdicts cachetz vollans: disant, au reste, qu'il ne se mesloit pas volontiers de telz affaires, ni pareillemente tous ceulx de leurdicte compagnie."

the *Cort verhael*.[1] This forfeits confidence by disingenuously suppressing all mention of what Mr. Motley terms the "curious fact" that a Jesuit confessor had discountenanced murder. The story is so told as to leave it to be supposed that the only Jesuit whom, as we have seen, Gérard mentions had, at least tacitly, approved his design. But, on the other hand, the *Cort verhael* adds to the original confession an appendix containing various particulars concerning which nothing is to be found in other documents of the period, amongst others those compromising the Franciscan, Father Géry, the only ecclesiastic named, and the anonymous red-haired Jesuit of Tréves. It is likewise stated that these supplementary avowals were extracted under torture[2]—a method which

[1] *Cort verhael vande moort ghedaen aen den persoone vanden seer doorluchtighen Prince van Orangien.* Anno mdlxxxiii. A contemporary French version is printed by Gachard, *op. cit.*, pp. 126, *seq.*

[2] The tortures inflicted upon this wretched man were so savage and brutal as to be an outrage on humanity, even in such a case. His right hand and forearm were burnt off with a goffering-iron; he was partially flayed and rubbed with salt and vinegar; pieces of his flesh, in six different parts, were torn off with red-hot pincers; finally he was disembowelled alive, and then quartered and beheaded. According to witnesses most bitter against him, he bore all without flinching or showing any sign of pain or even perturbation. As Aertsens, a Councillor of Brussels, wrote, July 11, 1584: "J'ai esté, toute ceste nuit et devant-disner, présent à la torture du malfaiteur; mais n'ay ouy de ma vie une plus grande resolution d'homme ny constance. Il n'a oncques dit *ay my*; mais en tous tourmens il s'est tenu sans dire mot, et sur tous interrogatoires a respondu bien à propos et avec bonne suyte," &c. (Gachard, *op. cit.*, p. 188. See also another letter by the same, p. 192, on the torture of July 13th).

obviously gravely detracts from the value of evidence so obtained, even if we suppose that Gérard actually testified as is alleged.[1] But Mr. Motley, as we have seen, treats all as coming on exactly the same authority.

In the present instance, moreover, over and above this intrinsic defect, there are other considerations which make it quite impossible to attach any credit to these allegations, and which seem to show that the authorities who put them forth, did not seriously affect to believe their own story.

Such considerations are suggested by the Jesuit Father Reiffenberg, who dicusses this whole matter at some length.[2] He observes that although we have many official documents concerning the murder and the murderer issued by those in power,[3] in none of them (the *Cort verhael* alone excepted) are the Jesuits even mentioned as instigators of the crime, albeit accusations are freely made against Philip of Spain and his agents, Parma and Assonleville.[4] Neither in the official letters addressed to the Dutch ministers abroad and to foreign princes (amongst others Queen Elizabeth), detailing what had happened ; nor

[1] Reiffenberg (1764) commented strongly on the fact that no authentic version of the culprit's confession had ever been published, making it impossible to be sure how far the admissions ascribed to him were really his (*op. inf. cit.*, bk. xvi. p. 571).

[2] *Historia Societatis Jesu ad Rhenum Inferiorem* (Cologne, 1764), vol. i. bk. x. c. 3.

[3] Several are published by Gachard, over and above those mentioned by Reiffenberg.

[4] Philip II. undoubtedly approved the deed of Gérard, whose family he ennobled and enriched.

in the replies received from these various quarters; nor in the particulars recorded day by day in the proceedings of the States-General, between the murder and the execution of the murderer;[1] nor in the account of an eye-witness[2] of the particular torture, of July 13th, in which he is said to have made this avowal; nor in the sentence passed upon the latter; nor in the epitaph upon his victim, is there a word about any priest or Jesuit as being accessory to the crime. Why, moreover, asks Reiffenberg, were no steps taken against Géry, who was actually named, or to discover the red-haired Jesuit? To identify the latter would have been easy, for it was alleged that he was the Superior of his Order at Tréves. But, far from this being done, within three years afterwards the Jesuits were admitted into Holland, where they laboured, with the permission of the States, for a century. More remarkable still,—Maurice of Nassau, the son of the murdered man and his successor in power, who at first was violently prejudiced against the Society, afterwards, having come in contact with it, and inquired into the truth of matters, became its friend and protector; for he not only allowed the Jesuit College at Emmerich to remain, when he captured the place, and at a later date (1622) personally interested himself for its safety, when imperilled by his fellow-Calvinists, but actually protested before the assembled States-General that he had convinced himself of the absolute falsity of the criminal charges brought against the Jesuits.[3] A witness so con-

[1] Gachard, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

[2] Cornelius Aertseus, Gachard, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

[3] Reiffenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 292, 300, 529.

vincing as this obviates the necessity of citing the various contemporary and other writers who know nothing of the accusation with which we are concerned, or attach so little credence to it as not to mention it.[1]

An interesting example here presents itself of the caution which must be exercised in regard of second-hand evidence. In the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (sub nom. Gérard, Balthazar) we read as follows:

"Ainsi finit ce sinistre fanatique que le jésuite Feller appelle, l'executeur d'un arrêt prononcé par un roi légitime contre un sujet rebelle."

Turning to Feller's *Dictionnaire historique* (same heading) we find that in the passage so summarized he speaks thus:

"De fausses idées qu'il s'était faites . . . achevérent d'égarer son esprit. . . . Nous n'imiterons ni les hommes inconsidérés qui ont donné des éloges à l'action de Gérard, ni les philosophes inconséquens de ce siècle [18th] dont plusieurs prechent, avec Raynal, l'assassinat des rois, et parlent avec une horreur factice et hypocrite de l'executeur d'un arrêt prononcé par un roi légitime contre un sujet rebelle; qui ne se recrient pas lorsque la tête d'un prince, légitime successeur du trône [*i.e.*, Charles Edward], est mise à prix en Angleterre (1746), et qui font un crime à Philippe [II.] d'avoir proscrit un chef de rebellion. Tout ce qu'on peut dire de plus raisonnable, de plus conforme aux principes du droit des gens et de l'équité naturelle, c'est que la révolte des Pays Bas ayant déja pris une espèce de consistance, et son chef paraissant en possession de l'independance, la nouvelle constitution du gouvernement étant à quelques égards affermie, la puissance de l'ancien

[1] They may be seen in Reiffenberg, pp. 298, *seq.*

souverain restait sans activite et sans force, et ne pouvait par conséquence autoriser une action qui dans un tel état des choses, et sourtout par les circonstances qui en précédérent et accompagnérent l'exécution, fut regardée, au moins par les étrangers, comme un assassinat."

It thus appears doubtful whether the phrase quoted by the *Biographie Générale* refers to Gérard's deed at all, and quite certain that in any case it does not imply approval of the act, as we should naturally be led to suppose.

(ii.) *Maurice of Orange* [*son of William the Silent*] *almost met the same fate, and the would-be murderer confessed.*

This is, of course, the same Maurice spoken of above, and what has been already said would be abundantly sufficient to disprove the present charge. Men do not take into favour cut-throats whose dagger has been at their own heart, and the alleged Jesuit attempt on the life of Maurice in 1598 was prior to the instances of his benevolence to the same Jesuits (in 1621 and 1622) quoted above.

It happens, moreover, that of all historical fictions none has been more completely demolished than this particular one. The facts are that in the year 1598 a bibulous and apparently half-witted creature, Peter Panne by name,[1] arrived at Leyden and began at the very gates of the city to make inquiries as to the

[1] "Ex illis tabulis publicis, dicitur Petrum Pannum fuisse natum sub horoscopo Lunæ . . . et eguisse elleboro, bibacem instar siccæ spongiæ, semper madidum, semper siccum, nequitiæ et ebrietati, luxui et saginæ natum; vento et foliis leviorem, obaeratum," &c. (*Sica Tragica*, p. 22).

whereabouts of the Prince, in such a strange manner as to arouse suspicion. Being arrested and questioned after the rough fashion of the time, he was said to have told an extraordinary tale of a Jesuit at Douai, who gave him Communion with one hand and a dagger with the other, at the same time pointing to a crown sent down from Heaven, which would be his should the Prince of Orange fall by his hand. The story was too good to be let pass, and was accordingly issued also in France by the Huguenots, but in a revised version which in some measure served to mask its original extravagance. Panne was executed, but before he died he retracted and denied all the allegations which had been extorted from him.

Such denial would no doubt be worth little more than the avowals extracted in the torture-chamber, but evidence of another character is fortunately accessible. The Flemish Jesuit Provincial, Francis Coster, was moved to deal with the story, which he did in a little book composed in his native tongue, but presently translated into Latin, under the title *Sica Tragica*, by Father Giles Schondonck, afterwards third Rector of the English College of St. Omers. In this are recited in full the solemn and official attestations of the magistracy of all the cities and towns wherein Panne had laid his narrative—that is to say, of Ypres, Antwerp, Mons, Douai, and Brussels. All bore witness that the circumstances detailed by Panne were inconsistent with known facts; that persons introduced as actors in the affair had not at the time been where they were said to be; and that the tale bristled with manifold absurdities. How complete was the refutation may be judged from the fact that

subsequent historians, however bitter and prejudiced, have left this notable incident severely alone. It will be sufficient to instance Mr. Motley, whose capacity for accepting whatever tells against Papists or Jesuits must suffice to render him a witness beyond suspicion, but who makes no allusion to this particular story, and does not even mention the name of Peter Panne.[1]

(iii.) *In Paraguay the Jesuits instigated the natives to rebel against Spain and Portugal: and the holy fathers, taking the field in person, proved themselves excellent leaders.*[2]

In this instance we may content ourselves almost entirely with the evidence of a single witness, Robert Southey. He was, as is well known, a bitter and uncompromising opponent of Papists and Jesuits; but he was also a serious historian, and, as is apt to happen with such men, while firmly believing that on all manner of other occasions the Society was guilty of all sorts of misdeeds, he was equally positive that in the particular matter which he had made it his

[1] The contemporary Dutch historian, van Meteren, who relates the incident, acknowledges that the Jesuits printed a denial of the narrative officially set forth at Leyden, contradicting the allegations therein made, and protesting that the matter should be fully investigated and proved to the bottom. "To this," he adds, "those at Leyden did not feel themselves bound" (German Edit. 1610, sub an. 1598, p. 94).

[2] The story of the arbitrary and tyrannical treatment of the Indians of Paraguay by the two Governments in question, and of the action of the Jesuit Fathers in the grave and lamentable crisis thus created, has been told in some detail by Father Sydney Smith in *The Month*, February, 1902, "The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions."

business to investigate, the accusations against the Jesuits were pure calumnies. We find him, for example, writing thus [1] :—

> All forepast crimes, errors, and offences of the Jesuits were recapitulated against them with terrible effect. Old calumnies were impudently revived, and new ones more impudently invented. They were accused of having established an empire in Paraguay, as their own exclusive dominion, from which they derived enormous riches. It was affirmed that they were defending this empire by force of arms, and that, renouncing all allegiance to the Kings of Spain, they had set up a King of their own, Nicolas by name. Histories of King Nicolas were fabricated and published. And with such zealous malignity was the falsehood propagated, that money was actually struck in his name, and handed about in Europe as an irrefragable proof of the accusation. The contrivers of this nefarious scheme were ignorant that money was not in use in Paraguay, and that there was no mint in the country [2]. . . . Such was the impression which falsehoods and exaggerated representations had produced in Europe that when [a Spanish squadron] arrived at Buenos Ayres, it was thought necessary to inquire, before any of the men were landed, whether King Nicolas were in possession of the city.[3]

It would be long to follow in detail this author's careful survey of the whole question. Suffice it to say, that he pronounces without any hesitation that the charges made against the Fathers are utterly false ; that these proved their obedience under most hard and trying circumstances, although they clearly

[1] *History of Brazil* (1814), part iii. c. xxxix. p. 473.

[2] According to Father Florian Bauke, who had laboured on the mission there, Paraguay is a "marshy, water-logged region, where one expects to find frogs rather than gold" (Duhr, *Jesuiten-Fabeln*, third edit., p. 225).

[3] *History of Brazil*, p. 449.

foresaw the misery and ruin which the insensate policy adopted would produce;[1] that the charge of tampering with Spanish officers "is as false as is the fable that the Jesuits were attempting to establish an independent Republic of their own;"[2] and that the childish character of the Indian tactics when they attempted resistance sufficiently attests that they had no advisers of any capacity or even ordinary common sense.[3] He shows, moreover, that both Spanish and Portuguese Generals in chief, who had come out from Europe strongly prepossessed against the missionaries, after full and thorough investigation were completely convinced of their innocence, to which witness was borne in the most formal and authentic manner. As General Cevallos reported to the Government at Madrid regarding the inquiry held by him according to their instructions[4]:—

> The process being concluded, I have ascertained from it that not only did no single Jesuit in any way incite the Indians to resistance, but on the contrary, as all the evidence proves, that the Fathers did all that men could to retain the Indians in due obedience. All this is confirmed by the testimony of the officers and those holding the chief posts in the army, as will be seen from the record of the process.[5]

(iv.) *Pope Clement XIV. was poisoned by the Jesuits. He had signed a Bull to suppress the Order. . . . The result of it was "Acqua tofana of Perugia," a slow and torturing poison.*

[1] *History of Brazil*, p. 458. [2] *L.c.*, p. 468. [3] *L.c.*, p. 478.
[4] Orig. Simancas, Est. Leg. 7104, ap. Duhr, *Jesuiten-Fabeln*, p. 216.
[5] See also Mr. Cunninghame Graham's *A Vanished Arcadia*.

On this subject the Protestant historian Schoell writes [1] :—

Clement XIV., whose health according to certain writers began to fail from the time the Brief was signed, died September 22, 1774, aged almost sixty-nine. His body being opened, in presence of a large number of the inquisitive the doctors pronounced that the malady to which he succumbed was of a scorbutic and hæmorrhoidal character, one to which he had been subject for many years, and which had been aggravated by excessive labour and by the habit he had adopted of artificially provoking violent perspirations, even in seasons of excessive heat. Nevertheless, the persons who were then denominated "the Spanish party" spread abroad a parcel of fables to induce belief that he had been poisoned with *acqua tofana*, an imaginary product, whereof many ignorant people spoke, but which no one ever saw or came across. A multitude of pamphlets were put in circulation accusing the Jesuits of being the authors of a crime the existence of which rests upon no evidence of which history can take account.

To this testimony as to what occurred, or rather did not occur, may be added a judgment no more open to suspicion on the ground of partiality, which was antecedently delivered as to the probabilities or possibilities of the case. The Duc De Choiseul, a prominent and implacable enemy of the Society, then chief Minister of France, wrote to Bernis, Ambassador at Rome, August 13, 1770 [2] :—

I cannot believe that he [the Pope] can be so credulous or so timorous as easily to receive the terrifying impressions

[1] *Cours d'histoire des États Européens* (1834), vol. 44, pp. 85, 86.
[2] Theiner, *Clement XIV.*, sub an. 1770, § 85.

which some endeavour to force upon him, concerning the attempts which the Jesuits might make against his life. By reason of its teaching, its institute, and its intrigues, the Jesuit Society has been regarded as dangerous in the States whence it has been expelled : but it has never been accused of being composed of poisoners, and base jealousy or fanatical hatred can alone have suggested the suspicion.

How far Choiseul's adverse testimony can be accepted as good evidence against the Society, those will judge who are acquainted with his character and career ; but obviously the fact that he entertained views so hostile does but lend additional weight to his opinion upon the particular matter with which we are now concerned.

Finally, Theiner, another authority who will not be accused of any favourable bias, thus curtly dismisses the subject [1] :—

The reader who remembers anything of what we have related concerning the illness and death of Clement XIV. will understand that they were due to natural causes alone, and that the suspicion of poison could have been suggested only by passion or mischievous delusion. For this reason we deem it altogether superfluous to trouble ourselves with the needless labour of a refutation.

Such is the nature of the contributions by which "H. S. Merriman" the historian essays to justify the performances of "H. S. Merriman" the romancer. Some will probably resent being asked to spend so much time in the examination of such trash—but so long as chaff like this is widely accepted for good grain, it is necessary, wearisome as is the task, to

[1] *Clement XIV.*, 1778, § 57.

furnish readers with the means of judging how empty and worthless it really is.

And what shall be said of those who in the name of "enlightened religious comprehension" disseminate this kind of thing? What must they themselves think of a cause which they suppose can be served in such a manner?

"THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS"

BY THE REV. JOHN GERARD, S.J.

ALTHOUGH every other weapon in their armoury should fail them, proving when put to the proof but a fragile reed with a perverse habit of running into the hand that uses it, yet upon one point anti-Jesuit writers and speakers feel quite secure; of the truth of one charge, they are persuaded, there can be no possible doubt. Do not Jesuits, as everybody knows, profess and practise the doctrine that "the end justifies the means"? And is it not the acknowledged signification of this atrocious maxim, that when any advantage is to be gained for the Church, or the Pope, or, most especially, for their own unprincipled Order, any means however bad in itself becomes good, in view of the goodness of the purpose which it can be made to serve, so that it is lawful and even meritorious to lie, or perjure oneself, or steal, or commit homicide, as the particular case requires?

Here, thinks the controversialist, is something like an argument, something sound, solid, and compendious, portable and ever ready for use, warranted to give his quietus at a moment's notice to any Papist or Jesuit that threatens to be troublesome, like the "Protestant flail" which men carried about their persons in the panic days of the Popish Plot.

Such a belief is undoubtedly very general, and if the man in the street entertains it, we can scarcely be surprised, for it comes to him upon the word of those whom he probably regards as authorities of the first rank, beyond whom it would be idle, if not impious, to attempt to mount. Has not, for instance, the learned Dr. Huber said so in Germany? and, he being an "Old Catholic," is it needful to add that he is in the front rank of theologians, whether for ability or fair-mindedness? Has not M. Yves Guyot lately affirmed the same in France? And is not France a Catholic country? Have we not the daily, or at least the weekly, testimony of religious newspapers, which title sufficiently denotes their character? Has not the late Dr. Littledale put the matter on record in the *Encyclopædia Britannica!* Has not Mr. Cartwright, who once was a member of Parliament, written a book specially about Jesuits, in which he solemnly declares:[1] "We believe it to be demonstrable that the maxim has been broached by an unbroken chain of Jesuit divines of first-rank standing, from Busenbaum down to Gury and Liberatore:" which assertion he proceeds to substantiate by "a series of quotations from writers whose authority cannot be disowned by the Order."—What more, it will be said, can be desired than evidence such as this?

And yet are there not some considerations on the very surface which the merest common-sense ought at once to suggest? Why should the Jesuits thus persist in spreading their nets before the eyes of those whom they wish to inveigle? Why, if they propose to impose upon men, should they be at such pains to let all the world know that they are impostors, that all their pretence of sanctity is a sham, and that none should venture to sup with them unless provided with a very long-handled spoon? Is it usual for swindlers to commence operations by advertising the particulars of the tricks they mean to play? Yet this is precisely what these proverbially cunning and crafty tricksters are represented as doing.

[1] *The Jesuits*, p. 167.

When we turn to an examination of facts, another difficulty still more serious at once confronts us. Whether Jesuit writers have or have not taught, as Mr. Cartwright and the others declare, that "the end justifies the means"—a question to be considered presently—there can be no manner of doubt that these same Jesuits, in common with all Catholic theologians, have taught as a fundamental principle at the outset of their treatises, and in the plainest terms, the exact opposite,—that the end, however good, does not and cannot justify the means, if those means themselves are bad.

Before proceeding to establish this assertion, a word must be said concerning the terms employed, that there may be no mistake as to what we are talking about, a point which those who treat of the subject frequently omit to determine.

In a human action three elements are distinguished: (1) The *end*, or that for the sake of which the action is undertaken. (2) The *means*, or the thing done to attain the end. (3) The *circumstances*, or conditions of time, place, and surroundings, under which the action is performed. The means, as being an objective act, while the end is but a subjective motive in the agent's mind, is frequently termed the *object*, not in the sense in which we now commonly use the word (viz., "The end and object"), but to signify the deed actually done,—that to the doing of which the agent applies himself. It is only in its relation to the end that such action is a "means."

The *end* and the *means* alike may be good, bad, or indifferent. Confining our attention to the means, with which we are mainly concerned, some things are good in themselves, as love of God and our neighbour; some are bad in themselves, as blasphemy, injustice, impurity, and untruth; some are indifferent, neither morally good nor morally evil, as reading, writing, art, and sport; and some, finally, though not intrinsically evil, are permissible only under conditions of exceptional gravity,—as the shedding of human blood, or mutilation of the human person. The *circumstances* may impart a positive

character, for good or ill, to an action otherwise indifferent: as Nero was rightly blamed for fiddling whilst Rome was burning.

It will thus be understood that a man who gives an alms out of charity, uses a good means for a good end. If he give the alms intending it as a bribe, he perverts the good means to a bad end. If he steal in order to give the alms, he endeavours to serve a good end with a bad means. If he sound a trumpet whilst giving his alms, he introduces a circumstance calculated to deprive him of his merit.

This being premised, let us turn to some Jesuit authors and examine their doctrine, selecting those by preference whom Mr. Cartwright proposes to put in the witness-box as representing his unbroken chain of Jesuit writers of first-rank standing.

Busenbaum[1] writes:

"A precept forbidding what is wrong in itself must never be violated, not even through fear of death."

[Things thus wrong in themselves being, for example, blasphemy, idolatry, impurity, slander,—as said above.][2]

Laymann:[3]

"The circumstance of a good end nowise benefits an action objectively bad, but leaves it simply and wholly bad. *E.g.*, He who steals to give an alms commits a bad action on the score of injustice, and does not perform a good action on the score of charity. . . . The reason is to be sought in the difference between moral good and moral evil: for, as St. Denis says, 'An action is good if all its constituent parts are good: it is bad if any one of them is bad,'[4] which means that for an action to be morally good both the *object* [*i.e.*, the deed done] and the end, and the circumstances must be good: whereas if any one of them be defective, it will not be a good action, but vicious and evil."

[1] *Medulla*, lib. i. tract. 2, c. 4, dub. 2, n. 1.

[2] v. ibid. dub. 2.

[3] *Theol. mor.* lb. i. tract. ii. c. 9, n. 7. Mayence Edition, 1654. p. 27.

[4] "*Bonum ex integra causa est, malum ex quocumque defectu.*"

This doctrine Laymann confirms by the following quotation from St. Augustine's *Enchiridion*:

"What is known to be sinful must not be done under any pretext of a good cause, nor for any end as being a good one, nor with any intention professing to be good."

And he thus sums the matter up:

"Whenever the choice [of means] is bad, the intention [*i.e.*, the end] is also bad. In other words, a vicious choice [of means] makes the intention also vicious."

Escobar[1] speaks in terms almost identical:

"The circumstance of a good end nowise benefits an act objectively bad, but leaves it simply and utterly bad: *e.g.*, to steal in order to give an alms. Because, a bad act is incapable of any moral goodness; for what is anywise bereft of the good it ought to have is simply bad."[2]

The doctrine taught by *Wagemann* is in exact agreement with that we have heard from his brethren, namely, that for an action to be good, end, means and circumstances must *severally* be good, while the badness of any one of these makes the whole action bad. His words, which must presently be textually cited and therefore need not be set down here, will serve also to declare the teaching of *Voit*, who adopted and incorporated with his own work the treatise of Wagemann, in which they are found.

Gury[3] says:

"Three sources of morality are reckoned—1° The *object* of the act. 2 Its circumstances. 3° The end of the

[1] *Theol. mor.* Lyons, 1652, p. 81.

[2] "Cf. D. Tho. 1-2, q. 8, a. 1."

[3] *Theologiæ Moralis*, Würzburg, 1760. *Tractatus prodromus de actibus humanis*. With the exception of the first nine lines, the substance of which he gives in another form, the whole of Wagemann's treatise *de actibus* is printed *verbatim et literatim* by Voit, whose marginal numbering of sections is, however, less by one, in each case than Wagemann's. The treatise thus reproduced terminates with section 34, in Voit 33, but the latter continues, adding four sections more (34-37), apparently borrowed from some other author, since, like what goes before, they are marked with inverted commas down the margins.

person acting. All of these are absolutely required for a good action. If even one of them be bad, the action will become bad. Hence the well-known maxim, 'Bonum ex integra causa,' &c."[1]

It would be easy to multiply such testimonies indefinitely, but there can be no advantage in doing so, for all Catholic authors, whether Jesuit or not, lay down precisely the same doctrine, and usually in very much the same words, a clear, crisp statement once made being constantly adopted and repeated by subsequent writers.[2]

This, it must be allowed, is a strange method of teaching that a good end justifies the employment of bad means. Yet it is *these very same men* whom we have quoted, who are cited as laying down a doctrine diametrically opposite to that which we have heard from them. How can this be?

It comes about, we must reply, solely because certain writers, sedulously ignoring such plain and unambiguous declarations as the above, have fastened upon other phrases a meaning which, in the light of the principles thus ignored, they could not possibly bear, and have given forth the phrases so misinterpreted as being the sum and substance of Jesuit teaching. That they should have found an opportunity of so doing is due to the circumstance that there is a sense in which we may

[1] *Compendium theologiæ moralis*, tract. i. c. iii. art. 2.

[2] Father E. R. Hull, S.J., communicates the following information:

"I have made a *catena* of about thirty Jesuit authors, from Vasquez to Génicot, all expressly teaching that a good end does *not* justify an evil means. The indirect evidence from this clears the whole body of scholastic theologians—not merely Jesuits—since from beginning to end not a single scholastic writer is cited as an opponent of the doctrine which they all clearly and consistently teach—none, in fact, are cited as antagonists, but ancient authors of the early centuries,—Cassian, an anonymous Greek commentator on Chrysostom, and some ambiguous phrases of Saint Ambrose, Saint Augustine, and Abulensis. Had there been any scholastics to quote in this sense, they would not have gone so far back to look for objections."

truly say that certain means *are* justified or even sanctified by the end for which they are employed. It is by misrepresenting the scope and significance of utterances dealing with this particular class of cases that the slanderous charge we are examining has been trumped up.

It is, for instance, quite obvious that such things as acting, or singing, or hunting, or fishing, are in themselves absolutely "indifferent." But they may become unquestionably virtuous if undertaken from a motive of charity, to obtain funds for a hospital, or food for the starving poor. They may even be heroic, if heavy sacrifices or great hardships be entailed. These are instances of the end sanctifying the means; or of the means being elevated and ennobled by the end; which, however, can only be when the means are capable of being sanctified, that is to say, as we have been told, when they are not intrinsically bad.

It is no less evident that certain actions which, though not intrinsically wrong, are not usually lawful, become lawful in view of a good end sufficiently serious to warrant their performance. Thus, for the purposes of a just war, it is allowed to kill men in battle: to save life, surgeons amputate legs and arms: for the protection of society, magistrates deprive burglars of their liberty: though it were wrong to support every trivial statement with an oath, we rightly speak on oath in a court of law. In such instances, and in such alone, can there be any question of the end justifying the means: that is to say, when the end is of serious importance, and when the means which it demands are capable of being justified, as not being intrinsically wrong, and being, moreover, proportionate to the end. No end whatsoever could possibly justify apostasy, or blasphemy, or theft, or adultery, or perjury.

It is of such cases, and only of such, that theologians speak when they lay down, as a mere *obiter dictum*, the maxim which has aroused so much horror, that "the end being lawful the means also are lawful," or that "for

whom the end is licit, for him are the means also licit." This does not signify, *as they are careful to explain*, any or every means, but means which are not intrinsically wrong, and which the end necessarily or naturally postulates. The end, in fact, cannot possibly be lawful, unless there be lawful means proper for its attainment. No theologian in the world, Jesuit or other, ever said that the end being *good* the means are lawful.[1] To style it *lawful* is to imply that the means needed for its attainment are not immoral.

The case considered by almost all the Jesuit theologians "of first-rank standing," cited by Mr. Cartwright, viz., Busenbaum,[2] Laymann,[3] Voit,[4] Gury,[5] is that of a criminal lying in prison under sentence, or with the certain prospect, of death or mutilation or torture. Such a one, they assume, is entitled, if he can, to make his escape, for every man, however guilty, has a right to secure his own life and liberty; just as, if condemned to death by starvation, he would not be bound to refuse food which his friends might manage to convey. Therefore, *within certain limits*, he may have recourse to the requisite means, that is to say, to such as, not being intrinsically wrong, the gravity of his situation warrants. He must not indeed, say the doctors offer violence to his keepers, or injure them, or tempt them to sinful neglect of duty by bribery or intoxication. But he may

[1] Boethius, who wrote in the fifth century, and who certainly was not a theologian, still less a Jesuit, and of whom it is not absolutely certain that he was even a Christian, incidentally, as an example of the *major* of a syllogism, gives the proposition, *cujus finis est bonus ipsum est quoque bonum*. (*De differentiis topicis*, lib. ii.) The few moral theologians who comment upon this utterance, observe that the means are assumed not to be evil, *e.g.*, Silvius, Bonacina, and Loth.

[2] *Medulla theologiæ moralis*, l. iv. c. 3, d. 7, a. 2.

[3] *Theol. mor.* Mayence, 1654, p. 75.

[4] *Theol. mor.* Würzburg, 1769, n. 191.

[5] *Cas Consc.* pt. ii. n. 14. Edit. Ratisbon, 1865. Gury expressly limits the liceity to "*media per se indifferentia*." Mr. Cartwright endeavours to explain that this limitation means little or nothing (p. 170).

have them provided with a good dinner in the hope that they will be less vigilant after it; or he may play a trick upon them to get them out of the way; and though he foresee that they will get into trouble for their negligence in letting him escape, he is not on that account bound to forego the chance of freedom, as it is not he but they themselves that directly bring their troubles upon them. Also, he may lawfully injure the property of the State, by breaking through bolts and bars and walls,—though he may not, to secure his liberty, arrange to have his prison stormed and all those confined in it let loose: for in such a case his private gain would not be commensurate with the public loss. Nor can he rightly attempt to escape if he has given his parole that he will not do so.

This case, as being somewhat extreme, is a favourite with authors who wish to convey an idea as to how far the principle upon which their solution rests will go. It is, in fact, as I have said, the stock instance, and it is the decisions pronounced regarding it, as indicated above, that have evoked so much obloquy from those who would not or could not understand them in the only sense in which they can reasonably be understood.

There is, however, another example which must not be omitted, affording, as it does, a prime illustration of the method according to which some controversialists can fashion for themselves arguments out of materials the most unpromising.

Amongst the Jesuit theologians called as witnesses by Dr. Littledale and Mr. Cartwright, quite singular importance is attributed to Wagemann, of whom we heard above, but whose name will be unfamiliar to many students tolerably well versed in the literature of the schools. Of his book, *Synopsis Theologiæ Moralis*, there seems to be no copy, or at least none accessible, within the British Isles.[1] Yet Dr. Littledale and Mr. Cart

[1] It is not found in the Catalogue of the British Museum, nor of the Bodleian, nor of Trinity College, Dublin, nor of Sion College, nor of any other library where I have inquired.

wright both quote it, and quote it in such a manner as to suggest that, unless the former has borrowed from the latter, who was first in the field, they have both drawn upon one common source; while in view of their usual practice in regard of evidence, it might with some confidence be assumed that this source is not the original book. Fortunately, however, it is possible to identify this fountain-head of their information. More fortunately still, it has been possible to consult Wagemann's own work, a copy of which is found in the Royal Library at Munich, with the result that a highly instructive and edifying chapter in the history of literary evolution stands revealed.

Dealing with the question of the morality of human actions, Wagemann writes as follows:

"*Question.* Is the intention of a good end vitiated by the employment of a bad means?

"*Answer.* I distinguish. If the end be intended with direct reference to a bad means, the action becomes absolutely bad: not so if the end be intended without any reference to the means. For example: Titus steals in order to give an alms out of his theft: and Caius intends to give an alms, thinking nothing at the moment of a means. *Afterwards*, through avarice, he determines to give it out of a theft, which he therefore commits. The *first intention of almsgiving* was good in Caius."[1]

Here, it might seem, we have a mere harmless truism, too obvious to merit utterance; yet from such a harmless germ has been evolved an immoral paradox shocking and scandalous to all honest men. In this wise—

In 1874 there was published at Celle, in Hanover, a book entitled *Doctrina moralis Jesuitarum*, compiled by an "Old Catholic" in a spirit of bitter hostility to the Society of Jesus, as we learn from the preface, dated on the hundredth anniversary of its suppression. In this work are collected a number of extracts from the writings of Jesuits,[2] frequently mutilated, always shorn

[1] *Synopsis*, i. 26. *Apud* Voit, i. 19. The italics are mine.

[2] In Latin and German.

of their context, and calculated, as they stand, to create a bad impression. Hence undoubtedly have Dr. Littledale and Mr. Cartwright drawn the information concerning Wagemann, which readers will naturally suppose to have been derived from his own writings. On p. 212 of the *Doctrina* the passage of his which we have already seen, is given in its first stage of transmutation with a few particulars prefixed concerning the author himself—as follows:

"Lewis Wagemann: Professor of Moral, in the University of Innspruck: born 1713, died 1792. *Synopsis Theologiæ Moralis*, Augsburg and Innspruck, 1762: *Permissu Superiorum*. 'Is the intention of a good end vitiated by the choice of bad means? Not if the end be intended without any reference to the means, . . . *e.g.*, Caius intends to give an alms, thinking nothing at the moment of a means: afterwards, through avarice, he determines to give it out of a theft, which he therefore commits.'"

That is all. The phrase containing the whole point of the solution is quietly burked, and the reader is left to conclude that because Caius did not at first intend to steal, Wagemann pronounces his conduct meritorious after he has stolen.

Next comes Mr. Cartwright. He manifestly betrays his entire dependence upon the information about Wagemann supplied above, though he does what he can by circumlocution and amplification to invest it with an air of originality. In particular he tries to improve upon the material supplied him, finishing off its obviously ragged end into such a point as he conceives it ought to have. Accordingly, he informs us as follows:[1]

"In 1762 the Jesuit Wagemann, Professor of Morals (*sic*) at the University of Innspruck, published a Synopsis of Moral Theology, duly authenticated by official approbation, in which occurs this passage: 'Is the intention of a good end rendered vicious by the choice of bad means? Not if the end itself be intended irrespective

[1] *The Jesuits*, p. 168. Italics mine.

of the means:' a proposition which he thus exemplifies: 'Caius is minded to bestow alms, without at the time taking thought as to the means; subsequently, from avarice, he elects to give them out of the proceeds of theft, which to that end he consequently commits;' *and so Caius is declared entitled to the merits of charity, though he has aggravated the offence of violence by the motive of avarice.*"

Here is undoubtedly a particularly fine specimen of the maxim we are considering, as exhibited in practice. In order to fasten upon a Jesuit author the stigma of so immoral a doctrine, it is considered right and proper to falsify his words, and so make him say the opposite of what he actually says. Such an end, in the judgement of our rigorous moralists, justifies such means.

We have, however, by no means finished with Wagemann, who is made to supply another example even more remarkable. Going back to the point at which we left him, we find that Mr. Cartwright thus continues:

"Wagemann is not a doctor who deals in obscure words, for he says, *Finis determinat probitatem actus* ['The end determines the righteousness of the deed'], a definition of neat preciseness."

The same neatly precise phrase is fastened upon by Dr. Littledale,[1] who exhibits it as the most terse form in which the doctrine is "laid down" that the end justifies the means. It may, in fact, be now considered as the crucial piece of evidence committing Wagemann himself and the Society whose authorities approved his work to the doctrine they would fain repudiate.

Here again, however, it is abundantly clear that the neat and terse proposition to which such supreme importance is attributed, has been supplied, not by Wagemann himself, but by the same hostile writer who was previously requisitioned. But hostile as he is, he is found to utter a note of warning which should have saved our learned friends from the trap in which they

[1] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, art. *Jesuits*.

have both been caught. The terrible phrase, "Finis determinat moralitatem[1] actus," occurs only in the *Index* at the end of Wagemann's book, and accordingly lays down no doctrine whatever, good, bad, or indifferent, but merely refers the reader to the place where doctrine may be obtained, and if we go to that place, this is what we find:[2]

"The goodness or badness of actions is chiefly to be sought under three heads: namely, the *object* [or means], the end, and the circumstances. For an act to be good, it is required that these three should *all* be good: for it to be bad, it is sufficient that *one of them* be bad, according to the principle—*Bonum est ex integra causa, malum ex singulis defectibus.*"

A little further on,[3] Wagemann writes:

"All employment of an evil means is evil: but, on the other hand, it does not follow that all employment of a good means is actually good."

Such is the evidence which is triumphantly cited as proving beyond question that Jesuits hold the vile doctrine imputed to them, and such is the kind of erudition for which Dr. Littledale has found so imposing a vehicle as the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

It is of course manifest, that even the phrase, as it stands in the Index, contains a large measure of truth. The end with which a person acts must always be *one* determinant of his merit, and in a vast number of instances it alone exerts any positive determination for good or evil, the other elements being purely "indifferent."

A homely instance in which the end thus determines the moral quality of the action is given by a German writer.[4] A schoolmaster flogs a boy. If he does so because the boy deserves a flogging, and it is likely to do him good, the master's action is good and praiseworthy. If, on the other hand, he chastise the boy with precisely

[1] Not *prohibitalem*, as Mr. Cartwright and Dr. Littledale have it.
[2] *Synopsis*, i. 17, 18. *Apud* Voit, i. 12. Italics mine.
[3] Ibid. i. 25. Voit, i. 18.
[4] Dr. Peter Henn, *Das Schwarze Buch*, 173.

equal severity, because he has a grudge against one, who, being poor, brings him no present at the New Year or on his birthday, the action is unprincipled and tyrannical. It is its end or motive that determines its morality.

Such are positively *the only grounds* upon which Jesuits are said to hold and teach that "the end justifies the means." Such in particular are the "classical instances," by which, as we are sometimes assured, Dr. Littledale and Mr. Cartwright have put the truth of the allegation beyond dispute.

There are, moreover, some extraneous pieces of evidence that should weigh with every fair-minded inquirer. The most bitter and determined assailants of Jesuits and all concerning them who, having been trained in the methods and terminology of the schools, were well qualified to judge of such a matter, have invariably shown what they thought of this particular charge, by entirely ignoring it. In the seventeenth century, we find no word concerning any such teaching in Pascal's *Provincial Letters*,—and Pascal was not the man to neglect such a weapon had he thought it of any possible value. For how little it counted in the storm of obloquy which in the eighteenth century presaged and facilitated the temporary destruction of the Society, may be judged from this, that it is not even mentioned as an accusation in Pope Clement XIV.'s Brief of Suppression, that document which some would regard as the last word on the iniquities of Jesuits. In the nineteenth century who were more fierce anti-Jesuits than Dr. Döllinger and Dr. Reusch, after their revolt against the Church? They specifically and in detail attacked the moral teaching of the Society; but they knew something of what they were talking about, and the idea that any Jesuit ever held or taught that the end justifies immoral means they left severely alone.

So we find an eminent Catholic writer, but no Jesuit, Mr. W. S. Lilly, in his *Claims of Christianity*, treating the whole matter as too absurd for serious discussion, and intimating that the idea we have been considering

is a vulgar error, which only the ignorant or the dishonest can entertain.

Finally, in the year 1852, the German Jesuit, Father Roh, issued a public challenge, offering to pay the sum of 1,000 Rhenish guilders to any one who in the judgement of the faculty of law in the University of Heidelberg or of Bonn, should establish the fact that any Jesuit had ever taught the doctrine that the end justifies the means, or any doctrine equivalent to it. The challenge has been before the world for fifty years; but the thousand guilders have never yet been awarded.[1]

Father Roh added a second clause to his challenge, and with it we may conclude:—

"Whosoever without furnishing the proof I demand, shall in speech or writing ascribe to the Society of Jesus the said shameful doctrine sets himself down as a slanderous scoundrel."

[1] See Father Roh' pamphlet, *Das alte Lied: Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel.*

JESUIT OBEDIENCE

By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

The title "Jesuit Obedience" would seem to imply that the purpose of the present paper is to explain what is special in kind about Jesuit Obedience, and differentiates it from the obedience of other Religious Orders and of other men. On the contrary, I wish to show that there is nothing special in its kind about the obedience which St. Ignatius has prescribed to his sons. Our Founder has spoken about the virtue of obedience in the Constitutions and in his famous Letter on Obedience. Both of these documents are easily accessible, and they are the authentic sources of information as to the sort of obedience to which the Jesuit pledges himself. As any one who refers to them will perceive, the writer has no consciousness that his teaching is different from what is commonly given to all placed under authority—for instance, by the Apostle St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, where he says: "Obey your masters in the flesh with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your hearts, *as to Christ*; not serving to the eye, as if to please men, but as the servants of Christ doing the will of God *from the heart*, serving with a good will, as to the Lord and not to men." St. Ignatius quotes this passage early in his Letter on Obedience, and it is not too much to say that it forms the text of which the entire Letter is intended to be an exposition. The one thing that he does desire to be distinctive of his Order is that it should strive to cultivate this virtue, incumbent on all, in a specially perfect way; so that, as other Orders are noted for the extent of their prayer or austerities, or the severity of their manner of living, his sons might become noted for the perfection of their obedience.

This, of course, is not the popular impression about Jesuit Obedience. The censors of the Society assure us that there

is something very special indeed about it, and very horrible. Thus Dr. Littledale, in his *Encyclopædia Britannica* account, or rather travesty, of the character of the Society, which seems to be generally accepted as if it were some authentic document, has the following passage:

"On this principle he [St. Ignatius] raised obedience to a position it had never held before, even among monastic virtues. His letter on this subject, addressed to the Jesuits of Coimbra in 1553, is still one of the standard formularies of the Society, ranking with those two other products of his pen, the Spiritual Exercises and the Constitutions, and it is evident that his views differ very seriously from the older theories on the subject, as formulated in other rules. In them the Superior is the head of a local family, endowed with paternal authority, no doubt as understood by the old civil code of the Roman Empire, centuries after the very memory of freedom had been lost, yet having fixed limits, alike traditional and prescribed, besides being exercised only within a limited area and for certain specified purposes. Loyola, true to his military training and instincts, clothes the General with the powers of a commander-in-chief of an army in time of war, giving him the absolute disposal of all members of the Society in every place and for every purpose. Not only so, but he pushes the claim much further, requiring, besides entire outward submission to command, also the complete identification of the inferior's will with that of the superior. He lays down that this superior is to be obeyed simply as such, and as standing in the place of God, without reference to his personal wisdom, piety, or discretion; that any obedience which falls short of making the superior's will one's own in inward affection as well as in palpable effect, is lax and imperfect; that going beyond the letter of command, even in things abstractedly good and praiseworthy, is disobedience; and that the 'sacrifice of the intellect' — a familiar Jesuit watchword—is the third and highest degree of obedience, well pleasing to God, when the inferior not only wills what the superior wills, but thinks what he thinks,

submitting his judgement so far as it is possible for the will to influence and lead the judgement."

In this sufficiently representative statement of the popular idea, we are told that "Loyola raised obedience to a place which it had never held before, even among monastic virtues"; and that his "views differ very seriously from the older theories on the subject" (of obedience). Let us see how far the points that are indicated bear out this contention.

One of them, at any rate, may be dismissed at once as irrelevant. No doubt in some of the older Orders there was, and still is, apart from the Pope, no general superior with a world-wide jurisdiction over the monks, no one above the abbot, or other local superior. But long before the Jesuits had come on the scene, the principle of Orders with a world-wide organization for world-wide work had been accepted, as for instance, in the great Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic. Nor is this distinction between local and general superiors a point which in any way touches the internal character of the virtue of obedience.

Nor again can it be said that Jesuit obedience differs from the obedience of other Orders, in that their obedience is to an authority whose powers are strictly limited, whereas ours is to one whose power extends to everything and anything which the Superior may have the wish to enjoin—"in every place and for every purpose." There are well defined limits to the obedience of the Society as well as of other Orders. As in them, a Jesuit vows obedience "according to the rules," or, to quote the exact phrase in the formula of his vows, he vows "perpetual obedience in the Society of Jesus, . . . understanding everything (*i.e.*, all his engagements under vow) conformably with the Constitutions of the same Society." For instance, if a Jesuit Superior were to order one of his subjects to start business as a lawyer, or a butcher—a thing which it is inconceivable that any Jesuit Superior should do—he might expect to be told by that subject, respectfully but firmly, that that was a mode of life which the Constitutions of the Society in no way contemplated, and which he was

therefore in no way bound by his vow to accept; in other words, that he had joined a Society of priests, assisted by lay-brothers, to do a certain kind of clerical work, in teaching, preaching, administering sacraments, and so on, and to live according to a certain rule and discipline, all of which the Constitutions carefully define. And he might add that not only had he never pledged himself to anything more than this, but that he could not fancy himself taking or the Church permitting a vow which was not thus carefully limited in its character—quoting perhaps in his support the words of the great Jesuit theologian, Suarez, who pronounces that it would be "indiscreet and inhuman" to take a vow which "was not limited in its matter as regards the variety, multitude, perfection, and difficulty of the actions prescribed, proportionately to the person taking the vow, and the state or manner of life he is professing."[1] It follows that when the power of the General is stated to be absolute, this can only be admitted in a qualified sense. He is the supreme guardian, within the Society, of the faithful observance of its Constitutions and of its inherited spirit, and he appoints directly to the more important offices, though only after receiving the recommendations, which he usually follows, of the local superiors and consultors. Keeping as he does on these lines, he is assured of a ready obedience from his subjects. But if we can conceive of the unprecedented absurdity, and imagine him seeking to rule otherwise, it is no disrespect to him to say that he would find the course of his government as much impeded as the course of a train derailed.

There is at all events nothing in the fact that a Jesuit General has fuller powers than the Generals of some other Religious Orders, which should cause the obedience of the Society to be deemed improper and horrible. The obedience to which a soldier is bred is not so regarded, and yet this goes beyond what the Jesuit is bred to, and it has fewer safeguards in the character of its chiefs than has the obedience of the Society. Let us see then whether we can discover any

[1] *De Voto*, tom. xv. lib. x. cap. 3, r. ii.

peculiarity of Jesuit obedience in the other points to which Dr. Littledale's paragraph directs our attention.

They are three in number—(1) that obedience is to be rendered to the Superior as standing in the place of God, without reference to his personal qualities; (2) that the subject's will is to be identified with that of the Superior; (3) and even, so far as is possible, his judgement is to be identified with the judgement of the Superior.

In supposing the first of these to be a Jesuit peculiarity, Dr. Littledale must have forgotten the text cited above, from the Epistle to the Ephesians, "Obey your masters in the flesh . . . *as to Christ*, . . . as the servants of God doing the will of God from the heart, . . . *as to the Lord and not to men*," and that other text, "He that heareth you heareth me." It is the doctrine certainly of the Catholic Church, and, seeing how clear is its Scriptural foundation, one would imagine also of Christians generally, that "all authority is from God,"[1] whether it be that of spiritual or temporal rulers, or of parents, or again of any who receive it by delegation from these. And the reason why Holy Scripture so speaks is surely not hard to understand. The fundamental title of all authority is possession. It is the possessor who has the right to dispose of his property; and men belong to God, their Creator, and Christ, their Redeemer. God, therefore, has the fundamental right to dispose of their actions, in other words, to rule them, and no one else can claim to exercise authority over them, save by delegation from Him, and as his ministers in some department of human life. It is only expressing this truth in other words to say that a superior, be he parent or duly appointed spiritual or temporal ruler, stands to those over whom he is set in the place of Christ, and that it is as such that they should regard him and obey him, rather than on account of any talent for government that may be in him. How absurd then on finding this rational and Scriptural doctrine set forth in the formularies of the Society, to pronounce it a Jesuitical and highly suspicious peculiarity!

[1] Romans xiii. 1.

It will assist us in discussing the other two alleged peculiarities of Jesuit obedience if we begin by taking note not only of the fact that God has placed us all under the authority of many earthly superiors, but also of the reason why He has so ordered. He has done it for the benefit both of our individual and our social development, because the weak and inexperienced need to be assisted by the strong and prudent, and because social action is united action, and united action is impossible except in so far as the many can be induced to follow a leader. By placing men under obedience to superiors clothed with a delegation of His own Divine authority, God takes the most natural and efficacious means of securing to them this two-fold benefit. But the benefit is so necessary that to secure it in some measure men are fain to substitute a shadow of authority and obedience even where the corresponding realities are no longer recognized. It is what we see around us in our own country at the present time. A spiritual view of obedience is still inculcated on the young, in the nursery and the schoolroom, but the average Englishman chafes under the suggestion that civil rulers are set over him by God, and still more (if we except a certain class) is he indignant at the suggestion that bishop, or priest, or minister, can have claims on his obedience. What he likes to think is that these are his own servants, holding under him in his capacity as one of the sovereign people, and that in conforming himself to their directions he is acting in consistency with himself. Still, as I am saying, he does lay stress on the duty of thus submitting himself to the laws of his country and the ordinances of the church or communion of his choice. It is what he does well, and is proud of himself for doing well. He has, he would say, a great respect for the laws, and for those appointed to administer them, a respect rising to loyalty as regards the person of the sovereign, especially if a female sovereign. And he assures us truly that he thoroughly appreciates the necessity of unwisdom submitting to be directed by wisdom, and the necessity in the interests of common action for the individuals to submit to the laws and

to the rule of their governing bodies, in the life of the state, or the municipality, or of any party or other voluntary associations. In other words, the Jesuit and the average Englishman are agreed that without the submission of the many to the behests of the few, the moral and social world would not go round, and differ only as to the character of the obligation thence arising, the one regarding it as a duty of submission to institutions on the orderly working of which the welfare of human society depends, the other as this indeed, but also as a duty of true obedience to superiors appointed by God and clothed with his authority.

We may pass on now to the two other alleged peculiarities of Jesuit obedience. With the aid of the comparison just made, we shall be able to see that these alleged peculiarities, so far from being such, are equally esteemed, not only by other Religious Orders, but even by the average Englishman of whom we have been speaking. He may not use quite the same terms as St. Ignatius, but he uses terms of equivalent meaning. We may go to the army for an illustration, and suppose the case of one appointed to a post which is very distasteful to him. To such a person the average Englishman would not indeed say, "Try and will what your military superiors will," but he would certainly say, "Do not be contented with a mere half-hearted and mechanical obedience, nursing meanwhile your discontent with grumblings and predictions of failure, but, on the contrary, put your heart into the work and strive to make it a success, just as though it were the work of your own predilection." And he would even go further, and say, "Strive hard to overcome your dislike for the work, and to transform it into a positive liking, for in proportion as you can accomplish this will you be able to fulfil your charge with ease and success." Such counsel when viewed in this connection sounds so obviously appropriate that one cannot contemplate its needing to be justified. Yet it is only this self-same counsel which, when given by St. Ignatius to his sons, is accounted unnatural and suspicious, and such as no other Religious Order or body of men would

tolerate. Clearly this paradox must be ascribed to some misapprehension, and the misapprehension is that when the Jesuit is told to "lay aside" (*deponere*) or "cast off (*exuere*) his own will," and "will only what his Superior wills," he is expected to stifle all exercise of volition within him, reducing himself to a kind of machine. The ground for so strange a supposition is to be sought, in addition to the expressions just cited, in certain images which St. Ignatius borrows from the ancient ascetical writers; such as [let him be] "like a corpse which allows itself to be carried in any direction and treated in any manner whatsoever," and "like an old man's staff which serves him wherever and however he likes to use it." But St. Ignatius never meant to be understood with such extreme literalism. To "lay aside" or "cast off" are expressions meaning no more than the common phrase "to give up" one's will, and it is a recognized law of language that "comparisons do not go on all fours." Moreover, it is in the consciousness of us all that the efforts to sacrifice our own will for the will of another, especially if the sacrifice is carried to the lengths described in the above case of the soldier, so far from annihilating the activity of the volitional faculty within us, stimulate and invigorate it. And we may perhaps appeal to the palpable fact, known to the large number who have friends or acquaintances in the Society, that Jesuits are not, speaking generally, notable for their want of will power, but rather for the abundance of it.

We come now to obedience of the judgement, the third alleged peculiarity of the Jesuit system of obedience, and that which is held to be its chief vice. How can a man without violence offered to his rational nature abdicate his own judgement for that of his superior? Ought not his endeavour always to be to make his judgement conform strictly and exclusively to the claims of the evidence which is set before his eyes? Can he without infidelity to truth stifle a judgement which he feels to be that of truth for a contrary judgement imposed on him by an outside authority? Indeed, is not such a mental process impossible, so that in attempting it he

does no more than nurse himself in a dishonest delusion? And finally, must not the ultimate result of such unnatural efforts, if carried out consistently, be to paralyze the judicial faculty and extinguish the sense of personal responsibility which God has attached to it?

This is the indictment, but we have only to recur once more to the analogy of the counsels which the average Englishman would give his fellows in the ordinary affairs of life, to recognize how absurdly unfounded it is. A chance number of the *Globe* has an article on "The Spirit of Opposition," from which we may borrow the following passage:

"There are many people moving about in the world to-day whose chief pleasure is found in opposing. To run counter to the views or desires of their own family circle, their fellow-townsmen, or even the world at large, is to them at once the aim of their lives and the acme of their happiness. . . . They are convinced in their own minds that there are always several reasons why the aspirations of the majority are ever in the wrong, and conceive that it is their mission in life to open the eyes of the rest to the follies they are in their blindness committing. They imagine it is their duty to teach mankind at large, and those with whom they come more in contact in particular, what ignorant folks they are."

For "majority" let us substitute "superiors," and we have set before us in these words the same infirmity of human character which St. Ignatius is contemplating, and for which he is offering a remedy, in the portion of his instructions on obedience with which we are now concerned; or rather, we have here an extreme form of the same infirmity. For there is in all, and specially in those of us who are endowed with a certain strength of character, a more or less developed disposition to harden ourselves in judgements adverse to the schemes of others, particularly when they are schemes the carrying out of which will affect our own interests and inclinations. And if the disposition is so general, and therefore bound to show itself in a Religious Order as well as elsewhere, it is to be expected that a far-seeing founder

should indicate a method by which it may be corrected, and its evil effects as far as possible prevented.

For these evil effects are prone to be considerable. The will and the judgement are faculties of the same person, and, as St. Ignatius points out so forcibly, there cannot well, without violence to nature, be a long-enduring opposition between them. One is sure, sooner or later, to draw the other to itself. If the judgement draws the will, the latter in turn will draw to itself the external action, and full and complete disobedience will be the final catastrophe, whilst during the continuance of the conflict there will be want of alacrity and diligence, want of courage, suffering, annoyance, weariness, meanness, excuses, and other defects, all which will eat away the perfection of the obedience, extend from one member of the community to another, cause divisions among them, and seriously paralyze the work of God in which they are engaged.

St. Ignatius's remedy is, we know, that in such cases the subject should put some pressure on his judgement in the endeavour to make it more conformable to that of his Superior. And the objection taken to this remedy is that it is immoral. The mind, we have heard, in forming its judgements should aim at truth, and that only; to bend it in any other direction, for the sake of pleasing a Superior or any one else, is unquestionably a form of depravity. To speak thus, however, is to miss the point altogether. What is suggested by St. Ignatius is not against the claims of truth but in their behalf, nor is it different from what most sensible men would recommend in like cases.

The Saint acknowledges that there are times when a man cannot change his judgement, namely, when the evidence in its support is clear and convincing. But the subject's judgement is not infallible; it may err; and the question for him to consider is whether the error may not be on his side, not on his Superior's. And just as the writer above-quoted is hinting to the combative characters he describes, that the bare fact of their having the "majority" against them should

be to them a sufficient indication that they have judged amiss, either through bias or through some infirmity of mental view, so St. Ignatius implies that the bare fact of a subject's judgement being opposed to that of his Superior should cause him to suspect that, from one or other of these two causes, the misjudgement needing correction is on his, not the Superior's side. For the Superior is presumably of as competent judgement as the subject, perhaps of more competent judgement, since soundness of judgement ranks high among the qualities for which a Superior is chosen. Besides which, the Superior is more favourably situated for judging correctly than the subject, being free from the bias which affects a subject when his own cause is at stake, being in a more central position for observing the facts, and having fuller access to the sources of information. In his consciousness that there are these presumptions in his Superior's favour, it is surely not unreasonable that the subject should be led to reconsider his opinions, with the result perhaps of deciding, calmly and prudently before God, that he was in the right after all, but more probably of discovering where he was in the wrong, or at all events of concluding that the truth may very possibly be on his Superior's side, although he has not the wits or the knowledge to perceive it.

And here we reach the question of the defensibility of "blind" obedience. The adjective "blind" may have a suspicious sound to those who have not reflected very carefully on its meaning, but the thing, when it presents itself in other connections, is wont to be praised, not condemned.

> "Theirs not to reason why,
> Theirs but to do and die:"

—our hearts all accord with the poet's when he thus sings the praises of the Six Hundred, and yet their action, which is deemed so noble, was precisely an act of blind obedience. They could not see the motive of such a charge; they were as blind men in that respect: but they trusted their commander, and rode on with all their might. In their case the

trust was not justified, as it was not with the men on board the *Victoria* and the ship which sank it. But of its own nature it tends towards success, and that is why in the army and navy so much stress is laid upon it. Nor is it without a direct success, even when the immediate result is signal disaster. The charge of the Six Hundred, and the behaviour of the men on the ships mentioned, have, as examples, contributed not a little to the efficiency of the British army and navy. Why then are the members of a Religious Order to be blamed because in parallel circumstances they set before themselves this same ideal of blind obedience elsewhere so highly esteemed? They are entitled to urge this question all the more, because in their case, engaged as they are in work for God, and regarding their Superiors as God's ministers, occupying His place towards them, they can repose their trust not merely or chiefly in the wisdom and prudence of these earthly Superiors, but much more in the overruling Providence of God. If the catastrophe of an ill-advised charge can lead to good ulterior results, much more can those engaged in spiritual work nerve themselves to a blind obedience, in the belief that what in relation to proximate causes and effects is failure may in the scheme of God's far-reaching Providence be the necessary preparation for some triumph of grace in the future.

Will it be contended that I am avoiding the real difficulty, which is that blind obedience in the Society means obedience which is blind to the consideration whether sin is not involved in the orders received? If so, that contention is incorrect. It is distinctly not questions of sin, but questions of advisability, just as has been indicated, which our Founder's exhortations to blind obedience contemplate. Such questions are constantly arising, as any one might suppose, in a great Order engaged in various works of study and spiritual ministration. Is it for the glory of God that such a mission or college should be founded or abandoned, is it advisable that I should be allowed to undertake such and such studies and employments, that I should be withdrawn from a position in which I

believe myself to be doing good which another might be unable to continue, or appointed to one not according to my tastes and for which I feel myself incompetent? These are but a few specimens, but they may suffice to define the standpoint from which the propriety of blind obedience should be estimated, and this seems a matter of importance, as so many are misled by the impression just alluded to, that it means the refusal to consider, except when the evidence of sinfulness stares one in the face, whether what is enjoined is not forbidden by God's law.

But let us pass now to this further question, and inquire what sort of contingency is contemplated by the excepting clauses, "where no sin is seen to be present,"[1] "in all things which do not involve sin."[2] That it is the possibility of an order being given compliance with which might appear to the subject to be sinful, is clear from the force of terms, but what kind of sin? Our censors instinctively think of not infrequent occasions in which a Jesuit might be called upon to commit a murder, or a theft, or to simulate the worship of some false religion. They fancy that the plans of St. Ignatius distinctly included crimes like these among the means by which the Order should pursue its object of subjugating mankind under the yoke of the Papacy, and that in consequence he wished to have the members of his Order trained to obey when called upon to commit any one of these crimes. But they further suppose that, realizing the power of conscience, and how it would be likely to thwart his evil plans, St. Ignatius thought to delude it by a specious excepting clause to the general rule; that he counted on the subject reading this rule and finding relief in its language from his pricks of remorse, whilst the superiors might be trusted to involve their orders to commit crime in mazes of casuistical subtleties which would effectually prevent the subject from pleading that the sin was palpable. To this strange theory, which would be incredible were it not actually held and advocated, a very short answer may suffice. Given the possibility of a set of men devising a Religious

[1] *Summary of the Constitutions*, No. 31 [2] *Letter on Obedience.*

Order on such a nefarious basis, or transforming in this sense one already existing, there could be no necessity of an excepting clause like the one we are considering, for the simple reason that no one could conscientiously join an Order of this nature or take vows in it. To vow obedience is an act of trust, and it would be an evil, not a pious act, to repose that trust in a class of men by supposition so unworthy of it. One might as well entrust one's safety whilst journeying through a lonely district to a gang of robbers. Nor, again, is it conceivable that a Pope, even the worst Pope who has ever sat on the Chair of Peter, should permit, still less sanction the existence of such an Order, which would be a trap for souls, not an aid.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not deny that, if a Superior should at any time so abuse his office as to command the commission of a gross and palpable sin, the clause in the rule, "except where sin is seen to be present," would cover the case, and direct the subject what to do if he needed any direction. By the force of terms it would do this. But, as has been said, such abominations are too incredible to be met by special clauses in the rules, and the question therefore arises what is the kind of sin which St. Ignatius thought a Superior might possibly be led to command, or be thought to command? I may answer the question by putting another. Outside the Society does it not occasionally happen, that a good man, acting in perfect good faith, asks another to do what the other, rightly or wrongly, considers to be sinful? I say "rightly or wrongly," for the error of judgement may sometimes be on the side of the person asked. But whether he be right or wrong in his judgement, the obligation of the person asked remains the same. If he thinks that what he is asked to do is sinful, he must refuse, for he cannot do it without sin. He may indeed, on reconsideration, see solid grounds for changing his opinion, or he may feel that the other person being a man of much sounder judgement than himself and perfectly conscientious, he is safe in preferring his opinion to his own. But unless and until he can form his con-

science on sufficient grounds, he has no alternative save to refuse what is asked of him. Well then, if outside the Society a man in good faith may find himself placed thus in conflict with the conscience of another, is it so hard to conceive that similar conflicts may occasionally happen within the Society, and require to be dealt with in just the same way? At all events it is so, and the clause, "except where there is seen to be sin," stands on record to prove the care with which St. Ignatius has wished on such occasions to safeguard the consciences of his sons. But it will make this point perhaps clearer, if an illustration is given of the kind of conflict between a superior's order and a subject's conscience which might arise. The Society, of course, requires of those whom she sets to teach theology that they teach in conformity with the teaching of the Catholic Church. But there is a deal of matter lying beyond this boundary, in the way of deductions, philosophical explanations, and so forth. In regard to these latter she cannot appeal to the decisive authority of the Church which by supposition does not exist, and yet she may desire to secure a certain uniformity in the teaching of her young students, on the principle that, if their professors are always fighting one another, the pupils will only get mystified and learn little, instead of which it is much better that they should receive their first formation on the best-accepted system, and wait to compare it more fully with other systems later. But the carrying out of this sensible policy may incidentally bring the Superior into conflict with the conscience of one or other of the professors, who on being appointed to a chair might reply, "I cannot in conscience teach that doctrine, not believing it to be true." If the Superior insisted, that would be an instance in which the professor would be entitled to fall back on the excepting clause in the rule, and he would be very certain to do so. In fact, however, the Superior might be trusted not to insist. Possibly he might be a little irritated at what appeared to him the *bizarrerie* of the professor's views, but he would not think of doing more; he would merely turn to some

one else whose ideas were more in accordance with his requirements.

This slight sketch may assist to show that the qualities of obedience on which St. Ignatius lays stress, are not, as is widely supposed, unpleasant peculiarities in the obedience exacted among the Jesuits, but qualities which, though not perhaps in quite the same terms, are declared to be the marks of a perfect obedience all the world over. And, this being the case, the further allegation perishes with it, the allegation based surely on inference, not experience, that obedience in the Society has the effect of annihilating in the Jesuit the faculty of judging, of destroying the sense of responsibility which pre-supposes it, and so reducing him to a mere machine. It has been already shown that it has not that effect on the will, and it is quite as clear that it has it not as regards the judgement. Indeed, it has just the opposite effect. Most men when called upon to submit to arrangements made by another which run counter to their inclinations, having formed a view more at the bidding of their wishes and prejudices than of their reason, settle down into it with a perverse indolence from which there is no moving them. A Jesuit, if he is faithful to his rule, must rouse himself out of this mental torpor, fight against the distorting influence of bias, and take a wider and more searching survey of the evidence.

And it may be added that the effect of his Jesuit training is to qualify him considerably for this intelligible course. For his spiritual training tends to render his conscience delicate, his theological training tends to make him acute in detecting the presence of sin, where with the average man it would probably pass unobserved, whilst his constant changes from one residence to another, from one work to another, and from the condition of subject to that of superior, and *vice versa*, give him frequent opportunities of estimating the force of bias, and act as a corrective of one-sidedness.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, LONDON, S.E.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice

Monday, 2nd June, 1902

Before

MR. JUSTICE WILLS

and a SPECIAL JURY

VAUGHAN

v.

THE ROCK NEWSPAPER PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED

This was an action by the Rev. Father Bernard Vaughan, S.J., to recover damages for an alleged libel published in *The Rock* newspaper on August 23rd last, under the title of "Jesuit Outlaws." The defendants pleaded that the words used were not capable of the meaning placed upon them by the plaintiff, and that except in that sense they were not defamatory, and were published by them *bonâ fide* and without malice, and were fair comment on matters of public interest.

COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFF: *Sir Edward Clarke*, K.C., *Mr. Hugo Young*, K.C., and *Mr. Denis O'Conor.*

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT: *Mr. Blackwood Wright.*

[Transcript of the shorthand notes of Messrs. HODGES & SON, 87, Chancery Lane, W.C.]

The expense incurred in publishing this pamphlet has been met to some extent by private subscription.]

First Day, June 2, 1902.

Mr. Blackwood Wright.—My Lord, in this case I appear for *The Rock* Newspaper Printing Company. The position of affairs is this: The Solicitor who was preparing the briefs, and who was engaged in the matter, became ill, and he was so ill that he could not do his work. It was expected that he would be better, but on Thursday last he had to put the matter into the hands of another Solicitor, who has not had time to prepare the briefs. I was to have had two leaders, Mr. Macaskie and Mr. Horace Avory, and we are in this position at the last moment. My application is—and I asked Sir Edward Clarke if he could see his way to accede to it—that the matter should be adjourned for a short time, so that the Solicitor now instructing me might have time to prepare the briefs. I had hoped that Sir Edward Clarke could have seen his way to accede to it. The matter ought to have come on before Whitsuntide, when the original Solicitor was well, and it was adjourned then for Sir Edward's convenience—at least, so I am informed.

Sir Edward Clarke.—I am not aware of that fact. My Lord, this is really a very remarkable application. Issue was joined in January of this year, and since that time, of course, we have been preparing for trial.

I think that this gentleman who appears to have instructed my learned friend, but so far as I know has not yet instructed anybody else, is the third Solicitor upon the Record, so that I do not really feel sufficient confidence in the *bonâ fides* of the application—not, of course, on my learned friend's part.

Mr. Justice Wills.—There is no affidavit?

Sir Edward Clarke.—No, my Lord.

Mr. Justice Wills.—I am afraid it must go on.

Sir Edward Clarke. — My learned friend is just making a note, if your Lordship will allow us a few minutes.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Yes.

[*After an interval.*]

Mr. Justice Wills.—Well, Mr. Young, is this to go on or not?

Mr. Hugo Young.—It is for my learned friend to say, my Lord.

Mr. Blackwood Wright.—I am in this position. My lay client is just at the moment out of Court. If your Lordship did not see your way to an adjournment I thought I had arranged certain terms with Sir Edward Clarke, but it appears I was mistaken with regard to this, and now my learned friend, Mr. Hugo Young, offers me other terms. I have not had an opportunity of speaking to my client, and I cannot take the responsibility of accepting them.

Mr. Hugo Young.—It is not right that my friend should say that he had arranged terms with Sir Edward Clarke.

Mr. Blackwood Wright.—I do not think I said I had arranged. I said I thought I had arranged.

Mr. Justice Wills.—He said he thought he had arranged.

Mr. Hugo Young.—When Sir Edward Clarke was called into another Court just at the last moment to open a case before the Lord Chief Justice, my learned friend said "I suggest" so and so, and the last words of Sir Edward Clarke were "Put them down in writing and we will consider them." That is what your Lordship has been waiting for, and to say that any terms were arranged between Sir Edward Clarke and my learned friend is incorrect.

Mr. Blackwood Wright.—I hope your Lordship will think that I do not want to mislead you in any kind of way. I saw Sir Edward Clarke about an hour ago and had a talk with him then. I am told by my learned friend, Mr. Hugo Young, and I accept it entirely, that I am mistaken as to what I understood Sir Edward Clarke to say then. Mr. Young is quite right in saying that Sir Edward Clarke asked me to put it exactly in writing. I am sorry I cannot accept the offer, my Lord.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Then swear the Jury, and call the case on.

[*The Jury were then sworn.*]

Mr. Denis O'Conor opened the Pleadings.

Mr. Hugo Young.—May it please your Lordship, Gentlemen of the Jury, I was hoping that my clients would have had the advantage of this case being opened to you by Sir Edward Clarke, but unfortunately he is obliged to be in another Court at this moment on an important case, and therefore I must lay the facts before you. I had hoped just now that you would have been

saved the trouble of trying this case, by the Defendants being willing to make a reparation and withdrawal to Father Bernard Vaughan for this libel upon him which has appeared in *The Rock* newspaper, and of which you have heard, but that withdrawal is not forthcoming and you will have to decide whether in your opinion this libel is justified as a fair comment. The libel was published as long ago as the 23rd of August, 1901, and the Defendants have not thought fit in the action to say that it is true, and therefore they do not allege the truth of the allegations that were made against the Plaintiff, but they say that it is a fair comment. I should have thought under those circumstances that they might have acted now as gentlemen, and if they are not bold enough to come into Court and say that the allegations they have made are true, that they might have said, "We do not make these against an English gentleman."

Gentlemen of the Jury, Father Bernard Vaughan, who is at present one of the Jesuit Fathers, at Farm Street, Berkeley Square, in London, is a member of a very old English Catholic family. He is, I think, the eleventh of the fourteen children of Colonel Vaughan, of Courtfield, Herefordshire, and one of his brothers is our distinguished Cardinal Vaughan, who is so well known. He entered his training—it is called a novitiate—as a Jesuit in 1868, and went through the severe training of character, and of education, which all Jesuits are obliged to go through, before he was ordained a priest, and commenced his duties. Gentlemen, that training is one of a very severe character, because every effort is made in that Order to take care that the people who have to take up the duties which are the especial duties of the Jesuits, namely, acting as priests, and preaching, and especially

in the education of youth, should all be people who are in the highest degree trained and fitted for that work. That training would take some twelve or fourteen years. After that he went to Manchester, and for eighteen years carried on the ordinary work of a priest in that district, performing the ordinary duties that you know a priest or parson does perform in the country—of a clergyman of any denomination attending to the religious duties of a certain district.

Now I think it is perhaps desirable, in dealing with a matter of this kind, to point out to you at once exactly what a Jesuit is. When you say a man is a Jesuit many people have got a sort of idea that a Jesuit is something, so far as doctrine is concerned, separate and distinct in itself; exactly the same as you would say a Methodist would be different in doctrine from a member of the Church of England or a member of the Roman Catholic Church. But that is not so with regard to Jesuits. So far as their religious teaching is concerned, so far as the doctrines which they hold are concerned, they are simply the doctrines of the Roman Catholic body generally. No layman of any kind or description can be a Jesuit. When I say can be a Jesuit, I mean in the ordinary sense of the word in which it is understood as a member of the Jesuit Order. There are certain servants and people of that sort who in a sense may be called members of the Order—what are called Lay Brothers and people attached to the Order for the purpose of doing domestic and menial work—but in the ordinary sense in which you speak of a Jesuit, he is merely a member of a religious Order in the Roman Catholic Church. There are many religious Orders: Franciscans, Benedictines, and various other Orders of monks, who live in communities and attach themselves

to the particular rule of a particular founder for the purpose of regulating their order of life. All those hold the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, just the same as, I understand, that in the Church of England there are Orders of people who call themselves by certain names, and they are members of the Church of England, but for their own mode of life they adopt a certain rule of life, and call themselves by some particular name. So with the Jesuits. They were an Order established especially for preaching, especially for priestly duties, especially for the education of youth; living together in community, observing certain rules and constitutions which are the regulations of their Order, but in no sense in the world holding any religious doctrines different from all other members of the Roman Catholic religion, of which they are only a portion, and all those people, being Roman Catholics in every sense of the word, are simply guided by their own constitutions and rules.

Now another thing I desire to point out to you, gentlemen, at the outset is this: that there is nothing at all secret in reference to the Jesuits. There are what are called their vows, by which they bind themselves to the rules of the Order. They undertake to observe certain things, and all their constitutions are public property. Anybody can go and read them in the library of the British Museum if they have not access to any other library where they are, and one great desire in bringing this action before a public Court is that my learned friend may have the opportunity, when he sees Father Bernard Vaughan in the box, of asking him any of these questions, and making against him any of these imputations which it is so easy to make in a newspaper, where no contradiction can

then be given, and where no explanation can be given as to the alleged sources of information in books, or otherwise, upon which these allegations are founded.

Now, gentlemen, that being so I will read to you the libel which has been published of Father Vaughan. On the 23rd August, 1901, this libel appeared in *The Rock* newspaper ; and I should tell you, in order that you may understand the meaning of it, that for a considerable time attacks have been made upon the alleged doctrines of the Jesuit body, as though they were some doctrines separate in themselves, as distinct from Roman Catholic doctrines ; and a great many attacks have been made with alleged quotations from writers, and matters of that kind, which, as a rule, are generally easily explained by showing that misquotations are made from writings, passages omitted which explain certain other passages, and wrong translations of the Latin, in which some of them were originally written. Those are all matters which I need say nothing about. Let them say what they like on such points : they do nobody any very great harm ; but at last several papers made personal attacks upon individuals, and you will understand that that is a very different thing. It is open to anybody to attack matters of religious teaching or political teaching, or anything of that kind, as much as they like, but when they come to make personal attacks upon individuals it is an entirely different matter.

The Chatham and Rochester News had made an attack upon Father Bernard Vaughan, and had alleged that as a Jesuit he had taken a certain form of oath. That was absolutely false, and Father Vaughan brought an action for libel against *The Chatham and Rochester News* for alleging that he had taken that oath which was one that,

if he had taken it, would rather seem to show he was a person against whom certain things could have been said. But, gentlemen, the simple answer was, "I never took such an oath. There is no such oath. There is no such oath ever thought of or known among the Jesuits." In that action there was an apology, and the costs were paid. Then another libel appeared against another Jesuit, Father Gerard, also of Farm Street, a gentleman well known from his very high attainments as a writer; and it was alleged that his word was not to be taken for anything he said. Again in that action there was an apology, a payment of money into Court, and the costs of the action were paid.

Now that being the position on the 23rd of August this libel was published. The gentleman was, of course, indignant because those apologies and those withdrawals had been made of allegations for which there was no foundation, and which they knew they could not face and justify in open Court. The libel was headed "Jesuit Outlaws," and runs as follows: "Words fail to express the amazement with which I hear of the various actions taken and threatened by Jesuits in this country. Pray, sir, have we, as a nation, completely abandoned even ordinary common sense? Is there not one lawyer to come forward and to remind the British public that Jesuits are outlaws, and their pretended 'actions' null and void?" Gentlemen, that is an allegation that a Jesuit in this country has no right at all to bring any action. It is a very extraordinary proposition to put forward, but I will tell you just what the foundation for that is. Some years ago, in the year 1829, before most of us were born, there was an Act of Parliament which was passed giving a considerable measure of relief to the Roman Catholic subjects of this

country in matters where they had been under very great restrictions before, but in that Act of Parliament it was thought right not to withdraw the restrictions so far as concerned various religious bodies—not Jesuits only, but various religious communities of men who were established in this country; and without taking you in detail through the Act of Parliament, which was considered only very recently before the Lord Chief Justice and two other Judges in a case of *The King* v. *Kennedy*, I may tell you generally what the effect of that Act was. The effect of that Act was this: that religious men who were in the country at that time in 1829 had to register their names, and then, having registered their names, they might remain in the country. There was also a law passed that none of these gentlemen who had been admitted members of these religious Orders out of the country were to be allowed to come into the country; and there was another law that no members of these Orders, of which the Jesuits were one, were to be admitted members of the Order in this country, and if they did break that law they were liable to be sent out of the country—"banished for life" were the words of the Act of Parliament—that is, if they were convicted. But, of course, as you know, gentlemen, nobody in this country is entitled to say to a person "You are a thief" unless he has been convicted and proved to be a thief; and even if one of these Jesuits, or a member of any other Order, had come within that law so that he had to be banished the country, until that order had been made, and until that conviction and banishment had been recorded against him, in no sense of the word could he be called an outlaw, and even then (under the direction of my Lord) I should say it was not open

to anybody to allege all sorts of injurious things against his character, and, if they were alleged against him he would have redress. But, gentlemen, let me tell you this: From the year 1829, although it has been known that members of these different Orders were in the country, and although it has been recognized, and they have taken part in the public work of the country in many ways, no single prosecution has ever been brought against any one of those gentlemen for either coming to this country as a member of an Order or for being admitted in this country. There is no doubt that in some ways it might be said to be a useful provision to keep on the shelf ready for use if the occasion arose; but these are not times when we attack people and banish people for their religious opinions, and so long as the members of these religious Orders go on as they have been doing now for many years, conducting themselves as English gentlemen, doing spiritual work in the country, and in the education of youth, and causing nobody any trouble or annoyance, you will not be surprised to hear that those laws have not been enforced, and, gentlemen, they never have been enforced. An attempt was made some little time ago to proceed under that Act, but the Magistrate before whom it came exercised his discretion in refusing to issue a summons. That came before the Lord Chief Justice, as I mentioned just now, and two other Judges, and they upheld the decision of the Magistrate, and would not direct, as was asked, that an order should be made that the Magistrate should be compelled to issue a summons in that case.

Now, gentlemen, that is the only justification for the allegation that Father Bernard Vaughan is an outlaw, and not entitled to redress if he is libelled. Then it

goes on: "We read with pain the letter in *The Ladies' League Gazette*, in which Mr. Thurston (S.J.) was permitted to insult our illustrious dead by terming Robert Ware a 'convicted forger,' and, by inference, to defame the memories of many of our most eminent men of letters—all of them men both hated and dreaded by the infamous sons of Loyola." Loyola was the founder of the Order of Jesuits, and they are called "infamous sons of Loyola." Gentlemen, I need not take you through the matters of literary controversy in which Father Thurston engaged, but I only point out that that is used in order to point a finger against all Jesuits by calling them infamous. "These supplied Sir James Ware with documents, and their honour was never questioned by their own contemporaries, either at home or abroad. Against them Jesuit calumny has for the first time in history been accorded an even partial hearing. Emboldened by the impunity of success, this outlaw next calls upon the editor of *The Ladies' League Gazette* for an apology, and threatens the committee of the Ladies' League with legal proceedings, in order to ascertain what protection the laws of their country afford the Jesuits." Then there was a footnote put to that which I ought to read now—it is at the end of the Statement of Claim: "See their constitutions, where, it is said, in more than five hundred places they are told to regard their General as God. See also the Papal Bulls dispensing them from all obedience to temporal rulers." Gentlemen, let me say this at once, that these allegations in the way they are put forward—I will not stop to explain them or go into a controversy with you—are not true, and Father Bernard Vaughan shall go into the box and say so. It is not for me to take him through all these allegations, but any one, or

any number that my learned friend desires to ask Father Vaughan about he will give his answer, which will show it is a gross libel and calumny to impute things of the sort to Father Bernard Vaughan as a Jesuit, as he is, and an English gentleman in this country. Then it goes on—"The Jesuits! Men who own no nationality, no law save the will of their own General, who were the sole cause of two revolutions here, and who every day perpetrate crimes against our laws and constitution by inciting Romanists to rebellion and to another civil war; men who introduced the shameful Canon Law of Rome into Ireland, and who are directly accountable for all the bloodshed which necessarily followed (see Lord R. Montagu's *Scylla or Charybdis*, Miss Cusack's *Black Pope*, Massey's *Secret History of Romanism*, &c., &c., &c.); men who have defied all authority, and to whom we owe the whole of our present troubles and perplexities! The Jesuits claim 'protection' against the free Press and against that free speech to gain which our ancestors shed their blood! 'The revolution of 1868 was made to the cry of "Death to the Jesuits,"' writes the Jesuit historian, Joly. 'England had waded through a sea of blood to obtain liberty of conscience' (*Poor Gentlemen of Liege*, vol. vi. pp. 75–6). We have looked for a crushing rejoinder from the Ladies' League, but so far we have been disappointed." Now, gentlemen, we come to where the application of all these charges against the Jesuits is pointed against Father Vaughan. "Consequently another of these outlaws, Mr. Bernard Vaughan (one steeped in sedition) 'commences an action' against the editor of *The Chatham and Rochester News*. Why has the truth been kept from that editor? that is, that even were the Oath proved false (and it never was) Jesuits

cannot be libelled. They are outlaws, and outlaws have no legal rights, either as corporations or as individuals." Just let me point out that though the libel contains this allegation, though the libel says, "Is there not one lawyer to come forward and to remind the public that all these actions are null and void," when they are brought to book—when this case is brought into Court they themselves dare not come forward, and have not come forward, to say that this action does not lie, and to raise that point.

Mr. Macaskie.—My Lord, within the last five minutes I have had a brief in this matter on behalf of the Defendants put into my hands. I understand that an application has already been made to your Lordship for an adjournment in this case, which would be, of course, I know, a very great indulgence; but, my Lord, I do feel that under the circumstances it is impossible, without an adjournment, to effectually deal with this case, and I would, although I understand an application has been made without, offer to pay the costs of the day.

Mr. Justice Wills.—No, there has been no ground alleged for it. Certain statements have been made, but they are statements which, if they were to be acted upon, ought to have been made on affidavit, and there is no excuse for their not being on affidavit; therefore, of course, I cannot act upon them. The case must go on.

Mr. Macaskie.—I think I could prove by the gentleman who, I understand, is the editor, or managing director, of the Defendant Company that he has had occasion to change his solicitors.

Mr. Justice Wills.—But it is too late. He ought to have made a proper affidavit at the proper time.

Mr. Macaskie.—Of course your Lordship must decide it, but I should have thought that no injustice could be

done to the other side by any adjournment until to-morrow morning upon the terms of every penny of detriment being reimbursed to them.

Mr. Justice Wills.—By to-morrow morning—and this case is not likely to be finished by then—you will be in a position to go on?

Mr. Macaskie.—What I feel about that is this, that within a very few minutes my learned friend will have concluded his opening, and it will be exceedingly difficult for me then and there, without having read the brief, or the proofs—I do not know whether I have any proofs—to cross-examine the Plaintiff, or any other witness put into the box.

Mr. Justice Wills.—You must wait and see. No ground whatever has been suggested for delay, and there is no material here for making this application.

Mr. Hugo Young.—I desire to leave myself in your Lordship's hands about the matter. I should be very sorry indeed for it to be suggested that for any reason——

Mr. Justice Wills.—Now that we have begun let us go on, at all events until the time comes for cross-examining.

Mr. Hugo Young.—I desire to say that I am quite willing that the case should stand over for my learned friend, although I do not understand how he comes to be in the position in which he is. I am perfectly willing to leave myself in your Lordship's hands entirely, and I will not oppose his application at all.

Mr. Justice Wills.—I have no other case in my paper to-day, and I must go on with it until it becomes necessary to adjourn it.

Mr. Hugo Young.—I do not want it to be suggested

that I am anxious to put my learned friend in an awkward position, and I would consent. I should like this case to be thoroughly dealt with. Why this was left to the last moment like this I do not understand.

Now, gentlemen, that is the libel which they have published, and I was pointing out to you that they have not attempted to allege the truth, they have not attempted to prove that Father Bernard Vaughan is not in every shape or form a perfectly loyal and good subject of His Majesty, like all the other Jesuits I believe to be in this country. I defy my learned friend, whatever his instructions are at any time—and I should like him to be fully instructed upon the point, in order that it may be thoroughly threshed out—to point to anything which indicates that it is right or fair to allege, as this does, that the Jesuits own no nationality ; that they own no will except the will of their own General ; and that they are steeped in sedition, or any other of the imputations which are made. Gentlemen, it will be found that their preaching and their teaching is obedience to the law and respect to princes and kings in every shape and form. It is suggested here that they regard nobody but their own General, and the obedience which they owe to the head of their Order is often pointed to as though it was something most anomalous and something most extraordinary. The obedience that they owe to their General is of the nature of the obedience that every soldier owes to his General, and that everybody who belongs to any sort of institution must owe to the person who has to direct their movements. The suggestion that they owe any obedience to their General when it becomes a question of his ordering them to do something that is sinful or wrong is another matter. My learned friend will inquire, and he will find

that there is no such suggestion of anything of that sort; but in matters of discipline, as to ordering them to go here, there, and everywhere as they may be ordered to go—to the furthest parts of the earth to preach the Gospel—there is, of course, discipline. In these matters which are mere matters of guidance, and not directing them to do that which is wrong, then as a general rule they owe obedience to their General in the same way as, I say, a soldier owes obedience to his General in the field.

Now, gentlemen, the answer they make to this is simply this: They first of all say they do not admit they printed and published it. Well, they have since admitted that they did. We had to deliver interrogatories to them; they would not admit it until we delivered interrogatories in order to compel them to answer on oath, and when they had to do that, they said, Do not serve the interrogatories on us—we will admit it. It went into Chambers, and that Order would have been made, but they admitted they did print it. Then they deny "that the said words are capable of the meaning alleged in paragraph 2 of the statement of claim or of any other defamatory meaning." What it was alleged they meant, and I think you will agree it is a fair interpretation, was this: "Meaning thereby that the Plaintiff was a seditious and disloyal person who repudiated all obligation to obey the laws of England and who incited the Roman Catholic subjects of the King to rebellion and civil war and was an infamous person with no legal rights who could be libelled with impunity." Then they say, "The said words without the said alleged meaning are not defamatory of the Plaintiff. The said words if published formed part of a letter written to the editor of *The Rock* newspaper by

a correspondent on a matter of public concern, and the said words were published, if at all, *bonâ fide* and without malice, and the position and character of the Plaintiff were and are matters of public interest, and the Defendants will at the trial crave leave to refer to the whole of the said letter." Of course they are entitled to have the whole of the said letter, and if it is not all set out in the statement of claim it certainly shall be put before you if they wish it.

Gentlemen, in commenting upon a matter of public interest—and I will allow for the purpose of argument that the position of a Jesuit may be such a matter—they are not allowed to make imputations upon his personal character and upon his personal honour, and say he is a seditious person ; that he incites to rebellion ; breaks the laws of the country, and does not recognize the laws of the country—they are not allowed to make those sort of imputations by way of what they call comment unless they are founded on fact, and if they are founded on fact should have come forward to prove those facts ; but if they are not founded on fact, as we must assume because they have not ventured to allege they are true, why in the world do they stand here and still seem, as it were, to persist in making these imputations upon a respectable English gentleman when they do not allege they have any proof to support them ?

Gentlemen, I will not detain you longer in opening this case before you, because I shall see more what line my learned friend takes when he has an opportunity of cross-examining Father Bernard Vaughan. All I can say is that if anybody knows anything about the Jesuits it is Father Bernard Vaughan. My learned friend may take it from me that he is a person who is

thoroughly acquainted with everything ; he is a member of the Order as fully as he can be a member of the Order ; he is fully acquainted with everything they do, the nature of the vows they take, the nature of the constitutions which form the basis of their Order, all of which are matters which I say are not secret, but which may be read in the British Museum by you, or anybody in Court, to-morrow morning, and he will explain any matter to my learned friend in connection with them. He is open to attack on all points, and he has sought this occasion of having an opportunity in public Court of answering these and many other foul calumnies which are hurled against him and other members of his Order.

FATHER BERNARD VAUGHAN SWORN.

Examined by Mr. Denis O'Conor.

Q.—You are the Plaintiff in this action ?

A.—I am.

Q.—You are, I think, the seventh son of Colonel Vaughan, of Courtfield ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Vaughans are descendants of Margaret Pole, the Plantagenet, who was executed in the Tower for her religion in 1541 ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were admitted to be a Jesuit in 1868 ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And since then you have been in the Order or Society of Jesus ?

A.—I have.

Q.—You have taken a prominent part in that Society ?

A.—I have.

Q.—Will you tell me what positions you have occupied, and where you have been ?

A.—Since I first joined ?

Q.—You were admitted in 1868?

A.—In 1868 I took my first simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. After my vows I spent three years in the study of philosophy at one of our colleges for the purpose. Then I was teaching at Stonyhurst College, in Lancashire, for two years. After that I went to another college of ours called Beaumont College, Old Windsor, where I taught boys the humanities for four years, I think. After that I went to St. Beunos, in North Wales, to study my theology, and I was in theology for four years, at the end of three years being ordained. After that I went to Beaumont College again on the staff of authority, and at the end of that year I was what I may call put through the mill again—that is, I went back again for another year to the noviceship, where my time was principally taken up in all sorts of work, household work and spiritual work, but not much study or teaching.

Q. After that where did you go?

A.—Studying the institute of the Society amongst other things. Then at the end of that time I went to the Holy Name, Manchester, and I was at that church, I think, about eighteen years, being Rector of the church and of the various houses in connection with the church.

Q.—And doing missionary work?

A.—Doing missionary work principally. That was till a year ago. After that I left Manchester, and was translated to the staff at 114, Mount Street, which works the church in Farm Street.

Q.—You are there now?

A.—I am there on the staff now.

Q.—During all these years you have had full opportunity of knowing the Jesuit constitutions, their rules and the vows they take, and so on, and is it in any way true to say that the Jesuits, or that you, as a Jesuit, teach disloyalty?

A.—No; I was going to say we were what many people would think Jingoes.

Q.—You have read this article in *The Rock* about which you brought the action?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are the suggestions there made either true as regards

yourself, or true as regards any of the Jesuits that you have known?

Mr. Macaskie.—This is not a class action.

Mr. Denis O'Conor.—No. (To the witness.)—It is perfectly untrue to say either that you are disloyal, or that you in any way encourage revolution or get people to perpetrate crimes, and so on?

A.—Absolutely untrue of myself as of every other member I ever met.

Mr. Macaskie.—Now I am in your Lordship's hands.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Can you get some distance with your cross-examination?

Mr. Macaskie.—Really, my Lord, I do not think I can. I am exceedingly sorry, and so far as money can avail of course the other side ought to be reimbursed every penny of the expense they are put to.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Then we will go on at half-past ten to-morrow morning.

Mr. Macaskie.—I am much obliged to your Lordship.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Of course, if any additional expense should be proved I reserve that to the end.

Mr. Macaskie.—I am much obliged.

Mr. Justice Wills.—If there had been any affidavit I should have listened to this application at the proper time, but I think there is no excuse whatever.

Mr. Macaskie.—I in no way venture to differ from what your Lordship has said.

[*Adjourned to to-morrow morning at* 10.30.]

Father Vaughan in the Witness-Box.

Father Bernard Vaughan, having in his examination-in-chief by Mr. Denis O'Conor, given particulars as to his entrance into the Society and the employments he has fulfilled in it, was cross-examined by Mr. Macaskie, K.C.

Q.—You are a natural-born British subject, are you not?

A.—I am.

Q.—How long have you been a member of the Society of Jesus?

A.—Since 1868.

Q.—You were admitted in 1868, I think?

A.—I took my first vows in 1868.

Q.—Does that constitute admission?

A.—Yes; up to that it is a noviceship that we pass through.

Q.—Have you a licence from the Secretary of State to reside in this country?

A.—No direct licence.

Q.—Have you any indirect licence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And what is it, may I ask?

A.—I should say this—that the law against us is a very technical law, and that on the authority of the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and Lord John Russell this law was never meant to be put in force unless it was set in motion by the Attorney-General.

Q.—Your view is that these eminent personages may overrule the Statute?

A.—That is not my view.

Q.—Be that as it may, have you got any licence from the Secretary of State?

A.—I have not.

Mr. Justice Wills.—He has already said so.

Q.—When was your attention first drawn to this letter?

A.—I fancy in the week when it was published.

Q.—I suppose I may take it that you are not a reader of *The Rock?*

A.—I sometimes read it when I want a little fun. (Laughter.)

Q.—You do not read it for "improvement"?

A.—Oh, not to improve my mind. (Laughter.)

Q.—I suppose you do not recommend your pupils or your flock to read it?

A.—I treat it with silent contempt.

Q.—I suppose you would not approve of their reading it?

A.—If they liked to read it, I think it would do them no harm.

Q.—You do not, I say, recommend them to read it?

A.—No.

Q.—Would you approve of their reading it?

A.—Yes, I should quite approve of their reading it.

Q.—Do you know Mr. Thurston, a member of your Society?

A.—If you mean Father Thurston, I know him.

Q.—Had he been corresponding in *The Ladies' League Gazette?*

A.—I think he wrote a letter or two.

Q.—Making an attack, we need not trouble whether it was right or wrong, on one Mr. Robert Ware?

A.—I should not say making an attack upon him, but rather answering his difficulties.

Q.—At all events it was not a very complimentary letter to Mr. Ware?

A.—I really cannot tell you, because I forget the details of it.

Q.—Do you know that he had called on *The Ladies' League Gazette* for an apology, and threatened legal proceedings?

A.—Yes, I think so.

Q.—Do you know what kind of paper it is?

A.—I should say it was emphatically a Low Church paper.

Q.—You yourself, in consequence of something written in *The Chatham and Rochester News*, brought an action against that paper which was afterwards settled?

Mr. Hugo Young.—My learned friend should not say it was settled; they apologized and paid the costs.

Q.—Were there any damages? Did you get any damages? My learned friend wishes to have the terms.

A.—I forget about the damages. I do not know whether there was £10 or not.

Q.—In this letter of which you complain I see this quotation from the Act of 1829:—

> "And be it further enacted, that if any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order, community, or society, as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, come into this realm, he shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of misdemeanour, and being thereof lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life."

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you aware of the terms of the Act of 1829 when you were admitted?

A.—Do you mean when I was admitted into the Society?

Q.—Yes.

A.—Well, I had heard something about it; but, as I said, it had never been put into operation.

Mr. Macaskie.—I will not trouble you to repeat what you said. Have you since heard more particularly what the terms of the Statute are?

A.—Yes, I have heard more about it.

Q.—I see the letter of which you complain says this: "Upon this Joly coolly remarks, 'the Jesuits knew that it was particularly directed against themselves, but they made no account of it'" (vol. v.). Who is Joly?

A.—I have no idea who or what he is.

Q.—Then it goes on:—

> "The present 'Relief Bill,' generally known as the 'Jesuit Relief Bill,' aims at the total abolition of the above clause, with some others of the few remaining barriers against the Papal invasion."

Was there a Bill, then pending in Parliament, for the purpose, among other things, of repealing that Section?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—You have made no inquiry whether there was a Bill such as I have indicated here, called the Relief Bill, then pending in Parliament?

A.—No.

Q.—Either for the purpose of amending the Act of 1829, or of giving any other relief?

A.—I have really neither bothered or inquired about the matter.

Q.—Now, turning to the last paragraph I see the words: "Following the example of Messrs. Thurston and Vaughan, Mr. Gerard announces his intention of vindicating his character by taking action against *The Methodist Weekly*." That was so?

A.—Yes, that was so.

Q.—*The Methodist Weekly* had said something about the Jesuits also, had it not?

A.—Yes, I believe it had.

Q.—Now did you notice when you read this correspondent's

letter that it appeared not as an article but as a letter to the editor?

A.—I really forget all about that detail.

Q.—You attach so little importance to this tremendous libel that you forget all about it?

A.—I forget all the details about it: whether it appeared as an article or as a letter I can't say.

Q.—You know now that it was not an article but a letter in the correspondents' column?

A.—You tell me it was a letter in the correspondents' column.

Q.—Do you doubt it?

A.—No, I believe it.

Q.—You believe it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And I suppose you know also that the letters which there appear are headed by the following warning words at the top of the column: "Letters to the Editor. The Editor disclaims responsibility for opinions expressed in these columns." You know that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Therefore I suppose you took this letter as expressing the opinion not of the editor of the paper, but of the correspondent who had written to him?

A.—When I first brought this action I had not seen this announcement at the top of the letter.

Q.—I dare say; but you have seen it since?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—And I suppose, having seen it, you understood that the letter which is complained of was the letter of the correspondent, and not one for which the editor accepted responsibility?

A.—It is quite so.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Can that make any difference in law?

Mr. Macaskie.—Not in law, my Lord.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Nor in common sense. (Laughter.)

Q.—Now, will you tell me what are the portions of this letter of which you really seriously complain? May I take it, going through them one by one, that the expression "Steeped in sedition" is the first?

A.—Yes, that is the most seriously important.

Q.—Did you read *The Rock* for September 6th?

A.—I really cannot tell you that.

Q.—Do you know that *The Rock* apologized for the use of those words?

Mr. Hugo Young.—I object to the question unless my friend puts in the paper.

Mr. Macaskie.—I have not yet offered to put it in?

Mr. Hugo Young.—I know; but my Lord will keep you within proper bounds.

Mr. Macaskie.—I am sure of that. *The Rock* subsequently expressed its regret?

Mr. Hugo Young.—I object to this unless my learned friend puts the paper in.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Yes, I think that must be done.

Mr. Macaskie.—Did you read *The Rock* for September 6th?

A.—I say I cannot tell you whether I did or did not, because I do not carry the details of the different issues in my mind.

Q.—It was the week after the libel.

A.—If you will tell me the substance of the letter or of the passage to which you refer, I could then say whether I had or had not read it.

Q.—It was an article referring to the use of the words, "steeped in sedition."

A.—If you are hinting at some kind of lame apology that was made in the paper, I remember that.

Q.—Did you read the lame apology?

A.—I did; and I beg to say that the charge was brought once more.

Q.—I have not asked you to say anything yet. As my learned friend insists upon it, I think I must now put the paper in. The paragraph runs as follows:—

"Libel Action against *The Rock*.—Our position as regards the Jesuits.—An unfortunate oversight.—On Saturday last, August 31st, we received a letter from a firm of solicitors stating that they were instructed by the Reverend Bernard Vaughan to commence an action against us for the libel contained in our issue of the 23rd ult.; and requesting the name of our solicitors for service of the writ by return of post. The writ was duly served on Tuesday morning on our solicitors. As the statement

of claim has not yet been delivered, we can only hazard a guess as to what this action is based upon. We presume it applies to a letter from a correspondent signed 'Pro Aris et Focis.' Although the place in which this communication appeared is a free column, and we therein expressly disclaim responsibility for the opinions of our correspondents, it is our practice to carefully expunge any statement which appears inadmissible, or any phrase even which seems too strongly worded. In the present instance we regret to find that there is a phrase of three words which, by an oversight, was not deleted. We repudiate the view of our correspondent that this phrase is applicable to the Reverend Bernard Vaughan. We should be sorry to think that Mr. Vaughan personally could be described as 'seditious' in any popular acceptation of the word. Wondering what possible justification there could be for such a phrase, we at once telegraphed to our correspondent, who lives in a remote country district, to state at once what evidence there was, if any, to warrant its use. This correspondent telegraphs, in reply, there is 'no hurry.'"

I see there they express their regret that that phrase "steeped in sedition" had not been, owing to an oversight, deleted, and repudiating the view that it is applicable to you, and saying that they would be sorry to think that Mr. Vaughan personally could be described as seditious in any fair acceptation of the word. You did not, I think, accept that apology?

A.—I did not.

Q.—And you do not to-day?

A.—No.

Mr. Hugo Young.—I think you ought to read the whole of it.

Mr. Macaskie.—Certainly. It goes on dealing with the general question.

"We entirely disagree with our correspondent on the point, and take the earliest possible opportunity, in this, our first issue since the oversight has come under our personal notice, of expressing our regret for the publication of the obnoxious phrase."

This in larger type:—

"While admitting this point, and hastening to do our duty in this incidental matter, we honestly believe that the Jesuits have not a legal status in this country, and we are prepared to contest this point (which is the main position of our correspondent's letter) on its merits. There is no doubt whatever that the efforts

of the Jesuits have been devoted to setting the authority of the Pope above that of the King and constitution of this country in matters of religion. Were the statute laws of this country enforced as they ought to be enforced, no Jesuit could reside within the four seas, and if he attempted to do so he would be liable to punishment, and if he persisted, to penal servitude for life. To confirm our view we quote from Stephens' *Digest of the Criminal Law*, Article 90 : 'Every Jesuit, and every member of any other religious order, community, or society of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, who comes into this realm commits a misdemeanour, and is liable, upon conviction thereof, to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life. . . . Every person ordered to be banished who does not depart from the United Kingdom within thirty days may be removed to such place as Her Majesty, by the advice of her Privy Council, directs. Every person ordered to be banished who is found at large in the United Kingdom after three months from such order is liable to penal servitude for life as a maximum punishment.'"

Q.—Did you accept the apology ?

A.—I did not accept that apology.

Q.—And do not to-day ?

A.—No.

Q.—(To plaintiff.)—What is the next passage you complain of—the expression "outlaw" ?

A.—Yes, I complain of that also.

Q.—You know that the Act of Parliament does forbid your presence in this country ?

A.—Yes, there is a technical objection.

Q.—Whether it is technical or not, we shall see.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Well, that is not being an outlaw.

Mr. Macaskie.—I do not say it is. (To plaintiff.)—Has this action been brought by order of your superiors ?

A.—No, it has been brought by my order.

Q.—By your order ?

A.—Yes ; with permission of my superiors, I put the case into the hands of the solicitors who used to act for my father, and now act for my brother, the Cardinal.

Q.—You have the permission of your superiors ?

A.—I have the permission of my superiors.

Q.—You told us yesterday that you had taken, on your admission into the Society, vows, amongst others, of poverty ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That involves, does it not, that your property, if and when acquired, goes to your ecclesiastical superiors, or to the Society?

Plaintiff.—May I be permitted to answer this question not quite directly?

Mr. Macaskie.—Answer it in your own way.

Plaintiff.—Well, we perform what we call an act of renunciation when we take our vows, and we leave what property is to come to us to any person or charity we like; it does not necessarily go to the Society. But we have nothing which we can claim as our own after our vows.

Q.—In other words, your property when acquired goes either to charity or other purposes?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have not suffered any pecuniary damage from this libel?

A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Or as far as you know that anybody else knows of?

A.—I am not so sure about that.

Q.—Can you suggest any pecuniary damage to the extent of one farthing that you have personally suffered from this libel?

A.—I can suggest that some persons, reading that I was accused of being "steeped in sedition," might refuse to give me what they had intended to offer for my works of charity.

Q.—You mean for charitable works?

A.—Yes, for my charitable works.

Q.—I asked you about pecuniary damage?

A.—I do not quite understand your question.

Mr. Justice Wills.—I should think the worst part of the libel in connection with pecuniary damages is the use of the word "outlaw," because that would imply a direct encouragement to others to believe that Jesuits as outlaws could not be libelled.

Q.—Of course that has to be dealt with, my Lord.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Yes.

Mr. Macaskie (to plaintiff).—You have not, I apprehend, lost the hospitality of any friend or acquaintance in consequence of that libel?

A.—How can I answer such a question as that?

Q.—I mean, of course, that you know of?

A.—Well, no one has actually written to tell me so. (Laughter.)

Q.—Do you suggest without their writing to tell you so that any one has refused you hospitality or withdrawn it?

A.—Persons who are bigoted and narrow-minded might have so done.

Q.—Might have done: have they?

A.—That I cannot answer for certain.

Q.—Can you name one?

A.—With certainty I cannot name one.

Q.—You do not complain of that part of the letter which deals with the expulsion of the Jesuits from France, do you, Father Vaughan?

A.—In the libel case I do not.

Q.—Do you accept the view that there is no distinction to be drawn between Jesuits and Roman Catholics?

A.—There is none whatever, except that we as regulars have a stricter rule of life.

Q.—You will not deny that in other countries, as well as in England, it has been the practice to draw distinction between the two?

A.—By those misinformed, yes.

Q.—For good reasons or bad the Society has had the misfortune, from time to time, to be expelled from nearly every country in Europe?

A.—That is so.

Q.—And even, I think, had the misfortune, in the year 1773, to be suppressed by Bull of Pope Clement XIV.?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you acquainted with the writings of Marianus de Luca?

A.—Yes, I am.

Q.—I think his book on Ecclesiastical Law has received the imprimatur of Signor Carini, the Chief of the Roman Province of your Society?

A.—Yes, it has.

Q.—That imprimatur was given so lately as 1900?

A.—Yes.

(Counsel then put to witness passages from "The Institutions of Canon Law," by Marianus de Luca, Professor of the Text of the Decretals in the Gregorian University, Rome, and bearing the imprimatur of the then Provincial, since deceased, Professor Carini.)

Q.—(To plaintiff).—In the view of your Society the Church has the power of the sword to punish heresy?

A.—Speculatively, yes.

Q.—And by punishment I suppose is meant censure, excommunication, fine, exile, and if need be, death?

A.—Yes, quite so.

Q.—Does this express the correct view: "Heretics despise excommunication, and say that that bolt is powerless; if you threaten them with a pecuniary fine, they neither fear God nor respect man, knowing that they will find fools enough to believe them and support them. If you imprison them or send them into exile they will corrupt those near them with their words and those at a distance with their books, so the only remedy is to send them soon to their own place."

A.—No, that certainly does not express the correct view.

Q.—In what respect does it not express the correct view?

A.—Your quotation, I believe, is from de Luca's book?

Q.—It is a quotation from Bellarmine.

Plaintiff.—May I ask, are you quoting it from de Luca's book?

Mr. Macaskie.—Yes, certainly.

Plaintiff.—May I then say I am glad to have this opportunity of publicly stating that I reject and repudiate all the speculative theories and views to be found in Father de Luca's book as monstrous anachronisms? My Lord, may I explain myself?

Mr. Justice Wills.—You may.

Plaintiff.—I beg then to inform the Court that Father de Luca is set down on the title-page of this book as "Professor Textus Decretalium," which means that he explains to his students the text and meaning of the Decretals which form a main part of the Canon Law of the Church. These Decretals, let me add, date many of them from the Theodosian and Justinian codes. They were first gathered into a Corpus Juris in 1153 by Gratian, and were finally republished with additions in

1313 by Clement V. Now let me remind you that in these Decretals were embodied the provisions of the Theodosian and Justinian codes, which made heresy a civil crime punishable with death. I beg, therefore, to be allowed to say that these Decretals formed part of the Common Law of the Christian States of Europe two centuries before Jesuits ever came into existence at all. In Father de Luca's book, then, there is nothing new, nothing original. The Father Provincial could not withhold his imprimatur just because there was nothing new in the book. The book is simply a reproduction and compilation from ancient authors on Canon Law, and is based on the ancient laws which regulated the relations between Church and State in a bygone day which can never reappear in the future. So that I may say, with Cardinal Manning, since the unity of Christendom was broken up the use of persecution for those who hold religious opinions contrary to ourselves would be a crime and a heresy. (Cheers, which were suppressed.)

Mr. Macaskie (to plaintiff).—Has not your Order practically acted on these principles in the past?

A.—No; it has not.

Q.—Do you mean that it has not had persons put to death for heresy?

A.—That is what I mean.

Q.—Can you suggest how it is that this book has so lately got the imprimatur of your Society?

A.—I have just said, because there is nothing new in the book.

Q.—You regard it as mere speculative opinion?

A.—Mere speculative opinion which never can be brought into practice.

Q.—Do you suggest to this Jury that this speculative opinion is never acted upon in this way in other countries by your Society?

A.—By the Society of Jesus?

Q.—Yes?

A.—Never.

Q.—What, never?

A.—I repeat, never have they been acted upon by the Society of Jesus.

Q.—Has any punishment for heresy been advised by the leaders of your Society?

A.—Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Justice Wills.—What does the imprimatur imply?

Plaintiff.—My Lord, it does not imply an endorsement of the doctrines, it simply says: "I do not see why this should not be published; there is nothing new in it."

Mr. Macaskie.—Your Lordship will find the imprimatur on page 23 [of *The Rock* translation].

> "The work bearing the title *Institutions of Public Ecclesiastical Law*, delivered by P. Marianus De Luca, S.J., now Professor of the text of the Decretals in the Gregorian University, having been examined by certain theologians of the same Society, to whom we handed it, and declared by them fit for publication, we give permission for it to be printed if those to whom it belongs think fit. To whom we have committed this letter, signed by us, and sealed with the seal of our Society."

Q.—Who was Bellarmine?

A.—Cardinal Bellarmine was a Jesuit.

Q.—The words I lately read to you about "sending the heretics to their own place" were his words?

A.—Well, that was not peculiar to Bellarmine; it was a doctrine held just as hard by Luther, Calvin, and I may add even by my own countrymen as it was by Catholics.

Q.—Have you ever repudiated that doctrine of Bellarmine?

A.—Do you mean, have I personally ever repudiated it?

Q.—I want to know has your Society ever repudiated it?

A.—I answer, it is not the business of the Society to repudiate doctrine which the Church approved of as a speculative theory. The doctrine referred to is not Bellarmine's private view—it was, in past times, the common property of Europe.

Q.—Do you suppose there is a sort of speculative killing of heretics?

A.—I should be sorry to think that there was any kind of killing of heretics wished for or sought—speculative or otherwise.

Q.—Now we will pass to another question. Have you got in your constitution a rule that nothing can be published in

the shape of a book or pamphlet unless it is approved by the revisors of the Society appointed for the purpose?

A.—Yes, it is as you say.

Mr. Justice Wills.—That is to say, nothing can be published by a member of the Society?

A.—Not till it has received, my Lord, the imprimatur of some one appointed for the purpose.

Q.—This rule, then, applies to books published by members of the Society?

A.—It does, my Lord, to all their books.

Mr. Justice Wills.—How far is this to go? Because such things as have been read are calculated to do just as much harm to the person who publishes them as to any one else in the present state of society.

Mr. Macaskie.—My Lord, that is true, I admit.

Mr. Justice Wills (to Mr. Macaskie).—Do not let us turn this Court into any scene of unseemly controversy between the professors of different types of religious thought. The real thing is whether this article or letter is calculated to bring the persons to whom it applies into discredit and disrepute. If it does the defendants are liable; if it does not then they are not liable.

Mr. Macaskie said an incautious phrase had been used by the writer; it might be that it was a little too strong, and he was referring to passages of the book as mitigating circumstances.

Mr. Justice Wills.—As far as the mere discussion of the position of the Jesuits or their doctrines on general grounds is concerned, I have nothing to do with them except to uphold, as far as I can, the utmost freedom of discussion.

Mr. Hugo Young.—We do not dissent from that at all, my Lord. We do not raise the least objection to that.

Mr. Justice Wills.—It is a great pity to make use of this opportunity for airing unpleasant things which may be said of a whole body of men.

Mr. Macaskie.—I have not dragged the thing into Court, and I am compelled to show mitigating circumstances, which go far to palliate or excuse the language of the letter.

Mr. Justice Wills.—I should say that it is not necessary to go very far in order to show that many things connected with

the Society of Jesus, many things connected with the doctrines it holds, in a Protestant community with a history like ours, may be justly regarded by many persons as mischievous.

Q.—May I take it, Father Vaughan, that this is the view of the Society, that there is vested in the Pope the power of deposing temporal princes who are wicked and incorrigible, and specially schismatics and heretics?

A.—I deny that there is.

Q.—Can you, then, account for its being found here?

A.—I can, because in a day now gone, when the Pope was the arbiter of Christendom, there was vested in him the power of which you speak. I suppose we all allow that there must be a deposing power somewhere—otherwise how about my own country? how about James II.? When Europe was Catholic the depository of this power was the Pope.

Re-examined by Mr. Hugo Young.

Q.—In the first place, has this question of using the power of the Statute, even in the matter of death in reference to heresies, been confined to Catholics alone?

A.—It has been the universal practice, and really quite as much in one country as in another.

Mr. Justice Wills.—In Calvin's time they were burning people in Geneva; we all know that.

A.—Yes, and Henry VIII. burned Anabaptist.

Mr. Hugo Young.—First of all, as to this book of de Lucas. Is this merely a reproduction of documents and writings of the 12th to 18th centuries.

A.—Quite so. If they had been new doctrines they would never have got the imprimatur.

Q.—And as a matter of history he, in lecturing to his students, has dealt with these old documents.

A.—He has to deal with these old documents, because he is dealing with an old time.

Mr. Justice Wills.—I suppose, Father Vaughan, you would thoroughly agree with me, that if any one attempted to teach such doctrines as have been brought under your notice as living doctrines, applicable to the present day, he would do far more harm to the Society he represented than to anybody he attempted so to teach?

A.—Yes, my Lord; and I may add he would be forbidden to do so.

Mr. Justice Wills.—The person to whom he taught them would reject them, and the Society would be brought into disrepute?

A.—Yes, quite so, my Lord.

Mr. Hugo Young.—Now my learned friend has put in the edition of the 6th of September in which that so-called apology appeared. Have you seen the second edition of *The Rock*, which came out with, printed in red ink upon it, "The Jesuits and *The Rock*. The great test case. About £2,000 required to fight the pending libel action. Every Protestant should help." Can you tell me whether, from that time to this *The Rock* has been what I may call running this paper on quite commercial lines—inviting subscriptions, and acknowledging them week by week?

A.—Yes; and vomiting forth a sewer of filth against the Society.

Q.—Every week since?

A.—Every week since, I should think.

Mr. Justice Wills.—This is pretty strong. Part of this is what Jesuits teach: "The Jesuits teach that lying, theft, parricide and murder are permissible."

Mr. Hugo Young.—Then on the 6th of September they had said that they had communicated with their correspondent about withdrawal, and that he had said there was no hurry, but that they had on their own responsibility withdrawn one word, leaving the rest standing as it was. On the 27th of September, after more matured consideration with this correspondent, did this appear? This is notes by "*Pro aris et focis.*" That is the gentleman who wrote the letter before, and this is his reply to the application to withdraw: "The following introductory notes were not originally intended for publication but for private reference only. The writer consistently declines to admit that statement contained in the published letter required offence, and only undertakes to write articles elucidating and enlarging upon them on condition that this is understood. As there has been no opportunity for rearrangement or elaboration, readers will pardon the somewhat disjointed style of these notes. Nothing new can be written of

the Jesuits. All that can be done is to rewrite and reprove what has been written and proved hundreds of times before. Wherever the Jesuits and their missions penetrate, history becomes an endless chain of repetition." Then he goes on: "Outlaws: that is, out of the King's protection, so that he cannot bring an action, yet he can be slain by any one as the King's enemy, as was anciently held"—that is the one thing that was left for him.

Mr. Justice Wills.—There is some comfort for Father Vaughan in that. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hugo Young.—I do not know whether it would be an advantage if he was reduced to the state to which they want to reduce him. (Laughter.)

Mr. Justice Wills.—Need we have any more of this, Mr. Young?

Mr. Hugo Young.—My Lord, there are a lot of different attacks, and then he goes on to what is Jesuitism; but what I wanted to refer to this for was that it reiterates the libels, because it says he only goes on to write these articles elucidating and enlarging on the direct understanding that there is nothing that requires defence in the letter that he wrote before. That is the point of it quite at the beginning.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Yes, I see that.

Mr. Macaskie.—That is quite inconsistent with the views taken by my clients.

Mr. Hugo Young.—They publish that the next week.

Mr. Macaskie.—We are not responsible for what he said.

Mr. Hugo Young.—We shall see. (To the witness.) In addition to the expression that my learned friend referred to, just let me ask you this: Do you think it is fair or pleasant to you to be described as one of the infamous sons of Loyola?

Plaintiff.—I think it is a most painful and disgraceful thing that after I have given up other possible careers in order to try and do service to my fellow-Catholics and fellow-countrymen I should be attacked in this manner. There is nothing secret or hidden in my life: I am before the public preaching, lecturing, mission giving, and yet that I should have these infamous things said against me, and that I should be charged with disloyalty to my King—I will never allow anybody to stand between me and my King. For

a thousand years my family have been here—living as law-abiding subjects, true to King and country; and I say it is very painful to me to have to come into Court to clear my name of these foul imputations. As an English gentleman I reject these slanders entirely, and I submit my case to a jury of my countrymen for justice and redress. (Applause, repressed.)

Mr. Hugo Young.—*The Rock* says, "Jesuits are men of no nationality and no law." Is that in any sense true?

A.—It is absolutely untrue.

Mr. Hugo Young.—"Who every day perpetrate crimes against our laws and constitution by inciting Romanists to rebellion, and to another civil war." Is it in any way right to say that doctrines of this sort have ever during the last century, we will say, been taught as matters of active policy by the Jesuits, or any other Catholics?

A.—No; and when we have to deal with them as matters of ancient history, we hate having to do it.

Q.—Are any of these books that are referred to anything at all more than books for study, and the discussion of questions, and not books that you preach from and publish widely or anything of that sort?

A.—No, they are not. The mistake which our opponents make is that they speak of these books, which are written for persons scientifically trained to serve as texts books in the study or lecture hall, as though they were books meant for the preacher and the public. They are meant for the confessor, not for the preacher.

Q.—There are always theoretical questions which learned people who have to go into the matter deeply, have to consider for extreme cases?

A.—Yes; every conceivable case has to be considered.

Q.—Are these matters, which any learned friend has touched upon ever brought before the people by the Jesuits in matters of instruction or preaching, or anything of that kind?

A.—No, never. What is brought before the public as matter of instruction and preaching may be found in the penny Catechism, and in the Roman Catechism.

Q.—Is any word ever spoken by Jesuits that could bear that interpretation?

A.—No word.

Q.—The Jesuits, we heard, have large Catholic schools?

A.—We have several large schools: among them there is Stonyhurst College in Lancashire, and Beaumont College, Old Windsor.

Q.—Could you give any idea how many students from Stonyhurst and Beaumont have been fighting for their King and country in South Africa?

A.—I think over one hundred old Stonyhurst boys have gone to the front, and three of them, at different times, have won the Victoria Cross. More than one hundred Beaumont boys have also fought in South Africa. That is what we have taught them to do.

Q.—I believe many have lost their lives there?

A.—Yes, it is so.

Q.—There is one other of these papers I should like to refer to, and that is the one of the 16th of May in this year, in which this paragraph appears: "Our readers will perhaps pardon us if we again refer to our needs in connection with the rapidly approaching trial. They have done well, but perhaps they can do more by influencing others to come to our aid. Recent developments have greatly depleted our funds, and in any case the struggle calls for at least £500 more than we have at command. It is a matter for prayer and for private effort on the part of every individual sympathiser. We feel sure we shall not appeal in vain." I believe some little time ago the letter box of *The Rock* was broken?

A.—I believe it was—a most serious affair. (Laughter.)

Q.—Do you remember that they suggested that the Jesuits did it.

A.—Yes, indeed they did. (Laughter.)

Mr. Macaskie.—Really, I must object to this. I shall take your Lordship's ruling about this—whether in re-examination anything about breaking into a letter-box can be gone into.

Mr. Justice Wills.—I think we may stop there.

Closing Speeches.

Mr. Macaskie.—May it please your Lordship, Gentlemen of the Jury, it now becomes my duty to address a

few observations to you on behalf of the Defendant on what in Court has become a controversy more ecclesiastical than personal. It is hard to see at once how this action is put. It is not put, or it was not yesterday, at all events, as a mere personal attack on Father Vaughan. It was suggested that it was an attack also upon the Society of Jesuits, to which he belongs, and more than that, that there was nothing to discriminate between them and any other Roman Catholics. Now, gentlemen, I do not think it is necessary here to go at any length into the history and teaching, or the present opinions, of the Society of Jesus, although it is impossible, in a case of this sort, altogether to shut out from one's consideration the matters that have been proved here to-day by the book I put into the Plaintiff's hands. Now I do not propose to make any unnecessary attack upon the Society, although I hope that the thought will not enter into your minds that the Society has done anything to justify the receipt of such a whitewashing certificate as seems to be thought necessary in this action. I am not here to deny the courage of the members of the Society of Jesus, nor the self-sacrificing devotion of its members to the interests of their Church, and especially to the interests of their own Society. Every historian, every one who has read history, is perfectly acquainted with their services and the conduct of the Jesuits on that side, at all events. I do not doubt that the Church of Rome is to them very largely indebted indeed for their services since the Reformation in rolling back Protestantism from the top of the Alps to the bottom. But, gentlemen, I have not to deal with any attack on the Jesuits, because the Jesuits are not suing in this action ; and it would be evil day if a man might not in

England speak his mind freely upon this Society, or any other Society. No; we have here to deal with the observations made in this correspondent's letter concerning Father Vaughan, and Father Vaughan alone. Now let us see what the attack made upon him, so far as it is an attack, consists of. It is to be noted that there is no personal attack upon him in his individual capacity. There is nothing said in that libel which I can discover which reflects upon him except as a member of that huge Society, the Society of Jesus. There is no attack, in other words, upon his personal honour. He is attacked, in so far as he is attacked, as a member of the Society of Jesus, and if it were true that he were an outlaw by virtue of the Act of 1829, to which I shall have to draw your attention, as in part, at all events, indicating that he and his Order have been placed in that position, and if it were true that he was concerned in opinions, or in spreading opinions which are seditious, would any one as a man of business treat that as any reflection upon his private honour or his private character? Now what is the meaning of "steeped in sedition"? What is sedition? I find in one of the large dictionaries, the Imperial, that the first definition of "sedition" is, "A factious commotion in a State, not amounting to an insurrection; the stirring up of such a commotion; such offences against the State as have the like tendency with, but do not amount to, treason." It is not treason, and is no crime. That is the sort of language, in other words, that is used by one party concerning the efforts of another to alter, except by lawful means, the constitution as established in Church and State, and I rejoice to find that that is substantially the definition of "Sedition" which is given by a very great criminal Judge, the late Mr.

Justice FitzJames Stephen, in his book upon the Criminal Law. It cannot be said here that these people were engaged by lawful means in any attempt to alter the constitution of the Church or State as they are now established, because I shall show you by a reference to the Act of 1829 their very presence—rightly or wrongly—is unlawful and amounts to a misdemeanour on the part of each of them, and if the law was enforced by the Attorney-General, or by any zealous Protestant, it would render the Jesuits liable to the heavy punishment they have incurred. But, gentlemen, after all, what is sedition? What sort of reflection upon a man is it to say he is seditious? I suppose there were never more seditious persons in history than John Hampden or George Washington, and there are no men that stand higher in history at the present moment; and if you come to our own century you can take the names of other people and make the same remark with regard to them. It is a term of political abuse. It is a term you use to describe the efforts of the man you are opposed to in politics, or in religion, involving, therefore, no reflection upon the private honour or honesty or reputation of the individual as to whose conduct the phrase is used.

Now, gentlemen, let me turn to the other matter of complaint. The other matter of complaint is that this gentleman was termed an outlaw. Before I deal with that let me remind you that the complaints he has made are confined to those two. It is true his learned Counsel, my learned friend, Mr. Hugo Young, making, as he was bound to do, the most of his case, read out the whole, with the exception of a part, which was not very material, of this letter from a correspondent, but you remember when I asked Father Vaughan in the

box, "What is it you complain of—'steeped in sedition?'" he said, "Yes." "Outlaw?" "Yes. Anything else?" "No." He could not remember anything else, showing how little impression anything else in the libel made upon him, even when he brought his action. It comes to this: that in order to magnify this mole-hill into a mountain you have got to spell out the attack upon the Society into an attack upon him by saying, "Why, here is strong language used of the Society: this man is a member of the Society: therefore, he is libelled just as if the libel had been upon the Mohammedans and the Roman Catholics, and a Mohammedan or Roman Catholic brought an action for libel because of the attack upon his Order."

Now, gentlemen, let us look for a moment at the circumstances of the publication of this libel. According to the letter, although Father Vaughan has made no inquiry into the matter—and that is most significant—a Bill for the repeal of that clause and for other relief of the Jesuits was pending in Parliament. He does not know that. All I can say is, that he must live secluded from the world if he does not know of Bills so vitally affecting the interests of his Order; but although that was so, we know this: that these were his two matters of complaint, and not only was that Bill, according to the writer, pending in Parliament at the time—a Bill of vital importance to those who take the extreme Protestant view in this country, and to those who suffer from the disabilities which the Jesuits do suffer from in this country—but there were curious complaints being made, attacks had been made, or were supposed to have been made, upon Mr. Thurston, Mr. Gerard, and, I think, somebody else, and an attack seems also to have been made by Mr. Thurston upon Mr. Ware, a dis-

tinguished Protestant, I believe, of bygone times, and those were followed up by other threats, or threats of writs and actions, and under those circumstances this letter is sent to the editor of *The Rock*. Now, gentlemen, I admit, and freely admit, that the expression "steeped in sedition," although really very little more than abuse, was an unfortunate expression, and as far as my client could, they endeavoured immediately, or almost immediately—within the next issue, or the next issue but one, by the paragraphs which they inserted—to remove any impression that might have been created by that expression, which was injurious to Father Vaughan. They state, first of all, how the error took place, by an oversight ; secondly, they repudiate the view that it can be properly applied to Father Vaughan ; and thirdly, they express their regret. Most gentlemen would have been content with so ample an apology ; but Father Vaughan was not, and technically perhaps he was entitled to refuse to be content with this apology because there remained behind the charge, which was not withdrawn, and which you remember, that members of his Order, including himself, were outlaws, whatever that may mean. It is not easy to find out nowadays what an outlaw does mean. Now, gentlemen, under those circumstances the letter goes on. It is preceded by a headline in which the editor says in effect : "Mark you : these are not my words. I am not responsible for them. They are the opinions of my correspondents." Now, I agree, if I may respectfully say so, with what fell from my Lord, that it is no answer, in point of law, to a charge that you have libelled a man, to say, "At the same time I put in a heading saying, 'This is the opinion, not of myself, but of a correspondent : it is his work, and not mine.'"

But although that is so in law, from the point of view of common sense it makes the greatest difference in the world whether a man by an oversight gives expression and publicity to a letter from a correspondent couched possibly in language too strong, or whether he writes seriously and deliberately a defamatory statement as expressing his own personal opinions. One is intentional ; the other is accidental, or an oversight as in this case. Gentlemen, so much for the circumstances of the publication of the libel.

Now let us see what Father Vaughan has lost. He has been perfectly frank about that matter, and it will be within your recollection, I dare say, that neither when he was in the box did I, nor do I now, desire to make the slightest reflection either upon his evidence or his conduct in the matter, but when he was challenged he admitted that in point of fact he was unable to point to any damage which he had suffered by reason of this libel. All he could say was that people might think this or that, and people might do this or might do the other, but when challenged as to whether any single individual had inflicted upon him any loss, or withdrawn from him any pecuniary gain, or whether any hospitality had been withdrawn from him, he was unable to do it. So, gentlemen, it stands in this way : that no pecuniary damage has been suffered by Father Vaughan. Now that distinguishes this case from most cases of libel, but there is upon this branch of the case a further observation to be made. Father Vaughan told us frankly enough that by the constitution of his Order he was under a vow of poverty, and that whatever property, damages, or anything else should come to him would immediately go over to his Society, or to his Church, or to some charity, no doubt connected

with it. So far as pecuniary damage is concerned, nothing that you can do can make the slightest difference to him.

Gentlemen, I have referred to the circumstances of the publication of the libel. Now let us look at the action. The action is brought by Father Vaughan with the leave of the Superior of the Order. I do not wonder that that leave was given. Possibly you will think that as the action could not proceed without his leave, and as he has given his leave, as Father Vaughan told us, and as any damages that you might give will go where Father Vaughan has told us, that this is in substance as much an action by the Society as by Father Vaughan himself. Now, gentlemen, let us look at the position that Father Vaughan takes up in regard to the complaint that he has been spoken of as being in the position of an outlaw. He treated, I think I must say, the Statute of 1829 in a very light and airy way. You will remember that up to the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, the Roman Catholics in this country were subject to serious disabilities, which it is not necessary that I should now enumerate. By that Act they were relieved of their disabilities, subject to some slight terms for the security of the State, but the Jesuits were placed upon a very different ground, and in a very different position from that in which the other Roman Catholic subjects of the Sovereign were placed.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Monastic Orders in general were placed in the same position.

Mr. Macaskie.—Certainly, my Lord. The objection of Parliament was to the Society of Jesuits, and to monastic Orders, and in order to place those upon a very different footing special sections of the Act of Parliament were enacted. I refer to those partly because it goes far to

explain the use of the term "outlaw," whatever that may mean, and partly because it so completely—I submit it to your better judgement—demolishes the contention put forward by my learned friend in opening this case, and also by Father Vaughan in the box, that there is no practical distinction to be drawn between an ordinary Roman Catholic and a member of the Society of Jesus. By the Statute of 1829 it is provided in Section 28: "And whereas Jesuits, and members of other religious Orders, Communities, or Societies of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, are resident within the United Kingdom; and it is expedient to make provision for the gradual suppression and final prohibition of the same therein; be it therefore enacted"; and then, without wearying you, gentlemen, with the language of the various sections, provisions are made by which every Jesuit of that day was, within six months, to send in a statement of his name and residence, and so on, to the Secretary of State, and to depart from the kingdom, subject to the payment of a fine if he did not. Then any Jesuits coming into the realm were to be banished subject to their getting a licence from the Secretary of State, which is not the case here; and then there is a provision that any person admitted a Jesuit or member of such religious Order admitting a person to be a member of his Order shall be guilty of a misdemeanour; and then comes Section 34, which is the section which applies to the present Plaintiff, and which I say goes far to explain the use of the term "outlaw" in connection with the Jesuits. It runs thus, and it is still the law of the land: "And be it further enacted that in case any person shall, after the commencement of this Act, within any part of this United, Kingdom, be admitted or become a Jesuit, or brother

or member of any such religious Order, Community, or Society as aforesaid, such person shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of a misdemeanour, and being thereof lawfully convicted shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life." Then there is a further provision in Section 36 that if he is at large after three months he may be transported for life. That is the state of the law at the present day, subject to my Lord's direction, concerning the Jesuits. Gentlemen, we heard propounded by Father Vaughan from the witness-box the extraordinary theory that this Statute of George IV. was what he called obsolete. Others may be better informed, but I know of no warrant in law for the theory that a Statute can lose its force by becoming obsolete. The Statute of Treasons is much older than this; the Act of Settlement, upon which the Protestant succession to the Throne depends, is much older also, but I hope it could not be contended that either of them is obsolete, or that any other Statute of George IV. is obsolete. We need not consider that, neither need we consider the fantastical theory set up by Father Vaughan that Sir Robert Peel could upset an Act of Parliament, or that any statesman could. The law is the law, and a statute is a statute, and nobody can repeal it but Parliament. If any further argument for that were necessary, it is enough to say that in 1871 Parliament had to consider this matter, and it passed an Act by which it repealed the Act of 1829, excepting the sections applicable to the Jesuits, and the sections were in that Act of Parliament expressly named; and therefore I say it is idle to pretend to-day that the Jesuits are not subject to the provisions of the Act of 1829, and if they are, their presence upon this soil of England is unlaw-

ful, and upon being prosecuted they may in the result be banished. I think there is a Statute by which for all transportation for life penal servitude has been substituted. Now no one desires, at least I hope not, to put the provisions of any Act of Parliament of a penal character unnecessarily in motion against people who behave themselves decently and in ordinary fashion; but when you find various religious controversies on foot it is not to be wondered at that a correspondent not skilled in the law, finding a provision that these people are to be banished, and may not remain in England, and may not be in England, should say that they are outlaws. What practical difference does it make between saying that a man is an outlaw, and saying that by Statute he ought not to be allowed to remain, and ought to be transported for life? It makes no practical difference. One is true, and the other is in substance practically true. It is a mere figure of speech indicating practically the same thing. Under those circumstances, what reasonable ground of complaint is there that this correspondent, seeing the situation, drew attention to the flagrant and daily breach of the law which every one of the Jesuits are committing? Now, gentlemen, what is Father Vaughan's position in the matter? He is compelled to come into Court admitting the existence of the Statute, and unless you adopt the theory that Acts of Parliament become obsolete within thirty years, he is compelled to admit, unless that be so, he is in daily disobedience and defiance of the Acts of Parliament, and he appeals to you by the same law which day by day he defies for the redress, or rather for the damages, which by the leave of his superior he hopes to obtain at your hands.

Now, gentlemen, one word more regarding that Act

upon which, I think, so much in this case turns. It is not an Act which requires any defence, because it is justified by a thousand incidents that have happened in the experience of Parliament in the history of our own land. I can understand why my learned friend Mr. Hugo Young was so eager to put his client, and the Society of his client, the Society of Jesus, upon a par with the ordinary Roman Catholics, but you do not have to look very far to see the difference in the conduct of the ordinary English Roman Catholic and the conduct of the Jesuits in times past in England. It is quite sufficient to compare the efforts of the Jesuits in the time of Queen Elizabeth to carry into effect the Papal Bull to depose Elizabeth with the loyalty of the English Roman Catholics at the time of the Armada. The same thing might be said of the incidents we are familiar with in the time of James I., and, more significant still, of the difference there was between the Jesuits and the Pope himself and English Roman Catholics on the other side concerning the incidents and breaches of the law which necessitated for the preservation of our constitution the Revolution of 1688. So it was that in 1829, when Parliament had to deal with the matter, Parliament in a considered judgement affirmed the distinction, and drew the broadest denoting margin between the ordinary Roman Catholics and the members of the Society of Jesus. Now, gentlemen, if that be so, are you going to be severe upon an honest although, it may be, a misguided correspondent, who, in the heat of ecclesiastical controversy, has used a phrase a little too strong or a little too wide? I hope not. It is your right to return a general verdict for the Plaintiff or for the Defendant; or if you think some injury has been done to Father Vaughan which can be repaired by damages in this

action brought by the leave of his superior, then you must give him such damages as you think fit. I should hope, even if you find for the Plaintiff, that they will be exceedingly small under the circumstances, for in matters of religious controversy all the blows are not on one side. People who embark in these things must expect on one side and the other that there will be hard knocks, and unless a man can point to some real pecuniary damage, or some libel which so affects his character that those about him think the worse of him, why then it is a triviality, and never ought to be brought into Court. When this case was opened it rested upon this: that they said of him he was seditious. They apologized for it, and withdrew it, and regretted it. Then it was said that he was an outlaw. That was explained, and except technically amply justified by the provisions of the Act of 1829. If you think that here this was no private quarrel between the parties, no private motive of a malicious character in the mind of the gentleman who as editor or sub-editor passed this letter, then you ought to take a different view from that for which the Plaintiff contends. It is right in a case of this sort, as I submit to you, when you find that which has been said is perhaps a little too strong, or a little too violent, a thing written in the heat of religious controversy, then, if the man is honest on the one side and on the other, and no appreciable damage has been done, you ought to throw the cloak of your protection about the honest correspondent and the honest editor.

Sir Edward Clarke, K.C.—Gentlemen, I am very sorry it has been impossible for me to have discharged all the duties that fall upon me with regard to this case, but I should like now, at its close, to have the opportunity of saying some few words to you on behalf of Father

Vaughan, who has come into Court here—who has been forced into Court by the attack which has been made upon him by the Defendants in this case, and with regard to which he asks you to do him simple justice in this matter. My learned friend, in the course of an ingenious speech, has from time to time thrown out suggestions about "an action brought by the leave of the Society," and that sort of thing, with a view, I am afraid, of endeavouring to find somewhere in that jury-box some corner where prejudice may exist with regard to particular forms of religious belief, and to apply that prejudice to a sentiment, honourable in itself, to induce you to give but small damages to Father Vaughan. Father Vaughan, gentlemen, has appealed to you, and it is not a question of Father Vaughan's honour because it has been admitted that the phrase which has been applied to Father Vaughan is an opprobrious phrase, a phrase under which no one would rest for a moment without insisting that the man who used it with regard to him should either withdraw it, or be punished for the use of it. My learned friend has endeavoured to coax you into giving a very small verdict to Father Vaughan upon certain grounds which, I confess, seem to me to be wholly inapplicable to this case. He has talked of an honest contributor, feeling strongly on religious matters, entering into a controversy, and from the strength of his feelings being led to use language which was a little too strong with regard to one of his fellow-subjects. Gentlemen, I will not stop to discuss how far my learned friend is entitled to call these sort of things "religious controversy" at all. There does not seem very much religion of any sort or kind in the attack which has been made in these papers, and in assailing the character of Father Vaughan

and others who agree with him. However, let us pass from that for a moment. Suppose it is, and ought properly to be called, a "religious controversy." What is the case here? This is not an action against an individual who, feeling very strongly on the matter, has allowed himself to be tempted for a moment into using language which was not strictly accurate. This is an action against a newspaper which printed that attack in its columns. It is an action against the Company that printed it, that traded upon it, and made it a means of obtaining financial support, and pecuniary help, for the newspaper which has, since the time when this libel was written and published, been blazoning forth everywhere that it is the champion of what it is pleased to call "Protestantism"; and that, as the champion of Protestantism, it is entitled to the subscriptions of the people in order to fight this case. Why, gentlemen, it is not a question of a misguided controversialist whose too eager mind has led him to use a phrase which cannot be justified; it is a newspaper trading upon libel; and, having libelled Father Vaughan in a way which it cannot now defend—which it cannot even find a lawyer to justify anywhere with regard to the accusations which have been made—has been from that day to this trying to collect money for its own support in consequence of having made this attack.

Now, gentlemen, what is the attack? It is not only a question of "the Rev. Bernard Vaughan, another of these outlaws, one steeped in sedition"—the attack is not confined to that. Father Vaughan is an English gentleman, a member of a good old English family, who has spent his life in this country free from blame or reproach, and who has devoted himself, under the

vows to which my learned friend has referred, to the teaching of that which he believes to be the highest truth, namely, the truths which he believes to be important to all members of Christian society. Against him no accusation of any kind can be or has been made. His life has been a blameless one, and it has been passed among his fellow-countrymen in discharge of what he believes to be his duty, and it is against him that this attack is made. "Is there not one lawyer to come forward and to remind the British public that Jesuits are outlaws and their pretended 'actions' null and void?" The answer is, "No, there is no one—no lawyer can be found to say such a thing." Gentlemen, the Jesuits are not outlaws. Their actions are not null and void. Here before my Lord, Father Vaughan is entitled to invoke the authority and assistance of the law in pursuance of his rights as an Englishman, and in that capacity he comes before twelve of his fellow-countrymen to repudiate imputations of the grossest kind. "Men who own no nationality, no law, save the will of their own General, who were the sole cause of two revolutions here, and who every day perpetrate crimes against our laws and constitution by inciting Romanists to rebellion and to another civil war." Then he is called one of "the infamous sons of Loyola." It is well enough to make an appeal to a jury, and I hope that appeal will never be made without a willing response from a jury when they are asked to consider whether a man ought to be attacked in a free discussion of public affairs or in a free discussion of matters, whether they refer to politics or religion or other matters of great public importance. But when an appeal is made to a jury to extend leniency and tolerance to a man who thinks that he is forwarding

the cause of religion by putting foul, slanderous libels of this kind into his writings, surely I may rely upon the jury for taking a stronger and more temperate view —a view far more consonant with the spirit of religion and with the principle of freedom, and to insist that protection should be given to any man against whom such accusations are made. My learned friend repeated several times that it was a thing which was said in a hurry, or that a little too much was said perhaps, and that they had apologized for it. Why, gentlemen, you have had before you this so-called apology. This is the apology which they printed : "Libel action against *The Rock*. Our position as regards the Jesuits. An unfortunate oversight." That is to say, they say that by an unfortunate oversight they put in the words—they slipped in, in fact ; but there is not a syllable of apology for calling the Rev. Father Vaughan "one of the infamous sons of Loyola"—not a syllable of apology for saying that he and those associated with him were daily committing crimes against their country—not a sentence of apology for suggesting that they are not to be believed on their oaths or for saying that they are outlaws who ought to be driven out of any English court of law, but in the very same paper in which that pretence of an apology is put this appears : "The Jesuits and *The Rock*. The great test case." Test of what, I wonder ? The test of the way in which *The Rock* deals with matters of this kind ? Then it goes on to say : "Every Protestant should help." Help how ? Why, by subscribing to *The Rock* and helping to pay the salaries of those who are running this newspaper and selling it from week to week for their own profit. Gentlemen, do consider this : that in the very number in which they published their

so-called apology there appears this, "The Jesuits teach that equivocation, lying, theft, parricide, murder are permissible under certain circumstances," and that suggestion is put in connection with the case in which Father Vaughan is obliged to come into Court and ask you for your verdict. "Will you help?" Then there is an appeal for £2,000. Then there is a later appeal only for just another £500—to help them to do what? Why, to help them to make a miserable appeal to a jury to let them off because a man had only said a little more than he was entitled to say, and because the money that was to be paid would not go into Father Vaughan's own pocket. As a matter of fact he has no reason to be ashamed of the obligation which he took upon himself many years ago that his life should be devoted not to the purpose of gain, but to the highest services to which a man could possibly devote his life. He has no reason to be ashamed of that; but is that fact, that he has chosen to deny to himself the enjoyment of wealth and the accumulation of means (the possession of which is often more attractive because of the opportunities of work that can be done for others than for the mere enjoyment which it brings to a man himself)—is the fact that he has denied himself these things to be made a topic by which you are to be induced to penalize him for having brought this action? There is the expense of bringing an action of this kind, and the incidental anxiety of the action, which can only be met, I suggest, by substantial damages being given by you in this case—all that he has had to face; and when he comes here there is now no suggestion that he is a man of dishonourable character or that there is anything to be complained of as to the way in which his life has been led. But this

newspaper, which has been collecting moneys for the purpose of fighting this case, you are asked to excuse, not because it has not got the money, for it appears to have collected substantial sums, but you are asked to excuse it on these suggestions which have been put forward by my learned friend. No one will say that Jesuits are outlaws. My learned friend says that there is only a technical difference, because there is an Act of Parliament on the Statute Book with regard to Jesuits and members of monastic Orders being admitted into this country. The distinction is a very grave one. If Jesuits were outlaws their appeal to the law courts would be of no use at all, they would have no rights of any sort or kind ; but no lawyer ventures to suggest that they are in any such position. They can undertake legal obligations, they can own land or houses, or do anything that other members of the community can do ; but according to my learned friend's suggestion the one thing which they cannot do, or cannot do with effect, is to defend their own character against attacks of this nature. Here, in the name of the freedom of the Press, conduct is attempted to be justified or excused which is as inconsistent with the true freedom of political or religious discussion as anything could possibly be. It is true that the damages which you give in this case will not go into Father Vaughan's own pocket, or be used for his own purposes or for his own advantage, but he has a disposing authority with regard to them, and if there should be anything left after the costs of this action have been dealt with he will be able in some way to dispose of that. But what has that to do with this case? Here is an Englishman appealing to his fellow-countrymen—you, gentlemen, in the jury-box—to be justified

in respect of a slanderous statement made about him with regard to which no attempt has been made to justify it—a man whose life is admitted to have been a life of honour and integrity, and against whom no personal accusation can be made—that man, surely, when he is obliged to come into Court to protest against an attack of this kind ought to receive at your hands a very handsome verdict.

THE JUDGE TO THE JURY.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Gentlemen of the Jury,—This is an action for libel. It is sufficient to say that a libel is any writing which tends to bring the subject of attack in it into public hatred, contempt, or disrepute. I suppose there is no doubt about the tendency of these articles, because although the two principal points which have been mentioned and dwelt upon by Father Vaughan are the expressions about his being "steeped in sedition" and his being "an outlaw," one cannot fail, also, to see that the most offensive things that can possibly be said have been said of the Jesuits, and he is put forward as a man — as a Jesuit — who owns no nationality, and no law save the will of his own General, and so on. It is undoubtedly a very offensive article as far as he is concerned, but still, gentlemen, that is entirely for you ; it is a question for the jury, and not for the judge, and it has been so for nearly one hundred years past. Therefore it is entirely for you to say, and not for me to say, whether this is a libel or not. But assuming that it is, then it is a mere question of damages. Now, you know, no one can regret more than I do the introduction of a great many of the topics which have been dealt with in this case. They are

very difficult to avoid, I grant, but we are not here to discuss religious controversies, or to discuss questions of social and general policy. People are entitled to have the widest possible difference of views, and to express those differences as strongly as they like upon all matters of general politics and social interest. Unfortunately when the subject of discussion is connected with anything like religious controversy, generally speaking, the spirit, which should be the spirit of religion, is gone, and all the elements of human passion, hatred, malice, and uncharitableness seem to be let loose, and of course the tone of this article and of the other articles (and there have been many other articles and parts of articles which have been referred to) are singular illustrations of this, perhaps, somewhat remarkable exhibition of the kind of innate weakness in human nature to which I refer, but I am afraid it must almost always be so. I have been saying to myself for the last two days, *pax vobiscum—benedicto benedicatur ;* and yet on the very day on which one has been rejoicing in peace, one gets involved in a sickening controversy of this kind, from which all the elements of peace and charitableness have been by this publication banished. Well, gentlemen, you may find this is a libel ; you may think it is a very offensive thing to say of a gentleman, who is a member of an old English family, that he is "steeped in sedition," a charge for which there does not seem to be a particle of foundation, except by a most far-fetched application of an argument founded on the Catholic Emancipation Act ; you may think that that is a most improper way of simply saying that there is an Act of Parliament in force under which he may be, if proper steps are taken, banished from this country, and under which it may be an offence to

be a Jesuit; you may think that is not what people would naturally suppose was meant by his being described as "steeped in sedition;" and you may think, also, that that is a very exaggerated way of describing the incidence of that law, into which I need not go, because it has been correctly described to us by both the learned Counsel for the Plaintiff and for the Defendant; you may think it is an extravagant and most offensive way of describing the incidence and operation of that law, to call him "an outlaw;" you may think that that is carried still further, as it certainly is, in this article by making this practical application of it, which, if it were true, would let loose a stream of calumny upon every member of a monastic Order in the Kingdom without redress. This is so, for not content with having described him as steeped in sedition, and so on, it says that one of these outlaws—that is the present Plaintiff—commenced an action against the Editor of *The Chatham and Rochester News*, and then it goes on: "Why has the truth been kept from that editor?" The meaning of that, gentlemen, is this: That editor had done what he ought to have done; he had apologized, and paid the costs, and there was an end of the matter; but it says, "Why is the truth kept from him? If he had known the truth he never would have done that." What they mean to say is that even were the oath proved false—I don't know what oath that means—the oath, I think, which it is suggested that the Jesuits take—even if that oath were proved false (and it never was), Jesuits cannot be libelled. That is in italics, so as to call attention to it. "They are outlaws, and outlaws have no legal rights either as corporations or as individuals." If they were outlaws that would be true. An outlaw used to be a person

who in early English law had no rights. In very early days anybody was at liberty to kill him if he got the chance, but fortunately, as one of the quotations which has been referred to in the course of the case, says, that is no longer so. But there were, until a few years ago, persons who were outlaws and who, by virtue of being outlaws, were deprived of the privilege which belongs to anybody else of bringing actions in order to support their legal rights—and the invitation here is to the newspapers to take advantage of that, and to represent that no Jesuit can be libelled, and therefore no action for libel can be brought, and that you are free to say what you like about them. Now, gentlemen, if you think that that is, in the sense in which I have explained to you, a libel, then it is a mere question of damages. There is an apology published as soon as this is brought to the notice of the editor, and of course that ought to be taken into consideration in assessing the damages. I am not surprised at Father Vaughan feeling that that was not at all an adequate apology. I should not have thought it was. No doubt it is quite true it does express the regret of the editor for its having found its way into the paper, but it goes on to repeat as much as they dare to repeat what they said against the Order to which this gentleman belongs, and most of us would feel, if we were intimately associated with persons who were still held up as necessarily enemies of society, and as persons necessarily to be avoided—if we found in the same breath in which the apology was offered that we were still held up to further opprobrium in consequence of our connection with our friends, I think we should very likely say we did not feel that the apology was adequate.

Now, gentlemen, I do not, of course, ask you to take

into consideration at all the mere language of general controversy in matters of this kind. That is harmless, and it is permissible. It may be in very bad taste, and to my mind a good deal of it is in shocking taste, but then I hope I am a man of peace, and I have learnt in the course of my life, if I have learnt nothing else, some small measure of Christian charity; but the mere fact that these articles are extravagant, and go beyond good taste and good feeling, is nothing to the purpose. The question is, what sort of imputation do they cast with regard to Father Vaughan? You are the judges of that, and, if you think they do convey serious imputations, imputations which have no ground, then your damages ought to be such as will mark your sense that all legitimate limits of controversy had been greatly exceeded, and I cannot help feeling in all these cases that to a certain extent the damages ought to mark the feeling of the jury with regard to matters of that kind, and, as has often been said before, when there is no pecuniary damage (and nobody supposes there is any pecuniary damage to Father Vaughan) it is not illegitimate to take into consideration that it is desirable to put an end and a stop to this kind of thing, which can only be done by reasonable and substantial damages. It certainly will not be done if you accept the invitation of the learned counsel for the defendants, namely, to hustle Father Vaughan out of Court with a contemptuous verdict, which would be a direct encouragement to everybody else to tread in the same lines as this paper has walked in.

Gentlemen, I have no more to say to you. You will take the matter into your consideration, and if you think it is a libel you will find for the Plaintiff with such reasonable damages as you think an English gentleman,

if he has been aspersed, is entitled to. A great deal has been said to you, I do not know how many times Mr. Macaskie has said it, but he never mentioned the fact about this action having been brought without adding "with the consent of his superiors." We all know what that means. It means, Do not you do anything to pat the Jesuits as a body on the back. It means, Take into account against him that this may be to some extent an action which his superior desires to be brought. But I do not think that is legitimate at all. If you were all members of the Society of Jesus yourselves, I should say to you, you must not give a farthing more because he belongs to the Society of Jesus, and because your sympathies might be with him ; and I say do not give a farthing less because he is a member of the Society of Jesus, in so far as that may tend to make your sympathies against him. Let us administer justice here, free from sympathy, free from passion, free from prejudices, and let us say, if you think an English gentleman has been libelled, and that his character has been taken away as far as the words could do it by this article, give him such damages as will show that there is no foundation for the imputations that have been made. Will you be good enough to consider your verdict, gentlemen?

THE VERDICT.

The Jury retired at 12.40, and returned into Court at 1.10.

Mr. Justice Wills.—During the course of the hearing of this case there have been some attempts at an expression of feeling. I hope there will be no expression of any such sort when the verdict is given.

The Associate.—Have you agreed on your verdict, gentlemen ?

The Foreman of the Jury.—We have.

The Associate.—Do you find for the Plaintiff or for the Defendant ?

The Foreman of the Jury.—For the Plaintiff.

The Associate.—With any damages ?

The Foreman of the Jury.—£300.

Mr. Hugo Young.—I ask your Lordship for judgement.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Yes.

Mr. Hugo Young.—There is a question, my Lord, about some costs in Chambers which your Lordship will, perhaps, allow my learned friend to deal with.

Mr. Denis O'Conor.—I also ask for a certificate for a special jury.

Mr. Justice Wills.—A certificate for a special jury—certainly.

Mr. Denis O'Conor.—My Lord, the defendants by their defence did not admit publication, and we wrote them a letter asking them whether that was purely a formal denial or whether they intended to rely on it, and asking them to admit. They refused to admit, and we had to interrogate, and the Master reserved the costs until the trial. I now ask for those costs.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Yes, I think you are entitled to them.

Mr. Denis O'Conor.—They were the costs of an application for interrogatories.

Mr. Justice Wills.—Yes.

"THE JESUIT PLOT FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF OUR LIBERTIES"

I.

Bible Readings for the Protestant Alliance.

(*The quotations are from King James's Bible.*)

"Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come. The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" (Matt. x. 22–25).

"Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake" (Luke vi. 22).

"If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also" (John xv. 18–20).

"As concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22).

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour" (Exod. xx. 16).

II.

A Word on Equivocation.

It is equivocation to use words which have an element of truth in them, but are calculated and intended to mislead, of which practice the Protestant Alliance has just furnished a very edifying example. We have taken as our heading the title of a recent fly-sheet of theirs, which we henceforth refer to as P. A. These are P. A.'s words: "The Jesuits have published in their magazine, *The Month*, for October, 1889, a scheme containing what they describe as 'salutary measures,' which they hope to put in force if they gain the ascendancy in this country."

We naturally conclude that we have here an exposure of Jesuit hopes and purposes as they stood in 1889. No such thing. *The Month* for October, 1889, is open before us. On p. 184 we have an article, "A Jesuit Scheme for the Reformation of England." We find that the "Scheme" is a scheme drawn up by Father Parsons in the reign of Elizabeth, and presented by some one, some eighty years later, to James II. at his accession.

P. A. sets down seven points, implying that such are the aims of the present generation of living Jesuits in England. The first is the restoration of Church lands, on which *The Month* quotes without approving the opinion of Parsons, that the papal dispensation, granted under Queen Mary to the retainers of such lands, was invalid. The second is for "abolishing the law which

makes it necessary that this Protestant nation shall be governed by a Protestant Sovereign," about which law Parsons is silent; and his silence is less surprising when we consider that the said law was not enacted till about a hundred years after his death. *The Month* is silent also. Of the remaining five heads—a Catholic Parliament, suppression of heresy and heretical books, and the establishment of a military order and of the Inquisition—there is no trace whatever in the pages of *The Month.*

The writer in *The Month* qualifies Parsons's proposals in general as "salutary measures"; he further says, "his constructive scheme is that of a good and prudent man"; and again, "he is very practical"; and "the main features of his scheme are of permanent interest, not merely as a historical study, but as affording some valuable suggestions for the guidance of Catholics." This is the sum total of what *The Month* says in commendation of Parsons's Scheme as a whole. We are right, then, in saying that the element of fact in P. A.'s statement is slender enough, and very much in arrear of the impression which his words are calculated to convey of the avowed aims of the Society of Jesus as now existing in England. This practice we call *equivocation.*

III.

A Word on Education.

The best mark of an educated man is his power of estimating evidence. Let us suppose an attack made by a French writer on the character of the medical profession in this country, to the effect that English doctors generally connive at immoral practices. To prove this most serious charge against a reputable body of living men, not one

word of contemporary evidence, oral or documentary, is adduced; no testimony of patients now living; no indication that the accuser is personally acquainted with any English physician, or has seen so much as the outside of a London hospital, or could understand a medical book if he got one into his hands: but what? A collection of extracts from the works of English medical writers of all sorts—two lines from one, three lines from another—compiled by order of the French Directory in 1797 on purpose to poison the mind of Europe against this country, with which France was then at war.

Such a book was written against the Society of Jesus, and sanctioned by the Parliament of Paris in 1762, in order to bring about the suppression of the Society. The work appeared in English in 1839, under the title of *Principles of the Jesuits.* Armed with such a venerable old blunderbuss; carefully avoiding anything on moral matters published by the Society in England in recent years; not inquiring what text-books are now used at Stonyhurst and St. Beuno's; shrinking from living Jesuits and their pupils as if they were adders—P. A. proves easily to his own satisfaction that "the Jesuits teach that EQUIVOCATION, LYING, THEFT, PARRICIDE, MURDER, are permissible under certain circumstances!!!"

This makes an interesting case as a study of evidence alleged, and thereby of education presumable. We are bound to suppose that the evidence alleged satisfies P. A.: else, as an honest man, he could not indite the conclusion. Thence we might be led to form some conjecture of the extent to which P. A. could be called an educated man, but we refrain. What interests us is the very low power of estimating evidence, and therefore the very low standard of education, which he presumes in the British public, notwithstanding the millions of

money which we are spending on schools. Just consider. The statement in question is proved by five references. One is to "Ligouri's [*sic*] *Moral Theology*, vol. ii. p. 308, 329, 330," &c. P. A.'s acquaintance with the authors whom he names, we should think from this quotation, must be much on a par with the Biblical lore of one who quoted "*The Babel*, p. 26," &c. Does he suppose that St. Alphonsus Liguori was a Jesuit? Has he any idea of the way in which it is usual, and indeed necessary, to quote St. Alphonsus? Has he ever seen his work? P. A. goes on to mention the names of four Jesuit theologians, the latest of whom died in 1679: he knows them by the pages of the French work which we have mentioned: all the evidence he has to offer is the number of the page, thus: "Suarez — *Extraits des Assertions*, p. 300; Emmanuel Sa—*ib.*, p. 349; Gobat—*ib.*, p. 437; Fagundez—*ib.*, p. 404, 411, 413," &c.

These are the entire references and the whole proof. He may have more than one reason for withholding the information what this *Extraits des Assertions* may mean.

Altogether an interesting study in Protestant Evidences!

About occasional parricide, we have taken the trouble to verify the reference as it is to be found in *Principles of the Jesuits*, p. 212. Gobat is there quoted as quoting Fagundez to the effect that "it is lawful for a son to rejoice at the murder of his parent committed by himself in a state of drunkenness, on account of the great riches thence acquired by inheritance." On which saying of Fagundez, Gobat writes: "Since then it is to be supposed on the one hand that the parricide was blameless, as well from deficiency of deliberation caused by drunkenness, as through the absence of premeditation; and on the other that very great riches would

result from this parricide, an effect which is either good or certainly not bad; it follows that the doctrine of Father Fagundez, which may seem a paradox, is true in theory, although it may be dangerous in practice." Now let this speculation of Fagundez or Gobat be as pernicious as you please—we have no mind to pronounce upon it—still as a matter of evidence it is plain that they are both far away from saying that a son may ever under any circumstances make up his mind to kill his father. Still less is the entire Society of Jesus chargeable with the guilt of maintaining that parricide is permissible under certain circumstances. P. A., then, is deficient, or supposes his readers deficient, in the power of estimating evidence. That is, P. A. is either himself an ill-educated man, or he writes for the ill-educated.

Would it be possible for the L.C.C. to open to the scribes of the Protestant Alliance an Academy for Young Gentlemen, or shall we say for Old Women, whose education has been neglected?

IV.

A Word on Manliness.

We gather from official returns before us, giving names and addresses, that there were in England, Scotland, and Wales, on or about the 1st of January, 1898, just 583 Jesuits of all arms of the service. Of these not one is living in hiding. Every one is known by all about him, who care to observe him at all, for a Jesuit or Roman ecclesiastic of some sort. They are the most knowable body of men in the country. They have no wish to hide, and never will go into hiding till the Protestant Alliance comes to have things all its own way, puts the clock back, and re-enacts the Penal Laws. If Govern-

ment so willed, these 583 could all be paraded in Trafalgar Square next week—Government to bear the expenses of the show.

Now suppose the rumour spread that on the 5th November next these 583 intended to march upon the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and put all the Protestants they found there to the sword. The police, we will suppose, is powerless, the army unreliable, and even the well-proved prowess of the Dons is for this occasion only in abeyance. Does any one expect that there would be a panic at those seats of learning? On the contrary, nothing would please the younger members of the University better than to see the Jesuits come on to the attack; the Undergraduates would be well able to protect themselves. Now listen to the Protestant Alliance; "Fellow countrymen! These men [these redoubtable 583] now demand from Parliament such license as would enable them to rob us of our freedom of speech and destroy our Civil and Religious Liberties." How ever would they go about it? We had thought that John Bull was well able to protect himself! that the elephant would not tremble before a mouse! But it is not John Bull who trembles; only the Protestant Alliance has lost its wits.

Perhaps it is cruel to challenge a man when you see him in a "blue funk." But we will make one proposal, which calls not for any great exertion of manliness, and which, if accepted and brought to act, would go a long way to dissipate the alarm of the Protestant Alliance. Let any one member of the body—we will say, the Secretary—let him call upon any Cabinet Minister, or ex-Cabinet Minister, even upon Sir William Harcourt himself, and ask him, upon his honour as a gentleman, to give a true answer to this question: *Has the behaviour of the Jesuits in this country*

ever caused your Cabinet five minutes' anxiety and alarm? We have no doubt of the answer, that the Society of Jesus, whatever it may have been in the past, is now quite a negligeable quantity in the political world.

Then why keep harmless men under the ban of the law? And why, oh why, after 50,000 of the P.A. fly-sheets misrepresenting them "have already been freely circulated," as the advertisement tells us, require "funds to circulate 20,000,000 copies throughout the country"? There is a line of Virgil—

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis.

("Spare me such aid, and send no such defenders.")

If we had the cause of Protestantism at heart, we should apply this line to the Protestant Alliance and its scribes, until the L.C.C. has provided for their better education. But they propose to cover the country with twenty million monuments of their stupidity—or worse.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69 Southwark Bridge Road, S.E.
[Price 2s. per 100.]

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 644 911 0