

HISTORY OF THE
GERMAN PEOPLE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE GERMAN PEOPLE

VOL. X.

Demy 8vo. 25s. per 2 Vols.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE at the
Close of the Middle Ages. By JOHANNES JANSSEN.

Vols. I. and II. translated by M. A. MITCHELL and
A. M. CHRISTIE.

Vols. III.—X. translated by A. M. CHRISTIE.

LONDON :

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. LTD.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

BY JOHANNES JANSSEN

VOL. X.

LEADING UP TO THE THIRTY
YEARS' WAR

TRANSLATED BY A. M. CHRISTIE



90056
13/8/08.

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. LTD.
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET, W.

1906

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

These Volumes (IX. and X.) are translated from Vol. V. of the German [Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions, improved and added to by Ludwig Pastor].

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.)

CONTENTS

OF

THE TENTH VOLUME

BOOK II

THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY ON THE PEOPLE AND ON THE EMPIRE UP TO THE YEAR 1618

CHAPTER

PAGE

I. THE 'MAGDEBURG CENTURIES' AND THE USE MADE OF THEM—

FABULOUS STORIES CIRCULATED AGAINST THE PAPACY 1

Luther's exhortation to show up the Papacy by means of history, 1-3.

Flacius Illyricus—His catalogue of witnesses to truth ('Catalogus testium veritatis,' &c.), 4-6.

The 'Magdeburg Centuries'—*Culter Flacianus*—Collaborators and propagators of the 'Centuries'—Aim of this work—The antiquity of Lutheran doctrine and the history of the 'Roman Antichrist,' 6-12.

The 'Centuries' on Gregory VII. and Alexander III.—The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa 'trodden under foot' by Alexander—Other Pope-fables of the 'Centuries'—Protestant opinions on the Popes in general, 12-19.

How the preachers taught the people history from the pulpit—Sermons about the Popes—The aim of this kind of preaching—The Antichrist and his followers pray to the devil, and will be carried off by the devil, 19-32.

The fable of the Popess Joan—The Ulrich fable, and how it was used for the embellishment of sermons—The cesspool of Satan, 32-37.

The La Casa fable—Praise of the 'Bienenkorb,' 37-39.

II. FISCHART'S 'BIENENKORB' 40

Origin of the work—Its calumnies, in especial against the Holy Communion and the Holy Mass—Further description of this work—Its wide circulation, 40-48.

How Fischart incensed the Protestant populace against the Catholics, 48-49.

Fischart's brother-in-arms, George Nigrinus—Portents and prodigies, and expectation of the end of the world, 50-51.

III. CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE IMPROVED CALENDAR—'SUPERNATURAL APPARITIONS' DURING THE 'CALENDAR CONTROVERSY'. 52

The Calendar reform of Gregory XIII. in 1582—The papal bull—The Protestant astronomers Tycho de Brahe and John Kepler consider this reform necessary, 52-57.

Whence the opposition to it chiefly came, and for what reasons: the theologian Lucas Osiander on the object of the new Calendar—The memorandum of the astronomer Pliening and a lunar wonder in Lorraine—Another lunar wonder in favour of the old Calendar in the Voigtland—Against the 'Jesuitical sophists' who do not believe in such wonders—'Wonders' in favour of the new Calendar, 57-67.

Pamphlet of the astronomer Mästlin and the Day of Judgment, 67-71.

The whole new system of astronomy a wretched piece of work—Copernicus 'a fool'—The people incensed against the new Calendar—Results of incensing the people—A Christmas scene at Frankfort-on-the-Main, 71-74.

IV. POLEMICAL ACTIVITY OF INDIVIDUAL CONVERTS—CONVERSION OF A REIGNING PRINCE—CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS CONCERNING THE PERSON OF LUTHER—CONTEMPORARY JUDGMENTS ON POLEMICS 75

The Calendar-wonders a mere 'drop in the ocean of marvels' which had occurred since the proclamation of the new evangel—Demon-wonders and the converts—Divine judgments, 76-77.

The 'Christlicher Gegenbericht' of the convert Frederick Staphylus, and how it was refuted by Protestant theologians, 78-83.

Utzing and Fischart on 'faithless apostates'—The convert James Rabe against John Marbach and the preachers, 84-88.

John Nas one of the most prolific polemical writers—Reminiscences of his youth—His first incentive to controversy—Rauscher's 'Hundred Popish Lies,' and other calumnies—'The Centuries of Nas'—His remarks on the tone of his polemics, 88-97.

'Anatomy des ganzen Luthertums vom Teufel gestiftet,' 98.

Fischart against Nas, 98-101.

Nas on the demoralising effects of Protestantism and the fruits of the doctrine of 'faith only,' 102-104.

His quarrel with Matthias Ritter about the statement: 'Omnis Lutherana meretrix'—Perverted quotations, 105-111.

'The evangelical weathercock,' and how James Heerbrand proceeded against it, 111-113.

Sebastian Flasch on the reasons of his conversion and the lives of the preachers—Luther a thoroughly obscene person, 113-116.

The convert John Pistorius and his relations to the Margrave James III. of Baden-Hochberg—The Margrave's religious doubts—Religious discussion at Baden in 1589—James Andrea against Pistorius—Religious discussion at Emmendingen—John Pappus and his appeal to St. Augustine—Utterances of the latter against the doctrine of 'faith alone,' 116-123.

Margrave James on the reasons of his conversion—His death in 1590, and the seizure of his family and his land by the Margrave Ernest Frederic—The latter acts in conjunction with neighbouring Protestant princes—A contemporary on the proceedings, 123-130.

John Pistorius takes up polemics, especially against Luther's 'Seven Qualities' and the 'Changeableness of the Augsburg Confession'—Lucas Osiander's 'Sweet-smelling Rosewreath' and the 'Friendly Dissection' of the same by Michael Anisius—George Ecker's 'Mahomedan Nettlewreath'—How Osiander answers his critics—William Holder's 'Ausgewaidete Maus,' 130-138.

Pistorius causes immense excitement in 1595 by the first part of the 'Anatomy of Luther'—Counter-writings by Samuel Huber, Cyriacus Spangenberg, and the Württemberg and Hessian theologians—Repetition of every imaginable Pope-fable—The 'Small Consolation-book' of Pistorius—Second part of the 'Anatomy of Luther,' 138-148.

The controversialist Conrad Vetter and his imitation of the preachers' language in his little treatise against Luther and the preachers—What Duke Maximilian of Bavaria adduces in favour of Conrad Vetter, 149-158.

Catholic and Protestant utterances concerning the savagery which characterised the polemical writings—A preacher's appeal to the example of Luther—George Nigrinus against 'the sect of the Epicureans' who call for 'a truce to the squabbings of scholars,' 158-163.

Andreas Lang's publication, 'Well-grounded and Right Instruction on Salvation,' one of the most outrageously slanderous books against Catholics, is championed by the Protestant Estates in defiance of an Imperial order based on an appeal to the Religious Pacification, 164-170.

V. CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE PERMANENT VALIDITY OF THE RELIGIOUS PACIFICATION—SHOULD FAITH BE KEPT WITH THE HERETICS ?—PUNISHMENT OF HERETICS . 171

Complaints of the Catholic Estates concerning Catholic controversialists, 171.

George Eder's 'Evangelical Inquisition'—A 'Dance of Heretics'—'Ends and Aims of the new Christians'—The 'Court Christians'—Imperial prohibition of the work, 171-176.

Eder's 'Golden River'—He recognises the validity of the Religious Pacification in civil and political respects—False interpretation of his statements, 177-180.

The controversialist Jodokus Lorichius—Whether he calls in question the validity of the Religious Pacification, 180-184.

Andreas Erstenberger's 'Autonomy,' and the high significance of the work—Five 'kinds and manners of religious freedom'—His recognition of the binding nature of the Religious Pacification—Charges against the Protestant Estates and exhortations to the Catholics, 184-193.

A counter-publication attributes this work to the Jesuits and inveighs against their 'barbarous heresy'—Examples and opponents of toleration in the olden time, 194-196.

Paul Windeck's 'Prognosticon' against Protestant 'Prognostica'—What is to be understood from his work with regard to the Religious Pacification—A Catholic's opinion on this book, 196-200.

An 'Awakener of the Clergy,' 200.

Inquiries of the convert Caspar Schoppe as to whether Catholic writers really disputed the validity of the Religious Pacification, 201-202.

Lucas Osiander denounces the Jesuits George Rosefius and George Scherer as messengers of the devil—Rosefius considers the Religious Pacification binding, and believes it to have been concluded with papal approval, 202-205.

Scherer on the Religious Pacification, 205. *

The Jesuit Martin Becanus teaches in a pamphlet that it is obligatory to keep faith with heretics, 205-207.

Peter Stevart's 'Apology of the Jesuit Order'—The Catholic past and the fruits of religious innovations—What the

CHAPTER

PAGE

Jesuits have in view—The Protestants demand religious freedom for themselves, but will not grant it to the Catholics, 208-213.

The Jesuit Mayerhofer on the punishment of the preachers—To what line of action Canisius urges the Duke of Bavaria—The Cologne Jesuits on forcible procedure against the heretics, 213-216.

Pamphlets of Doberreiner, Fabricius, and Muchitsch, like an 'echo of the exhortations of the preachers to root out the Catholics'—The Calvinist David Pareus summons to a bloody crusade against the papacy, 216-219.

The punishment of heretics still a public right among Protestants also—Claim of Luther and other Protestant theologians—Proceedings in the Palatinate in 1570—Verdicts of the Court of Sheriffs at Leipzig in 1574 and 1582—Utterances of the jurist Carpzov—What the criminal court decreed in 1582, 219-227.

VI. ATTEMPTS TO DISSOLVE ALL FELLOWSHIP BETWEEN CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS 228

Polemics consumed almost all intellectual forces—Complaint of Perellius in 1576—A 'Simple Layman' in 1617 on the productions of the book market—How the Germans were incensed against each other, and how the Catholic Church had become 'an abomination and a horror'—Examples of the distortion of Catholic doctrine—Writings about a letter of indulgence of Pope Sixtus V.—William Holder's calculation concerning the length of indulgences—What James Heerbrand gives out as 'Catholic doctrine'—A 'Christian song for children'—A 'Lover of Divine Truth' on the Catholics, and what he wished for them in 1615, 228-236.

Catholics on the 'preaching villains'—The heretics as 'cats and wolves'—Utterances of Ægidius Albertinus—Andreas Forner's 'Evangelical Pot-Cheese' of the year 1617, and two refutations by James Bobhard—Pretended Catholic 'relics,' 237-241.

'The popish idolatry' depicted in Protestant books of devotion—The Catholic worship held up to the people from the pulpit as a laughing-stock, 242-246.

The Catholics denounced as partisans of the Jews, 246-247. How all classes are stirred up against the Catholics—Pretended Catholic doctrine on matrimony as a sinful state in which salvation is unattainable—Catholics, on the other hand, allowed all manner of vices, 248-252.

Warnings of preachers and theologians against all intercourse with Catholics—Appointment of a Hessian general synod, and thunderings of a Hessian pastor, 252–255.

VII. ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE LUTHERANS AND THE CALVINISTS SINCE THE PROCLAMATION OF THE FORMULA OF CONCORD 256

The warfare between the Protestant controversial theologians carried on with weapons like those used against the Catholic Church—Utterances of Dommerein, Arminius, and Huitfeld—Every article of the faith disputed over, 256–259.

‘The devilish Calvinists’ no German growth—‘Proofs’ of theologians that the God of the Calvinists is the devil himself—Rivander’s ‘Wölfner Schafspelz der Calvinisten’—Appalling ‘judgments of God,’ 259–263.

‘The three-headed Antichrist’ and the ‘Calvinisch Gasthaus zur Narrenkappe,’ by John Prætorius—Writings of Andreas Engel and Albrecht von Helbach—How the Calvinists express themselves concerning Luther and the Lutherans, 263–267.

A Calvinist in 1601 against the ‘Ubiquist Antichrist,’ and the manner of life of the Lutheran princes and preachers—George Altenrath’s ‘Ubiquist Catechism’ of the year 1596, and preposterous utterances of Lutheran theologians on the omnipresence of the Body of Christ, 267–269.

James Andreä against the perversions of the doctrine of ubiquity—Nicodemus Frischlin against the murderous Calvinists—Samuel Huber’s ‘Von der calvinischen Prädikanten Schwindelgift’—‘Devil’s doctrines’—Reciprocal charges of perverting the Holy Scriptures—Calvinists on the Lutheran Christ and the Holy Communion—Exhortations to root out Calvinism, 269–274.

Character of most of the preachers—The jurists on the preachers—Reciprocal abuse among the preachers—Slanders against the Superintendents Herman Hamelmann, Polycarp Leiser, and Nicholas Selnekker—How Selnekker on his part carried out ‘the official duty of punishment’—John Prætorius concerning his colleagues—A statement of Valentine Weigel, 274–280.

VIII. THE DISSENSIONS BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND CALVINISTS AGGRAVATED BY THE INTRODUCTION OF CALVINISM INTO HESSE AND INTO THE ELECTORATE OF BRANDENBURG . 281

Nicholas Selnekker in 1591 on the spread of Calvinism—Introduction of Calvinism into Anhalt, &c.—Forcible measures of conversion used by the Margrave Ernest

CHAPTER

PAGE

- Frederic of Baden-Durlach—Armed resistance in Pforzheim—Constant changes in religion in the county of Isenburg, 281-285.
- Landgrave William IV. of Hesse against the Ubiquists—An exciting episode—Calvinism 'a devilish concoction'—Fabronius on the vilification of the Calvinists—Calvinism introduced into Hesse by the Landgrave Maurice since 1604—Maurice on the episcopal situation—His violent procedure—Tumult in Marburg in 1605—Scenes during divine service—Quelling the uproar—Iconoclastic riot by order of the Landgrave, 285-289.
- Expulsion of Lutheran preachers—How Calvinist preachers were treated by the people—Rising of the nobles on the Werra—Religious devastation in the lordship of Smalcald, 289-293.
- The 'papism' of the Lutheran people in the Empire, and how Calvinists talked about it—The Hosts and the Hessian communion cakes, 293-295.
- Character of the reciprocal lampoons in Hesse—An 'Eye-salve for Malodorous Prophets'—Maurice as a new Josiah—To what course David Pareus exhorts the Landgrave, 297-299.
- Further spread of Calvinism in the north of the Empire—Leonard Hutter against John of Münster on the 'French Confession,' 300-301.
- Ecclesiastical conditions in the Electorate of Brandenburg—The Elector John George against Calvinism—What he and his Chancellor said on the subject—The Elector Joachim Frederic and the promises that his son John Sigismund is compelled to make—'A True-hearted Warning against associating with Calvinists,' 301-303.
- Introduction of Calvinism through John Sigismund in 1613—He abjures his former promises before the Provincial Estates—His new 'confession of faith'—Complaints of Lutheran theologians that Luther's credit had sunk so low—Against the Superintendent-General Christopher Pelargus—The Court-preacher Simon Gedicke as enemy of the 'Satanic vermin' of the Calvinists—The Court-preacher Solomon Finck and the writings by him and against him—The 'devil's' doctrines of the Calvinists, 305-313.
- Matthias Hoe against the Brandenburg Calvinists, and the answer of the 'Berliners'—The controversy about the Host, and the 'popish veneration of the bread' still prevalent among the people—How it was attempted to introduce the Calvinistic doctrine of the Last Supper, 313-316.

Leonard Hutter at war with the Brandenburg Calvinists—The Lutheran and the Calvinistic ‘Beichtpfennig’ (penny fee for confession), 316–319.

Tumult in Berlin in 1615—Agitations in other towns—Petition of the Brandenburg preacher against a Church edict prescribed by the Elector—What dogmas the Elector abhors from the bottom of his heart—Appointment of reformed professors at Frankfort-on-the-Oder—The Elector in Königsberg and a sermon preached against him—What Matthias Hoe and Zacharias Faber want to prove respecting Calvinism, 319–322.

IX. CONTROVERSIAL WRITINGS AGAINST THE JESUITS—‘THE ORIGIN OF THE ORDER’—‘PRIVATE CRIMES OF THE FATHERS’ 323

How the Protestants in general thought concerning the Jesuits—Character of the polemics against them—A pamphlet of two Würtemberg doctors—John Fischart’s ‘Nachtrab’ and ‘Jesuitenrühlein’—‘True origin of the Jesuits,’ 323–329.

False charges invented against the Fathers in order to undermine their influence—A statement of Duke Albert of Bavaria—Peter Hansonius on the false charges—A ‘Jesuitenrische neue Zeitung’ of 1604—Official exculpation of the Jesuits from Munich, Graz, &c., 329–333.

Elias Hasenmüller’s so-called ‘History of the Jesuit Order’ more closely characterised, 333–339.

‘The unchristian fasting’ of the Jesuits, and other of their penitential exercises—Summons to exterminate the Fathers, 339–343.

The idol Moloch as type of the Jesuits—The Jesuits as the worst of criminals—James Gretser and his opponents—A libellous pamphlet against Bellarmin, and its object, 343–348.

What might be inferred from the ‘private crimes’ of the Jesuits, 348–349.

X. THE ‘PUBLIC CRIMES’ OF THE JESUITS—TYRANNICIDE . . . 350

The Jesuits denounced as the cause of all wars—Canisius on the participation of the Fathers in affairs of State—Warnings of the Provincial Hoffäus—Severe decrees of the year 1593 against interference in mundane affairs, 350–357. Jesuits as confessors to princes, and how they were to comport themselves as such, 357–361.

'The public crimes' of the Fathers in France, Spain, India, &c.—They desired to subject Germany to the King of Spain—They were lying in wait for the King of Spain's life—They wanted to poison all evangelicals and papists—The strength of their poison—The terror of the Jesuits, 361-367.

Tyrannicide a chief accusation against the Order—Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin, &c., on tyrannicide—Utterances of Calvinist jurists—What Scotch theologians teach on the subject—Warnings from George Buchanan and Paul Sarpi—A quotation from Milton, 367-374.

A Catholic treatise on tyrannicide—The Spanish Jesuit Juan Mariana—His work 'On the King and the Education of a King' of the year 1599—Contents and aim of the work—Its teaching on tyrannicide is repudiated by the General of the Order—A decree of the Order of 1610—Statements of the Jesuit Matthias Mayerhofer—James Keller's 'Tyrannicidium'—The Calvinists attribute to the Jesuits all sorts of books which they had not written, 374-392.

Melchior Goldast in 1611 against 'the Jesuitical bloodhounds and murderers of kings'—The Jesuits compared to assassins—How the Jesuits 'consecrate the assassination of kings,' 392-397.

Other publications against 'the murderous practices' of the Fathers—A great wonder at Molsheim—Lecture of Andrew Lanner showing how the Jesuits ought to be punished as the greatest criminals and the most devilish magicians, 397-400.

Opinion of a contemporary on the Press as a curse of the age, 400-402.

BOOK III

GENERAL POLITICAL CONFUSION IN THE DECADE PRECEDING THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

I. POLITICO-RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE IMPERIAL HEREDITARY LANDS, AND THEIR REACTION ON THE EMPIRE, 1608-1609 403

Opposition of the Austrian Protestants to their new reigning prince, Matthias—Their leader Tschernembl—Alliance with the Union—Hopes placed by Christian of Anhalt on the downfall of the House of Habsburg, 403-411.

In 1609 all the hereditary lands imperilled, 411.

Demands of the Bohemian Calvinists—Helpless condition of the Emperor—Open rebellion of the Protestants—Diet of the Union at Schwäbisch-Hall—The ‘Majestätsbrief’—Comparison between Catholic and Protestant Estates—Further demands of the Protestants, 412–422.

How Christian of Anhalt intimidates the Emperor—Treaty transactions of Christian with the Bohemian and Silesian Estates—Donauwörth and the Jülich-Cleves dispute, 422–425.

II. DISPUTE CONCERNING THE JÜLICH-CLEVES SUCCESSION—PLANS OF THE UNION AND THE GREAT LEAGUE FOR THE OVERTHROW OF THE HOUSE OF HABSBURG, 1609–1610 . . . 426

The principal claimants for Jülich-Cleves and the question of right, 426–427.

The ‘Possessioners’ in 1609—The Elector of Brandenburg solicits help from France and England—Promises of James I.—What Henry IV. demands, 427–430.

The Emperor’s designs respecting the Jülich inheritance—Archduke Leopold in Jülich, 429–431.

Intentions of Henry IV. of France, 432.

Distressing conditions in the Jülich lands—A wedding at Stuttgart—Christian of Anhalt commissioned by the Union to arrange an alliance with Henry IV.—What chiefly inflamed the French King’s warlike zeal—Liberation of the Princess of Condé, 434–439.

War negotiations at Paris and the promises of the States-General in 1610—Protestant propaganda at Venice and hopes for the downfall of the Papacy—Venice and the Union—Plans of the Allies for the overthrow of the House of Habsburg—Diet of the Union at Schwäbisch-Hall—Jubilation of the French over the general confusion in the Empire—A fuller account of the plans of the revolutionary party, 438–454.

A deputation of the Union to James I. of England—Promises of the latter, 455–456.

Henry IV.’s confidence of victory just before his assassination, 456–457.

III. MILITARY DEEDS AND FRESH PLANS OF THE ALLIES, 1610 . 458

Frederic IV. of the Palatinate levies contributions on the bishoprics—Acts of violence in the bishoprics of Bamberg and Würzburg, 458–459.

Horrors of war in the Jülich lands and in Alsatia—Three Lutheran princes on the criminal designs of the Union, 459–461.

Hollanders and Frenchmen called into the Empire—The fortress of Jülich taken, 462–463.

Further plans of the Allies—Death of Frederic IV.—The Union in need, 462–466.

IV. CATHOLIC LEAGUE OF DEFENCE—ITS POSITION WITH REGARD TO THE UNION—A CATHOLIC-LUTHERAN-LEAGUE PROJECTED, 1609–1610 467

Duke Maximilian of Bavaria endeavours to found a Catholic League of Defence—Will not the House of Habsburg join this league?—Founding and expansion of the League in 1609—Diet of the League at Würzburg in 1610—Letter of the Duke to the Pope and to his father, 467–474.

Diet at Munich—Supineness of the ecclesiastical members of the League—Maximilian threatens to resign the presidency of the League, 474–477.

Treaty with Spain—Diet of the League at Munich and serious preparations—The Union offers peace—Maximilian on the reasons why he had signed an agreement with the Union—Rome and Spain enjoin peace, 477–480.

The Electors of Mayence and Cologne bestir themselves to organise a Catholic-Lutheran League of Defence—A scheme for a league—Which Lutheran princes are in favour of it—Failure of the undertaking, 481–484.

V. FRESH DISTURBANCES IN THE IMPERIAL HEREDITARY LANDS—MEETING OF ELECTORS AT NUREMBERG, 1611—RUDOLF II.'S LAST PLAN—HIS DEATH, 1612 485

Intrigues of Christian of Anhalt—The Emperor's state of mind, 485–487.

Treaty between the Emperor and his brother Matthias in 1610—Breach of the treaty—The 'Passauers' as incendiaries in Austria and Bohemia—A Hussite religious disturbance at Prague—False accusations against the Jesuits, 487–493.

Matthias summoned to Bohemia by the Protestants and elected king in 1611—Position of the Emperor—A despatch of the Elector of Mayence, 493–496.

The persons around the Emperor—The Emperor and King Matthias both in alliance with the Union, 496–498.

Diet of Electors at Nuremberg to settle the succession in the Empire in 1611—Incidents illustrating the general religious and social conditions—Princely banquets and luncheons—An Election Diet summoned at Frankfurt, 498–502.

What the Emperor was aiming at—Hopes of the international revolutionary party—The Emperor's death a piece of good fortune for the Empire, 502-504.

VI. ELECTION OF THE EMPEROR MATTHIAS, 1612—THE DIRECTOR OF THE NEW EMPEROR 505

The Calvinists in favour of King Matthias—By what means the latter endeavours to win over the ecclesiastical Electors, 505-507.

The Elector of Cologne against Matthias—The Pope and Spain on his side—His election and coronation, 507-510.

Character sketch of the Emperor and of his all-powerful Minister Klesl—Opinions concerning the latter, 510-513.

VII. UNION AND LEAGUE, 1612-1613 514

The Elector of Mayence on the conditions in the Empire—The Union in alliance with England since 1612—Marriage of the Palatine Elector Frederic V. with an English king's daughter—Life at Heidelberg—The last resources of the land exhausted, 514-516.

James I. hopes for the Crown of Bohemia for his son-in-law—What means he employs for this purpose, 517.

Klesl supports the claims of the Allies—Efforts of the Viennese Court to move the Catholics to yield to these demands, 517-519.

John Schweikart of Mayence and Duke Maximilian of Bavaria on the reasons why it was impossible for the Catholic Estates to give in—What Maximilian demands, 519-525.

Diet of the Catholic League at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1613, and the two 'Recesses' of this Diet, 525-529.

Diet of the Protestant Union at Rotenburg and its decisions—Alliance of the Union with the States-General, 529-532.

VIII. DIET AT RATISBON, 1613 533

Brilliant cortège of the Estates and the Emperor—Deplorable condition of the Imperial finances, 533-535.

The Emperor moves for the dissolution of the separate leagues and a generous Turkish subsidy—The corresponding princes obstruct the proceedings—Their demands mock at every constitutional principle, 535-538.

Petition of grievances of the Catholic Estates, 538-540.

The Imperial Council divided into parties—Attitude of the Imperial Vice-Chancellor of Ulm towards the corresponding princes—His admonitions to the towns, 540-544.

Invasion of the Turks—Attempts at an understanding with the Corresponding Princes—Klesl's policy—Transactions with the town deputies, and the resulting 'Resolution'—Protest of the Corresponding Princes against the Imperial Recess—The Corresponding Princes give in their ultimatum, 544-547.

About Klesl—The Corresponding Princes on Klesl—Melancholy end of the Diet, 547-550.

The Emperor describes the position of affairs in the hereditary lands—The Bohemians resolved on abolishing the House of Habsburg—Overtures to the Elector of Saxony in 1614, 550-552.

Helplessness of the Emperor—Solicitations of an Imperial ambassador in Frankfort-on-the-Main and in Lübeck—Klesl, in 1615, on the Imperial Treasury, the Imperial finances, and the decay of all government, 552-556.

IX. DISTURBANCES AND RISINGS IN THE YEARS 1614-1616—THE STATES-GENERAL 'CHIEF RULERS IN THE EMPIRE' . . . 557

Quarrels of the Possessioners in the Jülich-Cleves lands—Utterances of the Elector of Cologne on the Catholic powers—The Dutch, called into the Empire in 1614, possess themselves of the fortress of Jülich—The Catholic Estates in fear of the States-General, 557-560.

Conversion of the Count Palatine Wolfgang William of Neuburg, and his Reform decree—What 'tidings' are disseminated concerning him and the Jesuits, 561-562.

Religious conditions in Aix-la-Chapelle—An evangelical rising in 1611—Imperial commands—Execution of punishment against the town in 1614—Enactments of the Catholic Council—Protestant opinions on the 'execution,' 562-569.

Origin of the dispute between Cologne and Mühlheim—Imperial mandate of 1612—Mühlheim destroyed in 1614, 569-570.

Hollanders and Spaniards in the Empire—A political 'memorandum' of 1616, 570-571.

Origin of a rising in Frankfort-on-the-Main—The demagogue Vincent Fettmilch and his plans—Plunder and expulsion of the Jews in 1614—The rising put down, 571-575.

Rising against the Jews in Worms in 1615—Capture of the town—A cry raised against the princes as favourers of the Jews, 575.

War-flames in the Duchy of Brunswick in 1615—The Hanseatic towns, Denmark and the States-General—Influence

of the latter—King Christian IV. of Denmark and the Hanseatic towns—Christian's designs for acquisition in the Empire—The Emperor on the States-General in 1616—Position of the latter in the Empire, and what they aimed at—What one of the allied princes feared from them and their followers in the Empire—The actual plans of the Union, 575–584.

X. MEASURES OF THE UNION AND 'DANGEROUS MACHINATIONS OF THE PAPISTS'—DISSOLUTION OF THE CATHOLIC LEAGUE OF DEFENCE, 1614–1616 585

What the Allies lay to the charge of the Catholic Estates—The Union seeks to strengthen itself—Calls in the help of the Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus—The latter's answer in 1615—What Maurice of Hesse aims at, 585–589.

Maurice of Hesse summons his Provincial Estates to arms against the Catholics—The Union enters into alliance with the States-General—Admonition of a Nuremberg councillor, 589–592.

Calvinistic summons against the Catholics—Foreign potentates are to restore order in Germany, 592–595.

Caspar Schoppe on Calvinistic plans for extirpating the Roman Empire—A pamphlet against the spiritual princes of the Empire—Admonition from a Catholic to the Lutherans—The 'Seven-headed Calvinistic Spirit,' 595–599.

The melancholy condition of the Catholic League of Defence—Maximilian of Bavaria on the indifference of the members of the League—How some of them excuse themselves—Maximilian threatens to resign the leadership—His proposals for strengthening the League, 599–603.

Weakening of the League by a new Constitution favourable to Austria given to it at Ratisbon in 1613—Maximilian against the changes in its Constitution and the preponderating influence of the Austrian Minister—Why he will not make the League dependent on Austria, 603–605.

A defensive alliance between Bavaria and a few ecclesiastical Estates in 1614—Resolutions passed at a Rhenish Diet of the League—What Archduke Maximilian, as third Director, demands of Bavaria—Maximilian of Bavaria resigns the leadership in 1616—Futile attempts of some of the members of the League to persuade him to cancel his decision—A smaller league arranged in 1617—The Elector of Cologne on the violent procedure of foreign troops, and the contempt into which the Empire had fallen, 606–610.

CHAPTER

PAGE

XI. THE 'COMPOSITION AND THE SUCCESSION IN THE EMPIRE'—
 VIOLENT MEASURES OF THE UNION, 1615-1618 . . . 611

The Corresponding Princes demand the settlement of a new treaty with the Catholic Estates at a 'Composition Diet'—Why the Catholics oppose it—Despatch of the ecclesiastical Electors and the Duke of Bavaria to the Emperor in 1615—Klesl favours the 'composition,' 611-614.

The question of succession in the Empire in connection with the 'Composition'—Secret memorandum of Archduke Maximilian of the year 1616 respecting the succession—The memorandum is smuggled into the hands of the opponents—Archduke Maximilian on Klesl as traitor, 615-619.

The 'terrific schemes' of the Habsburgers and the state of things in the Imperial hereditary lands, 619-620.

Archduke Ferdinand's treaty with Spain in 1617—Ferdinand King of Bohemia, 621-622.

What the League and its foreign allies guarantee to the Duke of Lorraine if he will try for the Imperial crown—The League offers the Imperial crown to the Duke of Bavaria—Its aim in so doing—The Duke's answer—Futile endeavours of the Elector Frederic V. in Munich, 622-625.

The Allies reject the Emperor's proposal in 1617 for the dissolution of the League—They prolong the existence of the League and seek to gain new members—Their plans of war and their alliance with Bohemia—Rebellion in Bohemia in 1618, and the fomentors of the rebellion—An utterance of the Margrave of Ansbach, 626-629.

INDEX OF PLACES. 631

INDEX OF PERSONS 638

Errata

- Page 149, note 1, *for* Kurz *read* Knox
„ 151, line 17, „ Hafenmüller, *read* Hasenmüller
„ 275, note 1, „ Nivander, *read* Rivander
„ 389, mid. „ Bañez, *read* Bañez
577, line 3, „ Ravenberg, *read* Ravensberg

HISTORY

OF

THE GERMAN PEOPLE

AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

BOOK II

THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY ON
THE PEOPLE AND THE EMPIRE UP TO 1618

CHAPTER I

THE 'MAGDEBURG CENTURIES,' AND THE USE MADE OF
THEM—FABULOUS STORIES CIRCULATED AGAINST THE
PAPACY

As long as Luther was alive, the Protestant controversy, directed entirely by him, was pre-eminently of a dogmatic nature; but after the middle of the sixteenth century it became, as regards the Catholic Church, chiefly historical in character. To this its second stage Luther also had given the impulse. When the Englishman Robert Barns published his 'Lives of the Popes,'¹

¹ *Vitae Romanorum pontificum, quos papas vocamus, diligenter et*
VOL. X. B

Luther wrote, as preface to the work, a letter which was repeatedly translated into German in order 'to draw careful attention to what this faithful man of God had at heart, and to the aims which he so earnestly held up to the writers of Germany.' The Hessian Superintendent George Nigrinus placed this letter at the beginning of his History of the Popes to serve as it were as a key to it. 'Lutherus says in the letter which stands at the head of Robert Barns's little book: "I have been constrained by sorrow of heart, and also by legitimate rage, to pour out all this in order that I might inspire other pious and Christian souls to investigate, as much as they can be investigated, the popish tyranny and the Pope's Church. For without doubt all those who have the Spirit of Christ know well that they can bring no higher or more acceptable praise-offering to God than all that they can say or write against this bloodthirsty, unclean, blaspheming whore of the devil. I for my part, unversed and ill-informed as I was at first with regard to history, attacked the papacy *a priori*, as they say—that is, out of the Holy Scriptures. And now it is a wonderful delight to me to find that others are doing the same thing *a posteriori*—that is, from history—and it gives me the greatest joy and satisfaction to see, as I do most clearly, that history and Scripture entirely coincide in this respect. For what I learnt and taught from St. Paul and Daniel—namely, that the Pope was the enemy of God and of mankind—this is now pointed out by the finger of history, and not merely in a general way, but by showing up to the world the actual man." ' Nigrinus also quotes what

fideliter collectae, etc. Cum præfatione Lutheri. Wittenb. 1536. See Hirschiuss, *Librorum* . . . *Millenarius*, iii. 52, No. 536.

Luther said in his pamphlet entitled ‘Wider das Papsttum zu Rom vom Teufel gestift:’ ‘If God will, I shall improve on this in another pamphlet; but if I should die meanwhile, God grant that the pens of some others may write a thousandfold more strongly. For the diabolical papacy is the greatest disaster on earth, and the worst all the devils can perform with all their power.’¹

In the last year of his life Luther repeated his exhortation: ‘It would be a blessed thing to do, if there were any who could do it, to strike out the Pope altogether as the arch-enemy of our Lord and Saviour, and the destroyer of His Holy Christian Church. Next to the Holy Scriptures the histories of the emperors are well adapted to this end, for in them it is seen how full of devils the Popes have been and still are, and also what gross, ignorant asses they have always shown themselves as regards the Scriptures, to the eternal shame of the accursed see of Rome.’²

The first to respond to this exhortation of Luther was Flacius Illyricus, of whom Luther had predicted that after his own death ‘prostrate hope would lean on this man.’³ In Wittenberg Flacius wrote, he had come to recognise that the Lutheran Church was ‘God’s most special work.’ ‘On the other hand,’ he goes on, ‘I became firmly convinced that the Pope was in very truth the Antichrist, and I cursed and anathematised himself and his ill-doings from the bottom of

¹ *Papistische Inquisition*, p. 1. The History of the Popes by Nigrinus, says A. Hauffen, ‘is written in the most hostile spirit, and its author has made the most uncritical use of all the slanderous stories and fables which were circulated concerning the papacy by the Protestants in the Middle Ages’ (Sauer’s *Euphorion*, v. (1898), p. 725).

² Collected Works, xxxii. 359.

³ Preger, i. 35.

my heart.’¹ He considered it his life’s vocation to fight against, if possible completely to extinguish, the papacy. He republished ‘the Holy Doctor Luther’s picture of the Antichrist’ with Luther’s verses and with explanations. This was a representation of the Pope riding in full canonicals on a sow, and with his right hand blessing a heap of human excrement which he held in his left hand, and which the sow was stretching its snout after. This picture, said Flacius, ‘was inspired by spiritual, divine wisdom.’ ‘No dung stinks so foully in our nostrils as the papacy, which is the very filthiest devil’s dung, reeking up to God and the holy angels.’ Luther had appended the following lines to his picture :

*Sau du musst dich lassen reiten,
Und wohl sporen zu beiden Seiten.
Du wilt han ein Concilium,
Ja dafür hab dir mein Merdrum.*²

Since this episode the Council of Trent had been held, and Flacius now declared it to have been ‘nothing but popish dung according to the above-quoted prophecy of the most venerable lord and father Luther ;’ it was not the Holy Ghost, but the devil who had conducted affairs there ;³ all papists were hounds of Satan and children of the devil.

His first historical work was ‘Der Katalog der Wahrheitszeugen,’ which appeared first in Latin in the year 1556,⁴ went through many fresh editions, and was

¹ Preger, i. 23 ; cf. Niemöller, *M. Flacius*, p. 78.

² See our remarks, vol. vi. 273, 274, 418–420.

³ A short account of the Interim, A 3^a.

⁴ *Catalogus testium veritatis, qui ante nostram aetatem Pontifici Romano ejusque erroribus reclamationunt* (First edition 1556, printed at Basle ; the second enlarged edition in 1562 at Strasburg ; and other editions). See Preger, ii. 1167, and Niemöller, *M. Flacius*, p. 81 ff.

also translated into German and Dutch. The Catholic theologian Eisengrein complained in a counter-pamphlet that 'this work was in everybody's hands, even in those of the common people.'¹ The object of Flacius in this historical work was to show that, in spite of all the obscuration of Christian verity by the 'Anti-Christian papacy,' there had been in every century individual witnesses who had stood up for the pure truth, which had finally been brought out into full light by the new evangel. The first of these 'witnesses to the truth' against the papacy was St. Peter himself. Others are the four Latin Fathers of the Church, St. Bernard, Thomas Aquinas, and a number besides, altogether about four hundred. On the other hand, in the persons of St. Francis, St. Dominic, Peter Lombard, and Gratian, the devil had sent four of his own apostles into the world. But if St. Peter was in no way the precursor of the Pope and the founder of the 'Chair of Pestilence,' it was probably from certain actions and faults of this apostle that the conduct and rule of the Roman bishops drew their pattern, and indeed were prefigured. In the first place, says Flacius, it can in no wise be denied that Peter was of humble birth and position, and quite uneducated; so also do the Popes, as a rule, work their way gradually from the lowest dregs of the populace up through the ranks to their heights of tyrannous rule, and they have generally been the 'most ignorant asses.'² 'Further, it cannot be disputed that Peter was often guilty of ambition and greed of dominion. For, not to mention his frequent quarrels with the other

¹ Eisengrein, *Catalogus testium veritatis* (Dilingae, 1565), in the dedication.

² 'Indoctissimi asini.'

Apostles concerning supremacy, he alone had the audacity to cast it in the teeth of Christ that he had left all to follow Him. Permeated with the lust of material power, Peter impudently scolded the Saviour for His willingness to suffer for mankind. Christ, therefore, rebukes him for his stupidity and ambition,¹ calls him Satan, and will have nothing more to say to him; all this points to the Roman Bishop, and signifies that he will become a scandal for the Church of God, and that the Lord Jesus Himself was bound to reject and denounce him in every way.' Thus and still more strongly did Flacius deliver himself concerning the Prince of the Apostles.² Effusions of this sort were joyfully welcomed by the Protestant preachers and carefully transposed into sermons. 'I must, indeed, myself acknowledge,' says the Weimar Superintendent-General Antonius Probus, in a sermon printed in 1590, 'that, although I had already before read, heard, and even seen much of the villanies of the Popes, and so had been strengthened in my conviction that the Pope of Rome was the Antichrist, yet when I read this book I found that popish iniquity was ten times worse than I had ever imagined. Now I hold it to be true and certain that, as the canonists also write, the Popes are neither men nor gods, but real incarnate devils who far outdo Satan in wickedness and rascality. If we were to collect together all the infamous deeds of the Popes recounted in histories, God help us, what a monstrous book it would make! We should not have enough ox-, cow-, donkey-, and calf-skins to bind it.'³

The most lasting influence which Flacius exercised

¹ For such, on consideration (he says), is the sense of the Greek *φρονεῖν*.

² *Catalogus*, pp. 1-3.

³ Marx, *Protest.* p. 44.

was by means of the 'Magdeburg Centuries' which he called into being. This work was a comprehensive Church History divided into centuries, and it became the actual storehouse of the Protestant controversy. The first volume appeared in the year 1559; the last, which included the thirteenth century, in 1574. For the production of this work Flacius had organised at Magdeburg an historical society of which he was himself 'the ship's captain or chief helmsman,' for he surpassed nearly all his contemporaries in power of work. His literary legacy, which may be seen at Wolfenbüttel, affords the most convincing proof that, when visiting libraries as a literary freebooter, he could use his 'knife'—that knife which had grown notorious—with skill and knowledge.¹ His principal collaborators were

¹ So speaks from close acquaintance the chief librarian Ebert, in the *Archives of the Society for Old German Historical Research*, vi. 2. When Flacius began compiling *The Centuries*, 'he travelled about everywhere,' writes Salig (*Historie der Augsburg Confession*, iii. 279). 'frequently in disguise, and visited the libraries in the convents; and whenever he found anything good, he was not so honourable as to scruple to cut out or tear out whole pages, or to carry the MSS. away with him; and thus to this day [the preface tells us that Salig wrote in 1735] *culter Flacianus* and *manus Flaciana* are still proverbial.' Respecting the legacy of MSS. left by Flacius, and which are in the Wolfenbüttel Library, Salig says, iii. 287: 'I see that the Scholastici Wittenbergenses by no means wronged Flacius when they wrote that he had broken open Melancthon's room and writing-table,' 'for there are numbers of Flacian's MSS. and letters here [at Wolfenbüttel]. Now among the MSS. of Wigand and Flacian there are found many autograph letters of Melancthon. Whence could these two men have got them? Melancthon, whose deadly enemies they were, would certainly not have given them to them. Therefore they must have been boldly stolen. Against this testimony of the legacy itself, Preger's *Justification of Flacius* (ii. 431 ff.) falls utterly to pieces.' A Rostock preacher and university professor writes at the end of the sixteenth century respecting the Rostock Dominican Library: 'Bibliotheca ex qua multos veteres libros manuscriptos et excusos M. Illyricus permissu Senatus acceperat ad usum Historiae ecclesiasticae . . . cliographo autem suo reddito Senatui et deposito rursus in Bibliothecam

the theologians, John Wigand and Matthias Judex, both of them 'inflamed with hatred against the Roman Anti-

istam promiserat librorum istorum restitutionem. Chirographum illud vidi cum adjuncto indice librorum ablatorum, sed *non intellexi* eos unquam restitutos fuisse,' in E. I. de Westphalen, *Monumenta inedita rerum germanicarum*, I. (Lipsiae, 1739), 1560. A Catholic contemporary of Flacius, Caspar Ulenberger, writes: 'I remember hearing a Lutheran clergyman, who lived for a time at Magdeburg, say that Illyricus was openly accused of robbery because he had sold parchment MSS. which had been lent to him, and which were no longer wanted, and had put the money in his own pocket. It is at any rate certain that he sold the "*Nicene Council*" at the Frankfort fair, to one of our party who noticed an erasure in the MS., for the like of which, as he was wont to say, a public writer or a notary would have been declared dishonoured. Originally the words "*assidente Constantino*" occurred in this MS.; but in the word "*assidente*" the first two letters had been erased and "*prae*" substituted, as though Constantine had presided over the Council.' With regard to the latter charge Preger remarks, ii. 433: 'Even if there were any ground for this charge it can be easily explained away. Flacius only corrected the falsification which the earlier popish copyist had allowed himself to make, and gave the right reading'! An ingenious defence of Flacius certainly. 'The Roman copyist' indulged in no falsification, for Constantine did not preside at Nicæa; but Osius of Corduba, as papal legate, with the two Roman priests, Vitus and Vincentius. See v. Hefele, *Konzieliengeschichte*, i. (2 Aufl. Freiburg, 1873) 39 ff., 302. The most zealous literary assistant of the Centuriators was Marcus Wagner from Friemar, near Gotha, who, in his own writings, claims the title of 'Historicus et antiquarum rerum inquisitor in Europa,' but who is guilty of the meanest historical falsifications; see Schulte, *Beiträge*, pp. 94 ff., 139-148. One of the most prominent patrons of this undertaking of Flacius was a councillor of the Emperor Ferdinand, Caspar von Niedbruck (Nidbruck), a secret Protestant, who was most closely bound up with King Maximilian of Bohemia (the future Emperor) and his Protestant court preacher, Sebastian Pfäuser (Schulte, pp. 62, 69 ff., 104 ff., 150). Flacius as well as Nidbruck carried on literary intercourse with George Cassander and Cornelius Wouters, who 'worked diligently at Cologne in furtherance of Flacius' ends.' This intercourse supplies a simple explanation for the 'disappearance of three codices from Cologne.' See fuller details in A. Nürnberger, *Die Bonifatiuslitteratur der Magdeburger Centuriatoren*, in the new *Archives of the Society for Old German Historical Research*, ii. (Hanover, 1885) 29 ff., 35. See also the complementary remarks of Niemöller, *M. Flacius*, p. 85 ff.; further, B. Bibl, Nidbruck and Tanner, *Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Magdeburger Centurien und zur Charakteristik König Maximilians II.* (Wien, 1898); Schaumkell, *Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Magdeburger Centurien* (Ludwigslust, 1898, Progr.).

christ and his members, the poisoners of Christianity,' for whose complete extirpation they beseechingly solicited the secular authorities. 'Not only,' wrote Judex, 'must all the ministers of the Divine Word combine with spiritual weapons against the Antichrist, but also all those who wield political power must take sword in hand and exterminate the papists as cruel murderers and soul-destroyers.'¹ According to Wigand it was part of the doctrines of Roman Anti-Christianity to regard the Pope as a demi-god, consisting of God and of man, to pray to the devil and to idolatrous images of gold and silver, brass and stone, and to deify the saints in a heathenish manner; as guardians of the decalogue, the secular authorities were bound to root out and seriously punish all this idolatry and sodomitish abomination.² The members of Antichrist—that is, in the language of the preachers of the sixteenth century, the whole body of Catholics—were, according to 2 Peter ii., the foulest of the human species, a truly sodomitish class of men: 'the mark of the beast was branded on their foreheads.'

It was out of views and assumptions of this sort that the 'Centuries' were evolved. The work, as Flacius said, was 'to reveal the beginnings, the development, and the ruthless designs of the Antichrist,' and it was to be 'a cornucopia of all the events, affairs, and quarrels of the Church.' It was to prove from primitive evidence that 'at the beginning of the Church it was not popish, Antichristian doctrine, but evangelical teaching and religion which had prevailed.' 'Since the creation of the world' no work on Church history

¹ See our remarks, vol. viii. 90-96.

² Schlüsselburg, xiii. 258, 278, 303.

had ever been published which had been so useful and so necessary to Christianity.¹ The exposure of the 'incarnate Antichrist at Rome' was considered one of the first and the most important signs that the end of the world was near.²

For the evidence of the antiquity of Luther's doctrine it was an awkward concession to make that in the second century—that is to say, shortly after the death of the last Apostle—corruption had already crept in; that there had been a lamentable obscuration of the most important articles of faith, especially of the doctrines of free-will and justification, and that the Catholic doctrine was already met with in the early Fathers. Clement, Justinus, and Irenæus teach falsely concerning justification and penitence; the devil has falsified these doctrines in order by his cunning to rob men of all comfort. With regard to the Mass, Flacius complains that, even in the writings of St. Ignatius of Antioch, a pupil of the Apostles and a martyr, there are 'inconvenient expressions,' and that Irenæus also uses equally inconvenient language on the subject.³

In the third century the true doctrine of good works was already quite on the decline; most of the writers of that period perverted the doctrine of penitence in an extraordinary manner; even celibacy had already come into vogue.⁴ This explains how it was that the 'Centuries' was repeatedly cited by the Catholics in proof of the antiquity of Catholic doctrines and precepts.

Flacius divided the history of the Antichrist—that is

¹ *Centuria i.*, praef. Preger, ii. 451.

² *Centuria i.*^b, 461.

³ *Centuria ii.*, praef. AA 2^b, AA 3^b, 58 ff.

⁴ *Centuria iii.* 79, 247.

to say, the Roman Pope—under three heads. He distinguished between the hidden or invisible Antichrist—subtly insinuating himself everywhere—the Antichrist ruling openly, and the Antichrist shown up in his true character.¹ The 'hidden Antichrist' is tracked by Flacius into the most secret mole-holes. He finds suspicious traces, even in Irenæus, because of his saying that all other Churches must conform to the Roman Church on account of the latter's priority of rank; also a remark of St. Ignatius of Antioch concerning 'the precedence of the Roman Church' had a suspicious ring. In the third century the 'mystery of evil' began especially 'to become alive in the Roman bishops.'² Later on there arose, side by side with the Antichrist and outside the Church, another Antichrist named Mohammed;³ in Germany, Boniface, 'the Apostle of lies,' worked in the cause of the first Antichrist. This errand-boy of the Pope went to work with cunning and with violence, insolently and shamelessly defying the warnings of all the exemplary men who urged him not to bring the yoke of the Antichrist on the neck of the Germans. He also gathered an army together and burst into Thuringia with 'spear and shield and iron,' a proceeding which could not but result in the massacre of numbers of the inhabitants. From this date the execrable Romish beast lifted itself higher and higher. Gregory VII. is put forward as the most monstrous of all monsters that the earth ever brought forth,⁴ as a disreputable sorcerer who had concluded a direct alliance with the devil incarnate,

¹ Niemöller, *M. Flacius*, pp. 89–90.

² *Centuria iii.* 170 ff.

³ Niemöller, *M. Flacius*, p. 96.

⁴ 'Monstrum omnium, quae haec terra portavit, monstrosissimum.'

and who had compassed the death of several Popes before he mounted the 'Chair of Pestilence.' For the dragon does not become a veritable dragon until he has devoured many others. The whole terrible description of this Pope, to whom the 'Century' writers imputed every imaginable crime, was a typical specimen of the Protestant polemics of that period, and even of later times. In his '*Catalogus testium veritatis*' &c. Flacius was careful also to give 'an appalling picture of the most obscene Hildebrand.' This Pope, he said, had been a sorcerer and had shaken fire out of his sleeves; he had thrown a consecrated wafer into the fire in order to inquire of the devil; he had also solemnly prophesied before all the cardinals that the Emperor would die before the festival of St. Peter, and had then despatched assassins to put an end to him.¹

'The marks of the Antichrist' were also strikingly apparent in Alexander III. 'He worshipped strange gods,' said the Centurists, 'strengthened and confirmed the teaching of the devil, and thought highly of Baalism.' 'One sign' that the Pope was the Antichrist was that 'by his decrees he supported the blasphemous people of Judah. For he not only tolerated them, but he allowed them to restore their ruined synagogues.' From the life of the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa in his relation to the Pope he produced all sorts of reports only calculated to excite indignation and horror.² We

¹ *Catalogus*, p. 219. See Niemöller, *M. Flacius*, pp. 100-104.

² Anyone reading these and numbers of similar fabulous reports in the pages of the *Centuries* must marvel at the judgment passed on this work by Professor F. X. von Wegele in his account of German Historiography since the rise of Humanism (Munich and Leipzig, 1885), pp. 333-334. For the battle against the papacy considered as Antichristendom, he says,

are told that Alexander used his influence craftily to persuade the Emperor to take the field against the Turks because he hoped that Frederic would be killed. When the latter, however, contrary to the Pope's expectations, met with successes, Alexander secretly sent a painter to take Frederic's portrait without his knowing it, and he sent the picture to the Sultan with a letter telling him that if he (the Sultan) wished to protect his sovereignty and possess it in peace he must keep his eye specially on the man whose picture he was sending him and take care to kill him. It happened accordingly one day when Frederic was about to return

the Centurists 'forged and used the weapons of *historical criticism*, which till then had hardly been thought of, and they have become a fruitful example for the general treatment of history in every way. Thus it came about that the *critical principle*, which is inherent in Protestantism as opposed to Catholicism, grew to such tremendous force in its application to history.' . . . 'In the investigation of the history of the papacy this critical procedure showed itself at its very best.' No less astonishing is v. Wegele's judgment of Aventin. We will only notice one point. A. Nürnberger, who had a more thorough knowledge of Bonifacian literature than anyone else, says in his article cited above at p. 7, note 1: 'The annals of the Bavarian historiographer, Johann Turmair, generally called Aventin, were very largely used by Flacius, who succeeded in getting sight of them in the collection of MSS. left by Aventin. Aventin was acquainted with the correspondence, as well as with the biographies of St. Boniface compiled by Willibald and Othlon. The way in which he used the first was uncritical and arbitrary in the highest degree. *The letters which are printed are in some cases complete interpolations—from ep. 12, for instance, nothing but the date has remained intact—in other cases they have been freely rewritten, in others they consist of extracts arbitrarily altered from the original.*' Three hundred years ago the Jesuit Gretser already pointed out to Aventin the most glaring falsifications (see *Gretseri Opp.* vi. 242-243). Nevertheless, v. Wegele writes (p. 261 ff.): 'To the Father of Bavarian historical writing' it is fitting that 'one of the first places be accorded among scientific investigators of his day.' He speaks in praise of Aventin's 'learned and *critical* standpoint,' of his 'lively instinct for historic truth,' his 'hatred of the encroachments of the Hierarchy' which 'opened his eyes and sharpened his sight,' of his 'righteous wrath,' of his 'winnowing conscience,' and so forth.

home from a victorious campaign, and, leaving his army, retreated with some of his cavalry into a large forest in Armenia to enjoy a refreshing bath, he was suddenly surrounded by Turks, who sprang on him from an ambush, took him captive, and conducted him to the Sultan. 'Although he at first denied that he was the Emperor, and gave himself out as his door-keeper, he was soon identified by means of the portrait sent by that traitor, the Pope, and by his Holiness's letter which was now read out to Frederic.' But in the end he was kindly let off by the Turk. 'Behold now, the Turk, the Turk, we say, the enemy of all honour and piety, is more just and righteous than the Roman Pope himself.'¹

The Centurists had good luck with this legend, which, by the way, had already appeared several times in earlier German books.² It was frequently reproduced and embellished in Protestant controversial writings, and also in sermons, as 'a true and terrible story of popish treachery and bloodthirstiness.' There was also another story which was still oftener circulated by the Centurists concerning this Pope and this Emperor.

One of the most edifying spectacles in the history of the Middle Ages is that of the reconciliation which was effected at Venice in 1177 between Alexander and Frederic Barbarossa. The latter had ruptured the unity of the Church, brought the odium of a schism on Christianity, and conjured up a terrific warfare of eighteen years' duration. At Venice he made public

¹ 'Ecce Turcam, Turcam dicimus, pietatis honestatisque hostem, ipso Romano Pontifice aequiorem et justiozem' (*Centuria xii.* 1416).

² It occurs in full in the pamphlet cited below at p. 17, note 1, in Luther's Collected Works, xxxii. 388-394.

confession of his guilt. 'The whole world shall know,' he said, 'that we were in a state of darkness under the influence of evil men, and that we well-nigh brought the Church of God to ruin.' He threw himself in tears at the feet of Alexander, recognising and venerating in the aged Pope the power of God triumphant over the mighty ones of earth. Alexander, weeping, raised him from his knees, offered him his lips for a kiss of peace, gave him his blessing, and then with loud rejoicing the choir of German singers struck up the hymn, 'Lord God, Thy name we praise.'¹

Thus the story was related in the genuine records. The Centurists, however, adopted a legendary account which suited their own purposes. They represented the Emperor as having been treated in the most unworthy manner by the Pope. He had been forced, they said, to fall on the ground and 'cringe at the feet of Alexander, who himself was seated on the most splendid throne and who trod with his feet on the Emperor's neck,'² and said: 'Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder, the young lion and the adder shalt thou trample under feet.' The good Emperor was much distressed at having this affront put on him before all the people, and he answered: 'Not unto thee, but unto Peter, whose successor thou art, do I render obedience.' The Pope, however, trod a second time on his neck and said: 'To me also as well as to Peter.' 'The Emperor thought the situation was becoming dangerous, and so remained silent, and thus peace was re-established.'³

¹ Reuter, *Gesch. Alexanders des Dritten*, iii. (Leipzig, 1864), 304 ff.

² ' . . . prostrati Imperatoris collum pedibus conculcans. . . . '

³ *Centuria xii.* 1417.

As early as the year 1545 a pamphlet had appeared at Wittenberg, with a preface by Luther, on the subject of the *Papsttreue* ('Pope's faithfulness') of Alexander towards the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa. The preface ran as follows: 'If these desperate villains had not been Popes and coarse, unlettered asses of the devil, but upright, pious, and learned bishops, they would have known better than to behave like this; yea, they would have been terrified to have trodden on the neck of an Emperor whose majesty was ordained by God for men to reverence (2 Peter ii.), nor would they have dared so scandalously and mockingly to use the language of Scripture against him, as Alexander III. does here with Ps. xci.: "Thou shalt tread on the lion and the adder, the young lion and the adder shalt thou trample under feet," turning the words with his hellish, devilish mouth into ridicule and bitter revenge against the Emperor. For in this case it would be juster to say that the hellish dragon and lion, adder and basilisk, Alexander III., treads and tramples on a Christian prince, and in the person of this prince treads under foot Christ Himself: that is the truth.' 'And for this iniquitous conduct of this scandalous, accursed Pope Alexander, emperors, kings, princes, and secular lords must nevermore forgive the Popes—nay, the beasts—but remember it against them for ever, to the everlasting disgrace of the Romish, devilish See; just as Christ nevermore forgives or will forgive the Pope and Chair of Rome for such iniquity, so His Christian Church must not forgive it. For they do not repent of it, they are not penitent, the blasphemous, desperate scoundrels, but, on the contrary, they laugh over the transaction and are well satisfied as though quite

the right thing had been done, and they would only too gladly follow this example with regard to all emperors, kings, and princes, if they could but manage it; and for this one deed of Alexander's only, all those who are or wish to be pious Christians should make a point of spitting whenever they hear the name of Pope mentioned, or even when they read or think about him. For what the Pope dares do to an Emperor, to such an excellent personage appointed by God, he would much more dare towards you and me—yea, to all Christendom, and to Christ also and God Himself, as his father the devil does, from whom, indeed, he has learnt this villainy.' After praising the admirable Emperor Frederic, Luther goes on: 'To think that such a dear man should have been trodden under foot by such a foul paunch, putrid belly, nasty pelt and stench-bag, who has no episcopal or other office in the Church (for the papacy is of the devil, as everyone knows), and who is not even worthy to unloose his shoes. Would not a Pope, if he was a Christian, think to himself: "Though I should refuse to spare his crown and majesty, ordained by God, I will at any rate respect the holy baptism and the precious blood of Christ, wherewith he was consecrated a Christian, that my blasphemous feet may not transgress so abominably"?' Yea, verily, how should these blasphemers and despisers of God, these great, coarse donkeys, blockheads, clappers, niggards, blackguards, rakes, senseless fools, devil's vermin, &c., &c., think anything else but what is well-pleasing to the devil?'¹

¹ ' *Papsttreu Hadriani IV. und Alexanders III. gegen Kaiser Friedrichen Barbarossa geübt*. Compiled from history, useful to read, with a preface by Doctor M. Luther' (Wittenberg, 1545), in *Luther's Collected Works*, xxxii. 359-361.

‘And so,’ wrote a Protestant polemical writer, ‘it has been made known openly to the world by many different writers, and especially by the great and learned Magdeburg Church History, what gruesome, inhuman crimes the Roman Antichrists and lieutenants of the devil have perpetrated against the emperors, how they have attempted to poison them and have trodden on their necks with their stinking feet, as happened to the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa at Venice; and now every child in the Empire will be well instructed to abhor and curse the Roman synagogue of Satan, and to mock in the streets at their carnal wickedness, their sodomitism, and by whatever name we can call the Roman vileness in trampling under foot the most highly laudable Imperial Majesty.’¹ ‘The Roman Antichrist and man of sin’—so preached the court preacher of the Elector of Saxony, Martin Mirus, in 1586—‘is now ridiculed by the children in the streets, while formerly emperors and kings allowed themselves to be trodden under foot by him, as in the case of the pious German Emperor Barbarossa.’² The polemical writer Eybenhold, in 1596, actually referred to Otto von Freising as his authority for the statement that Alexander III. ‘had trodden the Emperor under his feet, whereupon the bystanders had sung: “On adders and basilisks shalt thou walk.”’³

Many ‘truth-loving men and vigorous disputants’

¹ *Wölfe im Schafspelz*, Bl. 21–22.

² The third sermon preached on the occasion of the electoral funeral procession at Freiberg (1586). L 2^b.

³ U. Eybenhold, *Confirmatio gegen und wider die Jesuiten* (1596), p. 26; cf. the *Mitteilungen von Marx, Protest. Kanzel*, p. 40 ff., from a sermon of the Weimar Superintendent-General, Antonius Probus.

were not even satisfied with this terrible picture. 'Observe,' wrote the theologian Conrad Schlüsselburg, 'that the Roman Antichrist, who is in truth the devil incarnate, employs emperors, kings and princes as ordinary servants, as sedan-chair carriers, mule drivers, errand boys, and waiters.' Luther, the angel of the Lord, rightly said: 'Whosoever does not hate the Pope from the bottom of his heart cannot be saved.'¹ The theologian James Heerbrand 'piled up the agony' by declaring that the Popes in general trod with their insolent, devilish feet on the necks of the German emperors, uttering all the while abusive, scandalous phrases which they had composed for the occasion.²

David Maier, pastor at Hanover, said in the dedication of a pamphlet to Frederic Ulrich, Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg: 'Time after time it has happened that the Pope has not only set the crown on the heads of the emperors with his feet, but has also trodden underfoot these godlike rulers and loaded them with the utmost Satanic shame! The temporal authorities, whom Holy Scripture designates as gods, have been trampled on by this wretched son of Cerberus, made to wallow in dirt, and dishonoured in the most revolting manner. Such, for instance, among others, was the case with the godlike Frederic Barbarossa, that noble-minded, semi-divine Prince,³ who was treated in this manner by Alexander III. at Venice before the eyes of the whole town and the whole world. The only wonder is that not one of the imperial guardsmen, not one true and loyal German man who witnessed the proceeding, had the heroic daring to pierce in two

¹ Schlüsselburg &c. viii. 50.

² *Propfung*, p. 260.

³ '*Principi semideo.*'

with a dagger the heart of that whoremonger's son, Pope Alexander.' ¹

'And not only with their devilish feet,' says another preacher, 'have these hounds of Popes trodden down the majesties and highest ruling authorities of the German nation, but with their claws also they have scratched their faces till they bled, whenever they refused to obey their devilish commands and to fall at their feet and worship them.' ²

The theologian Samuel Huber also had been informed that it was 'well known how the wolves at Rome had sprung with all fours on many pious emperors.' 'No emperor and no king has ever been tranquil and safe from the Popes; they have been molested by them always and at all times until they have consented to sing *Placet* to their Holinesses; if they would not do this, then land and people could not furnish blood enough to satisfy the fury of these devouring wolves. Christian rulers have been nothing more to them than material for their carnival riotings.' 'Even the Turks can never shed so much blood as has been poured out by this hellish crew of bloodsucking dragons.' ³

The Hessian theologians confirmed Huber: the sun had never looked down on 'more villainous scoundrels than the Popes and their gangs; they were whoremongers, bloodshedders, adulterers, sodomites, murderers, persecutors of true Christians, perjurers; the Pope had permitted sodomy with boys.' ⁴

¹ *Omnium sanctorum jubilaeus evangelicus* (1617), Epist. dedicatoria 7^b.

² *Ein hochnottürfftige Predig wider den römischen Antichrist und sein Rottgesellen* ('A highly necessary sermon against the Roman Antichrist and his rabble of associates'), 1589, B 2, C 2.

³ *Antwort auf die sieben Teufel*, ii. (1596), 112.

⁴ *Notwendige Besichtigung*, pp. 245, 266.

By means of the 'Centuries' Huber demonstrated that Silvester II., Gregory VII., and many such 'bolts of hell,' down to Clement VII., 'had not only been devil's conspirators and depraved scoundrels, but actually devils incarnate.'¹

The historian Sebastian Franck, although a fierce antagonist of the papacy, nevertheless gives a whole list of Popes adorned with every virtue of heart and mind; he praises one for genuine piety, another for scholarship, and yet others for benevolent love by the couches of the sick and the dying.² Of this, however, the later 'zealots for God,' who pretended that 'from pure love of Christ they were compelled to make known all the world over the secret of Rome's iniquity,' would hear nothing.

Cyriakus Spangenberg had already uttered his historical verdict in 1562. 'The Popes,' he said, 'are murderers; they condemn and put to death all those who blame the godless, sodomitish profligacy of the popish priests, monks and nuns.' 'Their work is gorging and swilling and dishonouring women and young girls.' The reigning Pope, Pius IV., was a 'devil's head' and a 'snotty rat's king,' and he lay in Castle Sant' Angelo at Rome 'like a fattened sow in her sty.' 'All the Popes, from Boniface III. down to the present ass, who have idled on the Roman bolster—that is about 170—have been, with scarcely more than

¹ *Antwort auf die sieben Teufel*, &c., pp. 96, 102. Others heightened still further the colours of the *Centuries*. Thus, for instance, the Hessian theologians (*Notwendige Besichtigung*, p. 51) made Damasus II., who, according to the *Centuries*, xi. 525, had been poisoned, into a poison-mixer.

² See Bischof, pp. 121, 127.

two exceptions, desperately wicked scoundrels, idolaters, sorcerers, liars, and murderers.’¹

In order that ‘the dear reader might be converted into an enemy of the Roman murderers,’ the Hessian Superintendent George Nigrinus wrote a History of the Popes in 1582. His object was, after the manner of the ‘Centurists,’ to give an account of the Anti-christian papacy, ‘retailing all its abominations, showing its origin, development, rule, and then its fall, describing and laying bare everything from stories in history in such a manner as had never been done before in any German book.’ ‘For we are in duty bound,’ he said, ‘to show up the Babylonish whore and uncover her shame; she has deserved it and courted it, and we have also God’s command to do so (Apocalypse 18).’² This book gained Nigrinus the praise of being ‘a remarkable historian,’ who, ‘by means of incontestable documents and records, had freely and boldly besmirched the unhallowed papists with all the mud and “cart grease” that belonged to them,’ and which ‘they would now be compelled to lick through all futurity as befitted such wicked, artful rogues.’³ Nigrinus was firmly convinced that by this work he had proved that ‘Rome and the Roman Church was a prostitute and a den of thieves, yea, a habitation of the devil and a receptacle for all impure spirits.’ ‘This,’ he added honestly, ‘the papists do not believe.’⁴

A few years before, Nigrinus’s friend and brother-

¹ *Wider die bösen Sieben* (‘Against the wicked seven’), C 2^a, C 3^b, H^b, 4^b, J 1³.

² *Papistische Inquisition*.

³ ‘A sermon against the abominable papal whore and its wiles and designs since the beginning of Christian times’ (1584), D 2.

⁴ *Papistische Inquisition*, p. 727.

at-arms John Fischart of Mayence, 'in the service of his Fatherland, for the glory of the Church, and for the edification of all men and women,' had published, under the title 'Bienenkorb des heiligen römischen Immenschwarms,' a work in which the history of the Popes was divided into four groups. 'The first consists of heretics, epicureans, open blasphemers, frivolous mocking-birds, to whom all religions were food for fun ; the second of unclean whores, adulterers, incestuous persons, and sodomitish scoundrels ; the third of ecclesiastical flayers and execrable bloodhounds ; the fourth of sorcerers, votaries of the black art, poisoners, and others of the kind who consort with the devil and practise devil's arts, and bear on their escutcheons hoopoes, owls, huhus, bats, vultures, woodpeckers, crows, black dogs and cats, and devil's claws.'

Here, as in the 'Magdeburg Centuries,' Gregory VII. was depicted as the worst possible monster. It was said of him that 'he had helped at least six Popes out of the world one after another with "Italian sauces" and "Venetian soups" in order to make way for himself ;' on his death-bed he had himself acknowledged that he had raised disturbance throughout the whole of Christendom, and that he had maintained traitors, murderers, robbers of churches, incendiaries, and highwaymen ; he had engaged certain agents who undertook to put an end to the Emperor Henry by treachery or by poison, and with a view to this he generally carried a book of magic about with him. He had thrown the Holy Sacrament into the fire 'in order to find out from the devil by enchantment what sort of luck he would have against the Emperor Henry.' 'This "little Tommy" had introduced celibacy, had forbidden the monks "in all

eternity to eat flesh," he had separated the Countess Matilda from her husband "in order that he might have the dear woman all to himself, and indeed all histories testify that she was very intimate with him." ¹

'Although indeed,' wrote a 'peaceable minister of the Word' in the year 1584, 'it can in no way be denied that the idolatrous, devilish papacy has now, through the zeal of pious theologians and other writers, been so thoroughly and properly shown up and depicted in numbers of books great and small, in leaflets, and in penny sheets, that every intelligent person must be filled with horror at it, and though children in the streets have learnt to curse and mock the Roman Antichrist and his damned crew more than the Turkish

¹ *Bienenkorb*, part 6, ch. iii. This same Fischart, however, who under the name of 'Jesuwalt Pickhart' flung such a work against the papacy among the people, was not ashamed, under his own name, to associate himself with a publisher's undertaking in honour of the Popes. His relative, the Calvinist book-dealer Bernard Jobin, at Strasburg, published a work entitled *Eigenwissenliche und wohlgedenkwiürdige Contrafeyungen oder Antlitzgestaltungen der römischen Pöpste an der Zahl achtundzwanzig von dem 1378 Jahr bis auf den heut Stulffühigen künstlich angebildet*. This book was provided with 'summary eulogies' of the lives of the Popes, first written in Latin, but afterwards translated into German by J. Fischart, 'for the amusement and instruction of lovers of history and pictorial art.' Bishop Melchior, of Basle, to whom the book was dedicated, was requested 'nevermore to allow his great kindness and beneficence to fade.' The Popes appear here in quite different colours from those in which they are depicted in the *Bienenkorb*. Even Alexander VI. is praised as 'a man of great mind, witty, and eloquent;' all that is said to his blame is that he was 'by nature artful.' *Accuratae effigies pontificum maximorum*, &c. (Strasburg, 1573). If we compare the language which Fischart undertook to translate with the language of the *Bienenkorb*, of the *Jesuitehütlein*, and so forth, we cannot blame the Franciscan Johannes Nas for writing of Fischart: 'He is no honest writer: he paints in many colours.' Against this reproach Fischart cannot be defended by the fact on which Wackernagel (p. 92) lays so great stress, that in the preface to the *Effigies* he defends ancient German art against the Italian Vasari in the warmest terms.

abominations and crimes, nevertheless these books alone do not suffice for the enlightenment of the nation, seeing that such numbers of the common people can neither read nor write. The people must therefore be suitably instructed from the pulpit by the proclamation of the Divine Word and the brightly illumining evangel, and they must also be taught from the pulpit all that has gone on and is still going on at Rome among the devilish company of murderers, whoremongers, and sodomites and their devoted followers, for Christendom is growing lukewarm, and even among the evangelicals there is no small number of miserable compromisers and courtiers of the Antichrist who say that we must let the papists go their way, and that we can very well preach the Gospel without cursing the Chair of Pestilence and wickedness, and enjoining hatred of the papists. But those who speak in this way are acting against the commandment of God, who has said that we are to hate those who hate Him—that is to say, therefore, the papists—and the people must be taught to this effect from the pulpit.’¹

In sermons innumerable the people were indeed ‘taught to this effect.’ Doctor George Miller, for instance, preached as follows at Augsburg, in 1584: ‘No deeds of shame can be mentioned, no vice can be imagined, in which the See of Rome has not wallowed and defiled itself.’ The Popes were ‘sorcerers, craftsmen of the devil, assassins, poisoners, sodomites.’ ‘Up with you, hail, thunder, and lightning,’ he exclaimed from the pulpit; ‘yea, up with you, fire of hell, and punish this Roman profligacy.’ He was obliged, he said, to preach sermons of this sort, because even the believers

¹ *Die grewliche Papsthure*, &c. (see above, p. 22, note 3), Bl. C.

in the holy evangel 'did not from their hearts abhor' the Pope and his abominations. And yet Luther had expressed the wish that 'God would fill you all with hatred towards the Pope' because he had held it to be 'high wisdom and piety' 'to be at heart the enemy of the Pope.'¹

When Miller became, later on, Professor of Theology, pastor and superintendent at Jena, he delivered there a series of 'Sermons on the Popes,' and he published them in 1599, with a dedication to two Saxon dukes.² In these sermons he attempted, among other things, to show that the whole papacy 'was made up of lies, murder, shame, and robbery.' Thus, for instance, in the fourth discourse he treated of 'the Pope as a liar,' in the fifth of 'the Pope as a murderer,' in the sixth of 'the scandalous Pope,' in the seventh of 'the carrion Pope.' He said in his preface to the two dukes that 'whosoever was not as hostile at heart to the Pope as to the devil could not be saved,' 'as the Spirit of God had expressly stated through the mouth of Doctor Luther.'³

His object was to teach the people from the history of the papacy that the Roman Antichrist worked his way in everything by 'sword and violence, murder and slaughter, strangling and bloodshed.' The Popes, moreover, were 'devil's teachers, calumniators, blasphemers, and preachers of abomination,' and they were

¹ *Zwo christliche in Gottes Wort und bewährten Historien wohlbegündete Predigten vom Ursprung &c. des päpstlichen Stuhles zu Rom* (Tübingen, 1584), pp. 40 ff., 44, 48. ('Two Christian sermons, well-grounded on God's Word and authentic histories, concerning the origin &c. of the Papal Chair at Rome.')

² Mylius, *Bapstpredigten*, &c. I quote from the Frankfort edition of 1615.

³ *Bapstpredigten, Widmung*, ij^b.

so expert in all crimes and devil's arts that since Silvester II. twenty-two of them in succession, without exception, had been 'sorcerers, adepts in the black art, and devil's rascals.'¹ He had a great deal more information to give than his history-mongering predecessors. If, for instance, in the latter we read that Gregory VII. once shook fire out of his sleeves, so now from the lips of this pulpit orator the burghers and students of Jena learnt concerning 'that hellish Father' (Gregory VII.) that 'he had but to smile and straightway he spat out fire, just like a true hellish Cerberus, and if he did but shake the sleeve of his coat, sparks and flames of fire burst forth in such abundance that it seemed as if he must be quite full of hell fire.'² Of Alexander III. he said that he had not only intrigued with Turkey against the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa, but that he had also attempted 'on German soil to put an end to the Emperor by poison.' The Pope had also dealt so astutely with the emperors that 'he trampled them under foot and stood with his feet on their necks.' It was by papal instigation that the Emperor Henry VII. had been poisoned.³ And in order that there should be no likelihood of his hearers thinking that such inhuman atrocities were perpetrated only in earlier stages, Miller informed them, out of the 'Postille' of Siegfried Saccus, that the Popes during the thirty years from 1550-1580 had compassed, by murder and bloodshed, the deaths of no less than 900,000 people, 'among whom 30 were of princely ranks, 148 were counts, 235 barons, 144,515 members of the nobility, and 700,060 of the common people.' What the Pope wished was that all evangelical monarchies and principalities should be

¹ Pp. 77, 107, 112, 132.² Pp. 129, 203.³ Pp. 113, 114, 307.

destroyed by a common massacre. 'Like the devil incarnate that he was, he was so enamoured with these projects' that he would never desist from them until he saw 'the whole of Christendom swimming in its own blood.'¹

The Jena Superintendent and Professor of Theology considered it a special duty attached to the office of evangelical preacher to describe these monstrosities and horrors to the people from the pulpit. 'The preachers are bound to proclaim abroad by every possible means, by preaching, writing, singing, saying, planning and scheming, what these high ecclesiastical personages really are, to declare how the man of sin and the child of corruption has been found out, how his lying and murderousness, his sodomy and simony, have been brought to light, and how the whole world has been warned to have no part and fellowship with the abominable Antichrist.' As to what other preachers had done or intended to do in this respect he would 'leave that to each individual's conscience and responsibility;' but for himself, 'I intend, as I have done with other sermons before these, to do all in my power, as far as time permits, with the present "Bapstpredigten" in the full expectation that the Pope will once for all have had enough of me. If I come back again, I shall hope to do even better.'²

They were aiming by these means at another special object.

'After seventy or eighty years of fervent evangelical preaching against and denunciation of the idolatrous papists' "devil's tricks," the monstrous fallacy of the Apostolic succession of the "Pope-hounds" and devil's

¹ Pp. 116, 120.

² P. 332.

rascals was still deeply ingrained in the bones of the evangelical people, even in lands where there were no longer any papists, and where they were not tolerated; and it was with special regard to this fact that the theologians and preachers thought it indispensably necessary, with speech and with pen, to hold up sharply and unsparingly to condemnation and scorn (out of godly zeal and fervour) the history of the Popes and Antichrists.¹ ‘How could anyone still believe in the Apostolic succession,’ asked the Elector of Saxony’s court preacher, Matthias Hoe, in 1606, when ‘one infamous scoundrel had always followed another at Rome, and adulterers, sodomites, murderers, sorcerers had become Popes?’ and this not only in the Middle Ages but also in the sixteenth century. Pope Paul III., for instance, had wallowed in incest, ‘like a sow in the mire,’ and had put an end to his mother and his sister.² Johann Münster recapitulated and completed the ‘frightful and veritably true accounts.’ The Antichrist at Rome, he wrote, ‘makes himself equal to God and allows himself to be venerated and worshipped.’ ‘He is not ashamed, insolent devil that he is, to tread on the Emperor with his feet;’ ‘he pastures his sheep with sword, fire, halter and gallows.’ ‘Pope Coelestin placed the crown on the Emperor Henry VII.’s head

¹ That the object of all this abuse of the papacy was to prevent the people’s returning to the old Church is openly avowed by the Weimar Superintendent Antonius Probus, in a sermon printed in 1590. ‘Thirdly,’ he says, ‘we must not go back again to the godless papacy, nor allow ourselves to hanker after it, as we find so many people everywhere doing, like the Israelites who hungered for the flesh-pots, the garlic, and the onions of Egypt; but, on the contrary, we must loathe, shun, and treat as enemies the Pope and all his accursed dominion’ (Marx, *Protest. Kanzel*, p. 44).

² *Christliches Bedenken, wie sich die Protestanten in Österreich zu verhalten* (preface C, 2-5^b).

with his feet and knocked it off again with his feet. Pope Clement V. compelled Franciscus Dandalus, King of Crete and Cyprus, to crouch on his hands and knees in the papal hall, with a dog-collar round his throat, and to lie under the table with the dogs.' 'With fire, water, halter and sword' the Popes inflict martyrdom on all those 'who follow and conform to the faith and teaching of the holy Apostle Peter.' 'Not one of the Popes has imitated St. Peter, and still less the Lord Christ, to the length of letting himself be crucified.' 'Because the Pope is so utterly unlike and opposed to Peter he will be cast into hell as the veritable apostate, execrable tyrant and murderer and Babylonish whore, with the devils and their angels, who are condemned to everlasting punishment and torment which will never have an end in all eternity.' ¹

At the Easter festival of 1589 a preacher declared from the pulpit that, 'as had been truly made known by innumerable writings, the Popes, as the Romish devil's villains were called, had always been and still were, without a single exception, sodomites, necromancers, and magicians, that many of them indeed had been able to spit hell-fire out of their mouths; it was therefore not at all extraordinary that, when they wanted to pray, they invoked the devil, and that Satan then, as many trustworthy persons have declared from the actual evidence of their eyes, often appeared visibly to the Popes, in a terrific form, and joined with them in cursing and trampling the cross of Christ under foot, and held naked dances over it, which they called their divine service.' 'They are all children

¹ Maximilian Philos von Trier, *Examen und Inquisition der Papisten und Jesuiten* (1607), pp. 13, 20, 61-62, 64, 69, &c.

of the devil whom they worship, and who will come and carry them off. Amen.' ¹

For more detailed information the preacher advised the 'dear Christian people,' at the 'high festival of Easter,' to read a little 'Roman Book of Ritual' in which 'the popish crew were very amusingly and cleverly counterfeited.' A publication of this sort had appeared at Strasburg in 1572, but without any mention of locality. In it were set forth the doctrines, the doings, the life and the character of the popish priests, all told in short rhymes which were very amusing to read. Lucifer, it was said, had created the 'Antichristian Roman God;' his Benedicite before eating and drinking began with the words: 'The eyes of all ravens wait on thee, O Pope,' and when he had finished, his grace was 'Thanks be to thee, O Pope, thou devil abominable.' ²

'But all who pray to the devil and come from him, like the Antichrist and his gang, must also be carried away by the devil at last. And who has ever heard otherwise than that the Popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, monks and nuns, together with all their accursed throng, are always carried off by the devil into the burning, stinking pit of hell? This is the true evangelical faith.' ³ It was in conformity with this belief that in 1580 there was a representation at Tübingen, in the presence of princes and lords, of a comedy of Nicodemus Frischlin, in which the devil and his comrades are seen carrying away the Pope, a cardinal, and a bishop, and gloating over the good spoil they have taken. Christ Himself appeared in the comedy and sang the Protestant

¹ *Ein hochnottürfftige Predig wider den römischen Antichrist und sein Rottgesellen* (1589), D 2.

² Weller, *Annalen*, i. 330, No. 196; cf. pp. 197 and 198.

³ *Wölfe im Schafspelz*, 21^b, 22^a.

hymn : 'Keep us faithful to Thy Word,' and hasten on the slaughter of the Pope and the Turks.¹

The writers and preachers who in pamphlets and sermons delighted in calling down thunder and lightning—hell-fire if possible—on the Antichristian, idolatrous popish Church, were supplied with specially rich material for their purpose in the collection of historical fables which they unceasingly presented to the people as 'actual, indisputable facts.'

The first of these was the fable of the Popess Johanna. This fable had enjoyed universal credence since the middle of the fourteenth century,² and it was considered 'an abnormal crime' in the Jesuit George Scherer 'that he had the effrontery to attack and cast doubts on the credibility of this story.' 'From this alone,' it was said, 'people could see and know what double-dyed knaves and villains the "Jesuwiders" were,' for they 'obstinately persisted in denying that the English whore Agnes had been Popess at Rome and had given birth to a boy during a public procession, and this event must be recounted as an eternal blot on the hellish papacy; and in books and sermons, in poems and paintings, it must be strongly depicted to and impressed upon the people.'³ In 1558 Hans Sachs had written for the people a rhymed 'History of Johanna Anglika the Popess.'⁴ In the 'Magdeburg Centuries' this fable comes up three times,⁵ and there are few Protestant controversial books of the time in which it does not play a part. Even on high festival days it was made the

¹ Strauss, p. 128.

² Döllinger, *Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1863), p. 2 ff.

³ *Ein hochnottürfftige Predig* (see above, p. 31, note 1), C 3; cf. Eybenhold, *Confirmatio gegen und wider die Jesuiten*, p. 13.

⁴ Hans Sachs, viii. 652-655.

⁵ *Centuria ix.* 332, 337, 501.

subject of sermons.¹ 'It would seem indeed as though God had, as it were, preserved this incident as an infallible sign that the papacy is the kingdom of Antichrist:' it was thus that Jeremiah Vietor instructed his parishioners in his sermons on Revelation. The fact that the Jesuits would not acknowledge the existence of a Popess Johanna was plain proof to the court preacher Polycarpus Leiser that 'Lying is the characteristic of the Jesuits *in quanto modo*.' Vergerius was reputed 'an authentic witness' for the existence of the Popess whom the pastor of Schöngraben in Lower Austria designated as the 'Babylonish whore.'² Müller also preached exhaustively on this subject and pointed the moral by remarking that 'Immorality and scoundrelism of this sort, which had had full swing in the capital city, Rome, had spread to all places which had come under the dominion of the Pope.'³

Cyriakus Spangenberg, who wrote on the subject in 1562, was not satisfied with one Popess. The popes, he wrote, 'have often, while outwardly disguised as men, been nothing more than rejected harlots.'⁴

A second 'appalling story which gave an abominable stench to the papacy,' and was dished up in innumerable pamphlets, was the fable of 'the 6,000 children's heads.' It was taken from a supposititious letter of St. Ulrich of Augsburg to Pope Nicholas I. This letter was first printed in the year 1520,⁵ and then lapsed

¹ See, for instance, Erhard Lauterbach's *Zehn gründliche Predigten* (Leipzig, 1611), p. 34.

² Marx, *Protest. Kanzel*, pp. 38-39.

³ Mylius, *Bapstpredigten*, pp. 138-139.

⁴ *Wider die bösen Sieben*; see above, p. 22.

⁵ Weller, *Repertorium typographicum*, No. 1404, and 1955, 1956. For the origin and spread of the Ulrich fable, see Pistorius, *Epist. tres ad Pappum*, p. 116 sq. Concerning the spurious nature of the letter, see Fr.

out of memory until it was revived by Flacius, who referred to it repeatedly in his controversial writings, published it twice at his own expense, and also included it in his 'Catalogus testium veritatis.'¹ The 6,000 children's heads were said to have been found in the fish-pond of a nunnery in the time of Gregory I. 'Such-like unutterable and most monstrous deeds of sin and shame, of horrible, abominable profligacy,' says Flacius, and gruesome murder of countless innocent children, 'are still perpetrated at the present day by his Holiness the Pope and his priests, and promoted by their devil's doctrine of celibacy, and their most gruesome persecution of married clergy.'²

John Wigand set his co-religionists the following sum to calculate: if in one single fish-pond 'over 6,000 children's heads were found, how high would you fix the number of children that have been thus cruelly put an end to in all the different convents and monasteries, in all the colleges of canons and mass-priests all over the world, during all the centuries?'³ 'It is not without good reason,' Conrad Schlüsselburg insinuated with regard to Ulrich's letter, 'that convents and monasteries are for the most part built close to large ponds and swamps.' 'Who is there that does not shudder to his very marrow-bone, on hearing of such monstrous crimes? The Popes know that this had happened and that the same sort of thing was going

A. Veith, *Bibliotheca Augustana* (Augustae Vindelicorum, 1785 sqq.); *Alphabetum*, iv. 225-232, where all the literature connected with the subject is also added.

¹ Preger, *Flacius*, ii. 553. Flacius was answered as he deserved by the Dominican Johann Fabri; see Paulus, 'Joh. Fabri von Heilbronn,' in the *Katholik*, 1892, i. 113.

² *Etliche hochwichtige Ursachen*, &c. (1570), A3^b, A4^a.

³ Schlüsselburg, xiii. 285.

on daily around them, and yet they have been shameless enough to treat such deeds of iniquity with an amiable smile. From such filth as this neither the river Tiber nor the Mediterranean Sea can ever wash the Pope's kingdom clean; he will be reserved for the Stygian marsh, which has been created for such criminals as himself.' ¹

Like the fable of the Popess Johanna this Ulrich myth was also made use of in the pulpit to enliven sermons. George Miller introduced it in his 'Papst-predigten' as an explanation of 'the secret vaults in the convent churches, and especially of the fish-ponds round the nunneries, which were evidently connected with this horrible and monstrous system of child murder.' In order to impose on the world the illusion of virgin chastity, it had been necessary 'to devise some such means,' even at the cost of the woeful murder of many hundreds of thousands of innocent children.² The Ulrich fable was used especially in order to instruct the people concerning the desirability of marriage among the clergy. The Superintendent of Plauen, Matthias Hoe, alludes to it in a sermon which he delivered at the marriage of one of his preachers: but with him the number of heads has grown to 16,000.³

'I have heard it said,' wrote a Catholic controversialist of the year 1591, 'of an upright, honest Lutheran, who had no pleasure in such dirty pulpit-quarrelling, that in *one* year he had heard at least six preachers

¹ Schlüsselburg. viii. 5-7.

² Mylius, *Bapstpredigten*, pp. 139-140.

³ *Eine christliche Predigt von des heiligen Ehestandes Fürtrefflichkeit, und insbesondere von der Priesterche* (Leipzig, 1607), p. 16 ('A Christian sermon on the excellence of the holy state of matrimony, and especially on the marriage of priests').

tell the story of the 6,000 children's heads, and that they had given such disgusting accounts that the boys and girls in church had laughed and jeered.' ¹

¹ *Von neuen calvinischen Giftspinnen und Unflüthern*, C 2; *Wolfsbach über die 6,000 Kindsköpfe*. In reply to the Flacian Opitz, who related this story publicly in the pulpit at Vienna, George Scherer preached a sermon demolishing it altogether. *Scherers Werke*, ii. (Münchener Ausgabe), p. 171 ff.; see Menzel, iii. 37; Räss, *Konvertiten*, ii. 299-300. The convert Lorenz Albrecht wrote a refutation of the fabulous story of the Popess Johanna and of the Ulrich fable: *Bericht vom Papst Johanne dem achten, welcher soll ein Weib gewesen sein*, together with a letter from St. Ulrich, Bishop of Augsburg, which he wrote to Pope Nicholas, and in which he is said to have pleaded for the abolition of the vow of chastity. 'Amusing and useful for all to read.' Laurentius Albertus Francus (Dillingen, 1572). The fables in question, Albrecht remarks in his dedication to Cardinal Otto Truchsess, had already all been thoroughly refuted by learned men; he was therefore offering nothing new; he only wanted to make what others had written for scholars accessible to the German people; see Paulus, *Lorenz Albrecht*, author of the first German grammar, in the *Hist.-polit. Bl.* 119 (1897), p. 557 ff. Here, too, will be found fuller details concerning Albrecht's life and general activity. Before his conversion, when he was hostile to the Catholic Church, Albrecht had already bewailed in striking language the discord and divisions in Protestantism: 'It is a matter for tears and lamentation,' he said, 'that in so short a time after the death of the dear, pious man of sacred memory, Dr. Martin Luther, so many different sects should again have sprung up among the evangelicals; he would have stopped the mouths of them all had he lived on up to this time.' Like most of the Lutheran preachers of that period, Albert saw in this increase of sects 'a sure sign that Christ's second coming was not far off.' 'Who is there,' he exclaims, 'who in the midst of such errors would not wish and pray that the day of judgment and the end of the world might soon come? The masses no longer know what to believe. The common people complain that, within memory of the living, religion has been altered so often that nobody is certain of his faith. They say also that they would be thankful to have a full statement of belief, and of the way of salvation, if only there were anyone who was quite sincere and honest in teaching and preaching. Nowadays, however, there is no single clergyman who agrees with another; but they all quarrel with and blame each other, and each one insists that he knows better than anyone else.' It was this division of opinion among the Protestants which awakened Albrecht's interest in the Catholic Church; his conversion to Catholicism occurred at Würzburg at the end of 1567 or the beginning of 1568. Albrecht had probably heard there the sermons of Fr. Canisius. See Paulus, *l.c.* p. 553.

‘The iniquities of the Pope, which are as the sand of the sea-shore in number,’ said the preacher Johann Prätorius, in the same year, 1591, ‘are known to everybody, and our little children in the streets can describe out of their catechism what the Pope is, what the priests, monks, and nuns really are, what down-right hypocrites and superstitious old profligate women and whores they are.’

‘The spiritual Jericho, formerly a palace of the devil,’ had gone to ruin and was now ‘nothing more than a cesspool of Satan, where all the gnats of Beelzebub and the gadflies of Belial disport themselves, and seek to appease their gluttony on the food they find there.’¹

Beside the fable of the Popess and Johanna, and the Ulrich fable, another one was also pressed into the service to combat the papacy and stir up the people. The author of ‘Ein hochnottürfftige Predig’ (1589) and George Miller (‘Wider die bösen Sieben,’ F 4^b-G) proclaimed from the pulpit that the Antichrist and his crew, not satisfied with the common forms of sinful lust, had abandoned themselves to sodomy, bestiality, and every other nameless excess, and, worst of all, that the Archbishop of Benevento, John de la Casa, had written a book in ‘Praise of Sodomy and Pederasty,’ which book was printed and offered for sale by Trajano Navio at Venice. Other preachers filled in the details: the book was approved by the Pope; several bishops had written such books and praised the foulest sins as pleasant pastimes.

‘This is the way in which the unhappy people are deceived and incensed,’ says a Catholic writer quoting

¹ Prätorius, *Dreiköpfiger Antichrist*, C 3^a.

these imputations from ‘an inhuman, execrable lampoon on popish profligacy.’ ‘First of all there is a book written by La Casa in praise of sodomy. Nobody has seen such a book, for no such book was ever written. Next, La Casa—which makes things much worse—wrote this book when he was a bishop, or indeed, as others do not scruple to declare, he was made a bishop in reward for this abominable, scandalous book, which the Pope also commended. Then comes another who says that many such books no doubt exist in Rome, for that numbers of bishops had openly defended the sin of sodomy which they themselves practised.’ ‘Now I ask you where can even one such book be found, let alone numbers of them? Who among you has it in his possession, who has seen it, who has authorised its publication? If you cannot give an answer to these questions, how will you answer before God and the dear Fatherland for having unintermittently circulated such falsehoods?’¹

Nobody had seen the book, nobody could produce it, for there was no such book. All the same, they went on playing out the La Casa fable as a ‘trump card’ against the Catholic Church.²

¹ *Von neuen calvinischen Giftspinnen*, &c., F 4 to P.

² Times without number this fable was brought forward in controversial writings. In 1596 it was reproduced by Spangenberg in his *Gegenbericht auf die Anatomie des Pistorius*, p. 115 ff., and by Huber in his *Antwort auf die sieben Teufel des Pistorius*, p. 104; in 1597 by the Hessian theologians in *Notwendige Besichtigung*, pp. 226, 450, and by others. In the year 1617 a Calvinist wrote as follows: ‘Horrendum dietu et auditu,’ one of the bishops ‘has written a special prose book, *De Sodomia*’ (*Gegen-Erinnerung gegen Ungersdorf*, p. 24). All through the seventeenth century ‘fabulous stories were told about La Casa,’ until at last, in 1707 the Protestant Nicholas Jerome Gundling, professor of jurisprudence at Halle, made a stand against the practice in his *Observationes Hallenses*, i. 121 sqq. ‘Who,’ he asked, ‘has ever denied criminals accused of crime

‘Only go on unflinchingly fighting the Roman Antichrists and lieutenants of Satan and their whole rotten rabble; all means are lawful to this end: are they not all rascals, whoremongers, sodomites, blood-suckers, man-slayers, and even worse?’

‘If any want to be thoroughly informed,’ he goes on, ‘as to what is the true nature of the papacy, its character, its teaching, and its rites and ceremonies, let them read Jesuwalt Pickhart’s “Bienenkorb,” which is already in everybody’s hands. This book, he said, was an essentially true and Christian, and withal a very amusing, book.’¹

the right of defending themselves, even though their crime were of the most monstrous nature? If accusations only are to be permitted, who of us would be counted innocent?’ The truth is that Giovanni della Casa, in his earlier youth, according to the custom of the pagan, immoral Humanists, wrote some very dirty poems, notably the *Capitolo del Forno*. Casa’s *Rime e prose*, in consequence of the aforesaid *Capitolo del Forno* and other indecent publications, were put on the Index by Paul IV. in 1559. They were struck out of the so-called Trent Index, again put on the Index by Sixtus V. in 1590, and again struck out by Clement VIII. in 1596. See Reusch, Index, i. 204 ff. For Casa, see also Reumont, *Gesch. Roms*, iii. 2. 549, 552–690. Casa was attacked on account of his poems by his personal enemy, the apostate Vergerius, and there soon came into being, as Gundling remarks, ‘in the heads of those who invent mischievous reports and obtain credence for them,’ an actual book *De Laudibus Sodomiae et Paederastiae*. These wicked inventions, says Gundling, are passed on from one to another, although the Frenchman Ménage in his *Anti-Baillet* has satisfactorily demolished the calumny hurled at Casa. In Germany, Sleidan, the historian of the Smalcald League, appears to be the first who spread this slander against Casa: *Comment. libr. xxi. ad a. 1548* (Frankfort edition of 1786), p. 154. Maximilian Philo of Treves appeals to Sleidan in his *Examen und Inquisition der Papisten und Jesuiten*, p. 62. The same Philo has the tale that during the months of June, July, and August, two popes are said to have allowed the cardinals the practice of sodomy ‘on account of the great heat.’ George Miller preached on the subject at Jena (*Bapstpredigten*, p. 141).

¹ *Wölfe im Schafspelz*, p. 21^b, 23.

CHAPTER II

FISCHART'S 'BIENENKORB'

('BEEHIVE OF THE HOLY ROMAN BEE SWARM')

UNDER the name of 'Jesuwalt Pickhart,' the poet and jurist John Fischart of Mayence published in 1579 the 'Bienenkorb des heiligen Römischen Immenschwarms,' which was a translation, with many additions of greater and less magnitude, of the 'Byencorf der heylighe roomsche Kercke' by Philip van Marnyx.

Marnix, who exercised great influence in the politico-ecclesiastical revolution in the Netherlands, belonged to the party of 'the extreme Gueux' who rejected all Church tradition. Just as the Calvinist Theodore Beza declared 'freedom of conscience' to be a 'diabolical doctrine,' so Marnix maintained that to allow everyone to live according to his own religious convictions came near to the outrageous folly of sparing the life of a poison-mixer.¹

Marnix defended the terrible Church scandals and iconoclasm in the Netherlands in 1566, against the attacks of a Lutheran. The outburst of popular fury at that time, he said, was 'the judgment of God on idolatry;' it was a work of Divine Providence in which the hand of man had been used as an instrument.² In the eyes of this Calvinist hero of revolution 'the whole papacy was the most execrable idolatrous abomination

¹ Alberdingk Thijm, *Marnyx*, p. 57.

² *Ibid.* ii. 53-54.

in the sight of God,' and its extirpation 'one of the highest duties of a Christian man.' The actual object of his labours as an author was not merely to oppose the papacy, but to degrade and vilify it—if possible, to drown it in the mire.¹

The 'Bienenkorb' heaped calumny on calumny against the Catholics, and also against the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist as if this were a coarse ceremony of eating flesh and drinking blood. For the Catholic priests, they said, 'the bread juggling' was 'the best bird in the cage;' 'they drink blood on raw flesh;' they are somewhat more dainty and fastidious than their master, Satan, for the latter said to Christ in the wilderness, 'Command that these stones shall be made bread;' but 'they will not be content with dry bread.' . . . 'The parsons themselves are quite satisfied with partaking in one kind on Good Friday after White Thursday, when they have enjoyed a good soup of "Bastart and Romaney;" then the following day they say a dry Mass and indulge in secret carousing just as the laity do at Easter.'²

In the book of Bishop Durandus on the Ceremonies of the Mass it was explained why 'the priest, when he plays his rôle at Mass, goes through strange mummeries:' 'why, for instance, he is bound round the body with a cord, like a thief being led to the gallows; why he dances and tramples about in front of the altar;' 'why he stretches out his hands as a lazy dog extends his paws, and then draws them back again as if he were trying to catch flies.' 'He whispers his

¹ It is thus that Edgar Quinet, a man like-minded with Marnix, speaks on the subject; see Alberdingk Thijm, pp. 40-41.

² Fischart's *Bienenkorb*, second part, ch. iv. to vi. I make use of the edition marked S No. F. in Vilmar, *Zur Litteratur Fischarts*.

mysteries into the ears of the bread and wine and listens as if he wanted to give a secret watchword, while his associates howl at him with open mouths like wolves in a forest, or swine being scalded and stuck.'

Respecting the elevation of the sacred Host and the chalice the readers are informed 'why my lord Domini with the long shirt lifts up over his head, majestically and triumphantly, a small wafer and a chalice of wine, while all the congregation fall so humbly on their knees and beat their breasts with their fists. Also why the priest then puts on so piteous an air, like a calf that is being killed, and then begins to wail and shed crocodiles' tears; and at last, when he has rolled it round enough, like a dog with his bone, why he uncovers it again, and then with one snap whips it into his mouth and swallows it unchewed. After which he has the chalice filled full again, and with rapid pigeon-gulps empties down its contents into his capacious wine tub and beer barrel. Readers will also learn from this book why he licks the chalice so lovingly, as a monkey licks its young.'¹

It is in this sort of tone that the whole work is written, a work of which Fischart says that 'for the good of the Fatherland and the Church, and for the general profit and edification, he translated it into intelligible German, with here and there additions of some Mayence witticisms, because it is permissible to put new strings to an old fiddle, and to paint and renovate a shabby old idol with fresh and bright colours.'²

¹ Second part, ch. xix.: 'In praise of the Roman Honey' (*Lob des römischen Honigs*).

² *Vorstoss Jesuvalti Pickhart*, A 3.

The author, not content with ridiculing the Lutheran Communion service as coarse Capernaitism, also poured out mockery on the baptismal rites of exorcism and the sign of the holy cross which were used by both the Catholics and the Lutherans. By the uttering of strong incantations and by making the sign of the cross, 'the devil,' he said, 'was compelled to go out and make way for the Holy Ghost.' 'By this means he (Satan), together with original sin, was driven off to a distance of seven miles.' 'After this,' we are told concerning Catholic usages, 'the child is smeared on its nose and ears with the priest's spittle, which filth has extraordinarily efficacious power.' God must take great delight in these beautiful ceremonies 'with which devout people have markedly improved and smartly adorned His Son's institution.' 'Moreover, all this is not done for nothing, nor even actually for the sake of the merits of Christ, but it is paid for with hard cash.' ¹

'The Catholics venerate saints and pictures as the heathen do idols.' The crucifix has 'especial grace for them above all other pictures;' it was like 'the bellringer's cow which was allowed to graze even in the churchyard.' 'The holy cross was hung up, while the other idols stood or were stuck against the wall; it hung much higher up, moreover, and therefore it had an extra white loaf, and was worshipped with double reverence.' '*Summa summarum*, the cross is the pet and the cock of the walk in all the ceremonies of the holy Roman Church. Nothing happens but the cross plays a prominent part.' At the slightest mishap, an old nun 'must instantly make the sign

¹ Second part, ch. vii.

of the cross and say, "Jesu Maria." It is no wonder that the Church decks it out and caresses it as a monkey does its young—that she speaks to it and praises it as if it was a being of great intelligence; for when she fondles and dances it up and down she says and sings: "Oh, sweet wood! Oh, sweet nails! . . ." ¹ When any good, pious Catholic lies at the point of death, they do not disturb his head with much talk about Christ,' but they admonish him 'to partake of God and to let himself be smeared.' 'They have fashioned for themselves a god who lets himself be devoured by them after they have played with him enough, like a cat with a mouse.' Purgatory and hell are now said to be both but one hole and one fire, whence many have surmised a work in purgatory for 'nuns and old convent witches' to do.²

The material collected together in the 'Bienenkorb' is very wide in its scope, and comprises dogma, polemics, Church law, Church history, anecdotes and incidents. Just as all the doctrines of the Church were perverted, the Church precepts misinterpreted, and the rites and ceremonies ridiculed and slandered, so also Church events were perverted, and the sayings of Catholic theologians and controversialists were torn from their context and mangled; in short, the work was a more odious caricature of the Catholic Church than had ever been produced before. In keeping with a general scheme the different subjects are arranged in such a manner that points of doctrine always alternate with passages in which political, religious, and social passions

¹ Fourth part, ch. iii.

² Second part, chs. vii. and viii. : *Von der römischen Bienen Verdienstblumen, und Schussbrett zwischen Höll und Fegfeuer.*

are stirred up, so that all that is sacred may be dragged as much as possible in the mud. Thus for instance the author, before speaking of the ordination of priests, inveighs in the most unworthy manner against celibacy, and declares it to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church that it is 'far better for a priest to enjoy the wife of another man than to have a wife of his own.' He classes all convents together as breeding-places of debauchery and abortion. He is not ashamed to assert that the Roman Church, 'in order that the holy men should not go to excess,' had formulated 'a decree' 'that they might have free use of other people's wives, and that all wives must be common property. The Church is well pleased that her dear little mannikins, priests and monks, should share all women in common. Yea, verily, she ordains that it should be so, and justifies it with plain talk from Scripture, together with admirable maxims from the pagan philosophers.' 'And this may very possibly be the reason why the Roman Church, which after all can only be viewed as a particular church, seeing that Rome is only a single town, is at the same time called a *Catholic*, that is a universal, general Church; for it has instituted such a loving community of women and children, and it does its best to multiply the race over all the ends of the earth.' 'For this reason she is rightly called *Ecclesia oecumenica*—that is to say, the Church which is scattered and spread over the face of the earth like swarms of locusts.'¹ Not till after this disquisition does he proceed to discuss and abuse the seven degrees of holy orders. 'I have often wondered,' says Fischart in another work, 'why the

¹ Second part, ch. xvii. For the manner in which the *Bienenkorb* spoke of the Popes, see above, p. 23.

most illustrious, who are carried on litters and who tread on the skins of lions and otters so as not to hurt a single toe against a stone, do not have their toes as well as their fingers blessed, consecrated, scraped, cut, chrisomed, elemented and sacramented, that no slipper or shoe may pinch them. A future Council will not fail to consider this point.’¹

Fischart has given a faithful German version of the Dutch original, with all its low buffoonery and vulgarity, and here and there he has interpolated abuse of his own against the holy Mass and the Jesuits. He calls Father Canisius ‘the Canisian hell-hound skinner.’ So little was Fischart familiar with the passages which he quotes from the older theological literature and from the ecclesiastical law, that he did not even correct the misprints in the edition of Marnix’s work which he used.²

His whole position is summed up by him in the words: ‘the Catholic Church is more full of rogues and criminals than an egg is of slime.’³

Fischart’s ‘*Bienenkorb*’ had a very extensive circulation. ‘This book,’ wrote the Lutheran preacher Johann Prætorius, ‘which was compiled by a Huguenot or a Calvinist, is looked upon as a world-wonder by all Calvinists; they carry it about with them, and nobles and commoners, clergy and laity study it with the greatest diligence and delight.’⁴ In 1580 the ‘*Bienenkorb*’ went through a second edition; in the following

¹ *Geschichtklitterung*, p. 6.

² See Vilmar, *Zur Litteratur Fischarts*, pp. 15–16.

³ Sixth part, ch. iv. For Fischart’s additions to Marnix. see Vilmar, pp. 18–23. See also Suphans, *Vierteljahrschrift*, iii. (1889) 97 ff., 108 ff., and 116 ff.

⁴ Prætorius, *Calvinisch Gasthaus* (1598), Bl. 8^b.

year through a third and fourth, in 1586 through a fifth, and two years later through a sixth and seventh; besides these we may reckon positively five other editions to which no date is assigned.¹ ‘With the “*Bienenkorb*” of Jesuwalt Pickhart,’ said a Catholic writer in 1591, ‘the most abominable and disgusting book of slander against the doctrines, rites, and usages of the Holy Church that has ever been thrust on the poor deluded populace since the advent of the new evangel, especially of Calvinism—with the help of this book, I say, every tailor, shoemaker, scribbler, and whoever else is just able to read and to wrangle, imagines that he can dispose of all Catholics at the gallows and the pillory, as though they belonged to the scum and offscouring of mankind and were worse than heathens and Turks. It is impossible adequately to describe how this abominable writer scoffs and mocks even at the most sacred things, and turns them into a laughing-stock and a scandal for the common people, for the learned and for the unlearned, and drags everything in the mire.’ Among the Lutherans, also, numbers had expressed abhorrence of the book. ‘But none the less this infamous collection of libels is placed in the hands of tender youth, offered for sale at the annual fairs in towns and villages, together with quantities of obscene pictures, and hawked about from house to house, and everybody can hear how our boys and girls have become familiar with it and learnt all sorts of indecency and blasphemy out of it.’²

Fischart did not rest on these laurels. The assassination of the French King, Henry III., by Jacques Clément

¹ Vilmar, i. 112.

² *Von neuen calvinischen Giftspinnen und Unflütern*, D 4.

incited him in 1589 to write the following about the papists in an 'Ermahnung an die Bundpäpster:'

Wherever the authorities refuse

To force all consciences at will,
 And Christian blood to shed and spill,
 They've no more worth for any man,
 The Pope must place them under ban.
 To monks and parsons it is then
 Permitted to remove these men :
 Ah, then their priestly hands, scot-free,
 Against their priestly laws may be
 Immersed in Christian blood.
 Then musket, knife, and poison-cup
 But serve to destroy what God sets up ;
 Confessors then their penitents attack
 In the confessional with murder black.
 Then e'en some cloister-brother may
 In holy sacrament a poison lay ;
 And in the Host a snare to trap
 An Emperor's life, should he not clap
 ' Amen ' straightway to all decreed
 At Rome to-day by the serpent's seed.

Because the Dominican Order was chiefly associated with the office of Grand Inquisitor, he wrote of it :

Therefore, each other viper-brood
 It must excel in thirst for blood,
 Just as the rabble Jesuit race
 Are set on treachery most base.
 But say, is not the priestly herd
 By the papists well revered,
 In that for treacheries they use them,
 For poisonings and murders gruesome ?
 Thanks to their honours that we're told
 In what esteem this vermin we should hold.

Let the Romanists only go on showing themselves up as Antichrists

Who majesties divine and human trample
 Under foot with word and murderous blade,
 So all the sooner will your measure ample
 Be filled up and yourselves repaid
 Twofold what unto others you have played.

Such was the manner in which the Protestant population of Germany was stirred up⁷ against the Catholics.

Fischart's friend, George Nigrinus, the Hessian Superintendent, 'one of the most admirable of evangelicals in the campaign against the Roman Antichrist,' fought with the same weapons as Fischart. In his labours as a controversial writer he received not encouragement only, but actual support from the Landgrave William IV. of Hesse.¹

In the eyes of Nigrinus the Pope was 'the king of the hellish locusts, the veritable Antichrist whose advent is from Satan,' and therefore 'the most faithful servant of Satan.' 'The Catholics had revered him as though he were God, and in him they had worshipped the dragon.'² Because the Roman Church had obeyed the voice of the dragon when he said, "Fall down and worship me" (Matthew iv.), therefore its members belonged no more to the sheep of Christ, but to the seed of the serpent.³ As the pagans had their principal deities, Jupiter, Juno, Neptune, Pluto, Vesta, Apollo, Mercury, Minerva, Venus . . . Bacchus, so in the papacy they had set up the fourteen 'Helpers in Need,' Gregory, Blasius, Erasmus . . . Margaret, Barbara, and Katherine.'⁴ There were many other 'frightful' and 'extraordinary' things which Nigrinus described to his readers. For instance, with regard to the Sacrament of Confirmation, he asserted that 'when a child was confirmed

¹ Wackernagel, *Fischart*, p. 108; Vilmar, *Zur Litteraturgeschichte*, pp. 45-47.

² G. Nigrinus, *Papistische Inquisition*, at the back of the title-page, and p. 1. See above, p. 22.

³ Lehr, *Glaubens und Leben Jesu und der Jesuiten*, &c. (1581), last page; *Papistische Inquisition*, C 3^b, F 2^b.

⁴ Lehr, *Glaubens*, H. 3.

they slapped it on its cheeks ; if the child screamed the people laughed ; the louder the child screamed the more efficacious, it was considered, had been the slapping of its cheeks.’¹

‘They also teach that the monk’s habit is so sacred that, if a layman dies in one and is buried in it, he will obtain forgiveness for his sins, or at least of one third part.’

‘The monks sell good works, and those who buy these are saved by them.’ ‘If a priest,’ Nigrinus also informs his readers, ‘commits adultery, gambles, and drinks, the celebration of the festivals and the Mass, and attention to his hours of prayer will take all his sins away.’² All religious orders, the Jesuits more than any, ‘are thoroughly false prophets, the whole lot of them, servants and members of the Antichrist.’³

Not content with all the terrible tales that he could rake together from the history of the papacy, Nigrinus, in order to fill the people’s minds with still intenser horror, wove into his narrative accounts of ‘all sorts of prodigies, special chastisements, and abnormal occurrences.’ Just as Fischart had been ‘reliably informed’ that a Jewess had given birth to two little pigs,⁴ so Nigrinus, as a ‘first-class writer of history,’⁵ was able to add to all the other horrors about the Pope, the stories of a child who had been born at Erfurt with monkey’s claws, a horse’s nose, and a tall hat ; of an angel that had appeared in the sky at Hasmar with a naked sword in his hand ; of a fine city with walls and towers, and of a coach with four horses that had been seen in the air. He himself in the current year 1582 had

¹ P. 225.

² Pp. 238, 241^b.

³ *Papistische Inquisition*, D 5^b.

⁴ We cite this report later on.

⁵ See above, p. 22.

observed in the sky at Giessen ‘fiery beams and long spears and muskets.’ The disclosure that the Pope was the Antichrist, accompanied by such an unusual number of portents and prodigies, was certain evidence that the end of the world was at hand. ‘We have seen more “fire-tokens,” following in quick succession, this year than have ever been seen before. What else can this mean and portend than the Day of Judgment, which we know will come with fire?’¹

¹ *Papistische Inquisition*, pp. 682, 694, 705, 721, 728.

CHAPTER III

CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE IMPROVED CALENDAR—SUPERNATURAL APPEARANCES DURING THE 'CALENDAR CONTROVERSY'

THE assumption that the Pope was the veritable Antichrist, and that the Day of Judgment was at hand, played a principal part in the violent controversies which had gone on since 1582 in consequence of the introduction of the improved Gregorian Calendar.

For centuries past the necessity of improvement in the Julian Calendar had been insisted on by mathematicians and theologians, and work after work had appeared on the subject.¹ When at last, however,

¹ By the Franciscan Roger Bacon (†1294), for instance. From the middle of the fourteenth century the Popes had interested themselves in the reform of the Calendar. The question had been officially opened up at the Councils of Constance and Basle—at the latter at the instigation of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. Pope Sixtus IV. summoned the German astronomer Regiomontanus to Rome (see our remarks, vol. i. p. 144) to assist in the improvement of the Calendar; and for this same purpose the fifth Lateran Council appointed a committee at Rome in 1516. From Rome Paulus of Middelburg, Bishop of Fossombrone, himself an astronomer of note, in conjunction with the Ermland Cathedral Dean, Johannes Sculteti, addressed himself to the Cathedral Dean of Frauenburg, Nicholas Copernicus, requesting him to apply his astronomical labours to the improvement of the Calendar. See Dittrich, *Contarini*, p. 280. Fuller details concerning the earlier attempts at reform and concerning the improvements under Gregory XIII. are found in Kaltenbrunner, *Die Vorgeschichte der gregorianischen Kalenderreform* (Wien, 1876), and *Beiträge zur gregorianischen Kalenderreform* (Wien, 1880); J. Schmid, 'Zur Geschichte der gregorianischen Kalenderreform,' in *Histor. Jahrb. der Görresgesellschaft*, iii. 388–415, 543–595; and Supplement. *ibid.* v. 52–87; G. St.

Gregory XIII. wanted to introduce a reformed Calendar which coincided with the course of the sun, the work, on account of its originator, met with bitter opposition from most of the Protestants of Germany and Switzerland. Zürich and Bern forthwith declared the new Calendar to be a 'devil's work.'¹ The Pope in his undertaking had his eye in the first place only on the Catholics. In a Bull of February 14, 1581, he decreed that the old Calendar was to be abolished, and the new one, with the omission of ten days from October 5 to 14, be introduced and observed by all the clergy. The Bull ran as follows: 'By virtue of the power conferred on us by God Almighty, we admonish and beseech the Emperor Rudolf and the other kings, princes, and lords, and we prescribe to them, that they should

Ferrari, *Il Calendario Gregoriano* (Roma, 1882). Gregory XIII. first of all sent the proposals made by the Roman physician Aloigi Giglio and his brother Antonio to different universities and princes to procure their opinions, and then he appointed a commission under the presidency of Giglio, and later on under that of Cardinal G. Sirleto, to consider the question more thoroughly. When the Emperor, in January 1579, sent the memorandum of the Vienna University (see Kaltenbrunner, *Polemik*, pp. 491-493) to Gregory XIII., he assured him at the same time that 'he prayed God that He would grant His blessing on the pious efforts and the zeal of the Pope in this matter, and that He would bring it to a fortunate issue for the glory of all Christendom' (Kaltenbrunner, p. 506, note 1). To the Cologne University Gregory, on January 11, 1578, had sent a Brief to the effect that 'he had sent the draft of the proposed improvements in the Calendar to the Christian princes, and that he herewith begged the University also, to add any amendments that occurred to them, or else to ratify it' (Bianco, i. 699 ff.). Duke William V. of Bavaria pointed out, in the autumn of 1582, that the Calendar had been altered at the suggestion and with the knowledge of the Emperor and other Christian princes (Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, p. 21, note 4; cf. 39). Luther, in his pamphlet *Von den Konzilien und Kirchen*, had pleaded for a reform of the Calendar, but had said that as this matter had nothing whatever to do with religious faith, the reform should be entirely the work of the secular authorities.

¹ v. Segesser, *Ludwig Pfyffer und seine Zeit*, ii. 491.

manifest the same zeal which they desired us to bestow on the completion of the work—yea, even greater zeal, in accepting this our Calendar and in making arrangements for its observance among all their subjects, in order that there may be uniformity among all Christian nations in the celebration of the festival days: whoever sets himself against this ordinance, or acts in opposition to it, is informed that by so doing he falls away from the favour of God and of the Apostles Peter and Paul.’¹

Even had this Bull, as was not the case, formally threatened all who did not accept the Calendar with punishment by ban, such a threat would have had no significance for those who had long since been separated and banned from the Church.

In Italy, Spain, France, and Poland the introduction of the Calendar encountered no difficulties. Most of the Protestant provinces of the Netherlands also accepted it unhesitatingly, though under protest against the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope.²

In Northern Germany also this reform met at first chiefly with a favourable reception among the Protestants. The Elector of Brandenburg promised to consent to the introduction of the new Calendar if the Emperor published it in his own name, for then the work would emanate from him and not from the Pope; he favoured the Emperor with well-meaning advice as

¹ Bulle, ‘*Inter gravissimas*’ in *Magnum Bullarium Rom.* ii. 454–455. See the admirable remarks of Schmid, *Nachträge im Hist. Jahrb.* v. 86 ff.

² Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, p. 64. With regard to the data collected by Stieve concerning the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar in the different countries (*Histor. Zeitschr.* pp. 42, 135), see a correction in the *Mitteil. des österr. Instit.* 1899, pp. 107–112, respecting the Archbishop of Salzburg.

to the mode of publication.¹ The Protestant theologian Martin Chemnitz spoke in favour of the necessity of this reform, but he said emphatically that the acceptance of the Calendar must in no way be regarded as an admission that the Pope had any rights over the Protestants; 'this point,' he said, 'must be most carefully kept in view.'² The Görlitz patrician Bartholomew Scultetus, although a Protestant, defended the Gregorian reform and expressed his regret that such a good work should be opposed out of hatred to its originator.³ The great Protestant astronomer Tycho Brahe at once recommended the acceptance of the Calendar, and the renowned John Kepler, after the Protestant Imperial Estates had for years struggled against the reform, wrote to his former instructor, Michael Mästlin: 'What is half Germany about? How long does it mean to hold aloof from the other half of the Empire and from the whole European continent? For a century and a half astronomy has called for an improved method of reckoning time. Are we now going to forbid it? What are we waiting for? Many different modes of improvement have been suggested; but that which the Pope has introduced is the best. Methinks we have sufficiently proved to the Pope that we are able to keep to the old chronology for our festivals; it is high time now that we began to reform as he has reformed. It is a disgrace to the Germans; they have

¹ Kaltenbrunner, *Polemik*, p. 567. Professor Kaltenbrunner has collected abundant materials in Germany for a complete history of the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar. In the archives of Innsbruck, Munich, Dresden, and so forth, there is an extensive supply of documents for the purpose.

² Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, p. 18, note 6; Kaltenbrunner, p. 523.

³ Kaltenbrunner, p. 524, note 1.

themselves discovered the art of correcting the Calendar, and they are now the only people who are deprived of the improvement.’¹

In a special memorandum on the subject, Kepler pointed out that a reform of the Calendar must proceed from the Pope, and not from the Emperor, if all the nations were to accept it. ‘If,’ he said, ‘it was maintained that it was not suitable for the Pope to have conducted such a reform, he answered that his Imperial Majesty, although he had no one to respect in these political matters excepting God Almighty, had thought it best that the Pope should direct this reform because, in view of the authority which he possessed over European countries not belonging immediately to the Empire, the work would be more profitable to Christendom in general than if managed by the Emperor.’ Even the opponents of the improvements must ‘acknowledge that if the schism in religious affairs did not exist, it would be better for the above reason that the Pope—albeit with his Imperial Majesty’s consent—should conduct the matter than that it should emanate from the Emperor.’²

The fiercest opposition proceeded from the Protestant theologians of South Germany. The most

¹ ‘... Turpe Germaniae, cum artem corrigendi [astronomy] restaurarit, solam correctione carere.’ *I. Kepleri Opera omnia* edid. Chr. Frisch, iv. 6 sq. The letter is ‘stylo novo’ of April 9, 1597. See Kaltenbrunner, pp. 573–576 ff.

² *Kepleri Opera*, iv. 5 sq. Equally important for the knowledge it imparts of the reasons why the Protestant Estates rejected the new Calendar, and for presenting the view of Kepler, is a dialogue composed by the latter between two Catholics and two Lutherans, and an impartial ‘mathematician’ who openly represents Kepler’s position, in *Opera*, iv. 11–57; see especially pp. 11, 13 ff., 19, 23 below, 51 above, 55. See Schuster, *Joh. Kepler*, p. 55 ff.

zealous among these was Lucas Osiander, Doctor of the Holy Scriptures and court preacher to the Duke of Würtemberg. In 1583 he published a pamphlet full of ferocious charges against the Pope.¹ In the preface written by Johann Magirus, provost at Stuttgart, the reader is informed at the outset that the new Calendar is an 'unhappy abortion,' and that, in the eyes of all intelligent, right-minded persons, it is 'a childish absurdity,' and that they are all convinced that the Pope and his abortion will soon have to hide their shame. The object of the change was 'the upsetting and the abolition of the Religious Peace and of Christian liberty.' Therefore the honourable and deeply-learned Osiander had written his pamphlet as a warning against popish practices, and for the service of the Church of God, and nobody could accuse him of 'excessive severity.' For among intelligent Christians well versed in the Word of God there was no doubt whatever that the Pope was the Antichrist and the Babylonish whore, concerning which it was written in the Revelation of St. John that she was the mother of all whoredom and of all the abominations of the earth. 'Consequently there was urgent need, especially in these later times, that he should be denuded of all his brilliant colours, and should be shown plainly in his true light to the

¹ 'Bedencken, ob der neue päpstische Kalender ein Notturft bey der Christenheit sei, und wie trewlich dieser Papst Gregorius XIII. die Sachen darmit meine: ob der Papst Macht habe, disen Calendar der Christenheit aufzudringen, ob auch fromme und rechte Christen schuldig seien, denselbigen anzunehm' (Tübingen, 1583). See Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, xxiv. note 2, 40-41, 65; Kaltenbrunner, pp. 518-519. ('An inquiry as to whether the new papal Calendar is a necessity for Christendom, and how far Pope Gregory XIII. means honestly in the matter; whether also the Pope has authority to impose this Calendar on Christendom, and whether pious and true Christians are bound to adopt it.')

whole of Christendom, to those also who have hitherto not known him as he is ; for such a scab-head as his needs a drastic lathering, as I, dear Christian readers, desire with friendly intent to remind you.’¹

‘Without any necessity, out of sheer arrogance and wickedness,’ Osiander said, the Pope had produced his Calendar in order to ‘stir up disquietude and serious schism in Christendom. It was not in the least necessary that now, at the end of the world, the Pope should come forward with his Calendar,’ for to all Christians who had understanding, and were well read in the Holy Scriptures, ‘it was manifest that the end of the world was certainly not far off, but, on the contrary, very near at hand. Gregory, therefore, might have kept quiet with his great wit and extreme skill, and have let matters remain *in statu quo* during the few remaining years.’²

Besides all this, the work was not correct, as it was given out. ‘And there is no doubt that if this Calendar was also submitted to criticism at evangelical Christian universities a great deal of clumsy work that is of no value would be sifted out of it. For the facts are about as right as an old peasant’s matted tangled hair, in which one would need to break at least nine combs before getting it into a satisfactory state.’ Osiander ‘confidently’ predicted that the Calendar would not live longer than Gregory himself.³

¹ *Bedencken*, Vorrede A, pp. 2-3.

² *Bedencken*, pp. 6, 12, 48. The Protestant Consistory of the principality of Ansbach also rejected the new Calendar for the same reason, viz. that from the Word of God and other evidence it was known that the Day of Judgment was close at hand, when the present world with all computations of time would come to an end. Lang, *Neuere Gesch. des Fürstenthums Baireuth*, iii. 378-379.

³ *Bedencken*, pp. 7-8.

The Calendar-monger Gregory wanted to sell Calendars as indulgences had been sold formerly. He had given birth to this work so that he might not be deemed unfruitful, just as an earlier Pope, John VIII., 'had brought a lovely little child into this world.'¹ In such wise was the fable of Pope Joan exploited even in the Calendar strife.

The actual object of the Calendar was to bring about 'a bloody contest between the Germans' by means of which a sanguinary enforcement of the decrees of the Council of Trent should be accomplished. The Pope's coat-of-arms was in itself sufficient to show what he had in view, and also the figure which was printed on the last page of the Calendar. 'For although we do not doubt that the Pope's arms are inherited from his parents, and though the figure at the end of the Calendar may possibly be the printer's usual book-plate, nevertheless, just as Caiaphas prophesied unconsciously and without intention on his own part, so Pope Gregory unconsciously betrays by his arms and by the printer's figure what he has in his mind. For this Pope displays on his coat-of-arms or shield a terrible gruesome dragon with two wings, and a scorpion's tail instead of a tongue, and drops of blood are seen falling from the dragon. This venomous, bloodthirsty beast would gladly fly not only all over Germany, but over Italy, Spain, and France also, poisoning Christians with false doctrine by means of the Jesuits and organising a bloody massacre. But the dragon is cut or hacked in two, and is spilling its own blood.' The figure at the end of the Calendar was a cat with a mouse in its mouth, and this picture also referred to the Popes, who 'had long played with

¹ *Bedencken*, p. 19. See pp. 23-24.

the poor Christians as a cat plays with a mouse, and were now intent on devouring them with their bloodthirsty intrigues ; but if the Pope devours one Christian, may he get the devil's blessing for it.' God would grow weary of the 'bloodthirsty hypocrites,' and would 'pay back on their heads' all the innocent blood they had shed, 'even though He should have to use the Turks for the work.' The Pope was the veritable Antichrist and an enemy of Jesus Christ. 'Away to the devil with such a bishop and a shepherd who devours his own sheep and tries to drive their poor souls into the jaws of the dragon. We know the Pope of Rome for the Babylonish whore (as the Apostle John names him in the seventeenth chapter of his Apocalypse) which has now long since been drunk with the blood of the saints, and has been bedaubed and poisoned by the devil incarnate with all sorts of spiritual and bodily filth, such as syphilis and leprosy. Whosoever now is willing to dally with this Babylonish whore, and to adopt the Calendar for the sake of pleasing her, let him do it at his own peril. We, however, intend to have nothing to do with the harlot, which is to say that we will not recognise the Pope as our bishop and the pastor of our souls, but consider him an abominable murderer of souls. Therefore, even if we held this Calendar to be a good one, nevertheless, if the Pope insists on forcing it on us, we shall feel bound to cast it aside, for we must not enter into collusion with the enemy of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and make ourselves thus partakers of his sins and abominations.' ¹

¹ *Bedencken*, pp. 28-30, 42-44. Zach. Rivander (*Fest-Chronica*, i. [Eisleben, 1602] 128^b) writes: 'Most certainly the Pope's only object [with this Calendar] is by this means to sneak back again like a thief into

Jacob Heerbrand, professor of theology at Tübingen, also declared, like Osiander, that Satan was at the back of the Calendar, that the Roman Antichrist had manufactured it for the promotion of idolatry ; no secular rulers who ordered the observance of this Calendar must be obeyed, for people must not submit to the Antichrist or have any fellowship with the worshippers of idols.¹

On November 23, 1583, ' the rector, chancellor, doctors, and governors of the University of Tübingen ' handed in to the Duke of Würtemberg the memorandum he had asked them to draw up against the new Calendar. It was to the following effect : ' The Pope intended by means of this Calendar to obtain for himself " the office of shepherd " over the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, notwithstanding that they looked upon him, and rightly so, as a cruel, raging, devouring wolf, as Luther had been wont to call him ; ' as Antichrist he exalted himself ' above everything that belonged to the name of God or the worship of God ; he installed himself in the temple of God as though he were himself a God, and gave out that he was indeed as God.' ' The people of Germany must not identify themselves with the Antichrist and the enemy of our Lord Christ by accepting this Calendar.' ' By means of this Calendar, also, the Pope was making an attempt to get the electors and Estates with their princely dignities and governments into his hands, and to make them recognise him

our churches and then to rule them according to his pleasure ; and if people did not at once bow down before him with their hats off, he would then make this a ground for a war or a bloody massacre in Germany ; no other motive had impelled him to the work, that was certain and positively true.'

¹ Kaltenbrunner, pp. 524-527 ; Stieve, pp. 66-67.

as their overlord, and if they did not take care it might happen to them as to the Elector Gebhard of Cologne whom Gregory XIII. deposed from his office. Furthermore, they could not see what the new Calendar was wanted for. For, although the Spring Equinox was placed in it a few days later in the year, summer would not for this reason begin either earlier or later. If, however, a new Calendar was really wanted, the evangelical Estates should request the Emperor to commission his own mathematicians and those of the Estates to make a corrected version, which, not emanating from the Pope, might be adopted without injury to conscience. In any case, however, the Estates of the Augsburg Confession must prepare themselves for resistance against the Pope's Calendar.' 'Satan with his idolatry' had been driven out of the Church, and he must not be allowed to creep in again under guise of his substitute the Pope; his satanic majesty was bent on creating great woe and lamentation. 'Christian princes and lords were in duty bound to oppose him with watchful eyes, and to consider that, if such evil times came about, they would lose their lands and people, possibly also their lives as well as the true religion, which, however, might the Almighty graciously avert. Amen.'¹

In similar 'Christian and peace-loving strains' mathematicians and astronomers also lifted up their voices.

Lambert Floridus Plieninger, in January 1583, composed 'for the warning and encouragement of Christians, especially those of the German nation,' a 'short memorandum' concerning the new Calendar, 'with ac-

¹ Sattler, v. Beil. pp. 50-62.

companying prognostications as to the times we lived in, taken from the prophets Daniel, Zechariah, and the Apocalypse of John.' ¹ This writer agreed with the Magdeburg Centurists in thinking that the beginning of the growth of general corruption in Christian doctrine dates from immediately after the death of the Apostle John. Concerning the Pope as Antichrist, he said that he had met with scarcely any writer who came nearer to his own opinions than George Nigrinus.' Only the latter placed the 'commencement of the kingdom of the Antichristian papacy' somewhat later than he himself did, 'dating it not from Silvester I. but from Leo the Great.' Now the Pope's alterations in the Calendar proved that 'the numbers of the Antichrist must be counted from Silvester I., who was Pope at the time of the Nicene Council, and that they will run out and come to an end in this year.' ² As a man of extraordinary learning he demonstrated that the world at that time was in the sixth trumpet of the sixth angel of the Apocalypse, and that the Day of Judgment would come in seventy years. The Calendar was 'the last institution' of the Antichrist, for soon 'the kings of the earth would come to hate the Babylonish whore, would forsake her and reveal her shame, would devour their own flesh and destroy it with fire. Therefore they must not let themselves be terrified by the power of the Pope.' ³ But if the Protestant Estates accepted the Antichristian Calendar, the most terrible things would

¹ *Kurz Bedencken von der Emendation des Jahres, durch Papst Gregorium den XIII. fürgenommen, &c., ob solcher den Protestierenden Ständen anzunehmen sein oder nicht, &c.*, by Lambert Floridus Plicninger, in the year MDLXXXIII., and the month of January, &c. (Strasburg). See Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, pp. 91, No. 8, and 58-59; Kaltenbrunner, p. 520.

² *Kurz Bedencken*, ii. 22-23.

³ *Kurz Bedencken*, pp. 70, 76, 90-95.

come to pass, for the Pope intended by its means to inaugurate the tremendous persecution which was described in the Apocalypse. 'The elements and the firmaments in the upper and the under worlds also speak to us, and have spoken to us ever since the apparition of the new miraculous star of 1572, through many and various signs and wonders; but especially through the great comet of the year 1577, and they will never cease to speak to us.' So too, among other things, does the tempestuous weather speak to us which has prevailed almost all over Germany in these ten days which the Pope has excised from the Calendar for its improvement, notably on October 10, when there was a tremendous storm in Vienna and a large two-headed eagle, which had been set up in all its splendour only two years before, was thrown down and shattered to pieces, as was also a great iron cross from the top of the Jesuits' church. 'Then there are the voices of the water-floods which followed immediately on this storm in the days of the correction of the Calendar.' He had heard from trustworthy people that in the Saxon village of Ichtershausen, in the previous July, 'the fish-stream Piscina had been turned into pure blood, and had remained in this condition for six days.'

The learned man had heard of a still more astonishing wonder from Morthingen, in Lorraine. 'On March 3, between 8 and 9 o'clock in the evening, the moon had been seen to undergo a change, and to assume the appearance of a veiled woman's face; and when it had come down near to the earth it was heard to utter, with a loud scream, "Woe, woe," and this six or seven separate times, after which it returned to its usual

shape and course.¹ Thus the powers of the heavens according to the prophecy of Christ, Matthew xxiv., must be moving and speaking.’²

And it was not only at Morthingen that ‘trustworthy informants told the Rhinegrave, quaking and terrified, of a cry of lamentation seven times reiterated by the moon.’ In a village of the Voigtland, also, ‘just at the time when the devouring wolf and the Antichrist Gregorius was bringing out his iniquitous Calendar with a view to the ruin and bloodshed of the poor evangelical Christians, the moon came down to men on the earth,’ this time, however, not in the form of a veiled woman’s face, but ‘with a ferocious visage and bloody withal, for it was seen by several intelligent peasants who were returning home from the fair, as they testified on their word of honour as good Christians. And they distinctly heard the moon exclaiming several times : “ Woe, woe, blood, blood, Pope and Jesuits.” ’

And ‘all these and other appalling manifestations, prodigies, abortions, and fire-tokens were all the more alarming because the stiff-necked papists, the greasy parasites and satellites of the Roman Antichrist would actually not believe in them at all, but laughed at and ridiculed the stories, after their sceptical fashion ; for the Jesuitical sophists, epicures, and vermin, as we have been often enough told by numbers of godly Christian teachers and doctors of the Holy Scriptures, and have also learned in other ways, believe in nothing, not in God and eternity or in the last Day of Judgment which

¹ To this in the margin, p. 62, is the note : ‘ Septem plagas novissimas, Apocal. 15, 16.’

² *Kurz Bedencken*, pp. 59-64.

is standing at the door. But Christ, in the seat of judgment, will assuredly find out the villains, and with scathing words of condemnation, and for an encouraging spectacle to godly Christians and followers of our Lord and Saviour, will hurl them into the nethermost pit of hell, as they have long since deserved, let alone that by this senseless new Calendar they have evinced that they do not believe in Christ and in His return at the last judgment.'

'Alarming tales of this sort' were related by a 'simple minister of Christ and of His Holy Word' from the pulpit to his congregation in the year 1589, 'in order to create a wholesome horror of the Pope, the Jesuits, the Calendar, and all the idolatrous, anti-christian brood of vipers which were polluting and dishonouring the dear Fatherland.'¹

In the face of 'so many wonders' which happened in favour of the Protestants and the old Calendar, the Catholics, of course, could not be behindhand with their own tales of marvels. 'It is commonly said,' wrote Johann Rasch in 1590, 'that on St. Vincent's Day birds annually choose their mates and pair. Although many people think this an absurdity, it is nevertheless a visible fact. Now certain persons who have made careful observations, both in this and preceding years, attest on the evidence of their own eyes that this year the birds mated on the day marked in the new Calendar as St. Vincent's Day, and no longer went by the old Calendar. The birds are good Catholics, and have more understanding than many a pig-headed, obstinate human being! They marry on the Church festival, and reverently observe the new Calendar.'²

¹ *Ausslegung der geheimen Offenbarung*, pp. 9, 12.

² Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, p. 32.

It was also reported as a special wonder, and accepted for truth by high spiritual and temporal dignitaries, that a nut-tree at Campo Longo, in Friaul, three miles from Göez, went by the new Calendar. This tree had always before, and even in the year 1582, begun to sprout and bear fruit on St. John's Day. But after the new Calendar had been introduced into Friaul in 1583, while still keeping to St. John's Day, the tree deferred its sprouting till ten days later, according to the innovation of the new Calendar. A traveller, who made closer inquiries into the matter on the very spot, sent branches of the tree to the Bishop of Olmütz and the Count of Dietrichstein, and was desirous also of sending a branch to the Pope. In 1584 he wrote as follows to the pastor of Nikolsburg, in Moravia : ' I was anxious to apprise your reverence of this incident, in order that you may perceive and recognise the wonders of God's creation, and learn that, as time goes on, the unintelligent trees are gaining more understanding and becoming more loyal and obedient to the Church of God than those men who set up as most highly intelligent—viz. the heretics.' ¹

Among those scholars ' who were the most deeply distressed concerning the antichristian popish Calendar, and utterly weighed down in spirit,' was Michael Mästlin, professor of mathematics at the University of Heidelberg, and later on at Tübingen. He sent the Palatine Elector Louis ' an exhaustive and well-grounded report,' in which it was stated that ' The Calendar of the Roman Antichrist led plainly to the conclusion that the Prophet Daniel had actually had this work in his mind when he

¹ Kaltenbrunner, *Polemik*, p. 535 ; Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, pp. 32-33, 92, No. 12.

said (chap. vii.) of the little horn, "He shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." And that these words apply to this work is all the easier to believe, seeing that this present Pope has taken on himself to change the times and the laws, especially the *Jus Canonicum*, that is the law of the Church.' This being so, and 'the blasphemy of this horn and its false doctrine having been sufficiently brought to light by other godly Christian teachers,' he, Mästlin, had contented himself with showing in his 'simple report, on political, ecclesiastical, and mathematical grounds,' that the chronological alterations of the Pope were 'erroneous in political affairs, scandalous in Church ritual and spiritual matters, and false and worthless in mathematical calculations.' Whereas the Day of Judgment was now at hand, and 'in the whole extent of this Gregorian Calendar there was no mention by a single syllable of the Day of Judgment, but on the contrary the title was "The perpetual or everlasting Gregorian Calendar"—there was no alternative but to suppose that the author of the Calendar, together with the Pope and all those who approved of it, took no account of the Day of Judgment, and therefore they did not concern themselves either about Christ or about the end of the world—yea, verily, that they thought less about them than the epicurean scoffers spoken of by the Apostle Peter (2 Pet. iii.), of whose chair the Pope pretends to be the inheritor.'¹

¹ *Ausführlicher und gründlicher Bericht*, &c. (the complete title is found in Stieve, p. 90, No. 5); Kaltenbrunner, pp. 514–518; Stieve, p. 27. In the year 1586 Mästlin published a second *Examination of the New Calendar*, in which he maintained that the Calendar was characterised by 'numberless deficiencies;' 'in short there were no defects in any Calendar

Among those who approved of the Calendar, and who were accordingly included in this verdict of Mästlin, was the Emperor, and the Elector Louis himself informed Rudolf of the judgment passed by Mästlin, sending him at the same time the report of the Heidelberg professor.

When Rudolf II. ordered the improved Calendar to be introduced into his hereditary lands the Protestant pulpits in these territories 'broke out loudly in abuse and invective.' Seven South Austrian preachers declared in a special manifesto that, if the Emperor sanctioned the papal Calendar, it would be nothing less than 'paying court to the abominable Antichrist.' Pope and devil were one and the same thing: whoso in any way obeyed them became deserving of everlasting damnation.¹

It made no difference whatever to the Protestants, either in the imperial hereditary lands or in the Empire, that Rudolf II. enjoined the adoption of the Calendar

which were not represented in this Gregorian one.' His evidence appeared to him so strong that he challenged all the defenders of the Calendar to enter the lists against him. On the other hand, the Jesuit Anton Possevin, in a larger work printed at Cologne in 1587 (*Moscovia, et alia opera, de statu hujus saeculi*, &c.: see De Backer, ii. 2113 to 2116), said that Mästlin's arguments had already been refuted; that his quotations, moreover, whatever he might think or wish, told in favour of the Gregorian Calendar. Thereupon Mästlin flew into a rage, and in 1588 wrote a defence of his second 'examination' expressly directed against Possevin (*Defensio alterius sui examinis*, &c., Tubingae, 1588), in which he accused his adversary of 'venomous malice.' He set up the assertion that the author of the new Calendar as well as its patron, Gregory XIII., were *consciously* endeavouring to lead the people into error, and denounced the new Calendar as a 'mine and sink' of all the defects which calendars could possibly have (pp. 1, 14-15, 16, 20). 'Ein Verzeichnis der Gelehrten, welche gegen und welche für den neuen Kalender schrieben,' in Wolfius, *Lectiones*, ii. 944; see also Schuster, *Joh. Kepler*, p. 49 ff.

¹ See our remarks, vol. viii. 389 ff.

in his own name without reference to the Pope. ‘The Calendar,’ said a preacher, ‘is an ecclesiastical matter, and in ecclesiastical matters the secular authorities have no right to dictate; it all emanated in the first place from the Pope and the Jesuits who were manœuvring to bring Germany back under their yoke, and who were making a show of so-called science. But the whole new scheme of astronomy was a miserable business, as also that which Copernicus taught, which was contrary to all Holy Writ, and which had therefore been rejected by Luther.’¹ ‘The Roman Antichrist and the Jesuits,’ the preacher went on, ‘want to compound with reason, the devil’s harlot, as Luther says, and to overthrow everything which is decreed in the Divine Word. To this end they have artfully devised this new Calendar, and they want to smuggle it in as if it was a Divine work.’² In the year 1584 there appeared ‘a true and graphic description of the four ecclesiastical fomenters of mutiny and the seditious Jesuits and priests who had invented and brought out the new Calendar in order to raise disturbance throughout the whole world.’³ The Saxon preacher, Kaspar Flüger, published in the same year a ‘Conversation between two peasants of Meissen on the new Calendar,’ in which, among other things, he introduced the statement that at Rome the Resurrection and eternal life were regarded as fables; that the Pope himself only cared to realise money out of the fables of Christ, as he called the Gospel,

¹ Luther had declared Copernicus to be a fool: ‘The fool wants to overturn the whole science of astronomy;’ Melanchthon also had combated the Copernican system. See Hipler, *Nikolaus Kopernikus und Martin Luther* (Braunsberg, 1868), p. 8, note 16.

² *Die rechte Auslegung der geheymen Offenbarung*, p. 14.

³ Weller, *Zeitungen*, No. 599.

but that he was destined, according to the revelation of St. John, to be thrown alive, with his whole retinue, into the fiery pit which burns with brimstone. Therefore the following prayer was sung daily in the churches : ‘ Lord, uphold us with Thy Word, and slay the Pope and murderous Turk ’ . . . ‘ for they are all villains, murderers, robbers, and bloodhounds, the Pope as well as the Turks, and they are the real Antichrists, for they dare to alter what Christ ordered and instituted. Christ was born under and according to the old Calendar. . . . The Pope is afraid that He might come back too quickly to pronounce judgment on him, and so he has made this new “ Kaldander ” so that Christ may be puzzled and not know at what time He is to come, where He is to set up His tribunal ; and thus the Pope will have less cause for alarm, and will be able to go on all the longer sinning and blaspheming with impunity. May God punish these scoundrels ! ’ Such was the fashion in which the Saxon pastor made one of the peasants deliver himself. The other answered : ‘ The Pope calls the Calendar a perpetual one in order to show that he does not believe in the Day of Judgment and the end of the world ; yea, verily, he is as cocksure about it as though Christ were obliged to do what he wished. ’ The old Calendar, they settle, must be the right one because the animals went by it ; the stork, for instance, times his flying away exactly by the old, not by the new, Calendar. ‘ The cattle also keep the right Christmas Day and stand up in honour of Christ’s birth on the old Christmas night, and not on the new one. ’ In a ‘ Peasant’s Lament,’ composed at the same time for the peasants, and which went through several editions, there are the following lines :

O Pope, what evil thou hast brought us
 With thy Calendar most impious :
 So hast thou altered time and season
 We poor folk seem bereft of reason,
 We're sore perplexed and no more know
 When we should plant, or dig, or sow.

There appeared also a publication entitled 'Ein Weibekrieg wider den Bapst, darum, das er zehn Tage aus dem Kalendar gestohlen hat.'¹

This process of stirring up the people had its effect. In Lower Austria and Styria, in Augsburg, Riga, Leutkirch, Hagenau, Kaufbeuren, Donauwörth, Dinkelsbühl, and elsewhere, serious disturbances broke out on account of the Calendar.²

¹ Weller, *Annalen*, i. Abt. I, No. 386, 419; cf. No. 387-391, and the Appendices ii. 515; Stieve, *Kalenderstreit*, pp. 91, Nos. 9 and 10; 98, No. 30.

² With regard to Augsburg, see Kaltenbrunner in the *Mittheil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* i. 499-540; Hirn, ii. 131 ff.; and Radlkofer, *Die volksthümliche und besonderes die dichterische Litteratur*; see the 'Augsburger Kalenderstreit' in the *Beitr. zur bayer. Kirchengesch.* vii. 1 ff., 49 ff. In 1584 there was an interval of four weeks between the Easter festival according to the new Calendar and that according to the old one. Now at Augsburg—where both confessions enjoyed equal rights—as the wardens and privy councillors of the town relate, the butchers were informed (by the preacher George Miller, so the wardens supposed) that whoever among them regulated his slaughtering by the new Calendar had already lost his God, his conscience and the Confession of Augsburg. No manner of mild and amicable invitations from the authorities could, in consequence, prevail on them to slaughter for Easter Day of the new Calendar. It was all in vain that they had been referred to the Religious Peace, and also assured that 'their feasts and holy days might still be kept on the same days as before.' M. James Rülch, Protestant pastor at Heilig Kreuz, himself assured the principal members of the guild of butchers that 'the proposed change had nothing to do with conscience and religion, and was not a violation of either. . . .' All was in vain. The Augsburg Protestants had 'at all times eaten and procured butcher's meat without any distinction of day or season, and many of them had had no compunction in eating meat on the sacred Good Friday.' In the year 1583, however, they went to such lengths out of hatred of the new Calendar that many of them 'for four whole weeks after the Easter Day of the new Calendar, and up to that of the old Calendar, neither bought nor ate a

When, in the year 1583, the Dominican friars at Frankfort-on-the-Main kept the Christmas festival according to the new Calendar, a wild and furious mob broke into their church. 'I cannot hide from you,' wrote the prior to the burgomaster, 'what an amount of outrage, insolence, and rascality has been perpetrated in our church by the younger men, and also by tolerably old ones. For, not to mention the laughter, scoffing, and screaming, they broke open doors, battered in windows, so that nothing but the lead was left, and stabbed with knives the boys whom I set to guard the doors. After having burst open the door of the choir they rushed on the altar in such a manner that even to-day we have had to pick up jewels that have been knocked off; besides which some low fellows have had the impudent audacity to pull down all the altar ornaments by drawing a cloth across them. I will not speak of the shockingly immoral language used to myself, not only by the older people, but even by young girls not more than twelve: from which it can be seen what they are in reality, for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. In very truth it seemed to me not as though Christ's birthday were being celebrated, but Dame Venus's festival.' In order to prevent the spread of the uproar the council had the

morsel of green meat.' See *Der Herren Pfleger und Geheimen Rath des (sic) heyligen Reichstatts Augsburg Warhaffter gegenbericht der Augspurgischen Hündel*, &c. (Augsburg, 1587), Bl. K 2^b-K 3^b. For the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar into Vienna see the article of K. Uhlirz in the *Mittheil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* xii. (1891), 639-647, which is based on unprinted documents. For the Calendar contest in Styria, cf. Zahn in the *Mittheil. des Hist. Vereins für Steiermark*, xiii. 126 ff.; Mayer in the *Archiv für österr. Gesch.* p. 74 (1889), 24 ff., and Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 441 ff.; *Akten*, p. 501 ff. For the opposition to the improved Calendar on the Eichsfeld, cf. Knieb, *Gesch. der Reformation*, p. 223 ff.

mob driven out. But the rioters got off scot free. On the Archbishop of Mayence insisting on a serious inquiry into the affair, the council threw all the blame on the monks, and contented itself with warning the burghers that they must not in future disturb divine service in the abbeys and churches.¹

‘This [lenity of the magistrates] is verily the chief reason,’ says a Catholic in the year 1586, ‘why the insolence and wickedness of the people go on increasing ; for crimes and riots, though enacted on the highest Christian festivals in public churches, and committed against the clergy and the devout Catholic people, are simply winked at or passed over with smooth words by the magistrates, examples of which have been seen ten and twenty fold in the last years. Not to mention that in towns and boroughs seditious mobs are heard declaring that their proceedings are not at all displeasing to the municipal authorities and the clergy ; and as for the idolatrous papists, they cannot be sufficiently tormented, even should they be driven from the Empire.’²

¹ Kirchner, ii. 298-299. For the Calendar contest in Frankfort-on-the-Main see also Grotefend in the *Berichte des Frankfurter Altertumsvereins*, vii. 98, and *Frankfurter Didaskalia*, 1883, No. 135.

² *Trostwort und Vermahnung zur Stärke in heiligen catholischer Glauben, ohngeachtet aller Unbilden und Widerwärtigkeiten* von Friedrich Kreuzmann (1586), pp. 12-13 ; cf. pp. 17, 19, 23.

CHAPTER IV

POLEMICAL ACTIVITY OF INDIVIDUAL CONVERTS—CON-
VERSION OF A REIGNING PRINCE—CONTROVERSIAL
BOOKS CONCERNING THE PERSON OF LUTHER—CON-
TEMPORARY JUDGMENTS ON POLEMICS

‘THE many signs and wonders’ which were connected with the ‘Calendar contest,’ wrote an expositor of the Apocalypse in 1589, ‘were, so to say, but “a drop in the ocean of marvels” which had occurred during the last fifty or sixty years, and had been discerned by means of the brightly illuminating light of the precious true Gospel. For instance, there have been sea wonders more strange and remarkable than any described in former ages of history—fish with popes’ heads, monks’ cowls, and Jesuits’ hats; new-born infants with two, three, and even more heads; women who have given birth to little pigs or donkeys; children who have come into the world with a gold tooth, or wearing trousers or collars, sometimes even speaking and prophesying wonders the instant they were born; fire-tokens, bloody rain, blood-red comets, images of Christ in the sky with blood flowing from Him, angels who had preached audibly in the clouds—in fact, the whole country was full of stories of this sort which were quite true and were well known to all the people.’ ‘Still more startling and terrible were the innumerable wonders of hell which happened almost daily:’ in many places the

devil went about in bodily shape and was seen in all sorts of forms, 'for there is no doubt whatever that he lets himself be seen and preaches in the form of Jesuits and other such scoundrels.'

'But one of the most remarkable of hell-wonders is that in these latter distressful times so many people are being influenced by Satan and are falling away again from the holy evangel and the godly doctrine which alone has power to save, and are running back into the jaws of the accursed diabolical papacy, are actually defending it with word and pen, and want to set it in full swing again.'

So great had grown the power of hell that 'many of these new hell-hounds, who, knowingly and with certain conscious malice, as they themselves confess, deny the evangelical truth, were either carried away alive by the devil, or else howled like tigers and wolves at their deaths, as is certainly known to have been the case with the low scoundrel Staphylus; and that cunningest of cunning villains and tailor's valet Nas, who, on credible report, carries about with him a live devil in a glass, also in a ring from which he speaks to him and prompts him, will surely meet, if he has not done so already, with as terrible an end.'¹

The sort of fate that befell the enemies of the 'evangel' and the authors who were so zealous in writing against it is described in a pamphlet written by the Superintendent Erasmus Alber (†1553) and published in 1556. Alber was able to inform the world

¹ *Die rechte Auslegung der geheymen Offenbarung*, pp. 17, 19. For the innumerable 'Wonders and diabolical appearances,' see our eleventh volume (German vi.) . . . 'Literature of wonders and apparitions, . . . Literature concerning the secret art, magic, and the devil.'

that many of them had 'died suddenly' in Worms, Brunswick, Würzburg, Bautzen, Berlin; 'such cases,' he said, 'were so numerous that a big book could be made out of them.' James Latomus, he reported, had committed suicide, and likewise the blasphemer Pighius; Johann Hofmeister had become insane; a bishop of Treves had bellowed like an ox when on his death-bed. 'There are some also who believe, and it was the common talk in Italy, that Pope Paul III. was already dead before Dr. Martinus died, and that Satan took on himself the body of this same Pope, and made it appear as if he was still living; for the devil can easily do this if it is permitted by God.' ¹

In the year 1589 the expositor of the Apocalypse uttered an earnest injunction that 'under pain of everlasting damnation' the people must read no 'popish books' nor tolerate them in their houses, least of all the books of 'such apostate scoundrels and mamalukes as Staphylus, Nas, and many others who had fallen away from the evangel.' 'The books of these men are more to be shunned than the pestilence of hell; whosoever looks at them and reads them becomes deserving of damnation, in like manner as does everyone in whose possession a devilish Jesuitical book is found. Wherefore let all who do not wish to deny Christ and fall into the jaws of the devil beware of these publications.' 'I preach verily nothing else than Christian love and piety,' said this pulpit orator in conclusion, 'and I say Amen, Amen in the Lord.' ²

Frederic Staphylus of Osnabrück (placed first in

¹ *Wider die verfluchte Lehre der Carlstader, &c.* (Newenbrandung, 1556), Vorrede, Bl. 1-3.

² *Die rechte Auslegung der geheymen Offenbarung, Schlussworte.*

the list of apostates by this preacher), who before his return to the Catholic Church had been professor of theology at the University of Königsberg, was the first convert whose writings caused serious agitation among the Protestant theologians and preachers. In 1558 he had brought out a treatise on the divisions among the Protestants,¹ which was followed in 1561 by another polemical pamphlet entitled ‘Christlicher Gegenbericht an den gottseligen gemeinen Laien vom rechten wahren Verstand des göttlichen Wortes, von Verdolmetschung der deutschen Bibel und von der Einigkeit der Lutherischen Prädikanten.’² Among the influences which had led to his conversion Staphylus especially dwelt on the effects of the Lutheran doctrine of ‘faith alone’ and the innumerable sects and parties within the pale of Protestantism. The attacks which he directed against the latter were all the more damaging because he handled the German language with consummate skill and was the spokesman of a very wide circle of the people. He frankly recognised the deep abuses in his own camp; but these, he insisted, could not be laid to the charge of Catholic doctrine. ‘There is no more dire complaint against the clergy among the lower classes of the laity nowadays,’ he said, ‘than that some of them do not live up to their own precepts; they insist that the laity shall live virtuously and honourably in the fear of God, but they themselves do not touch these commandments with the least of their fingers. The state of things is almost precisely what our Lord Himself described

¹ *Epitome Theologiæ M. Lutheri trimembris*, s. l. 1558; cf. N. Paulus in Wetzer und Welte’s *Kirchenlexikon*, ii. (2 Aufl.) 732.

² ‘Christian Information for pious Lay Folk concerning the true understanding of the Divine Word, the Interpretation of the German Bible, and the Unity of Lutheran Preachers’ (without locality, 1563).

through the prophet: "I looked that My vineyard should bring forth grapes, but it hath brought forth thistles." And what further? "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may drink strong drink: that continue until night till wine inflame them! And the harp, and the viol, the tabret, and pipe, and wine are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of His hands."

'Who can gainsay this? It is, alas, but too true. But is it right? Is it indeed Catholic? No Catholic would answer "yes." No Christian would approve of all this. For the teaching of our Christian faith forbids it: the Catholic Church condemns it. But if the oft mentioned vices are seen among our priests, prelates, bishops, and preachers, shall the teaching of our Catholic faith for this reason be regarded as blasphemous and accursed? God forbid. What they tell you and teach you, that shall ye do; but do not after their works.'¹ But, on the other hand, the sins of the Protestants must not only be 'attributed to the persons who committed them, but also to the Lutheran doctrine.' Thus, for instance, Luther taught that 'a woman was justified, under certain circumstances, in contracting a secret marriage with her husband's brother, or his most intimate friend.' 'Is not this a beautiful tree? What good fruit has come forth from it? Why, this: that one brother may take another living brother's wife for his own, as Herod did, and as is very customary now among the Lutherans; that a woman may have several husbands, and likewise a man several wives, as is the custom of the Turks, and as happens indeed

¹ *Christlicher Gegenbericht*, C 3^b.

publicly in Germany also, not only at Münster, but in other places as well.'

'Do not these results coincide with the doctrine? Luther taught: if the wife will not, then take the maid. From this noble tree has come forth such exquisite fruit that the whole of Lutherdom is overflowing with adultery and debauchery, and these iniquities have so enormously gained the upper hand that the Lutheran preachers themselves are crying out about them, and wondering greatly how it is that such scandals have never been so common in the papacy.'¹ Luther himself confesses that under the new evangel mankind had become a hundred times wickeder than they had been under the papacy. Innumerable vices had sprung up out of the doctrine of Luther and Calvin that 'God compelled men to commit sin.'²

Staphylus dealt exhaustively with the falsifications which Luther had been guilty of in his translation of the Bible,³ and expressed the following sentiments concerning 'Bible-reading' as it was understood and enjoined by the Protestant: 'Every layman, forsooth, is to plunge into Holy Writ with unwashed hands; yea, verily, booted and spurred, and without any preparation for the work, to extract the right meaning and interpretation. This is exactly the same thing as if the common people were to turn the doctors and apothecaries out of the chemist's shop, and each one of them were to set up as understanding all about the nature and uses of all the medical jars, materials, and condiments.'⁴

¹ Bl. D 2^b-D 3^a.

² Bl. D 2^a-b.

³ Bl. L 3 ff.

⁴ Bl. L 2^a. Staphylus writes in greater detail on this subject in his pamphlet *Vom letzter und grossen Abfall*, pp. 16-17, 28, 43.

At a time when every individual could set up a faith of his own without regard to the ecclesiastical authorities, it was inevitable that countless sects should spring up ; the catalogue of these compiled by Staphylus was considered by the antagonists ‘an especially villainous piece of work of this apostate.’

It was an additional dire cause of bitterness that Staphylus laid the decadence of the Empire to the account of Protestantism. ‘It was through the Catholic religion,’ he wrote, ‘the faith common to all believing Christians, that we Germans were first Christianised ; it was through this religion that our dear and pious forefathers attained eternal salvation ; it was through this religion that the Roman Empire came to the German princes. In the might of this religion the noble German nation has gained many splendid victories, has augmented the Empire, and converted the heathen to Christianity—witness the Hungarians, Bohemians, Poles, Wends, Slavs, Prussians, Livonians, Danes, and Swedes.’ ‘That this is the case is proved by our old chronicles and ancient documents.’ ‘But that all these advantages have been slipping from us during the last forty years, we perceive now to our infinite sorrow. It is evidenced by our great and manifold defeats and losses, by the marked diminution of the German Empire, by the contempt and ridicule which German soldiers meet with among all other nations.’ ‘What has become of the Dietmarsch which formerly belonged to the archbishopric of Bremen ? Denmark has taken possession of it. What has become of Livonia, which of old was the hospital of the Saxon nobility ? The Muscovites have wrung it from us by violence.’ Prussia, ‘which we conquered by means

of the old evangel, has been purloined from the German nobles through Luther's new evangel, and made over to the Poles, so that a people formerly tributary to our Emperor now rules over the Germans.' Hungary also, he said, had fallen a prey to the Turks in consequence of the discord in religious matters, and the venom of hate and envy which the preachers were sowing everywhere.¹

This pamphlet aroused 'local indignation' in the Protestant camp. Staphylus was handed over to general odium as 'an open blasphemer of God and Christ, a desperate perjurer and hell-hound.' 'A man who wittingly and intentionally defends evil and idolatry'—so the Superintendent Nicholas Gallus of Ratisbon preached—'is an infamous wretch and a traitor to God in his heart. Therefore Staphylus is an infamous wretch and a traitor to God.'² Cyriacus Spangenberg pronounced 'this abominable blasphemer' to be 'one of the most distinguished disciples of the devil,' and to be 'possessed of many legions of blaspheming devils;' he accused him of having 'pandered, against his conscience, to the Romish dragon,' and to have been bent on 'bringing murder and bloodshed into all governments.' The papists had long since been convicted of teaching false, idolatrous doctrine, emanating from the devil. The ruin of the Empire was not the work of the evangelicals but of the papacy. Spangenberg made a special defence of the teaching and person of Luther who had been 'a holy man' and a 'Prophet of the Lord,' and who had also had 'more learning,

¹ Bl. C 3^b-4^b, D^a-^b.

² *Vom bñptischen abgöttischen Fest Corporis Christi, &c. Predigt* (Regensburg, 1561), Bl. B¹.

wisdom, skill, and understanding in one of his fingers than all Popes, bishops, monks, and parsons put together, and than many of all times ever since the papacy had existed, with all their councils, universities, schools, and foundations, nothing and no one excepted.'

It was not from the Lutheran evangel that all the many divisions had arisen, but rather from the papacy, which was a mess of all heresies. Staphylus, 'the accursed Judas Iscariot' and 'the murderer of souls,' 'would be as little able to injure the Lutheran evangel, as had been Eck, Emser, Murner, and other devil's heads.' The obdurate papists, however, 'took such immense delight in his blasphemies, and revelled in his foul lies, &c., like pigs in the mud.'¹ Other theologians also gave vent to similar utterances.

Staphylus replied as follows: 'It is the habit of these new "evangelicals" to slander their antagonists so shamelessly that many people would rather let the truth remain suppressed than involve themselves in disputations concerning our Catholic faith with such loose and evasive adversaries.' In reference to a book directed against him by Andreä he asked: 'What else does this Schmidl do in this book but rate, abuse, revile, and slander me for a scoundrel, a traitor, a Judas Iscariot?' 'As far as concerns me personally,' he adds, 'I trust to God Almighty that it is not from any fault of my own, but only on account of our Christian Catholic religion, that I have to endure the calumnies of the Lutheran preachers. For verily it cannot be alleged against me with any foundation that I have ever committed a murder or a theft, or any other

¹ *Wider die bösen Sieben*, Bl. S¹-S³, T 1^b, V 4^b, Y 2^b, F 4^b, L 3^b.

criminal action, or that I have ever done injury to any one in his office.’¹

As for those who go over to the papacy, wrote the preacher Utzinger, it is to be feared of such persons, even to put it mildly, that there is no ‘sound hair’ in their heads, and that ‘they are not to be trusted in the very slightest degree.’ ‘Anyone who so wickedly deserts his God, becomes so treacherous and faithless, cannot possibly ever again be held in trust and respect by men, however nearly related by kindred or by other obligations;’ ‘such a fellow would without doubt be capable of betraying his country, and no roguery or iniquity would be too great for him.’²

Consequently, it was not to be wondered at that John Fischart should impute to the convert James Rabe, son of a superintendent of Ulm, the most scandalous crimes,³ and that it should be ‘known on the most credible authority’ that this man, as well as the convert Martin Eisengrein, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt, ‘had made a special covenant with the devil and signed it with their own blood.’⁴

James Rabe had written a refutation of a sermon on bishops which John Marbach had delivered at Strasburg and had had printed, and he had denounced this sermon as a ‘libellous publication.’ He said that its author, the Lutheran Superintendent, had slandered persons of high position and also the Catholic Church, that he had incensed subjects against their rulers, sheep against their pastors, and that he was just such

¹ *Nachdruck*, &c. (1562), Bl. 6-7, 8.

² *Nothwendige Erinnerung*, Bl. F 3^b-F 4.

³ In the poem ‘Nachtrab oder Nebelkräh,’ &c. in *Kurz*, i. 1-97.

⁴ *Die rechte Auslegung*, &c., Bl. 4³.

another preacher of rebellion as Thomas Müntzer.¹ Marbach had better not interfere with Catholic matters if he only wanted to calumniate; let him look first of all after his own business and that of his own sect. He was pleased to attack the pomp of the prelates, but 'where was it written in Holy Scripture that an evangelical superintendent should drive about with five, six, eight, or even nine horses, that he should dress in Brunswick plaited coats, that he should have one or two pistols hanging at his saddle, or stand in wattled boots in his stirrups? Where also is it written that an evangelical overseer is to act as judge, that he is to confiscate convents and churches, to storm them, or to shut them up? That he is to go about dressed in velvet and silk, one or two servants following him?'² In opposition to the everlasting slandering of the Catholic clergy Rabe wrote: 'I say it openly, if you want to find anywhere a pack of low, godless, drunken fellows, go to any village where they are evangelical. There you will see what sort of evangelical cap-and-bell men they have for preachers, what nice, regular lives they lead, when and how they preach, how learned they are in the Scriptures, and so forth. If you want draughts or card-playing, drinking, wrestling, harlots, there you will be abundantly supplied. There are very few of them—scarcely two people among fifty—who have learnt grammar at all correctly, still less the Holy Scriptures. At the best they are nothing more than prattlers and babblers, and the utmost they can do is to get up into the pulpit and inveigh against Pope, Emperor,

¹ *Christliche bescheidene wohlgegründete ablähnung der vermeinter Bischofspredigt so jüngst . . . den 26 Januar dieses laufenden 69. Jahrs im Münster zu Strasburg gehalten, &c.* (Köln, 1570).

² *Ablähnung*, Bl. 10³.

King, princes, and lords. And then they are praised up as excellent, well-intentioned preachers, and the Superintendent's very dear little chicks.' 'If you call me a liar, dear Herr Marbach, I will forthwith produce palpable evidence—indeed, I will mention those villages and preachers by their names—for I happen to have been on an (official) visitation to them. What I saw there that was good it is not my business to relate here.' ¹

The convert Bartholomew Kleindienst, who entered the Dominican Order at Augsburg shortly after 1550, published an 'Exhortation to the beloved Germans,' ² in which he addressed himself chiefly to those Christians 'who were weak in the faith or else erring and doubting, but at the same time well-intentioned at heart.' For had he not learnt, 'through certain experiences he had had, that there were many people to be found among the sectaries and elsewhere, who could easily be made to see and understand by what a thick, coarse, gigantic fool's rope Germany had for the last thirty years allowed itself to be led and dragged about by any and every fool?' In this compendious pamphlet Kleindienst inveighs with special indignation against the calumnies with which the leaders of the sects endeavoured to make the Catholics hated by the people. 'There were certain of them,' he writes, 'who were so shameless in lying that they dared—presumably against their own consciences—to persuade the poor people into believing that we present-day Catholics, or

¹ Bl. 55^{a-v}.

² *Ein recht catholisch und evangelisch Ermanung an seine lieben Teutschen*, by Dr. Bartholomew Kleindienst of St. Annaberg, Professor of Holy Scripture (Dillingen, 1560). For later editions see Paulus in the *Hist.-polit. Bl.* 109 (1892), 493, note 4.

papists as they call us, have nothing more to do with Christ; that we pray to the saints as though they were gods—yea, verily, that we look upon the Pope as our God; that we expect to wrest heaven from God by our own good works without the help of God's grace, that we no longer believe in Holy Scripture, that we have no genuine Bible, and that, if we had one, we should not be able to read it, and that we place more reliance on consecrated water than on the Blood of Christ. This is the sort of abominable, blasphemous lies that they invent against us without end. People of any sense know, moreover, that the sectaries excel pre-eminently in the art of making the papacy seem an abomination in the eyes of the common people who else would be quite well-disposed towards it.' The full justice of this complaint is proved by an utterance of Bucer, who in 1544 made the acknowledgment that 'Our party has got to such a pitch of wrangling and quarrelling that in certain points they still persist daily in accusing the opposite party, both in preaching and writing, of things which they repudiate, and which we cannot prove that they hold.'¹

The travestied versions of Catholic doctrine concocted by the heresiarchs so exasperated Kleindienst that he declared, 'I call God in heaven to witness, on behalf of my poor soul, that if such things were not a pack of outrageous, abominable lies, but were really the truth, I would use my utmost diligence to be as hostile to the Pope and the papacy as Luther was, or as no devil has yet been. I cannot sufficiently lament that the poor simple people have been so long led by a

¹ Lenz, *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmütigen von Hessen mit Bucer*, ii. 240; cf. *Hist.-polit. Bl.* 109 (1892), 497.

fool's rope and have been so piteously deceived. There is no doubt whatever that, if the people were rightly informed about matters, their good sense and feeling are such that they would become as hostile to the sects as they have ever been to the papacy.'

The preachers' fiercest assailant among the converts was John Nas, who wrote several pamphlets against them. And he, above all others, was denounced by them as 'the grossest and foulest refuse of popish idolatry, blasphemy, and soul-murdering iniquity,' and that, as they gave out, with all the more reason because, as was known to everybody, he managed to get a very extensive sale for his works by means of diabolical magic. Many of his writings went through three, four, and five editions.¹

John Nas,² of Eltmann in East Franconia, was born of Catholic parents, but during his wanderings as a tailor's apprentice he went over to Luther's doctrine. 'At Nuremberg, Ratisbon, and Augsburg,' he wrote later, 'I hungrily devoured the so-called Word of God according to its interpretation in Luther's books.' Often on Sundays he heard as many as four sermons in the day, and he says, 'I used to sing the hymn :

Uphold us, Lord, by Thine own Word,
And slay the Pope and murderous Turk,

as loud as any man.'

¹ See Schöpf, p. 73.

² With the careful work of Schöpf compare (now) especially Hirn, i. 235 ff., 252-262. See also Kröss, *Der sel. Petrus Canisius in Österreich* (Vienna, 1898). The short Latin autobiography of Nas has lately been published by J. Zingerle in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 18 (Halle, 1886), p. 488 ff. A work on Nas by Bucer will shortly appear in the *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*.

The invectives of the preachers had made such an impression on him, that he would instantly look about for stones to throw, if, after hearing one of such sermons, he chanced to meet a Catholic priest or bishop.¹ All his life long he could not shake off the memory of these ‘innumerable scoundrelly pulpit vituperations,’ and it ‘went to his heart to think how greatly the poor misguided people had had to suffer on account of them.’ Diligent reading of the ‘Imitation of Christ’ awakened in him a serious state of mind ;² he joined the Catholic Church again, turned his back upon the world, and in the year 1552 entered the Franciscan Order at Munich. At first he still carried on his trade in the monastery, and afterwards, too, he always continued to hold it in esteem. When he became auxiliary Bishop of Brixen he added the tailor’s scissors to his episcopal arms.³ After he had applied himself to learned studies the authorities sent him to Ingolstadt, which was at that time the centre of Catholic learning and polemics in South Germany. Under the guidance of the Jesuits he occupied himself with the Bible and the Fathers, learned the Greek and Hebrew tongues, and also came forward as a popular preacher, in which capacity he gained high renown. His sermons and his polemical writings exhibit him as a man of great power of language and well versed in national lore : like Geiler and Luther, he dug ‘from the mines of the people ;’ but the moderation of Geiler, who was nothing if not honest, he by no means displayed in all his writings. To appear as a controversial writer had been altogether foreign to his intention at the outset. ‘I should have liked best,’ he said, ‘to have devoted myself

¹ Schöpf, pp. 6-7.

² Nas, *Centuria ii.* 145.

³ Schöpf, pp. 8-9.

entirely to instructing the people in the Catholic faith from the pulpit and through the education of the young, and to have ministered to them in the confessional and in hospitals ; but the endless, unmentionable calumnies of the preachers have dragged me into the field, and I am now compelled to scourge and fight them with their own weapons, and to answer them back in the language which they themselves use, for they neither understand nor will listen to any other.' He did not take any delight in his pen-and-ink campaign. 'Who,' he asks, 'will be any the more pious for reading over and over again of other people's rascality?' 'It is not they only who have sinned ; we are all alike sinners, so help us, God, and we all stand in extreme need of repentance and reform ; therefore it would be best that each one should look to his own door and punish himself, and leave other people alone and in peace.' If the adversaries would also see things in this light and strive after Christian peace it would be far better, 'it would be more brotherly, Christian, and evangelical to bear one another's burdens, to cover each other's weakness, misery, and delinquencies, to care for each other's interests as Germans did in the good old days, and to act peaceably, uprightly, and kindly towards each other ; this would be much better than endless quarrelling and scolding, brawling, and fighting, without any improvement on either side, but with great detriment to our German reputation for uprightness.' ¹ 'But what are we to do when, day after day, as we may truly say, fresh libellous writings appear and our opponents break into the Catholic fold like wolves and devastate the vineyard of the Lord, upsetting

¹ *Centuria ii.* ; *Vorrede*, Bl. 3-4.

all discipline and morality, delighting in the most indecent language, circulating obscene pictures and paintings? Should we remain silent at such a time and not drive off the wolves? I ask anyone, who would assume the responsibility of such a course? All their sermons are permeated with abuse against the Catholics, and the unhappy creatures imagine that it is the right thing, the very standard of earnestness and zeal.’¹

His first incentive to appear as a polemical writer was a work published in the years 1562 and 1564 by Hieronymus Rauscher, court preacher to the Rhine Palatine, with a dedication to Duke Chistopher of Württemberg, and entitled ‘Hundert auserwählte, grosse, unverschämte, feiste, wohlgemästete, erstunkene papistische Lügen.’²

Rauscher had collected from different books all manner of legends and marvellous tales on the basis of which he had represented the entire papacy as a mass of idolatry and devilry. For the last forty years, he wrote, the papists had been holding all sorts of secret meetings, and had been carrying on deceitful, cunning intrigues in order to root out the pure doctrine of the Gospel and to bring everyone back under the godless yoke of popish idolatry. One of their chief assistants was Frederic Staphylus, into whom the devil had entered as into Judas Iscariot. This man was serving

¹ *Centuria vi.* 241^{a-b}; cf. *Centuria v.* 188^b, &c.

² ‘*Hundert auserwählte, grosse, unverschämte, feiste, wohlgemeste, erstunkene papistische Lügen*, which far exceed all other fools’ lies, such as Eulenspiegel’s, Marcolphi’s, the priest Kalenberg’s, Fortunati’s, Rollwagen’s, &c., with which the papists defend the principal articles of their creed (blinding the poor Christians and leading them into the pit of hell), collected from their own scribes, and with special reflections attached to each one, 1564.’

the devil 'openly against his own conscience.' He reviled and slandered the true religion, and placed his reliance on the secular lords who still adhered to the accursed papacy; as the herald of the devil he was going to organise a bloody massacre.¹

'The prelates of the papacy are the devil's servants, they promote and extend the empire of the devil.' 'The Roman Popes live like monsters, and the end of it is that they are now going to the devil;' 'in short, the devil vomits out his lies into the world through the godless papists and Mahometans, and the greater part of the world is by this means being dragged down into the pit of hell.' 'The nunneries are public brothels for the great lords, the cathedral priests, and the nobles;' 'the devil is the father of the diabolical monks, and he prompts them to utter all sorts of lies;' their 'place is under the devil's tail, and he leads them right and left, he rules them, and will finally take them into his kingdom of hell.' The legend of a Franciscan brother who was thrown into the sea by sailors but transplanted thence to Paradise, where he was led about by Enoch and Elias, after which he reappeared on board the ship, was altered and magnified into the following account: 'He was conducted to the dark star and to the Venusberg; there he beheld the back parts of Lucifer, which are the monk's paradise, but Enoch and Elias had nothing to do with this arch-villain; Beelzebub, Lucifer, and his associates sing and dance and make merry in hell when they get such a fellow among them.'² Rauscher heaped special obloquy on St. Francis of Assisi. Report said that this saint had pulled off his nether garments before his death

¹ *Vorrede.*

² Pp. 23, 63, 81, 83, 95, 172 ff.

because he wanted to die like Christ, and Rauscher added the tale that it was 'his custom to do this when he was alone with the sisters of St. Clara, and that the nuns were obliged to take off their veils and to hang their robes on the clothes line and to pray naked.'

'When St. Francis died, the demons held carnival in hell; Beelzebub, Lucifer, and his comrades received him into their kingdom with great honours as a faithful servant, and set him on high beside the devil's mother. . . .'¹

Rauscher dedicated this work to Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, because the latter's ardent and active love of the true and alone-saving religion was well known to everybody.² 'The dear Christians' were exhorted to consider 'in what darkness those who adhered to the papacy were still sunk at the present day, and how abominably they were deceived every day of their lives.' For they were obliged to accept all these lying stories as truth, and whoever dared to speak a word against them was persecuted with fire, water, and hanging.³

With even stronger 'Christian zeal' did the Palatine court preacher express himself in a second 'Centuria' which he dedicated to the Margrave George Frederic of Ansbach. 'The Babylonish harlot at Rome,' he

¹ P. 208 ff. The Catholic worship was treated in like manner, for instance: 'The sole object of the holy water and the consecration of the impious priests is to promote the kingdom of the devil' (p. 45); 'the newly canonised saints, who are to be venerated and invoked, have many of them never even existed, and many of them have their abode with Beelzebub in hell' (p. 100); 'the festival of Corpus Christi has been introduced into the papacy in order to make people stare with open mouths and swallow mouse-dung for pepper and horse-droppings for figs' (p. 154), and so forth.

² *Vorrede*, p. 19.

³ P. 210.

informed the prince, had condemned the Word of God by the blasphemous decrees of the Council of Trent, and was determined to restore all the old idolatry and blasphemy in Germany. The Catholic Church he pronounced simply to be 'the devil's bride,' and told his readers, among other monstrous things, that 'to beget illegitimate children is no sin in the papacy, and if they are put an end to at once, and the matter hushed up and confessed to the priest, all is forgiven.' 'If you have to live under papal authority, bethink you,' he warned the Catholics, 'what execrable wolves and soul-murderers you have for your pastors and preachers, and how scandalously they deceive you under the semblance and in the name of the old Christian Catholic Church, to which indeed they do not belong, for they are members of the Church of Judas and Cain.'¹

'It passes all credence,' said Nas, 'that these preaching screech-owls and stormbirds should dare to publish all this abuse and calumny under the name of German princes.' 'The ruling authorities, already heavily burdened with other business, are dragged into quarrels and complications, the common people are embittered and incensed against the clergy, and the whole world is thus filled with strife, wrangling, envy and hatred, out of which follow war and devastation of land and people, as indeed we now see before our very eyes, and as the poor misguided masses must recognise to their great sorrow.'²

Rauscher, he said, had aroused him from inaction³

¹ *Centuria secunda das andere hundert der auserwählten &c. papistischen Lügen, welche alle Narrenlügen weit übertreffen, &c.* (1565), Vorrede, A. 2 ff., J 3. M 2.

² *Centuria 3, ; Vorrede, A 2^b ; cf. Centuria v. 13.* ³ *Centuria 6, 28^a.*

and driven him to take up his pen ; but Rauscher was only *one* in a great crowd of calumniators who were flooding the world with their ‘blasphemies, scoffings, execrations, against all the saints and sacred things of God, against all Christian discipline and respectability, and above all against Mary the Mother of God and against the body ecclesiastic.’¹

In opposition to all this scurrilous abuse Nas began by publishing, in 1565, his pamphlet entitled : ‘Das antipapistisch Eins und hundert auserlesener gewisser evangelischer Wahrheit, bei welcher, als bei den Früchtein der Baum, die reine Lehre soll und muss erkannt werden.’² The most prominent Protestant controversial theologians, Tilmann Hesshus, Nicholas Gallus, Lucas Osiander, Cyriacus Spangenberg,³ Jacob Andreä and many others got a ‘fine wiggings’ in this pamphlet—that is to say, ‘they were answered back in their own elegant language with like vigour and plain-speaking, so that they might be brought at length to perceive, without any veiling or disguise, what sort of fruitage they were, and what had grown up out of their dung-hills. This publication, says Nas, set the whole ‘Lutheran swarm’ in motion, and developed into a fierce pen-and-ink contest which dragged on till 1568, and in the course of which Nas followed up his ‘Eins und hundert’ with five other ‘Centuries,’⁴ The more acrimonious the attacks became, the more

¹ *Centuria i.* ; *Vorrede*.

² ‘The Antipapistic One Hundred and One selected certain evangelical truths, by which, as the tree by its fruit, the pure doctrine is to be known.’

³ Rembe has lately published the correspondence (*Briefwechsel*) of C. Spangenberg (Dresden, 1888) ; but this collection of letters is by no means complete ; cf. Kawerau in the *Theol. Lit.-Zeitung*.

⁴ For the full title of the *Centuries* see Schöpf, p. 73.

rasping was Nas in his answers, yet without being able to come near his adversaries in the art of personal insults and vilification. Lucas Osiander himself alone brought the number of words of abuse used against Nas up to 72, and these were all recapitulated by Nas for his readers with complete accuracy.¹ Every coarse word of abuse which he had used, Nas said, he could also point out in the writings of Luther, Spangenberg, Andreä, Osiander, Celestin, Rauscher, and others. 'It must be remembered that it is one thing to instruct the Catholics and another to make a defence against apostates. A shepherd must behave differently to the wolves than to the sheep. In my sermons and my other Catholic writings I do not scold and revile

¹ *Centuria* 6, 243. In the first *Centuria*, p.144, Nas repeats all the numerous terms of abuse which Cyriacus Spangenberg applied to the excellent Bishop of Naumburg, Julius Pflug—a smeared, tonsured stallion, an old wolf, a priest of Baal, a raging, senseless, roaring fool, a devil, and so on. This was what the preachers were. To please their father the devil, they so often write down his name. 'On the other hand, if we dare to look at them askance, to call them by their true names, and to measure them with the same measure that they mete out, they cannot endure it. If anyone says that Schmidel (Jacob Andreä) has a torn sleeve, he instantly cries out "Murder! Not even my sleeves will they leave alone!" But if *he* calls Staphylus a mamaluke, a traitor to divine truth, a Judas Iscariot, a villain, it is all perfectly correct, and the Holy Scriptures confirm it. Indeed, it may be taken for granted that it is pious, just, and entirely right; for Christ Himself, they say, called the Pharisees hypocrites, vipers, and other bad names. George Nigrinus also came forward 'manfully.' He called Nas a 'pig's snout' (a play on the word *Sau-Nase*):

*Deiner Nasen kein Würz gefällt,
Denn welche einer jeden Sau schmeckt.
Die Saunase nichts lüßeres reucht,
Denn was hinten aus dem Menschen kreucht . . .*

Nas was a child of Satan, and the Catholic clergy in general were 'the whole lot of them wicked rogues,' 'epicurean swine,' 'they hate and flee from the cross like Satan himself,' and so on. Vom Bruder Nasen Esel, B 3^a. *Willkomm und Abdank der Antigratulation Johann Nasen*, C 2-3, F 3-9.

or indulge in words of abuse, and for this reason, that I am not dealing with wolves but with sheep. But in my controversial writings, if it is not always "Dear child" and so on, if there are ugly spots and patches as well, it is,' he repeated again and again, 'because I have to do with people who understand no other kind of language.'¹ The poor, misled Protestant people were not to blame, they were only to be pitied; on the other hand, the preachers who were the misleaders and blasphemers must in no way be spared. The manner of his campaign against them is exemplified in the following words: 'I seldom pass through an evangelical hamlet without hearing the cry of terror, "Wolf, wolf." These wolves are the murderers of souls, the villagers' own preachers, who are so plentiful that scarcely anyone can escape from the vermin. For wherever they nest they multiply like fleas. For the rest there is everywhere a great lack of sound preaching, but in all directions there are swarms of insipid shoemakers and tailors, hangmen, bailiffs, women and landsknechts who are quite fit to preach, according to the saying of Scripture: "And these shall be like people, like priests."

'And whereas they have now dissipated the goods of the Church, they perpetrate one abomination after another, and they build more customs houses than churches; yea, verily, in their evangelical fashion they turn churches into thieves' caverns, toll-houses, and dens of murderers, of which I shall gladly give a number of instances in case anyone should doubt what I say.'²

Because Luther was the father of all the 'calumni-

¹ Schöpf, p. 11.

² *Centuria iv.* 309.

ating, cursing preachers, who had learnt all their terms of abuse from him,' he must undergo 'special expiation.' Luther had proclaimed the papacy to be an institution of the devil, and in revenge for this Nas published an 'Anatomy des ganzen Luthertums vom Teufel gestiftet.'

He quoted quantities of Luther's sayings in proof that the latter was 'a low, indecent fellow and a swinish preacher:' he called him 'the devil's piper and lute-player.' 'I often wonder,' he said, 'whether Luther was not the veritable son of corruption, the Antichrist.'¹ In the fourth 'Centuria' 'the miserable Lutheranism was dissected to such an extent that it presented a perfect Pantheon of all sorts of evil fruits—several hundreds at least—of the accursed evangelical fig-tree.' The fifth was 'a careful record of the whole biography from birth to death of the saintly man, Dr. Martin Luther, written down in order that the fruits of the doctrine might be unmistakably seen in the "tree" of the teacher.' Nas acknowledged that he had 'written in scathing language against the dead Luther;' but the opponents, while loading Luther with immoderate praise as a saint more exalted even than Paul and John the Baptist, far exceeded him (Nas) in coarse 'slanders, curses, and abuse against the saints of God.'² He cited horrible instances in proof of this: the Holy Virgin herself was described in language 'too dreadful to repeat.'³

Nas could also point to the poet John Fischart as a 'shameless calumniator of the saints.' This man had endeavoured, in two satirical poems directed against

¹ *Centuria v.* 266-267, 292, 495.

² Cf. Schöpf, pp. 19-26.

³ *Centuria vi.* 205^a.

Nas, to drag St. Francis of Assisi and St. Dominic in the mud.

In the first poem, 'Der Barfüsser Sekten und Kuttentstreit,'¹ Fischart compared St. Francis to Mahommed; as the latter was worshipped by the Turks, so was St. Francis by the monks.² When St. Catharine observed and heard

How greatly Francis was adored
On account of his five wounds, great and bleeding,
Which he had probably scratched himself,
She, too, thought of a cunning trick,
And inflicted five wounds on herself,
And said that when she was in a trance
Mary had wounded her thus,
But that Francis had himself made his wounds,
And had bound them up himself.
Hereby she did the poor man great harm,
For she herself, without any shame,
At once gained a great following
Of preachers, monks, and agitators,
Who all ridiculed St. Francis
And praised their Catharine instead.
Who will settle this question of the wounds ?³

Through the wranglings of the different parties
of one and the same monastic Order, Francis

Was daily and hourly
Stigmatised and more deeply wounded ;
Although he already had five wounds
Which made him weak enough,
His friars' band devoutly wished
To cause him still more martyrdom.⁴

A second pamphlet bore the title : 'Von S. Domini, des Predigermünchs, und S. Francisci Barfüssers, artlichem Leben und grossen Greueln, dem grauen Bettelmönch F. J. Nasen zu Ingelstat dediciert, dass

¹ In Kurz, i. 101-120.

² Verse 19 ff.

³ Verse 225 ff.

⁴ Verse 99 ff.

er sich darinnen seiner unverschämten Lästerungen und Beiwohnung der Teufel bei den Mönchen (welches die Nas D. Luthern Seliger aufzudrehen begeret) zu erinnern und zu ersehen hab.' ¹

Even in his 'Flohhaaz, Weibertrutz' he made game of St. Francis :

. . . It is told in the legend of St. Francis
That the pious man always called
The flea and the louse his monastic brothers,
And commanded that each member of the order
Should refrain from shedding his brother's blood,
And therefore none of them must kill a flea or a louse.

'There is nothing so true,' says Fischart in another place, 'as that the cowl, the frock, and the priest's long coat have drawn down all the shame and curses of the whole world. And the explanation of this is that they eat the dirt of the world—that is to say, they swallow its sins, and therefore they are consigned like chimney-sweeps and nightmen to their secret apartments . . . which are their cloisters and convents, so that they may be cut off from all political fellowship, like the Cl . . . in houses and the brothels in towns.' ²

Compared with such abuse as this, the language which Nas made use of might pass as respectable. If Fischart and his brother-in-arms Nigrinus ridiculed the quarrels—petty and unworthy enough—going on between different monastic orders, they did not thereby by any means 'refute the attacks which Nas made on

¹ Kurz, i. 121-252. 'The peculiar life and great abominations of the Friar-Preacher St. Dominic, and of St. Francis the Barefoot, dedicated to the gray mendicant friar, F. J. Nas, of Ingolstadt, in order to place before his eyes and mind his shameless blasphemies, and the cohabitation of devils with monks (which Nose [Nas] attempted to palm off on the late Dr. Luther).'

² *Geschichtklitterung*, pp. 479, 483.

the numerous sects and parties into which Protestantism was split up, and which were at war together concerning the most important points of faith, and mutually accused and condemned each other.' Everything in Germany, Nas said, was bound to fall out of gear, because, outside the Catholic Church, there was no stability in religious ordinances, but only constant innovation and increasing bitterness and strife. 'It is a disgrace before all nations,' he wrote in the year 1581, 'that we Germans should thus curse and swear at each other like troopers. Such princes and lords are a mere laughing-stock, for the longer they live the more unstable they become, they make fresh church ordinances every year, and they, the secular lords, impose them on their clergy, the sheep on their shepherds, and everything is declared to come out of the Word of God. For a long time they were on good terms with the Calvinists in France, England, and the Netherlands; they praised them up and placed life and property at their disposal; now they condemn them as strongly as the papacy!' ¹ Each sect insisted that it alone was right and tried to suppress all the others. 'It is very distressing to simple-minded people to hear each separate sect and faction declaring that in its fold alone is Christ to be found. The Flacians proclaim that the whole world is in error with the exception of themselves. The Adiaphorists say that the Flacians lie, but they themselves lie just as much, for they declare that the Church is nowhere but in their midst; the Schwenkfeldians say that it is with them; the Anabaptists say that all the world has apostatised from God and gone astray, and that they alone have

¹ *Examen Concordiae* (1581), pp. 403-404.

remained in the true Church. Each separate sect sings this same song concerning itself. But this is no new cry of to-day, for it has been learnt from the old heretics, especially the Donatists and the Cathari.’¹ Only in hatred against the Catholic Church are they all one, and the deluded, misled people are stirred up by the preachers, especially against the priests and Orders. ‘Just think of the insolent, unseemly manner in which the commoner sort among the evangelicals have learnt from preachers to judge and condemn the monks; the instant they catch sight of a cowl they scream out “murder, wolf, wolf, scoundrel, thief, demon,” and so forth. They behave like this to people with whom they have never exchanged a word all their lives, and who have never done them any harm. Nobody can repeat all the terms of opprobrium and mockery which they have at their fingers’ ends.’²

Nas produced evidence from numbers of Protestant writings to show that since the advent of the new Gospel morality and respectability had disappeared and the people had become rough, savage, and uncivilised. The actual root of the evil, he explained, lay in the fundamental principle of Protestant doctrine that faith alone justified men, and that good works were not necessary to salvation. Through the spread of this doctrine, which destroyed all active Christian life and put a stop to all works of benevolence, Germany had been altogether led astray. While the preachers were denouncing the Catholic doctrine of good works as an invention of the devil and an outgrowth of hell, Nas, in 1588, expressed himself as follows concerning ‘only believing.’ ‘In like manner as the Turks have

¹ *Centuria iii.* 63.

² *Centuria ii.* 45.

made for themselves out of the true God a Turkish and a sham god, so these ministers of the Word, with their false devil's notions and "only believe," have made out of the true Christ a pseudo-Christ, who is of no use to us, who wears the devil's mantle and is subject to his will, who only tenders the devil's chalice and lying bread; wherefore they, like him, are inclined to lying and murdering.' ¹

'Oh, my beloved German Fatherland! those who tell thee that thou art saved through faith alone upraised to heaven, are misleading thee as surely as God lives and reigns. They are all misleading thee, all of them who sanctify, comfort, and allure thee in this wise, and assure thee of salvation. Their fruits are murder, robbery, lying, deceit, gluttony and drunkenness, incest and villainy, which they practise without fear. For faith alone, they say, justifies everything, so that no sin is hurtful, while good works are detrimental to salvation.² When anyone forsakes us, becomes a rogue and criminal, robs another of his wife or property, he runs off to the evangelicals, and he is straightway an honourable upright man. They have nothing else, therefore they boast of their "faith alone," and would to God they did nothing but believe. But alas for faith alone! They commit and indulge in all sorts of iniquities—war, devastation, uproar, plunder of churches, bloodshed, without intermission.'³

'Oh, Germany! thou the beloved of my heart, my noble Fatherland, canst thou not yet understand, what nevertheless is so clumsily concocted that even

¹ *Angelus paraeneticus, der Manungengel* (1588), p. 173.

² P. 171; cf. Schöpf, pp. 65–66.

³ *Praeludium in centurias hominum sola fide perditorum* (1588), ii. 3.

blind Jews, Turks, and infidels see through it, and mock at thee, or are the shame and ridicule not written largely enough for thee to read and be enlightened? Ah me! wilt thou not soon bestir thyself? Wilt thou not soon repent thee and forsake the milksops, the “sugar-preachers” and ministers of the Word, who deal out sweet words, who slip a silken cord into thy mouth to lead thee—wilt thou not forsake them and drive them off to the devil?’¹

In the midst of life we all
By death are compassed round;
Whom shall we seek, upon whom call,
That grace by us be found?
On Thee, O Lord, alone.

We are oppressed with our sins’ yoke—
The sins which God’s wrath did provoke.
Oh, holy Lord our God,
Oh, holy, strong Lord God,
Holy Saviour merciful,
Thou eternal God,
Let us not be led astray
To the heretics’ perdition—
Help us in our dire condition.²

Again and again Nas returned to this same point: ‘Because the new faith is so powerful that in itself alone it is sufficient for salvation, all works of benevolence have ceased. When were there ever so many poor people in the land as are to be found nowadays? When were the hospitals so poor as at the present day? What numbers of convents have been confiscated under pretence of endowing the hospitals: but these have never been so deeply in debt as they are now. What has become of the revenues of the schools? How many poor people have been fed by the convents?’³

¹ *Widerinwarnung* (1577), p. 238. See Schöpf, p. 58.

² Schöpf, p. 68.

³ *Sechs Hauspredigten*, p. 242^b.

A quarrel which arose between Nas and Matthias Ritter, preacher at Frankfort-on-the-Main, is highly significant as illustrating the tone and manner of the polemics of the period. Nas had said in his fourth 'Centuria,' if among the Catholics also 'the mothers and sisters are more conspicuous for chatter than for piety,' the evangelical women are still more 'inveterate gossips,' especially in matters of religion and of the Divine Word; they disregard St. Paul's prohibition and his command that they 'should learn from their husbands.' 'They chatter and babble like geese in a stream, and oftentimes mislead upright men, after the example of their Mother Eve and King Solomon's concubines. When Eve listened to the first preacher who absolved her from fasting, this was the first manifestation of the devil in the form of a serpent, and Eve forthwith led the man astray, as Delilah did Samson; *Summa Summarum: Omnis Lutherana meretrix.*'¹

In answer to this Ritter published a 'Dialogus das ist ein Gespräch von den ehrwürdigen und lästerlichen Urteil Bruder Johann Nasen zu Ingolstadt, dass alle Lutherischen Weiber Huren seien.'² Nas, he said, was 'an outrageous blasphemer, altogether resembling the first pulpit-screacher in the Garden of Eden;' for he travestied and perverted God's Word, no less than did the devil, when he said that 'the Lutheran women were harlots because they talked about the Word of God.' 'What has God to do with whoredom? Does he want to make God out to be a keeper of harlots? It

¹ *Centuria iv.* 258^b.

² 'A Dialogue on Friar John Nasen's slander, that all Lutheran women be whores.'

is enough to curdle one's heart with horror only to think of such utterances.' ¹ Moreover, Nas had declared that 'not only a few, or a number of Lutheran women were whores, but all of them, not excepting the Lutheran queens, electresses, princesses, and others of high positions and belonging to the nobility. No life is more abject and devilish than that of whores; yet, according to Friar Nas, the world must be told that such is the life of all Lutheran women, of high or low degree. And note here a very masterpiece of popish revengefulness.

'Of us men he does not say that we are whoremongers, but he fastens this infamy on our wives in order at the same time to cover us and our children with shame. For if the wives are harlots and the husbands tolerate it, they too are disreputable men, and the children are bastards. Who under such circumstances will want to marry our daughters? What guild or honourable company will be willing to admit us or our children?' Lutheran princes, or the children of Lutheran princes, would not be able to sit at the Diets, or to come into their heritages. Nas relegated all of them to the hangman and the brothel-keeper. 'On the other hand, the papists alone would be able to bear high and honourable names and titles, to conduct the government, to be lords of the world, to carry on honourable trades, and to maintain civil right and order. In short, they alone will be regarded as real people, their concubines will take precedence over our princesses, the priests' bastards will be set up above the children of our princes, and it will be woe to him who shall think anything discreditable about them: away with such a one to the

¹ *Dialogus*, Bl. 22.

stake or the gallows !' This was what Brother Nas was doing with the 'bloodthirsty, devilish blasphemy' contained in his three words.¹

Nas entered the lists against Ritter's 'Dialogus' with a fresh pamphlet which surpassed all his former ones in virulent attacks on the 'pulpit-screechers.'²

'It is seen and realised better and better, as time goes on, that the preachers of Lutherdom are altogether blind, raving, and diabolical ; for, like the devil himself, they are immoderately bent on seeking out cause for vengeance.'

'They are aiming at my life with all sorts of intrigues, open and secret ; they are stirring up against me—for such is their power—many famous towns and estates, and many of these have gone so far as actually to place me under the ban, although they do not all of them read my books, but only believe on hearsay all that their preachers tell them in the pulpit and at meals.' One favourite dodge of the preachers, he said, was to befool prying, inquisitive women—'to declare in their presence that I had denounced them one and all, women of rank and distinction as well as others, as harlots, and had made this statement publicly in print. That is what they publish in print, send to ladies of high rank as a "Beutpfennig," sing and proclaim in the streets: all Lutheran women are whores ! In none of my books, however, is there to be found such "a slanderous calumny."'³ 'Why,' he asks Ritter, 'did you not quote the full passage with the context as it stands at p. 372 of the fourth "Centuria" ? There it is clearly aimed at

¹ *Dialogus*, Bl. 22 ff. ; cf. H. Echartus, *Papa pharisaizanus* (Jena, 1605), p. 444.

² *G. Asinus Nasi Battimontanus, das ist ein Bericht von Fratrís Joannis Nasen Esel, auch von des Esels rechtem Titel G. N. B.* (Ingolstadt, 1571).

the pulpit-screechers. Is not that fine evangelical truth? Forsooth, all Lutheran women ought to rise up against their pulpit-screechers, abuse them soundly and publicly for having, through their whoring with nunnery refuse, brought upon them all the accusation of being whores.’¹

In a pamphlet published two years before the appearance of the fourth ‘Centuria’ Nas had gone to the length of saying, concerning the marriage of persons outside the fold of the Church: ‘If they consider the ceremony a sacrament we cannot agree that it is so any more than a Mahommedan marriage is one. No, dear Christian friend, outside the Church marriage is no sacrament.’ Nevertheless, he allowed the conjugal union of heretics to be marriages. ‘It is certainly a conjugal state,’ he said, ‘but no sacrament.’ But, as regards the apostate priests and monks, he declared that the marriage of such persons was ‘nothing more than accursed wickedness, disguised under the name of marriage.’²

It was against apostates of this sort and their wives, for the most part former nuns, Nas said, that his attacks were chiefly directed. ‘Not only have I not condemned all evangelical women wholesale, any more than I have included Jewesses and pagan women in so comprehensive a verdict, but I have been far more restricted in my attacks on the honour of Lutheran women than have their own preachers. Yea, verily, if the poor deceived Lutheran women were as little impugned in their honour by their own pulpit-screechers as they have been by me, they would be, without a doubt, much more respectable than this women-rider has

¹ Bl. 39^c-43.

² *Drei geschrieffte Predigten* (1566), Bl. 34-35.

shown them to be by his actions, his teachings, and his writings.' ¹

Ritter had also invented and said that 'I had called the Lutheran women drag-nets for no other reason than that they talk about the Word of God and discuss religious questions. To which I answer that everyone can see from this that this knight (Ritter) himself had clearly perceived that I had made no attack on the bodily honour of the Lutheran women, but that I was speaking figuratively and of spiritual matters. Nevertheless, he sets up a gross carnal scandal, as if I had called them harlots in a carnal sense. Herein is seen his malicious forgery. For I do not admit that I called them adulteresses on account of the Word of God, but on account of irreligion and Luther's or Lucifer's word and soul murder, of which things they are sent to dispute, as also was Eve.' All heresy is spiritual adultery, and by his words '*Omnis Lutherana meretrix*' he had only meant that 'the whole of Lutherdom, instituted by the devil, had committed adultery against God.' ²

But Nas in his fourth 'Centuria' had made one far more poignant statement, in respect of which there was no need for him to defend himself against Ritter, for the reason that Ritter had not alluded to it. Ritter had either not read the book thoroughly or else he had purposely passed over the statement in question, in order to lay more stress on his contention that Nas had called all Lutheran women whores because they occupied themselves with the Word of God.

This statement, however, to which Nas himself drew his opponent's attention, was as follows: 'The

¹ G. Asinus, Bl. 45.

² G. Asinus, Bl. 60-61 ; Bl. 48.

proceedings of the preachers are chiefly made up of sheer roguery and mutiny.' 'The stock of harlots is beyond reckoning, so numerous are they; for it is certainly probable *quod omnis Lutherana sit meretrix*, that they are all adulteresses or born in adultery'—here there is a marginal note: 'heretics are the adulterous generation'—'and as this is incontrovertible in a spiritual sense, so also is it in a carnal one, for I have already shown that every woman who does not violate her marriage vows is considered guilty of pride by the evangelical preachers.'¹

What he had 'disclosed' about the preachers was as follows: 'What can I say about their false "wonder-works," which are nothing but deception, through which the evangelical Hetzer brought twenty-four married women to ruin? This is the way he proceeded. Whenever a beautiful woman came to see him, after talking to her about her interest in the evangel and her desire to partake of the Eucharist in both forms, according to the Lord's institution, he would say to her, "Dear lady, you are on the right road, but there is one thing wanting in you; you have in you a kind of pride which you must get rid of if you wish to become perfect, and it is this: you have not yet broken your marriage vow, and for this reason you have a sense of superiority over other women; but this is of the devil; and therefore, if you wish to become perfect, you must put away this pride, &c." ' In confirmation of this Nas referred, in the margin, to Luther's 'Table-talk,' edited by 'Aurifaber,' p. 459, and added: 'These are Luther's own words, according to Aurifaber.'² This, of course, would make all readers who were not

¹ *Centuria iv.* 372^b, 373.

² *Centuria iv.* 369.

acquainted with the 'Table-talk,' and who did not take the trouble to refer to it, and who did not know who the 'evangelical Hetzer' in question was, think that Luther himself had spoken 'these words' as an expression of his own opinion, whereas they only represented his account of the *Gartenbruder Hetzer*,¹ an Anabaptist from Augsburg,² who used to seduce women in the manner above described. Luther had plainly stated at the end of his narrative (what Nas left out and only indicated with an '&c.'): 'In this way he (Hetzer) seduced numbers of women.' Nas tried to excuse himself for this misleading quotation by remarking that he had quoted Luther's words 'in the same way that Gallus, my cook, had quoted the words of Hosius.' But because the Superintendent Gallus of Ratisbon allowed himself to make dishonourable citations from books, this was no justification for Nas's doing the same thing.

James Heerbrand, professor of theology at Tübingen, was of opinion that 'nothing proved so plainly that the wrath of God was visibly manifest and that the end of the world was undoubtedly at hand as the fact that the papists had no shame and scruple in attacking, both in his life and his teaching, the noblest jewel of the Holy Church, the divinely-illuminated Martin Luther, and in accusing him of inconsistency and changeableness, as if by so doing they could disgrace the whole evangelical Church.' Heerbrand's wrath was called forth by a small pamphlet which the Jesuit Sigismund Ernhofer published anonymously at Graz in 1587 under the title: 'Der evangelische Wetterhahn, das ist: Ungleiche Reden Martini Lutheri von den

¹ Nickname of the Anabaptists.

² See our remarks, vol. v. p. 158.

fürnehmsten Artikeln christlicher Religion.’¹ That Ernhofer was guilty of making incorrect quotations or that he mangled or falsified Luther’s words could not be asserted; the rhymes at the back of the title-page were the sole contribution made by the author himself to the collection.

He who to one same thing saith Yea and Nay,
Slight faith and trust doth verily betray.
Now Luther he was such a man,
To prove which is this booklet’s plan.
A very weathercock, I swear :
Let every one of him beware.

Heerbrand gave vent to his wrath by publishing in the following year a big volume entitled ‘Propfung und Abfertigung des vermeinten neulich ausgebrüteten evangelischen Wetterhahnen,’² in which, without any attempt at a real refutation, he hurled the most terrible accusations against the Pope and the Catholic Church. The Mass, he said, ‘had been invented and instituted by the devil in opposition to Christ; in this ceremony Christ was daily crucified anew; purgatory ‘had been invented by the heathens and trumpeted up by the devil;’ the Holy Scriptures were as much detested by the papists as the cross was by the devil; the Pope, according to Catholic teaching, forgave sins for money; he would even, if such a sin were possible, forgive any one who had committed fornication with the Mother of God; in short, ‘the popish Church was not Christ,

¹ At the end: Grätz, 1587; cf. Reinlich in the *Mitteil. des Hist. Vereins für Steiermark*, 27 (Graz, 1879), p. 160.

² ‘Examination and Refutation of the newly published so-called *Evangelical Weathercock*’ (Tübingen, 1588). Respecting Heerbrand’s controversy against the Jesuit of Graz, Sigismund Ernhofer, see also Loserth, *Reformation und Gegenreformation*, p. 486 ff. Heerbrand was incited to proceed as he did by the Graz preacher Zimmermann.

but the bride incarnate of the devil ;' everything in this Church, as every-day experience plainly showed, was antichristian and 'abominable idolatry—worse than that of the heathen.' Heerbrand attached no importance to the contradictory statements of Luther, for the latter, he said, had only come gradually to the recognition that 'the papacy had been founded by the devil.' 'Therefore, you Jesuits, and whoever is the adulterous father of this weathercock, press, squeeze, get whatever you like or can out of Luther's books : you have not convinced us, all the same, that we believe and teach false doctrine ;' he was fighting 'with God's Word ;' 'what do the words or sayings of Luther matter to us ?' ¹

With regard to the personality of Luther the convert Sebastian Flasch, formerly preacher at Mansfeld, had already, eleven years before the publication of the 'Evangelical Weathercock,' provoked 'the implacable wrath of every respectable evangelical.' In the year 1576 Flasch had published at Ingolstadt, in the Latin language, twenty-two reasons ('Beweggründe') why he had embraced the Catholic faith when already an old man.² The first reason given is that, after long research, he had come to the conviction that the Protestants had misrepresented the Catholic religion with numberless obvious lies in order to make it appear odious and contemptible. Other reasons were deduced from the substance of Luther's teaching and its

¹ *Propfung und Abfertigung*, pp. 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 38, 46-49 ; cf. pp. 174, 260.

² *Professio Catholica M. Sebast. Flaschii Mansfeldiensis, non vulgaris eruditionis et autoritatis viri, ubi Lutheranam Haeresim, in qua et natus et a puero institutus fuerat, libere abjurat, simulque abjurat[i]onis suae causas viginti duas adducens* (Ingolstadt, 1576).

contradictory statements ; others from the endless controversies which the Protestants kept up concerning doctrine, and the manner of life of the preachers. What he said on this last point exceeded everything that Nas had written, and called down upon him the imprecations of his former colleague in office. ‘He is morally degraded and damned, Flasch, the traitor to God ; he is a mamaluke and a tool of Satan ; he deserves to be carried off by seven demons and torn to pieces.’¹ ‘Although the preachers are married men,’ wrote Flasch, ‘they are nevertheless so little satisfied with their help-meets that for the gratification of their insatiable lusts, and following Luther’s sanction, they abuse their own maids, and, what is still more scandalous, they do not scruple to betray wives of other men, or to arrange among themselves an exchange of wives. I should not dare to assert and write such things openly, but that during my long intercourse with them I have myself had positive experience of the truth of all this and much more.’ ‘I will give one instance only : A certain preacher of good position wanted to make a bargain with me for an exchange of wives, and actually endeavoured to force me into giving my consent, when he saw that at no price could I be talked into such a crime. My sense of shame forbids my dwelling longer on other outrageous actions of the kind.’ Further, ‘the ignorance of the Lutheran ministers had grown to such a pitch of barbarism that it could not possibly become worse. For, since the first champions of Lutheranism had died out, men who had been educated by the Catholics and had been distinguished by great learning and acquirements, there had been scarcely

¹ In the sermon quoted above, p. 20, note 2 (Bl. C 3).

anybody left who was capable of rightly comprehending and defending the Lutheran position. Even if some of them plume themselves on their scholarship, they nevertheless bring forward such absurdities in their pamphlets and extempore sermons that it is scarcely worth while to read them or listen to them. They do nothing but repeat the trashy falsehoods of their predecessors—falsehoods which have long ago been shown up and refuted by numbers of Catholic authors. And so it happens that, by reason of this dearth of educated, cultivated men to proclaim the Divine Word and to administer the sacraments—men of the most degraded kind, apostate monks, tailors, shoemakers, jailors, butchers, and others of the working class hold the field, so that the cover is of a piece with the dish and the bowl with its contents.’ With regard to Luther, Flasch said he had found frequent contradictions in his books, and a mass of the bitterest invectives and accusations against his adversaries, together with such disgusting expressions, such coarse buffoonery and indecency, that the most shameless harlot would blush at them. He abstained from citing instances ‘so as not to offend chaste and pious ears.’¹ Then when, in consequence of his ‘false and shameless accusations against the precious man of God,’ he was proclaimed by a preacher to be ‘worthy of the gallows and every imaginable punishment,’ he published another pamphlet in 1577 under the title, ‘Augenscheinliche Erweisung aus Doktor Martin Luthers eigenen Büchern und Worten, dass er kein heiliger Prophet Deutschlands, sondern ein rechter Unflat gewesen’ (‘Plain evidence, from Dr. Martin Luther’s own books and words, that he was

¹ Räss, *Konvertiten*, ii. 254-265.

not a holy prophet of Germany, but a thoroughly obscene person').¹

This pamphlet contained violent marginal notes on Luther's utterances, and also 'a very abusive' epilogue. Caspar Goblerus answered it with a short '*Bericht wider die lästerliche Calumnia des ungelehrten Esels Flaschens, eines Mansfeldischen Jesuiters*' ('Statement in refutation of the scandalous calumnies of the ignorant donkey Flasch, a Mansfeld Jesuit'), published in order to save Luther from 'the Catholic accursed children of Ham.' This writer professed to entertain 'filial respect' for Luther, and said that he wrote 'to the best of his ability.'²

Flasch's pamphlet is to a certain extent the prototype of the '*Anatomy of Luther*' by Johann Pistorius. The appearance on the scene of this most dreaded of Catholic controversialists is connected with an event which caused agitation throughout the whole German nation: namely, the entrance of the Margrave James III. of Baden-Hochberg into the Catholic Church in the year 1590.

James, who was conspicuous among those of his own rank by his intellectual endowments, his solid and many-sided learning and culture, and, above all, by his honourable and blameless character, had been troubled for many years with serious doubts; he questioned whether the Augsburg Confession, in which he had been brought up, was really 'the true religion, the only religion which could ensure salvation.' 'For, after long and diligent reflection,' he wrote to the Superintendent and to other Church officials of his land, 'we

¹ Ingolstadt, 1577.

² Printed at Christlingen, 1591; see Bl. A 2^a, A 3^b, B 4^b.

have come to see that there is no certain rule and invariable code among our co-religionists ; but, on the contrary, daily division and change, while each preacher introduces innovations ¹ at his pleasure, and all of them are free to put a different interpretation on any point in religion.' 'Furthermore, we have found so much in Luther's own books and pamphlets, and also in his translation and interpretation of the Bible, to show that he was not a spiritual man but a carnally-minded one, that we have come to doubt whether the Almighty really intended this more than fleshly man, who can so well conceal the Holy Ghost in his books, to be the instrument for proclaiming the true religion.' There is also, 'alas, no devoutness whatever in our religion ; there is not a single rite or ceremony which conduces to reverence, and most of its votaries, including the clergy, are even ashamed to kneel down in church or when they pray ; therefore it is to be feared that in this case the child is being shaken out with the bath.'

He was only the second member of his ancient race who had not belonged to the Catholic religion, in which his ancestors had lived and, as he hoped, had 'obtained salvation like all the holy fathers, martyrs, and other distinguished Christians.' All these reasons and others besides 'had aroused his conscience and filled him with no slight doubts concerning his religion.'²

Johann Pistorius, physician, and later on councillor to the Margrave, had had great influence on the religious attitude of the Margrave.³ He was the son of a highly

¹ ' *Ja dass ein jeder Prediger eine Neuerung fürbringt.*' This is obviously the right reading instead of ' *ja dass in der Predig ein Neuerung fürbring,*' as in Kleinschmidt, p. 87.

² Despatch of March 23, 1590, in Kleinschmidt, pp. 86-87.

³ ' *Sorgfältige biographische Angaben über Pistorius*' in Stieve's *Politik*

respected superintendent at Nidda in Hesse, a man 'deeply versed in theology, jurisprudence, and medicine,' who after long spiritual wanderings had entered the haven of the Catholic Church in 1588. After studying all Luther's works, as he asserted, three several times, it had become plain to him that Luther had been anything rather than a true reformer of the Christian Church, that he was a false prophet and a disturber of the true unity of the faith. On account of his apostasy from Protestantism, Pistorius was denounced as 'a real arch-heretic' who was 'far more wicked' than Judas the traitor. Protestant princes in their letters to the Margrave James called Pistorius a mamaluke who 'had acted in violation of his own conscience.' Pistorius, said a poet, was a follower of the rogue Staphylus, who 'was now the court piper to the devil,' on whom 'he sharpened his claws.' The territory of Baden would soon 'spew him out,'

To the dragon in the flames of hell,
Where Judas thine associate doth dwell.
Thou art the whore of Babylon,
And sittest on the dragon's throne . . .
With the blood of Christians drunk thou art,
And of all who in the Lord have part . . .

and more to the same effect.¹ The polemical ardour and activity which Pistorius developed as time went on brought him into such odium with his former co-religionists that eight years after his death, in 1616, a pamphlet was published informing the world of

Bayerns, i. 10-11, note 1. See Räss, *Konvertiten*, ii. 488; Wetzer und Welte's *Kirchenlexikon*, 10 (2nd edition), 41 ff.; Hirn, i. 270 ff.; and Roth, *Kleine Beiträge zur deutschen Sprachforschung* (Munich, 1850), Heft vii. 62 and 74.

¹ Mone, *Quellensammlung*, iii. 165 ff.; Kleinschmidt, p. 158 ff.

the terrible judgment with which God had visited him. He had died, it was said, uttering the most horrible blasphemies and curses against God, and calling on the devil; the earth had twice vomited up his corpse, and then given it over to the devil.¹

In order to arrive at certainty in his religious perplexity the Margrave James arranged for a religious discussion to take place at Baden in November 1589, between the Württemberg theologians James Andreä and James Heerbrand and several assistant councillors on the one hand, and Pistorius, the Jesuit Theodore Busæus, and several clergymen on the other hand. But before the beginning of the discussion Andreä already brought a defeat on himself by asserting at a gathering at which five princes and several court followers were present, that the Catholic religion taught that mankind was not saved by the merits of Christ. If he was not able, he said, to prove this statement from a canon of the Council of Trent, he was ready to write himself down a liar and no true Christian. A copy of the decrees of Trent was brought to him, Busæus writes, and Andreä 'was proved to be a liar.'² Neither did the discussion end in his favour. Andreä 'went away with a long face,' wrote the Calvinist David Pareus, professor of theology at Heidelberg, to a friend, in December 1589; an ambassador of the Elector Palatine, who was present at the debate, praised 'the intelligence, the astuteness, and the

¹ According to the report of eye-witnesses Pistorius received the last sacraments, and died a peaceful death. But the fable of the 'Divine judgment' met with so much credence in certain circles that the Jesuit Gretser thought it necessary to devote a special pamphlet to its refutation (*Gretseri Opera*, ii. 924).

² Kleinschmidt, p. 152.

eloquence of the renegade Pistorius.’¹ His embassies and journeys in connection with the Book of Concord, Andreä assured Pistorius, had not been undertaken of his own will, but in response to a ‘divine call.’ After the conclusion of the discussion Pistorius addressed to his adversary a letter which the Margrave James called ‘rude and harsh.’ Andreä’s answer was that ‘Pistorius must be possessed by many devils and it would not be strange if the earth were to open and swallow him like up Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and if they and all the people who were with Korah, with all that belonged to them, were taken down alive into hell and the earth covered them up.’²

The Margrave, still labouring sorely with spiritual doubts, gathered together several Protestant and Catholic theologians for another religious discussion at Emmendingen the following year, and presided over the meeting himself. ‘This colloquy,’ he said, ‘has been arranged solely for the glory of God and for the strengthening and reassurance of my conscience, and for no other reason.’ As the Protestants refused to carry on any further discussion with Pistorius, of whose genius and knowledge they were cognisant,

¹ *Mitto ad te Epistolam Pistorii Apostatae, qua pro viatico instruxit Schmidlinum Badena ex Colloquio magno cum naso discedentem. Misit Illustriss. Princeps noster Secretarium quemdam, auditorem Colloquii non clam sed consciis Marchionibus, qui etiam ad mensas commode fuit collocatus et excepit colloquentium sermones. Praedicat is Apostatae ingenium, et facundiam. Schmidlinus concionibus pro more ad coronam agi voluit. Contra Apostata syllogistice et breviter. Sic de modo agendi biduum consumptum est. Schmidlinus interrogatus a Marchione: Doctene an indocte coram tot doctis . . . disputare vellet? Respondit: Indocte. Ita re infecta discessum est* (Hummel, *Epistolae*, i. 85-86). With this agrees what Busæus wrote about the Colloquy in Kleinschmidt, pp. 149-152.

² *Acta of the Colloquy at Baden (1590)*, pp. 330, 339, 344, 354-355.

he was excluded from the transactions, and James brought with him in his place the court preacher Johann Zehender, who had been instructed by Pistorius for a short time in the Catholic faith and was later on converted to it. The teaching of the Church was to be the principal subject of discussion. James and Zehender pleaded in defence of the necessity and the actuality of a visible, infallible Church continuing in uninterrupted succession from the days of the Apostles. This position was disputed by Johann Pappus, pastor and professor at Strasburg, who had been engaged by the Baden preachers and who led the dispute on their side. Driven into a corner, he took refuge in the assertion that the Church was capable of erring, even if inspired by the Holy Ghost; the Galatians, who had been bewitched and were full of error, had still had the Holy Ghost dwelling in them. But he was confronted with some of Luther's utterances. In a passage in the book against the 'Hansworst' Luther says: 'The Church cannot and must not lie, or teach error, not even in a single point; if she but teaches one falsehood she is altogether false, as Christ declares;' and a little further on: 'Simply and solely God's Word or Truth, and no errors or lies, must the Church teach, and how can it be otherwise since the Church is God's mouthpiece?' And again, 'God cannot lie, neither therefore can the Church.' Pappus, on the contrary—so the official report of the Colloquy goes on to say—'contested most vehemently that the Church could err and be unsound in certain principal points of religion, and yet retain the Holy Ghost.' Being called upon to mention a few instances at least of persons who, before Luther, had thought and taught in a

thoroughly Lutheran manner, Pappus mentioned no less a man than St. Augustine, adding that if within three or four months he was unable to prove that this Father of the Church had been Lutheran at every point, he would himself become Catholic. George Hänlin, Rector of the University of Freiburg, replied that if Pappus proved his point, he would become a Lutheran. The adversaries then pledged their faith by shaking hands, and the Margrave himself would not forego the pleasure of joining in the compact.

But Pappus had chosen an unfortunate champion of his opinions, for concerning the very corner-stone of Lutheranism—namely, the doctrine of justification by faith—St. Augustine had said: ‘If without any regard for laws we can enter into life by faith alone, which without works is dead, how then can that be true which Christ will say to those on the left side: “Depart ye into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels”?’ Christ does not reproach them for not having believed, but for not having done any good works. Yea, verily, let no man flatter himself that he will gain eternal life through a faith which without works is dead.’¹

‘How can the Protestants,’ wrote a Catholic pastor in 1587, ‘go on appealing to the Holy Father of the Church St. Augustine, as though he were one of

¹ ‘*Illud quoque non video cur dominus dixerit: Si vis venire ad vitam, serva mandata, et commemoravit ea, quae ad bonos mores pertinent. Si etiam his non servatis ad vitam venire potest per solam fidem, quae sine operibus mortua est, illud deinde, quomodo verum erit, quod eis, quos ad sinistram positurus est, dicet: Ite in ignem aeternum, qui paratus est diabolo et angelis ejus? Nec increpat, quia in eum non crediderunt, sed quia bona opera non fecerunt. Nam profecto ne sibi quisquam de fide, quae sine operibus mortua est, promittat aeternam vitam,*’ &c. (*Augustini Opp.* iv. [Parisiis, 1531], pp. 13–18).

themselves, when all the time we find in his writings the very opposite of all that they teach ?' He put this question to the Protestants : ' Is it true that St. Augustine used to say Mass and that he taught concerning it exactly in the same way as the Catholic Church does at the present day ? Is it true or not that this holy Father enjoined invocation of the Blessed Virgin and of the saints on all the faithful, and that he himself diligently obeyed this rule ? Is it true or is it not that he considered prayers for the dead, according to the words of Scripture, salutary and useful, and that, as we know from himself, he prayed for his mother Monica after she was dead ? His works lie open before our eyes, and if in these you should discover that he taught and practised everything which through all the centuries, and still at the present day, the holy Catholic Church teaches and practises, you will do well to leave off proclaiming such a teacher of the Church to be on your own side and to have been, as has actually been said of him, a precursor of the true gospel of Luther.' ¹

A few weeks after the Colloquy at Emmendingen, in the middle of July 1590, the Margrave James was solemnly received into the Catholic Church in the Cistercian convent of Thennenbach near Freiburg. As his chief reason for taking this step he gave out that ' By careful examination he had learnt that the doctrine of the Catholic Church was quite different

¹ In the pamphlet (Bl. 5^a) cited at vol. ix. p. 363, note 1. Luther and Melanchthon both acknowledged that the doctrine of justification by faith did not coincide with the teaching of St. Augustine. See our quotations, vol. v. pp. 252-256. Pistorius challenged Pappus to fulfil his promise, and in his *Epistolae tres ad Pappum* (Coloniae, 1594) he set himself to prove that nobody before Luther had taught like Luther.

from what the preachers had represented it to be.' In the 'Motive' for his conversion, the publication of which he entrusted to Pistorius, and the first part of which he read shortly before his death, he began by stating that 'We have heard it said and we have subsequently read ourselves in books and pamphlets in what an unscrupulous and unchristian manner Luther and his followers and Lutheran theologians and theologians of other sects also were wont to invent uncouth and erroneous doctrines which they imputed to the Catholics and made out as being believed by the Catholic Church, and how with these imaginary spectres they gained for themselves the favour of the common people, while they unjustly brought the Catholics into odium. If there were any real warrant for all that is put forward in Lutheran books and sermons as Catholic doctrine, it certainly could not then be denied that the Catholic faith must be worthless and false, and that all pious souls should have a righteous abhorrence of it.' The Margrave cites a number of false 'accusations,' which 'with utter baselessness' were made against the Church. 'In the first place the Lutheran theologians say and write that the Catholics do not allow that the Holy Scriptures are true and valid, and they do not scruple, in spite of all the explanations they have received, and in the teeth of manifest truth, to scream this out in their German Church hymns. A further invention was that the papists (as the Catholics were now mockingly called) do not rely on the merits, passion, and death of Christ, and do not think these sufficient for our salvation, but expect to gain and possess themselves of heaven by their own works, money, and human laws. And this calumny is so common and wide spread

that through it alone the larger portion of the laity of the lower classes have been deceived and led into error.' The people were also made to believe that 'in the Mass Christ was again crucified by the priest,' and further that 'the Catholics made the saints of God into idols and rendered them divine honour and service.'¹

Immediately after his conversion the Margrave availed himself of the rights of reform which the Religious Pacification of Augsburg conferred on him. He desired to convert his whole territory by degrees to the Catholic faith. But he died on August 17, 1590, and 'events then occurred which filled the hearts of the Catholics with profound bitterness and caused even loyal evangelicals to say that there was no longer any justice or equity left—nothing but cruel tyranny and deceit.' 'For in very truth,' wrote an eye-witness of the proceedings on the 29th of September, 'we have not often heard in the Empire of such deeds as the brother of the deceased Margrave (of whom even the enemies

¹ *Motive Jakobs, Markgrafen zu Baden*, &c. (the full title is given in Stieve's *Politik Bayerns*, ii. 339, note 1), pp. 31–126. In addition to this work of Pistorius, we may take into account, as regards the conversion of the Margrave James III. of Baden and Hochberg, a report which was probably written by the Bavarian agent, Minutio Minucci, to which attention was first drawn in the *Hist.-Polit. Bl.* 38, 962 ff., by Zell, whose Italian text was published in the article 'Zur Geschichte der Konversion des Grafen Jakob' in the *Freiburger Diöcesanarchiv*, iv. 91 ff. Fresh documents from the Vatican archives have been published by v. Weech in the *Zeitschr. für Gesch. des Oberrheins*, 7 (Neue Folge, 1892), pp. 666–700. Here, too, all the literature connected with the subject is calmly and judiciously estimated. The documents made known to the world by Weech bring out with special distinctness the important share which the zeal and fervour of Louis of Saxony, Guardian of the Capuchins in Appenzell, had in the conversion of the Margrave James (see above, vol. ix. p. 342–343, concerning Louis). Weech published supplements to his article in his *Mittheilungen aus dem Vatican. Archive*, xii. (new series, 1897), pp. 250–272 (No. 50).

of his Catholic faith said that he was a high-minded, benevolent, generous, and upright prince) has perpetrated, in violation of all right and honour—deeds which cry to heaven for revenge and punishment.’¹

James left two daughters and a widow, Elizabeth Countess of Eulenburg and Manderscheid, who was near to her confinement. On his death-bed he had made a will, attested by seven witnesses, appointing his brother Ernest Frederic, and two Catholic relatives, Duke William V. of Bavaria and Count Charles II. of Hohenzollern Sigmaringen, co-guardians of his children with his wife Elizabeth. The children were to be brought up in Catholic places, in the Catholic faith, and if Elizabeth should give birth to a son the Catholic reformation of the country was to be completed. Among his court officials he specially commended to the care of the guardians ‘his most learned councillor and dear and trusted friend Dr. Johann Pistorius, who had at all times served him honourably and faithfully as befits an upright servitor.’ He gave instructions that the guardians should clear him from ‘the odium which had attached to his name on account of his (the Margrave’s) change of religion,’ for he had done nothing more than was commanded him, and what, ‘in obedience to Christian duty and his office,’ he could not have omitted doing. ‘Neither Pistorius nor others’ the Margrave declared to those around him, with death staring him in the face, had brought him to take this step: it was solely the result of his own researches and of the illumination of the Holy Ghost. Supplicatingly, and with threats of the wrath of God, he implored

¹ Bernhard Perneder, September 29, 1590, to the ecclesiastical councillor of Mayence, Christopher Hagemann. Contributed by Böhmer.

the guardians to fulfil the requirements of his will and testament.¹

The corpse of the Margrave was still lying in state in the church of Emmendingen, when the Margrave Ernest Frederic appeared on August 19 with an armed retinue, extinguished the candles burning round the coffin, caused the images and altars in the church to be overthrown, and drove the Catholic priests out of the land. Pistorius also was obliged to leave the country, and his goods were sequestered. A poet addressed the Margrave as follows :

O Margrave Ernest, faithful lord,
Who thirstest ever for God's Word,
Right princely let thy verdict be,
Pistorius hang on gallows tree,
Who thy brother has converted
And to a lying creed perverted.

‘The whole world,’ wrote Johann Frey, professor of medicine, ‘will be too small for Pistorius, as it was for Cain, on account of his evil conscience.’²

Ernest Frederic, regardless of all considerations of right and all the stipulations of the will, at once usurped dominion over the land.³ James had left orders that he should be buried in the Catholic town of Baden. But the usurper would not even fall in with this stipulation. In spite of all the protestations of the widow, he had the corpse conveyed by night to the Rhine and taken on to Pforzheim, where it was interred with Protestant rites by his own court preacher. He enticed the widow, who on August 26 had made

¹ Kleinschmidt, pp. 117–119 ; Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 30–31.

² Kleinschmidt, pp. 123, 164–165.

³ He was ‘avaricious to the point of utter unscrupulousness ;’ ‘right feeling and equity were foreign to his nature ; his savagery knew no restraints’ (Stieve, i. 31).

confession of the Catholic faith at Freiburg, to his castle of Hochberg, placed her under the strictest surveillance, and when on September 4 she gave birth to a son, he ordered her to give him the names of Ernest James and to have him baptised according to Protestant usage. The Countess Elizabeth was condemned to pass her days in solitary and strict confinement; she was not even allowed the free exercise of her religion; her daughters were carried off to Durlach by Ernest Frederic. Simultaneously, however, he wrote to Duke William of Bavaria that 'it was a wretched calumny' to say that he was in any way wronging the Margravine. On November 15 he extorted from the poor woman, reduced almost to frenzy, a contract in which she was forced to designate him as the 'rightful guardian,' and to entrust the education of her children to him without any reserve, and with assurance that there would be no retraction later on. He endeavoured by all sorts of jugglery to establish that this contract was entered into willingly by Elizabeth. Of his own promises in it he did not fulfil a single one: he gave back to the mother neither her freedom nor her daughters, and he even tore from her her little son, whom he had sent to Durlach.¹

These revolting actions of the Margrave were performed in concert with several of the neighbouring Protestant princes. 'Without the knowledge and approval of the Elector Palatine John Casimir and of Duke Louis of Würtemberg,' Ernest Frederic wrote to the Landgrave William IV. of Hesse Cassel towards the end of October, 'we have hitherto done and undertaken nothing.' On September 21 he had already

¹ Stieve, i. 33-34.

begun exerting himself to obtain the help of Duke William and of the Landgrave Louis of Hesse-Marburg in the event of Elizabeth's two co-guardians, the Duke of Bavaria and the Count of Zollern insisting on the fulfilment of the terms of the will. In the face of these two and of the Archduke Ferdinand, whose Austrian frontier lands were in part intermixed with those of Baden-Hochberg, 'he would be too weak, without cordial assistance from his nearest neighbours and associates in the Augsburg Confession,' to accomplish the 'Christian work' which he had begun. He urged, therefore, that the princes 'for the furtherance of God's glory and the necessary maintenance of the true and alone-saving religion,' should 'give him strong support,' in case of his finding himself unable, by his unaided power, to 'establish on a permanent footing the ministry of preaching which had been reintroduced in the Margravate of Hochberg.' Both these princes were in full sympathy with Ernest Frederic's proceedings against the 'popish idolatry' and the promised help. 'The Margrave,' wrote the Landgrave William on October 11, 1590, 'has in all things acted wisely, well, and in a Christian manner. Let the limbs of the wicked enemy,' he added, 'the mamalukish Pistorius and others, work as hard as they will, God Almighty, who never forsakes His own, will nevertheless provide us with ways and means,' 'and to your beloved self other evangelical Estates will extend a hand in case of need.' On April 19, 1591, the Landgrave Louis stated that 'he could not think otherwise than that all Ernest Frederic had done since his brother's death had run in the right groove.'¹

¹ Despatches of September 11 and 21, and October 1 and 14, 1590, and

And in the same 'right groove' the matter rested, for no help was to be obtained from the Emperor for the Catholic cause. Rudolf II. confined himself to transmitting to the Margrave sundry admonitions with regard to restitution, which admonitions Ernest Frederic, backed up by the Protestant Estates, answered with coarse, defiant, offensive language.¹

'Whatever the Estates of the Augsburg Confession,' wrote Bernhard Perneder from Freiburg-in-Breisgau on February 3, 1592, 'choose to do in violation of justice, the constitution of the Empire, testaments and contracts, that alone is to be considered right, godly, and good, and whoever speaks or acts in opposition to them—be the right on his side as clear as sunshine—is denounced as a hater of peace, a sedition-monger, a mamaluke, a reprobate, a limb of Satan, as indeed we here in Baden are again experiencing to our desperation. Let our own writers at least sharpen their pens for necessary defence and for the contradiction of such calumnies as are dealt out by the great prophets and God-enlightened teachers of the new evangel: may God have pity on us.'²

Pistorius at Freiburg, in particular, had indeed sharpened his pen. In the year 1591, by order of James III., he had written the pamphlet entitled 'Christliche erhebliche und wohlfundierte Motive' ('Christian, important, and well-grounded reasons') why the Margrave embraced the Catholic faith. To the first of these reasons, viz. that the Catholic religion was

April 1, 1591 (old style) in the Marburg State Archives; *Markgrafen Jakobs Tod*, kindly presented to me by Dr. J. Niemöller (since dead), who was at work on an exhaustive biography of Pistorius.

¹ Fuller details in Stieve, i. 34 ff.

² To the Mayence ecclesiastical councillor, Christopher Hagemann.

quite different from the caricature which had been drawn of it by the Protestants,¹ he added a second, which, as the court preacher Johannes Zehender wrote, 'stares even evangelicals themselves in the face.' This reason was the want of unity among the Protestants. 'It has cut us to the heart to see how, more and more as time goes on, the Lutheran religion becomes divided and schismatical, and how day by day it splits up into more and more new sects, so that it is no longer easy to distinguish between what is and what is not Lutheran.' After enumerating the different sects by name, he goes on to say: 'Not only is division apparent in all the many different sects, but, what is still more worthy of note, we do not find many Lutheran scholars and laymen who continue all their lives to give the same interpretation to Lutheran doctrine; whole countries, towns, and villages even have repeatedly changed their beliefs; none of the new Churches agree entirely with Luther, and he himself altered his meaning continually. In the midst of all these religious perplexities we do not know and we cannot know who is right, as there exists no recognised arbiter. One and all, it is true, appeal to the Word of God, to the Holy Scriptures which they acknowledge as the only true guide, and to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. But the very fact that there are such numberless different sects, who all interpret the Bible in a different manner, shows that the Bible is not so very plain, and that at any rate the Holy Spirit can have nothing to do with all these differences of interpretation, these contentions and contradictions. No one in all Christendom before Luther believed and taught as he did, for which reason

¹ See above, p. 123. †

he had no scruples in asserting that he had received his doctrine straight from Heaven, and that he was the first person to whom God had revealed His Gospel. But he did not confirm his mission with miracles. Whereas, however, we have seen nothing but contention, variableness, divisions and splits among the Lutherans, we have felt constrained to investigate the old religion which has been handed down from the Apostles and has throughout the ages been embodied in one visible and united Church; and this all the more because the Lutherans offer no certain guide, no infallible method by which we can steer our course through all the conflicting sects and discover a Church with at least some few landmarks of truth.’¹

As a third reason for his conversion he adduced Luther’s personal character, and his statements and citations in this connection launched Pistorius on an ocean of controversy and led to his name becoming especially feared and detested by the Protestants.

‘Granted,’ he says, ‘that the Catholic religion was erring and decadent,’ it was impossible nevertheless to conceive that for the restoration of the true Church God would have called such a man as Luther, who revealed himself in his writings as ‘beyond measure unclean, blasphemous, dissolute, untruthful, puffed-up, full of doubts, and obscene.’ For each of these ‘seven characteristics’ of Luther ‘a couple of examples’ were cited from his own writings. With regard to his ‘spirit of blasphemy’ he says: ‘As to the scandalous and blasphemous nature of his pen and mouth, a whole volume, or indeed many volumes, might be made of it. If we wanted all this to be fully described, we could

¹ *Motive*, pp. 127-183.

suggest no better way than that all his books should be collected and placed side by side, and that everybody should read them for himself or herself. For there are few in which he does not use several legions of words of abuse, and in which he does not behave as if he were possessed by a wicked spirit. His Imperial Majesty and the princes with him are downright liars, they are German beasts like unto wolves or swine, murderers, miserable blinded beings, shameless, mad, idiotic, insensate, raging, frenzied fools and blasphemers. . . . Duke George of Saxony is pledged to the devil in hell, he is an accursed wretch under the protection of the devil, spiritually and corporeally possessed by Satan . . . a mad, raging tyrant, the assassin of Dresden.' Then follow similar outbursts of Luther against other princes, especially against all his opponents: 'The Pope is the devil; if I could manage to put an end to the devil why should I not do it, even at the risk of my own life?' 'The papists in general are in his eyes all demons and demons' satellites, who glory in the worship of the devil.' Pistorius is bold to say: 'The Christian reader will find few of his books, those especially that are written against the papists and the heretics, in which all the pages are not blackened with the devil several times over; and in one book he places as many as seventy-seven legions of devils; in the book on the Councils the devil occurs fifteen times in four lines; in the book against Duke Henry of Brunswick a hundred and forty-six times. All this, however, is not to be wondered at, for he writes openly of himself: "And so I will now begin as one whom God has awakened, to be as a devil against all you Roman devils, murderers, and

bloodhounds, as indeed some call me, Elijah against Ahab and Jezebel." Is not this enough to stamp Luther as an impious man, and is further proof wanted? Is he still the prophet of God?'¹ The other 'spirits' or characteristics of Luther were dealt with in similar fashion.

The fourth 'reason for [the Margrave's] conversion' shows up the unwarrantable changes that the Augsburg Confession had undergone. 'Even the first two editions of the Confession and of the Apology, which were both issued in the same year and from the same printing press at Wittenberg, agree neither with the original copy, as it was handed in to the Emperor, nor with each other; but are, on the contrary, different confessions and apologies. The original Latin text of the Confession and the German of the Apology have, down to the present time, not yet seen daylight; the German text of the former did not appear till 1580, and the Latin text of the Apology not till 1587. Nevertheless, the Lutherans, both in churches and schools, for the last fifty years have, without knowing these documents, appealed to them, taken oaths on them, and taught and believed things quite opposed to them.'²

The fifth 'motive' gives opportunity for an exhaustive disquisition on the reasons why the Catholic Church is the only true one and the only one which leads to salvation.³ The work met with no refutation.

Simultaneously with its appearance there issued from the pen of the Würtemberg court preacher, Lucas Osiander, a publication entitled 'Ein schöner wohlriechender Rosenkranz von acht und zwanzig Rosen'

¹ *Motive*, pp. 184 ff., 199 ff., 242, 260-261.

² *Motive*, pp. 271-399.

³ Pp. 400-582.

(‘A beautiful, sweet-scented rosary of twenty-eight roses’) which had been collected from the ‘Konformitätenbuch’ of the Franciscans ‘in order to make publicly known the peculiar devoutness and holiness of the Seraphic Brothers.’¹

The Bamberg Franciscan, Michael Anisius, wrote an answer to this.² Osiander, as Anisius demonstrated, in his translations of the ‘little tales’ in the book, had perverted the Latin text in the most shameful manner, in order to heap all manner of obloquy on the Franciscans.³

¹ Tübingen, 1591.

² *Freundliche Zerreiſſung des ſchönen wohlriechenden Rosenkranz*, &c. (Ingolstadt, 1592); *Vorrede*, A 2^b. (‘The beautiful and sweet-smelling Rosary amicably torn up,’ &c.)

³ Thus, to give only one instance, Osiander in his *Rosenkranz* translated a passage at p. 4 as follows: ‘Francis sent two of his brothers to Florence, and they stood under a shed the whole night, quite naked, in very cold winter weather, and a woman thought that they were thieves.’ To this Osiander made the marginal comment: ‘Here’s a sample of the filthy saintliness of the Barefoot friars . . . should a respectable man stand naked before a woman?’ To this Anisius answered, p. 22: ‘You lie, Hoserle [Hoserle = Hos = Andreas, the original German name of Osiander], you venomous, accursed adder, you lie! In the Latin nothing whatever is said about standing naked all night. The text says: “Then, when they came to Florence, they could not find any lodging; but they came at length to a house which had a shed in front of it; they begged the woman for a lodging, but when she refused them, *in porticu illa tota nocte steterunt, nihil tegumenti habentes, cum esset frigus intensissimum.*” O Hoserle! does *nihil tegumenti habentes* mean standing naked? Are roof and clothes one and the same thing? The remainder of the Latin text ran: “*Vir enim dictae mulieris credebat, eos ribaldos esse et fures; nihil voluit eis accommodare. Et summo mane recedentes a dicta porticu ad ecclesiam perrexerunt, quos mulier predicta videns orantes, intra se dixit: isti non sunt ribaldi, ut dixit vir meus:*” that is to say, “and early in the morning they went from the shed to church, and when the woman saw them praying, she said to herself: ‘Those men are no thieves and robbers, as my husband said.’” This whole context, Hoserle, convicts you of lying. What now becomes of your dirty gloss, in which you talk about the filthy holiness of the Barefoot friars, making out that they stood naked before the woman?’

But Osiander did not allow himself to be disconcerted. He could not justify his translation or deny the charge of having falsified in numberless ways. He therefore adopted the line of declaring that Anisius was 'a devil incarnate and an unblushing slanderer' and that he (Osiander) troubled himself 'as little about his calumnies as about a goose hissing or a dog barking at him.' With a 'proclamation' of this sort to 'all pious Christians' he remanded the 'slandering' Anisius 'to the righteous judgment of God, who would not fail to vindicate His own honour and truth. Amen.'¹

Before Anisius, the Barefoot friar George Ecker had already entered the lists against Osiander's 'Rosenkranz' by publishing in 1591, 'to serve as a mirror to show up the blasphemy and abominable uncleanness of the Lutherans,' a pamphlet entitled 'A beautiful wreath of nettles from the exquisite, unsurpassable (not "Table-talk," but other) illustrious works and books of the man who has lost so many souls, and is therefore so dear—the unfrocked monk, Martin Luther.'² His 'nettles,' Ecker said, he had transcribed from the 'Seven Lutheran Spirits' of Johann Pistorius, and that the latter would soon be produced in the original and enlarge his wreath.³

¹ *Bericht an alle fromme Christen, welche die Wahrheit lieben; warum die beide rasende Barfüßner Mönche Georg Eckhart und Michel Anisius keiner Antwort wert seien* ('A statement to all pious Christians who love the truth, why the two raving Barefoot monks, George Eckhart and Michael Anisius, are not worth answering') (Tübingen, 1592), pp. 2, 6, 13, 14.

² *Für ein Messkram zusammen in unterschiedenen Azoaras gebunden und auf des gottlosen Lukas Osianders . . . unsinnig alkoranische Haupt zu Aussziehung seiner ehrwürdiger lügenhafter Dämpf aufgesetzt* ('Tied up in separate bundles for sale at the fair, and put on the godless Lukas Osiander's senseless and Mahomedan head to draw out its slanderous and lying vapours') (Freiburg im Uechtland, 1591).

³ *Vorrede*, A 3.

Osiander, without going more closely into the contents of the pamphlet or attempting to refute it, answered that 'there was no obligation to accept every word of Luther's writings, but that those who maligned and slandered them were "children of the devil," and now that George Eckhart and his allies have already skimmed the broth of Pistorius's "Seven Spirits" and, as they say, taken off the best of the fat, I have good hope that, when Pistorius comes down upon us with his seven spirits, his brothers and co-calumniators will already have laughed down the best of his jokes.' ¹

Pistorius had kept his work on Luther's 'execrable life and teaching' back from the press, because, as he said, he 'was ashamed to write down things so disreputable, so indecent, and so distressing to many pious hearts.' ² It was not till after the appearance of the 'Württemberg clamourers, and of the wretched Friar Wilhelm in particular,' that he set his scruples aside. Wilhelm Holder, chief preacher and consistorial councillor at Stuttgart, had published in 1593, under the auspices of the Württemberg Consistorium, a treatise against the 'Rosenkranz' entitled 'Die ausgewaidete Maus' ('The disembowelled mouse'). Instead of looking out for the motes in the eyes of Luther, whose utterances he interpreted so abominably, Pistorius should turn his attention to the beams in the eyes of the Roman Church. Among these immeasurable beams, 'popish buffoonery, absurdities, and contradictions,' Holder included the school question widely discussed by Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, and not seldom in highly

¹ In the report quoted on preceding page, note 1, pp. 3-5 of report.

² *Anatomie Luthers*, p. 39.

objectionable forms, 'whether a mouse which ate a consecrated wafer had swallowed the body of Christ, what had become of this body, and what would happen to the mouse?'¹ 'The mice,' Holder remarks frequently in the margin, 'make the papists perspire with fear.' 'Take care, Pistorius, you too have many mice. Francis the saint belongs also to the "spirits of Luther" by reason of his diabolical temptations. The mice had devoured a popish saint alive out of sheer piety.'²

What Holder was pleased to regard as the 'notes in Luther's eyes' was dealt with by Pistorius in a voluminous work the first part of which, 550 pages long, appeared at Cologne in 1595 under the title 'Anatomy of Luther,' and gave an account of Luther's 'seven wicked spirits,' the spirits of whoredom, of blasphemy, and of lewdness. According to the testimony of a Protestant this work was the result of 'stupendous, almost Herculean labour;' it is 'a book of imperishable fame.'³

Pistorius had read Luther's writings through three times and had taken the greatest trouble to procure the oldest and most authentic copies of them, and he published a full catalogue of all the different books he used.⁴

¹ The full title of the treatise occurs in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 341, note 2.

² According to the Tübingen edition of 1688, pp. 128, 137. The refutation cited by Stieve, i. 342, note 1, is unknown to me.

³ *Anatomiae Lutheri pars prima, das ist aus den sieben bösen Geistern des vil Seelen verlustigen und also teuren Mannes D. Martin Lutheri die drei ersten Geister: I. der fleischliche Geist; II. der Lastergeist; III. der Lottergeist* (wherein, as also in the remaining four 'spirits,' Luther is painted in such a lifelike manner with his own words, that all readers can at once perceive, trace, and understand without fail, whether he was a prophet of God or something quite different) (Cologne, 1595).

⁴ 'In the first place I declare publicly that I have not done Luther any

Each of the three 'spirits,' in imitation of the Koran, is divided into seven 'Azoars,' and these again subdivided according to necessity into chapters.

Each Azoar discusses a specific subject with precise reference to the place where it is dealt with in Luther's works, and contains explanations and comments of the greatest penetration and bluntness. The conclusions which Pistorius deduced from his materials, and which he sums up at the end of each Azoar as 'laws of Luther,' aroused such indignation among the Protestants that the Hessian theologians exclaimed: 'May God reform the laws of Pistorius with fire and brimstone as He did in the case of Sodom and Gomorrha.'¹ What Pistorius quotes in the second and third Azoars, concerning

injustice in respect of his vocabulary, and I will gladly submit to public chastisement if in any one syllable I have perverted his sense. But in order to save trouble in referring to the book, and to make it easy for everyone to find the sayings quoted, I have done my best to supply the reader with a complete list of all the books from which I have taken the Lutheran abominations, with the year and place of publication.' 'But, although all the evidence is taken from the Jena edition, it may still sometimes happen that there were contributions from the Wittenberg copies. In such cases, however, I always quote "Wittenberg." Wherever the name Wittenberg does not occur, it may be understood that I always use the Jena text. At the same time, in case any should not believe in the Jena edition—which nevertheless has always passed as the best among the Lutherans—I am ready to prove all and everything over again from the very first best-prized quarto editions printed at Wittenberg, which I have collected with great trouble, in order that the Lutherans may have no loop-hole of escape in this direction.' The catalogue follows at p. 63. He speaks to the same effect also in the preface, pp. 3^a and 3^r. Spangenberg could find no other fault with him but that in one place he had written *adulterum* for *adultum*, although he knew that it was a misprint. In the account of 'the first wicked spirit,' p. 50, 'from the first copy *Captivitatis Babylonice*, anno 1520, at Wittenberg,' Pistorius remarked: 'The following passage is shamefully omitted in all the volumes published at Jena and at Wittenberg, without doubt because the Lutherans were ashamed of their prophet Luther.'

¹ *Notwendige Besichtigung* (see below, p. 147, note 1).

the 'third wicked spirit' as 'Hurenpossen' and 'Dreckpossen,' is not fit for reproduction.¹ Everybody was to learn to know aright 'the execrable monster' and 'the blindness of poor Germany' in proclaiming such a man to be a prophet. If Pistorius had already in the 'Motive' quoted the most virulent and abusive invectives of Luther against the Emperor and different German princes, he now, and for a special reason, reproduced his 'calumnious utterances against the Elector Joachim I. of Brandenburg.' The latter had been described by Luther as 'a liar, a mad bloodhound, a devil's papist, a murderer, a traitor, a good-for-nothing villain, a murderer of souls, an arch-knave, an unclean sow, a child of the devil, the devil himself,' and so forth. 'The House of Brandenburg had best take heed of the words of Luther.' 'It is matter indeed for wonder what they,' the descendants and relatives of Joachim I., 'will think of their prophet after reading this pamphlet, and learning how with his swinish snout he dared to bespatter and befoul their friend and ancestor, a German prince and elector, and to impeach him both in his temporal and spiritual honour: whether they will quietly endure such outrageous insults and still believe that the Spirit of God was in this man, and that he is worthy to have any faith placed in him.'²

Simultaneously with the first part of the 'Anatomie' Pistorius brought out a pamphlet against the Wittenberg professor, Ägidius Hunnius—an answer, namely, to the 'Theses on Justification' which Hunnius had published against him. In the short space of seven

¹ *Anatomie, dritter böse Geist*, pp. 13-63.

² *Anatomie, der andere böse Geist*, pp. 93-94.

pages—so Pistorius said—his adversary had been guilty of ‘one hundred lies, besides eighteen or more falsifications of Holy Writ, and forty illogical deductions, thus showing by his own words that he and other Lutherans and Calvinists knew very little indeed of what were the controverted points in the discussion on justification.’ All the disciples of Luther were of the same stamp as their master who had ‘perverted Holy Scripture and rejected the Church wholesale and all the holy Fathers, and had placed all his hopes on the wanton calumnies and falsehoods with which our poor Catholic Church was besmirched in order to fill the people with horror of it.’¹

Ever since the appearance of the ‘Anatomie Luthers’ Johannes Pistorius, ‘the impious mamaluke *Phisterhans*,’ had been, ‘in the eyes of every single evangelical Christian, the most scandalous of debauchees which the idolatrous papacy and devil’s synagogue had produced since the advent of the Gospel,’ and consequently ‘such an object of horror and abomination to every one that the diabolical villain ought to be hanged and burnt as he deserved.’ Samuel Huber was the first to begin the attack, with an almost inexhaustible fund of slanderous, abusive language in his pamphlet, published in the year 1596, ‘Antwort auf Hans Pistorii sieben Teufel und unmenschliche wie auch unchristliche Schmähschrift.’²

He could not deny the authenticity of the passages which Pistorius had quoted from Luther, and did not

¹ *Ein hundert Unwahrheiten*, &c. (Konstanz, 1595); *Vorrede*, 1^a, 2^b, 3^b.

² ‘Answer to John Pistorius’ inhuman and unchristian pamphlet, *The Seven Devils*’ (without locality, 1596).

trouble himself to make a closer examination of the book. He was satisfied with asserting that ‘Pistorius, for the sake of his belly, had placed his God, his soul, and his salvation at stake;’ ‘he did not dwell in a church, but in an owl’s nest, in a habitation of dragons and basilisks;’ he was ‘up to the knees in blood which the Roman Church had shed;’ he had ‘swilled himself full with this blood,’ and he ‘meant to feed and fatten on the belly and breasts of the Popess Johanna.’¹ With a certain amount of skill Huber collected together, from all the controversial writings that had so far appeared, the most outrageous and abominable things that had been written and invented about the papacy.² He concluded as follows: ‘Anyone who looks into the structure and nature of the papacy will find himself gazing into a region of brimstone and hell-fire, where the devil, masked in human form, carries on his government of the earth. . . . The *Saugeist* (swine spirit), *Ziegegeist* (goat spirit), *Hundsgeist* (canine spirit), and all unclean, unhallowed field devils and field spirits have exalted a Gomorrha into a Church.’³ When Pistorius complained that the most absurd, preposterous statements were foisted on the people as doctrines of the Catholic Church, Huber defended this charge by writing among many other things the following absurdities: ‘The Pope, in the estimation of the Catholics, is both God and man, and a God on earth; he can make whatever he wills out of nothing; he has control over the angels in heaven, and he has power over all that is in hell; he can do all that God can

¹ Huber, *Antwort*, Bl. 2^a, 2^b, 3.

² See, for instance, pp. 28 ff., 99, 103 ff., 107, 108, 112, 153 ff.

³ Bl. 106, 145 ff.

do; for all things that God does in heaven, the Pope does on the earth.’¹ ‘At bottom’ the Catholic doctrine came to this, that ‘Christ was no Christ, no Redeemer, and no Saviour.’ Under the name of Christ they had smuggled into the Church ‘Masses, pilgrimages, invocation of saints, cowls, tonsure, dead men’s bones, rays of fire issuing from St. Margaret’s head, chrisom, anointing, purgatory, consecrated water, and so on: it was through mummary of this sort, and not through Christ, that they looked to attain salvation.’²

According to Huber the true secret of the strength of Protestantism lay in impressing vividly on the youth of Germany these ‘abominations’ of the papacy, and it was a matter of deep distress to him that enough was not done in this direction. And for this reason he predicted ‘the imminent fulfilment, alas! of Luther’s prediction, viz. that the Gospel would not be preserved in any one place longer than the period of a man’s life.’³

Cyriacus Spangenberg, in his pamphlet published in 1596 under the title of ‘Gegenbericht auf Pistorii sieben bösen Geister,’ was no more able than Samuel Huber to refute the historical part of the ‘Anatomie Luthers.’ But he complained that Pistorius, whom he loaded with as much abuse as Huber had bestowed on him, ‘in his glosses and additions writes much more coarsely than Luther, that he actually revels in obscenity, perjuries, gives indecent meanings to words—and this so frequently, often repeating offensive passages three or four times, or even oftener—that it would be impossible to produce a fouler and uglier composition.’ Things that never entered into Luther’s head or were written down by his pen ‘he squeezes and

¹ Bl. 27.² Bl. 41.³ Bl. 2^a.

presses out and cannot make them loathsome enough.' In order to parry his adversary, Spangenberg, for the benefit of his readers, had painted the execrable 'Anti-christ' with 'a hundred marks or characteristics derived from the Holy Scriptures,' merely reiterating all that Luther, Flacius, Wigand and others had uttered before him. Out of the 116 pages of the pamphlet only six were directed against 'the three wicked spirits' of the 'Anatomie.' It was anything rather than a refutation of the latter.¹

In the opinion of the Protestants, also, the writings of Huber and Spangenberg were not adequate to the occasion.²

Next, and thirdly, the Württemberg theologians took up the cudgels against Pistorius. In their account of his 'Lästerbuch' they too expressed the opinion that 'Satan had dictated it to him from the pit of hell;' they wished for their antagonist, 'who had sinned against the Holy Ghost,' that 'brimstone and pitch might fall on his head.' They contrasted favourably, however, with Huber and Spangenberg in that they avoided immoderate abuse and accusations against the Catholic Church. They transferred Luther from the days of great prophets to that of smaller ones, and they allowed that in some points, especially in his decrees about polygamy and divorce, he had gone too far. Pistorius,

¹ *Gegenbericht auff Doctoren Joh. Pistorij Sieben böse Geister, so sich merklich in ihme selbs regen; darneben hundert Merkzeichen auss heiliger Schrift zusammengezogen, darbey augenscheinlich zusehen, wer eigentlich der Antichrist sey* ('Refutation of Dr. Joh. Pistorius's Seven Wicked Spirits, which rule so markedly in himself; besides a hundred characteristics from Holy Scripture, whereby it may be plainly seen who was the veritable Antichrist' (without locality, 1596): Preface, Bl. 1, pp. 2, 3, 27, 41-47). The 'Characteristics' occur from pp. 47-116.

² See Stieve, ii. 345, note 1 (83, note 1).

they said, wanted to make Luther out a Turkish prophet, and he had therefore divided his book into Azoars, as the devil's prophet Mohammed had done with the Koran, so that everybody might understand that 'all Luther's writings were nothing else than Turkish doctrine and abomination.' They abstained from quoting passages from Luther's 'Table-talk' because he 'had not given instructions that these utterances should be revered as something sacred and put into print; they had only been, as it were, caught on the wing; they had not been recorded by notaries: talk at convivial meals ought not to be posted up in the council house.' The theologians made a lame attempt to justify Luther's indecent and scandalous language by infelicitous reference to the Holy Scriptures, in which still worse things were to be found. 'If this is the reason,' they said, 'why Pistorius spits in Luther's face, why does he not rather spit in the face of God?' In his invectives against the Pope and the Roman Church Luther had had the example of Christ before his eyes. Pistorius had been quite wrong in his judgment of these utterances of Luther: 'as if one were bound to lay an adversary, who had attacked and blasphemed divine truth, on a soft cushion! Had not Christ denounced such false teachers as Luther's opponents had been, as hypocrites, as an adulterous generation, a brood of vipers?' The princes had praised or condemned Luther according as they wished to follow his teaching or not: emperors, kings, and princes had also 'had the good sense' not to put him to death on account of his extreme language, nor to sue him at law, but they had allowed matters to take their

course.¹ This pamphlet also was in no way a refutation of the 'Anatomie.'

Still less so was the 'necessary examination' (*notwendige Besichtigung*) which several theologians and preachers in the upper principality of Hesse bestowed on the book in 1597. For this examination consisted chiefly in wanton invectives against Pistorius, that 'bedevilled man and instrument of Satan,' and against the Popes, who were treated collectively as 'the worst of scoundrels,' as practisers and even defenders of every kind of vice and unmentionable sin; all pious Christians, it was said, ought to take to heart Luther's prayer: 'May God fill you with hatred against the Pope!' In order to inspire the people with righteous horror of the Roman 'devil's heads,' every imaginable Pope-fable was repeated and exaggerated. One Pope had had a sow 'who had fur and claws like a bear.' Another had been strangled by the devil and 'had been seen in a most terrific form, with the body of a Moor and the head and tail of a donkey,' and so forth. 'Gregory VII. had engaged an agent to carry huge stones to an attic just over the spot where the Emperor was in the habit of saying his prayers, and when he was most devoutly absorbed in his devotions, the man was to hurl them at his head and dash him to pieces.' This 'Necessary Examination' was to be the means of retaining the people in allegiance to the 'true evangel.' The Hessites vented their wrath on the Jesuits also in order to ward off the attacks against Luther: they called them 'wicked scoundrels, sorcerers, ministers

¹ *Christlicher, bescheidenlicher und gründlicher Bericht über das Lüsterbuch Doctoris Joannis Pistorii Nidani, welches er Anatomiam Lutheri genennet hat . . . durch die württembergischen Theologen* (Tübingen, 1596), pp. 8, 13, 50, 51-52, 54, 62, 74, 75, 79, 83, 93.

of devils and idols, lovers of lust rather than of God,' and so forth.¹ The Jesuit Bellarmin attributed indirectly to the Pope the authority to 'trample on the heads of emperors and kings' as the Emperor Barbarossa had allowed Alexander III. to do to him.²

Pistorius did not honour the 'libels' of Huber and Spangenberg with an answer; but against his theological opponents he issued, in 1597, a pamphlet composed in four days entitled 'Kleine Trostschrift an die württembergische und hessische prädikantische Gesellschaft.'³ In this he attempted 'once for all to answer and demolish the senseless clamourers who were flocking from all directions with bottomless tubs full of powerless liquids, to extinguish the raging flames that were consuming their temple of Diana, and to set before their eyes the absurdity, the vileness, and the utter uselessness of all their efforts which only served to belittle and depreciate Luther.' Pistorius dwelt especially on Luther's new matrimonial laws, reproduced a sermon which Luther had preached and published on conjugal life in 1519, and which he had afterwards sought to withdraw from the press, and demonstrated that their 'prophet' had considered polygamy lawful and permissible, even if not advisable. 'Herewith,' he said, 'readers would no doubt for the time being be satisfied, and would, by this sample alone, be convinced of the wretched, beggarly nature of Lutheranism.'⁴

¹ *Notwendige Besichtigung, Vorrede*, Bl. 2^a, pp. 46 ff., 51, 53, 172, 182, 194-195, 224-225, 226, 266.

² Pp. 46, 47. See above, p. .

³ 'A small Consolation Book for the Company of Hessian and Württembergian Preachers' (Constance, 1597).

⁴ *Trostschrift, Vorrede*, 1^a, Bl. B-C 3^b, D 2^b. 'Zwölf Kontradictionen zwischen dem Luther und den hessischen Prädikanten' ('Twelve Contradictions between Luther and the Hessian Preachers'). Bl. J. 'Ein und

The 'Notwendige Abfertigung der Trostschrift'¹ which this publication called forth from the Hessian theologians had no practical value and was made short work of by Pistorius in the second part of the 'Anatomie Luthers' which appeared in 1598, and which dealt with the fourth of the 'sieben bösen Geistern des viel Seelen verlustigen und also teuren Mannes'—that is to say, the spirit of heresy. No less than 'one hundred and three heresies against the Holy Trinity' were brought to light 'from Luther's own well-known books.'²

In the following year Pistorius completed his 'Anatomie' and again brought forward the 'Seven Wicked Spirits of Luther,' introducing them into his 'Hochwichtigen Merkzeichen des alten und neuen Glaubens.'³ His object, among other things, was to show that the originators of the new doctrines had been altogether bad men. Thus, for instance, he related *fünfzig Lügen, so in dem hessischen Buch auf zwei Blatt stehen* ('Fifty-one Lies found on two Leaves of the Hessian Book').

¹ The 'Necessary Refutation of the Consolation Book.' Full title in Stieve, ii. 347, note 1.

² Köln, 1598. To his knowledge, Pistorius says, at p. 2, Luther 'had never in plain words denied the Holy Trinity or written strongly against it in his general publications; but here and there, either unintentionally or intentionally, in order to be better able in the future to overthrow the mystery, he had interspersed and insinuated abominable things which certainly implied denial of the Holy Trinity, and were calculated to raise doubts on the subject in the minds of intellectual persons.' Thus, for instance, at p. 87 it says: 'In the diabolical book of which, at the present day, all Lutherans are ashamed, and which was marvellously expurgated in its last edition, *assertio omnium articulorum per bullam damnatorum*,' Luther says, Art. 27: '*Essentiam non generare et generari* and *animam esse immortalem* are execrable doctrines which have grown up on the Roman dung-heap, and are not written in the Scriptures.' Pistorius explained this as follows: 'That the soul is immortal is to Luther a popish lie. Open your ears, you Lutherans!'

³ Münster, 1599. The book, as the title informs the reader, is a new revised edition of the *Motive des Markgrafen Jakob von Baden*. &c.¹ but 'as good as a new book,' Preface. 4^a.

as a counterpart to the calumnies against La Casa, that Theodore Beza had been guilty of scandalous conduct with a boy named Audebert, and with his paramour Candida, and that he had not been ashamed to boast of this behaviour in print.¹

The example set by Pistorius was followed by Conrad Vetter, one of the few German Jesuits who took the pulpit language of the preachers for their model and acquired an undesirable mastery of the art. Vetter, a native of Engen in Suabia, had not received his whole philosophical and theological training in the Order. He entered it first as a priest in 1576, after having filled the office of a choir-master at the church of the convent at Hall, and he was placed among 'the clerical co-adjutors.' He gained great renown as preacher at Munich and Ratisbon.²

After the manner of Protestant controversialists who wrote under feigned names, or 'assumed Catholic surnames and claimed relationship with Catholics,' Vetter posed in his pamphlets as 'Conrad Andreä, own brother to James Andreä of saintly memory.' Flasch and Pistorius, he said, 'had given the preachers plenty of bags to wash;' the latter, in his 'Anatomie Luthers,' 'had brought whole tubs full;' anyone 'desirous of seeing the whole mass of Lutheran filth and abomination collected in a heap' should buy this book and read it: 'The Lutheran preachers will know how to

¹ P. 240. See pp. 239, 242, 243 ff., what is quoted from the life of the 'Evangelists,' Calvin, Kurz, and so forth. A controversial pamphlet well worthy of attention is the *Wegweiser* (sign-post) *vor alle verführten Christen*, published by Pistorius in 1599 and printed afresh in 1605. Fourteen of the most important questions in dispute between the Catholics and the new religionists are here treated with great skill.

² Agricola, i. 171; Kropf, iv. 345; cf. A. Hirschmann, 'Das Religionsgespräch zu Regensburg, 1601,' in the *Zeitschr. für Kathol. Theol.* 1898, p. 3 ff.

give him the *Botenbrot*, foremost among them Huber, Spangenberg, and the whole pack of Würtembergers and Hessites ;' these last tried to devour Pistorius (= Baker) whole, 'but this man can knead them as dough.'¹ But Pistorius was too expensive, and so he (Vetter) had divided his work into separate 'small tracts.'² For he was anxious, 'once at any rate, to depict Luther from the latter's own words and writings.' 'And what has chiefly moved me to do this,' he says, 'is that the preachers never cease to proclaim this person as a saintly man, a great prophet, and a third Elias, while at the same time they are pleased to drag all the great Catholic saints in the mud and mire, and to give out that we Catholics are blasphemers and idolaters, that we pray to saints and images, that we are rogues, whores and sodomites of the worst description, that we think nothing of Christ and the Divine Word, but expect to be saved through our own works, and so on through the whole gamut of innumerable unblushing lies with which these lying, blaspheming preachers beslaver the whole world.' 'They produce enormous works, which they call "Histories of the Jesuits," full of most monstrous abuse ; they say "Ignatius, the founder of the Order, was a bloodthirsty man, possessed and instigated by the devil ; all Jesuits are thieves and murderers, raging hounds and beasts, Neronians, filthy hogs, foul epicures." All this is to be considered right and lawful, and they actually justify all their execrable calumnies by appeal to God and to the holy evangel, and want to have all the

¹ *Der unschuldige, demütige u.s.w. Luther* (Münster edition, 1606), pp. 150, 247.

² *Zwölf unterschiedliche Tractütlein* (Ingolstadt, 1600), *Vorrede*.

bishops, monastic persons, and clergy, and all who are loyal to us, driven out of the land or even condemned to the stake.' 'And in the teeth of such innumerable slanders and vilifications we forsooth are to bow down meekly and cringe before our calumniators. But they are out in their reckoning here, the rascally knaves; we are not turned out yet, and we will pay them back with their own coin, even if their bones should crack in two, so that the people may see with what vermin it has to deal and by what sort of prophets it has been deceived and led astray.' In these 'expressions of opinion,' Vetter, 'among many other libellous writings' which 'had moved him to take up his pen,' had especially in his mind a so-called '*Geschichte des Jesuitenordens*' which the Lutheran theologian Polycarp Leiser, in the year 1593, had compiled in Latin from the papers of Elias Hafenmüller, and which had been published in many editions and had been translated into German.¹

In the years 1594–1599, Vetter published first of all ten separate pamphlets under the titles: 'Der unschuldige' (innocent), 'der demütige' (humble), 'der wahrhaftige' (truthful), 'der christenliche' (Christian), 'der andächtige' (pious) Luther,' and so forth; and in 1600 he brought out a collection of the above with additions under the title of '*Zwölf unterschiedliche Traktätlein aus Luthers eigenen Schriften zusammengetragen*' ('Twelve separate little treatises collected from Luther's own writings'), dedicated to all lovers of divine truth. After a fierce combat by word and by pen with James and Philip Heilbrunner, he produced several more similar 'elegant posies' from Luther's

¹ We treat of this in chapter ix. of this volume.

works.¹ Finally, in 1607, he came forward with no less than 'Zweihundert Luther,' viz. with 'Zweihundert hellen und sonnenklaren Proben des unschuldigen Luther, wie er an der Verwüstung deutscher Nation und so vieler seelen Verderben sich am jüngsten Tag werde entschuldigen können'² ('Two hundred proofs as clear as sunshine of the innocent Luther, by which, at the Day of Judgment, he will justify himself for the ruin of the German nation and the perdition of so many souls'). He says in his preface that his object in compiling this work was to supply 'the Catholic preachers with a much needed alphabetical compendium and register, by the help of which, whenever they wanted to warn the people against that abominable heretic Luther, they could at once lay their hands on the required passages.'

That he had made use of gross, even the very grossest terms of abuse, Vetter did not attempt to deny, nor did he deny that such abuse was contrary to the custom of the Jesuits. He challenged his adversary Philip Heilbrunner as follows: 'My dear fellow, I dare you to collect out of the Jesuits' books all their terms of abuse, to lay them in the balance, and to compare them with the slanders which your preachers alone circulate against the Jesuits by word and by writing.' 'Such calumnies are lying in shoals in large and imposing books in the open market and in cupboards. But tell me, where are ours to be seen?' As for his own 'new libels,' however, there was not 'a single abusive term

¹ See full and accurate details in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 348, note 2; 589, notes 3 and 4; 597, note 1; 598, note 1. See also *Forschungen zur bayer. Gesch.* ii. (1894) 77.

² Ingolstadt, 1607.

in them' which had not been taken from the writings of Luther or those of his 'progeny.' 'Go on calling the papists wicked hounds which leave the pious wolves no rest.'¹

How much 'he learnt from the language of the preachers' his own words, for instance, testify: 'In the Wittenberg edition of his works, vol. 5, fol. 1^b, § 6, Luther says: "The Gospel does not preach to us what we ought to do and what to leave undone; it demands nothing of us, it does precisely the opposite; it does not say, 'Do this,' but bids us open our hands and receive; and it says, 'See, dear friend, what God has done for you; He has caused His Son to be incarnate for you; for your sake He has let Him be put to death and has saved you from your sins, from death, the devil, and hell; believe this and accept, and you will be saved.'"" 'O Luther, O Lucifer, O liar, O scoundrel! What then becomes of the *Nisi abundaverit* &c., and *Nisi poenitentiam* &c.? And how does this pig's snout dare to aver that the Gospel does not say: Do this or that? Why, it is said in plain words: *Fac hoc!* (Do this!) and *Fac similiter!* (Do thou also likewise). Countless sayings of the kind are found in all four Gospels and in all the apostolic writings. If the evangelical law is no law at all, why then is it called law? Is the law of grace no law? And what is the whole of this law but instruction to us what to do and what not to do: instruction to do what is good and to leave undone what is evil? And what, on the other hand, is Luther's opinion and conclusion but that Christ has done everything, and therefore we are to do

¹ *Antwort auf den unschuldigen Luther*, pp. 47-48.

nothing ? To the gallows with such a teacher and his doctrine !' ¹

Luther, said Vetter, would be able to exonerate himself at the Day of Judgment, 'because he himself had more than enough warned all the world against his own person and doctrine ; but the world, as he says, was determined to be deceived.' The preachers, however, could not justify themselves. 'At the Day of Judgment there would be nothing that would cause the preachers so much shame and bitter smarting as the thought that they had knowingly and palpably exalted into a holy prophet, apostle, and evangelist, such an insensate beast, unclean sow, fickle weather-cock, wanton liar, shameless sensualist, angry brawler, hyperbolical Thraso, insolent Goliath, ribald jay, declared heretic and violator of nuns ; such a mass of filth, scum, and dregs as Luther.' ²

'The poor deluded Protestant people, who go on in their simple ways, I will not have abused and damned ; but the preachers, the liars, the noisy slanderers, are worthy of all ignominy. Who can be at peace in the presence of such scoundrelly villains ? Ought not every man of honour to scourge them right and left ?' 'The Catholics have been driven to such a state of exasperation by the incessant lying and slandering

¹ *Zweihundert Luther*, 'der antinomistische Luther,' 31. At p. 59, it says :

To Luther Moses is the greatest curse,
Than devil, pope or antichrist far worse
Off with him to the gallows grim,
No longer must we fight with him.

Tom. Witt. i. 215^a ; *Tischreden*, pp. 153^b and 528^a.

² Conrad Andreä's *Akademischer Luther*, already quoted as a deterrent specimen of the polemics at the time by K. A. Menzel, *Deutsche Gesch.* iii. 149, note ; Hurter, *Ferdinand II.*, Bd. 1, 417, note. With Vetter's *Büschel*, compare the abusive language quoted by us in vol. viii. p. 182 f., which Wittenberg theologians themselves poured out concerning Luther.

of the preachers, that several eminent authors have felt constrained to fill their books and writings with the glaring falsehoods of the Protestants, and some of these volumes contain fifty, sixty, or a hundred, others three hundred, five hundred, and even eight hundred lies with distinctive lying titles, now plainly shown up, and side by side with exhaustive refutations and exposure of their mendacity.’¹ It was expressly on account of the preachers, he said, that he showed Luther up. For ‘it must and shall be known,’ he says, ‘that the preachers are swine and the sucklings of this saintly Luther. But who has ever heard that a sow, saving your reverence, ever turned away in disgust from the stink of its own dung?’ ‘It is positively necessary that these hogs and beasts should have the stinking filth of their “prophets” rubbed well and often into their long beards and over their noses and mouths, so that they may at last see and taste that dirt is dirt and not gold, that tallow is tallow and not balsam . . .’

‘I could bring forward many reasons,’ he goes on, ‘to show how unwilling I was personally to touch this Martinian or Lutheran swamp and stinking pond, for not only does the human mind shrink from such words and subjects, but also it is inevitable that many right-minded Catholics would think the man who undertook to handle such materials was himself somewhat wanting in a sense of shame or delicacy. However, the shameless, brazen-faced preachers have gone to such lengths that we are forced to some extent to lay aside our innate Christian modesty, and against our inclination to stir up the dirt of this filthy hog-sty ;

¹ *Antwort auf den unschuldigen Luther* (1600), Vorrede, iii.

though for myself, as I have said elsewhere, I would rather see it buried fifteen fathoms deep—yea, verily, sunk in the nethermost pit of hell—than that such disgusting uncleanness should come into the hands of a multitude of pious Christians.’¹

But these writings fell into many hands, as their author himself states: ‘For I have already found out through much practical experience that everybody who reads through a sample of my “Innocent Luther” can never rest till he has read the others, however many there be, and got them into his own hands, as the bookseller knows also to his profit, whose only complaint is that his copies are always running out, and that my samples are now pirated, plagiarised, and printed and arranged in such a form that workmen and journeymen can put them in their pockets and carry them about hither and thither.’²

‘Your Excellency,’ wrote Duke Maximilian of Bavaria to the Elector Palatine Philip Louis of Neuberg, ‘seems to be displeased with Conrad Andreä’s style of writing. You say that in his treatises he condescends to absurd buffoonery. We, on the other hand, have discovered that he has adopted these coarse jests from Luther’s own works. Moreover, Conrad Andreä is not, and does not, want to be regarded as a man of whom one would think, and from whom one would expect, all that one thinks and expects of a Pope, or some other great prelate, or from an Apostle himself. Luther, however, according to his own statements, did want to be considered one of the most

¹ *Vorrede zum sauberen Luther*, dated from Ratisbon, August 19, 1602; Münster edition of 1606, pp. 445-455.

² *Antwort auf den unschuldigen Luther* (1600), pp. 12-13.

exemplary of men, more enlightened than all the others who had belonged to the Church more than a thousand years ago, and one of the greatest evangelists or Apostles, who, for the first time after so many centuries, had been awakened to exterminate the idolatry that had taken root. What sort of a man, in God's name, ought he to have been if all this were true? With what courage, humility, chastity, purity of life, steadfastness in doctrine, wisdom, and other Christian virtues—to judge only according to ordinary human judgment—ought he not to have been endowed? But the opposite is well known; it is well known how wanton and blasphemous he was. This no one can deny who is not altogether shameless, so that, if Conrad Andreä is to be measured with Luther, it can with truth and without trouble be asserted and proved that he is an eminent saint and “doctor” compared to the “prophet.” That Luther did ‘now and again teach and speak a true word and proclaim some good articles of doctrine’ is so well known to the Catholics that out of his own writings ‘they have compiled a thoroughly Catholic catechism, but they have done this only for the purpose of proving how changeable he was, in his own way, as to doctrine, and that he thought one thing to-day, another to-morrow.’ ‘Andreä was not called upon, in his writings against Luther, to point out all the good passages in the works of the latter. Whenever do the Lutherans, often as they attack the Jesuits’ lives, teaching, and vocation, or blame and denounce them quite falsely and, as far as we know, without any basis of truth—whenever, I say, do they praise that which is praiseworthy in them? Yea, verily, never at all.’¹

¹ Wolf, *Maximilian*, i. 461–464.

If Vetter could plume himself on his writings being eagerly read by all the people, this was the symptom of a sad aberration. ‘Unfortunately, God have pity on us,’ says a Catholic pastor in 1603 in an ‘*Erklärung der Bergpredigt Christ*’ (‘Explanation of the Sermon on the Mount’), owing to the incessant scandalous slanders and invectives of the sectarian preachers and writers, which are now being imitated by the Catholic writers—though none of them as yet equals their models in abuse—it has come to this in German lands, that the common people on both sides are greedy for such books and pamphlets, and find this food congenial to their taste, because their taste is corrupted; but verily they afford no true nourishment for the soul after the pattern of our dear Saviour’s Sermon on the Mount.’¹ Another Catholic writer lamented in similar fashion over the ‘corruption of taste’ which was also showing itself among the Catholics. In a refutation of the Augsburg preacher Bartholomew Rüllich, who had filled a whole volume ‘full of all manner of abuse and vilification of the Christian Church and all its members from the highest ecclesiastical and civil authorities downwards,’ this writer said: ‘I have no intention whatever of resorting to abusive language, or of paying them back with the same coin. If Rüllich brags that “more Lutheran books issue from the book-sellers’ hands than Catholic ones,” there is certainly no other cause for such a statement than the strange new method of calumny which flourishes among the Lutherans; for to the large majority of readers and listeners nowadays nothing is so delightful as to come upon a whole heap of abusive terms. Of this

¹ Mayence, 1603, *Vorrede*.

no other proof is requisite than the experience which shows that when a Catholic scribe is moved to answer the fool according to his folly, and to make their rejoinders echoes of the tones that have first sounded, his writings are sure to go through two or three editions. Personally, however, I would rather,' said the author, 'that my work should be read by a few judicious persons who love the truth, than by a host of light-minded people who are only on the look-out for fresh terms of mockery and insult.'¹

Vetter did not act upon the precepts of Father Canisius, whose 'inmost soul was averse' from all harsh and bitter polemics. His dictum was: 'We must defend the truth with all our hearts, but we must do it considerately and temperately, so that our moderation may be known unto all men, and that we may, if possible, obtain a good testimony from those also who look on from outside. Well-disposed people are disgusted with anything that smacks of bitterness; they like to see discretion coupled with dignity and weighty reasoning.'²

When the 'sanguinary' James Heerbrand not only declared his Catholic antagonists to be devils, but also frankly demanded their execution,³ and the Jesuit Gregorius of Valentia, in 1579, answered him back in violent language, Canisius wrote as follows to the General of the Order, Eberhard Mercurian: 'Father

¹ 'Kunstreicher Meisterstück M. Bartholomäi Rülchs, Prädikanten zu Augsburg,' in the *Disputation wider Dr. Konrad Dosch* (Ingolstadt, 1608), Bl. B.

² See our remarks, vol. viii., 219-220, and Braunsberger, ii. 72-73, 75.

³ G. de Valentia, *Confutatio Calumniarum, quas Heerbrandus Spongia quadam sua, ut appellat, complexus est* (Ingolstadii, 1579), B^b. The controversial writings of Valentia against Heerbrand catalogued by de Backer, iii. 1264.

Gregory, the Spaniard, in his controversy against Heerbrand, exceeds the bounds of discretion which befits our theologians. Soon, I fear, he will be embarking on a third defensive pamphlet in order to refute this abusive and extraordinarily quarrelsome antagonist. What real benefit accrues to our Society or general readers from this kind of word-fighting, I cannot understand.’¹ ‘The members of our Order’—such was the earlier injunction of Johannes Dirsius, Rector of the Innsbruck College, in a memorandum to the superiors at Rome—‘must guard themselves against denouncing our present-day religious antagonists as heretics; also they must not call them good-for-nothing creatures or devils, or hurl other odious names and calumnies at them.’² The eighth general assembly of the Order issued the following injunction for the members of the general book-revising committee: ‘In the case of the members of the Order who write against heretics, the revisers must be particularly careful to see that these writers combine solid learning with such wise moderation that no one shall be able to maintain that their tone was unduly bitter, or that they were in any way lacking in becoming dignity.’ In the different provinces of the Order the revisers, whose business it was to examine those writings which were not to be sent to Rome for inspection, were obliged to observe this injunction minutely.³

Among the Protestants Johann Mathesius, pastor at

¹ ‘. . . *Ex quo concertationis genere quid solidi boni aut Societas aut lector capiat, nondum intelligo*’ (Fragment of an autograph letter; copy in the library at Exacten).

² ‘. . . *nec vocent eos nebulones nec diabolos vel aliis vocabulis et calumniis odiosissimis*’ (Copy in the library at Exacten).

³ *Regulae revisorum generalium*, No. 7, 15; *Institutum Soc. Jesu*, ii. 71-73

Joachimsthal († 1565), had spoken out seriously and honestly against 'these cantankerous writings' in a pamphlet which appeared in 1567.

'They corrupt good manners,' he said, 'and invariably leave a bad odour behind them. There is little comfort, moreover, to be got for a perplexed conscience and a troubled heart out of such libellous writings and books as are produced everywhere.' 'Holy writers write what is just and true, and injustice falls to pieces of itself. Experience, alas ! plainly shows that neither poor Christendom nor the Gospel are much benefited on either side by all this reviling and wrangling. May God hinder and defeat such unprofitable persons and books, and give and preserve to us gentle and kind spirits who with patience and discretion will continue to serve the Church of God.'¹ Another preacher said that 'the Gospel ought to be preached according to the simple word and letter, without invective and abuse : that the pulpits should not be dishonoured every Sunday by continual yelping and barking.' 'There ought also to be friendly relations between the opposite parties in everyday life, in trade, and so forth ;' it was 'a sign of the divine wrath against the beloved Fatherland that there was so much hateful dissension in religion, and that mockery, wrangling, and strife went on increasing, so that the brethren of one house and one race were ranged against each other as declared enemies and venomous slanderers.'² A different view, however, was

¹ *Ein Christlicher Unterricht wes sich gottselige Unterthanen verhalten können zu der Zeit der Verfolgung* ('A Christian Instruction for the conduct of God-fearing Men in time of Persecution') (Nuremberg, 1567), Bl. F 2^b-F 3^a.

² *Predig über die Bitte : Und führe uns nicht in Versuchung, &c.* ('A sermon on the prayer : "And lead us not into temptation,"' &c. (1593), Bl. B 2.)

taken by the majority of the nominal 'combatants for the glory of Christ and for the pure and holy Gospel.'

'To the devil with the neutralists, epicureans, and the peace-brothers,' wrote a preacher in 1593, 'who actually preach in the pulpits and write in pamphlets that we ought to keep peace with the idolatrous papists and leave them to follow their own way. Such men as these are an accursed, jesuitical sect, lurking in the midst of the evangelists themselves, and though they are not many in number, they are causing frightful disaster in the fold of Christ; but they will not escape divine chastisement.' 'Father Luther, the third Elias, has said: "They are all miserable dolts, who hold that we ought not to revile and abuse the Pope and his followers; on the contrary, by word, writings, books, letters, and paintings we ought to scold, denounce, satirise, caricature, and disgrace them in every possible manner." "We must tell the whole unvarnished truth to the scarlet whore, with whom the kings and princes of the earth have committed, and still are committing, adultery," says Luther, on fire with the Spirit of God, "for she must be trodden down like the dirt of the streets. Cursed be all who remain idle in the matter, when they know that they have it in their power to render service to God, who designs, and indeed has already begun, to crush them to earth and grind them to powder." Every true Christian is bound to echo these godly prophecies of our venerable Father so long as he has power to speak and write, to poetise and paint.'¹

The Hessian Superintendent George Nigrinus had

¹ *Wahre Erklärung des römischen Antichristes aus den heiligen Schriften gezogen* (1593), pp. 5, 9, 13. See Luther's Collected Works, xxix. 377-378.

fully realised, ten years earlier, the general state of devastation which followed in the train of perpetual religious dissension. 'Faith is extinguished,' he wrote in 1582, 'in all the children of men. They are all fighting and wrangling about their creeds, and each one insists that his own is the true one ; but it is all nothing but words, there is no sap or strength anywhere.' 'Is it possible for avarice to be greater than it is at present among all classes ? Is it possible for eating and drinking to be more thought of than nowadays ? Can ostentation, pomp, and extravagance in dress rise to a higher pitch ?' 'To say nothing of the immorality, the cursing and swearing, and all the other vices of the day.' With all this endless 'disputing and wrangling about faith the people had become utterly reckless and obdurate, and actually boasted of their sins, as did the people of Gomorrha, and made no attempt to conceal them.' Nigrinus therefore exerted himself strenuously against the 'sect of the Epicureans,' which had gained such a strong footing among the Protestant population. 'These people,' he said, 'according to their lights, seek peace and quiet, and a truce to the squabbings of the scholars ; they would like to grant each man freedom in religion, so long as he kept quiet with his creed, and nobody knew which party he belonged to or was inclined to. This carnal cunning is more dangerous and hurtful than anything else in the way of sectarianism ; dissension and controversy, at any rate, exercise the soul and keep it on the alert, but epicureanism plunges it into the depths of security and inanition, and dechristianises the whole nature.' 'We can preach the Gospel quite well,' they say, 'without concerning ourselves as to whether the Pope or any other man thinks

or teaches differently.' Nigrinus reckoned this 'sect of the Epicureans' among the certain signs that the last day was drawing near.¹

The manner in which the controversy against the papacy and the Catholics was judged by Protestant imperial Estates was shown by a work which the Carinthian preacher Andreas Lang published in 1576 at Frankfort-on-the-Main, under the title of 'Gründliche und rechte Unterweisung von der Seligkeit' ('Well-grounded and right instruction on salvation').

Lang imagined himself 'filled with burning zeal for God,' and 'on the strength of his office' he set about to demonstrate to the whole body of 'papists' of high and low degree, spiritual and temporal, kings and princes, burghers and peasants, that all of them, 'as idolaters and blasphemers,' would fall into the everlasting pit of hell. The Pope, he said, 'gives out concerning himself that he is as God, and that he can make something out of nothing; that he is an earthly god and a deified man.' In reality, however, as had long since been shown, he was the Antichrist, 'the bodily incarnation of the devil.' He prayed to the devil, annulled marriage, considered the secular estate sinful, but at the same time allowed the greatest sins to be committed with impunity.² Therefore, all those who adhere to the papacy and obey the Pope are following 'a diabolical religion,' belong to 'the synagogue of the devil,' do not believe in Christ, but are one and all 'Antichristians,' 'be they of ecclesiastical or secular estate.'³ If such a pronouncement appeared

¹ *Papistische Inquisition*, pp. 724-725, 726, 727.

² *Von der Seligkeit gründliche und rechte Unterweisung* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1576), pp. 17-26, 114, 116, 170.

³ Pp. 12, 31 ff.

too daring and severe, it must be remembered that 'the holy office of preaching' was instituted in order 'to declare the judgment of God against sinners,' and against those sinners also who, though not themselves papists, were so hardened and obdurate as not to hate the papacy from the bottom of their hearts. 'Both the papists,' said Lang, 'and their flatterers who do not detest the papacy with all their heart, must be confronted with the whole mass of divine evidences, so that there may be all the less excuse for their ignorance at the Day of Judgment, and that they may be plunged all the deeper into the pit of hell.' To this end he was writing a book, in order to fulfil the command of Christ and to be able to say with Christ: 'The words that I have spoken, they shall condemn them at the last day.' He was inexhaustible in his denunciations against the Catholics. 'The papists, like other Turks, Jews, and heathen, are outside the pale of God's grace, of forgiveness of sins and of salvation; they are destined to howl, lament, and gnash their teeth everlastingly in the burning fire and brimstone of the flames of hell;' 'for they are stubborn, stinking rams,' who 'blaspheme and curse God's Word,' and observe and obey 'the decrees of the Pope, the canons of the councils, the precepts of the Fathers, the Platonic theology of the Schoolmen, and the dreams of the monks.' As 'stinking, stubborn, stiff-necked goats,' they are incensed beyond measure against us, the true Christians; they are one and all of them 'enemies of the Cross of Christ and servants of the belly.' It is only for the sake of their stomachs, and quite against their consciences, that they remain under the papacy; and so they will be condemned to have 'their fat venison paunches

smelted down in hellfire, and to suffer everlasting pain in everlasting flames.’¹

Lang declared that as little as Christ was a blasphemer when He called the Pharisees a brood of vipers, and so forth, so little also was it blasphemy to denounce the papists as ‘blasphemers, arch-deceivers, and murderers, as idolaters, soul-murderers, sodomites, and whoremongers;’ for it was ‘only speaking the plain and bitter truth, and some of these names are the same as Holy Scripture itself bestows on them as the declared Antichrists.’ Scripture makes no exceptions, not even with regard to the secular ‘idolatrous, papistical rulers;’ neither, therefore, must Lang, except the Emperor and the hereditary Lord of Austria, whose subject he was. Although all the papists did not commit all the sins that were imputed to them, nevertheless they all form collectively one Church and community, one body corporate, of which all are members, whose head is the Antichrist, the Pope. Now, ‘whatsoever the head does, all the members consent to it.’ Whereas ‘the popish kings, princes, counts, lords, noblemen, bishops, prelates, burghers, peasants, and lanzknechts’ give help to the Pope and his retinue for the persecution of the true Christians, ‘they are all of them Antichristian murderers and children of Satan, who have learnt from their father the devil how to shelter their diabolical lies by diabolical murders. Therefore they are all Antichrists, and of their father the devil, who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning; they are fashioned according to his nature and character; with him they will inherit the kingdom of hell and dwell in it for evermore.’

¹ *Von der Seligkeit*, B³, pp. 12, 179–180, 181.

In defence of his invectives against 'the idolatrous rulers' Lang appealed to the example of the prophets, the Saviour, and the Apostles, who had often 'made tingle the ears of kings,' as well as those of the people. 'To follow this example' he, as a minister of Christ, 'was bound in this degenerate age.' 'The faithful ministers of God' must not let themselves be restrained and inhibited in their preaching and punishing, even though the idolatrous rulers seriously espoused the cause of their idolatrous priests and insisted on immunity from penalties and reform.¹ If rulers of this sort ordered their subjects not to teach any other doctrine, and not to receive the sacraments in any other way than was customary in the papacy, 'such a mandate was opposed to God.' 'For God says: Ye shall not turn yourselves to the idols, and ye shall not fear any other rulers, whether emperor, king, prince, pope, or bishop, and ye shall not venerate them—that is, obey them when they issue such impious mandates.' 'And if the subjects of such rulers do not become rebellious, but submit to the ruler who has given them unchristian orders, they are rebels in the kingdom of God. And God lets them rage against His Christians for a while, but in His own good time "He puts down the mighty from their seat."'² Lang summoned the temporal powers to rob the Pope and his spiritual satellites ('therefore also ecclesiastical princes of the Empire') of their secular power, 'to depose them from their offices,' 'to abolish their idolatrous worship, and to punish them in body and life.'³

This work of Andreas Lang was expressly approved

¹ *Von der Seligkeit*, B^b, C4^{a-b}, pp. 32-37, 182-183.

² Pp. 239, 298.

³ P. 289.

by the Protestant Estates of the Empire, who declared such language against the 'papists' to be in common use among Protestants.

As soon as the Emperor heard of this work, which was so extremely defamatory to all Catholics, he addressed a severe letter (September 10, 1577) to the council at Frankfort-on-the-Main. The town printer, Nicholas Basse, Rudolf II. wrote, had printed the work without giving his name, but had entered it in his own catalogue of books and had sold it. Whereas the book was full of venomous, seditious, and offensive words directed against the highest spiritual and temporal authorities, as also against the Electors and Estates of the Empire, and as, therefore, both the author and the printer had rendered themselves highly guilty and punishable with regard to the imperial laws, the constitutions of the realm, and the decrees of the Diets, the council was herewith enjoined to place the printer in custody and to lay an embargo on all the copies of the book.¹ In conformity with this order Basse was arrested and put in prison on November 17.

He appealed, however, to the Landgrave William of Hesse, who interceded for him. On December 10 the Landgrave addressed himself to the council, informing them that 'he had looked through the condemned book and had given it to others to read, and he found nothing in it that was disparaging to the Emperor, or to the electors and princes. Lang's attacks on the undeniable errors of the papacy, and his denunciation of the Pope as Antichrist, could not be regarded as depreciation, for Lang was not the first to bring forward such charges. On the contrary, the Estates of the

¹ In the Frankfort Archives, *Kaiserschreiben*, pp. 16, 119.

Augsburg Confession and several theologians, ever since the beginning of the Reformation, had said the same things openly at Diets and had had them printed, and it had all been so fully confirmed from Scripture that nothing could with any plausibility be advanced in opposition. It was precisely because Lang's book was grounded on the Word of God that the Jesuits had incensed the Emperor against it. He must therefore request the council to represent to the Emperor the innocence of their fellow citizen, and to intercede on his behalf.' ¹

'The "Unterweisung von der Seligkeit," which Lang has so eloquently and delightfully written for the Christian German people, driving the plain truth home to the idolatrous papists of every estate, is highly to be esteemed, and not in any way to be condemned,' wrote a Protestant official of the Imperial Chamber, on December 7, 1577, to a Frankfort friend, 'and therefore they ought to let the printer Basse out of prison, notwithstanding the imperial behest, if they do not wish to get the name of pandering to the Antichrist and his Jesuitical brood and vermin.' ²

On January 30, 1578, Basse addressed himself personally to the council, stating that he had been put into prison quite unjustly on account of an 'evangelical book' against the papacy, 'but that an incalculable number of similar books had already been and were daily being issued'; and that the book was being sold publicly at the Leipzig fair and at Augsburg.³

¹ In the *Kaiserschreiben*, pp. 16, 122.

² Doctor Joseph Engelmann of Speier to Gotthelf Heinrichs, counsellor-at-law.

³ *Kaiserschreiben*, xvi. 126.

Before receiving this petition the council had already complied with the Landgrave of Hesse's wish and written to Rudolf II. that they had examined the book and found nothing in it that could bring dishonour on the Emperor and the Estates. If it was to be condemned because it had attacked the papacy, then all other books of the kind must be condemned and inhibited ; but this would not be in accordance with the Religious Peace, as freedom of writing was allowed the papists also.¹

Whether the Protestants were willing to grant the latter this freedom, the coming years were to prove.

While the work of Andreas Lang, which was a summons to root out the Catholic faith and to exterminate the ecclesiastical princes of the Empire, was pronounced uninjurious and taken under protection, there arose among the Protestant Estates a storm of indignation against Catholic writings, which were accused of disputing the continued validity of the Religious Peace.

¹ *Kaiserschreiben*, xvi. 127, 131 : Kirchner, *Gesch. von Frankfurt*, ii. 292, briefly states the imperial command and makes the marginal comment : 'The Jesuits at the court disturb the book trade at Frankfort.'

CHAPTER V

CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE PERMANENT VALIDITY
OF THE RELIGIOUS PACIFICATION—SHOULD FAITH
BE KEPT WITH THE HERETICS?—PUNISHMENT OF
HERETICS

At the Ratisbon Diet of 1576 the Protestant Estates had complained to the Emperor Maximilian II. that 'there were at the present day people who held the opinion that the holy Religious Peace was merely a temporary arrangement drawn up, so to say, for the occasion. This opinion, moreover, was shamelessly asserted in public print, so that the discontent of these contumacious spirits was patent to the world, and it was obvious that they were only watching their opportunity to upset the whole treaty of religious peace.'¹

These complaints referred chiefly to a work which the imperial court councillor George Eder had published in 1573 under the title 'Evangelische Inquisition wahrer und falscher Religion wider das gemeine unchristliche Klagegeschrei dass sich niemand mehr wissen könne, wie oder was er glauben solle.'² Eder aimed at showing, in the form of a Christian consultation, 'how every Christian person might be fully

¹ Lehmann, *De Pace Religionis Acta*, i. 131.

² 'Evangelical Inquisition concerning true and false Religion, in answer to the general, unchristian outcry that nobody can know any longer how or what he ought to believe.'

instructed in and convinced of his faith, and in such a manner that he could not easily be deceived or led astray.’¹ ‘I can well believe,’ he said in the dedication of the work to the Archdukes Ferdinand and Charles of Austria, ‘now that our sect leaders of the new religion have shot out all the contents of their bags, that their patrons would be extremely glad if, under the pretext of peace, the Catholics were forbidden to write books.’ ‘But it would not only be contrary to all justice and equity, but contrary to reason itself, that the heretics should be allowed to revile, insult, and slander people as much as they please, while the Catholics were rendered unable to reply and to proclaim and prove their innocence; besides which, it was of itself an altogether preposterous thing to refuse to make peace until one party was already entirely crushed, and, besides, so to press on the weaker party that it never could rise again.’ Then, too, there would spring up day after day numbers of fresh errors which would never be eradicated if everybody was obliged to keep silence regarding them; and we should at last be compelled to accept, believe, and venerate all the absurdities of every ranting fanatic as the holy evangel and the Word of God, which would be a monstrous outrage to Christianity in the sight of God, and an everlasting disgrace in the eyes of the world.’ ‘Whereas, therefore, the sects are not growing idle, but go on producing one text-book after another in order to distribute their poison among the common people, the Church

¹ Dillingen, 1573. Concerning Eder, see Aschbach, *Gesch. der Wiener Universität*, iii. (Wien, 1888), 166-179; *Mittheilungen des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* vi. 440 ff., and especially Paulus, *Reichshofrat Dr. Georg Eder. Ein katholischer Rechtsgelehrter des 16. Jahrhunderts in Hist.-polit.* Bl. 115 (1895), 13 ff., 81 ff.

has never before been under so great necessity as now to write in its own defence, in order that our descendants may see that we did not remain silent all the time, but that we ever opposed the strongest resistance to their errors and attacks. In particular, however, there is among us Catholics a lack of such German books as would enable the uneducated classes to understand not only the real ground of the whole religious dissension, but also the difference between true and false religion.' This was the aim he set before him in this book, which he had compiled from the leading controversial books of the scholars.

In proof of the numerous schisms among the Protestants, Eder quoted 'the actual confessions' of their own theologians and preachers, from James Andreä, George Major, Nicholas Amsdorf, and others, and made use of the writings of several Catholic controversialists, who had 'noted down and tabulated the principal sects and factions from the books of the new religionists.' He showed also 'how the sects mutually denounced and condemned each other as heretics,' and how, on the other hand, 'by secret, intangible accusations, as well as by open falsehoods which they circulated everywhere against the Catholics, they endeavoured, as far as possible, to make the Roman Church contemptible and odious to everybody.'¹ 'In forty-seven pictures' 'a heretics' dance' passes in front of the reader. One of these representations deals with 'those articles in which some of the evangelicals are in agreement with the Jews'; in another the subject is 'points in which the new evangel corresponds to the Mohammedan Koran and the Turkish idol'; by a third the reader

¹ *Evangelische Inquisition*, Bl. 50 ff., 137^b ff., 159 ff.

is shown 'for what causes the evangelicals are still more sacrilegious than the Turks, heathen, and mamalukes, whom to some extent they surpass in wickedness;' in the fourth and fifth 'points of resemblance between the new sects and the devil himself,' and 'how to prove that under the semblance of the Gospel the Word of God is being suppressed and the devil's doctrine set up in its place.' Like the Franciscan Nas, Eder also 'paid the preachers back in their own coin.' After having mustered several 'troops of satanic prophets,' he adds: 'Many more such devil's associates, soul murderers, renegade Lucifers, and lying spirits might be described and named. Whereas, however, all sectarian and misleading doctrines are at bottom nothing else than so many devil phantoms, it is unnecessary to rake up each of them again individually.'¹ The actual 'end and aim,' he said, of 'the new Christians in general' was 'carnal liberty.' 'They aim in all things at liberty of the flesh, and therefore they cannot endure any spiritual authority over them, for each one wishes to be his own master and to do nothing else than what he himself pleases. They consider it popish heresy and oppression to have to confess and retail their sins to priests or to receive any sort of penance from them, still more to gain reprieve from any temporal punishment by the accomplishment of good works, although these last proceed from the grace of God, or to obtain eternal life by their means. They say that it is by faith only that anyone can be saved.'²

Eder depicts admirably 'the Court Christians,' 'the neutralists,' 'the weathercocks,' and the Emperor Maximilian II. must have felt himself badly hit by the

¹ *Evangelische Inquisition*, Bl. 89-97^a.

² Bl. 143^b-144^a.

pronouncement: 'Some of them are Lutherans at heart, but pose outwardly as Catholics'; 'some are half Lutheran, half papistical, but nothing wholly, and they change coats according to the wind. With the papists they are papists, with the Lutherans, Lutheran.' Eder also inveighed indignantly against those 'Christians' 'who at bottom were neither papists nor Lutherans,' and who, under pretence of peaceful mediation, 'stirred up all manner of sedition, incensing both parties, Lutherans and papists, against each other, and bringing things to such a pitch that they tear each other's hair out, and proceed to bloody massacres.' 'Insurrectionists would be a better name for such men than even Court Christians.'¹ Others of these religionists 'have got round many of the civil authorities and persuaded them that they have as much right as the bishops, or as the Pope himself, to dictate and govern at their pleasure in matters of religion; and the result is that the common people are now possessed with a strong delusion that because the men who frequent these mundane, princely courts are, as a rule, fluent in speech, well up in the affairs of the world, experienced, polite, and of good position, they must also know better than anyone else about things of the faith, and be able to talk about them better. But to tell the truth, things have never been in such a woeful plight with regard to Christianity as in these present times, when religion is dragged from the Church into the courts of secular lords, from the schools to the pulpits, from the mouths of theologians and professors to the pens of the jurists, and, finally, from the chairs

¹ Bl. 166-168^b. I have already quoted a passage about the Court Christians in vol. viii. p. 298.

of the preachers into drinking-taverns among the lowest clod-hoppers.' ¹

This work aroused the greatest displeasure at Court. By an imperial mandate of October 2, 1573, the author was commanded, under pain of the highest disgrace and penalty, instantly to cease from all writing on religious matters, and neither secretly nor openly, neither in his own nor in another name, to publish anything more on the subject. Eder was at once to hand over to the Government all the copies of the work in his possession, and all that he had given away he was to recall and deliver up. In the imperial cities, as well as in the Austrian lands, the book was inhibited and laid under an embargo. ²

Three years after the death of the Emperor, Eder, at the instigation of Duke Albert V. of Bavaria, published the second part of his work, which had already been announced in the 'Evangelical Inquisition,' under the title of *Das guldene Fließ christlicher Gemain und Gesellschaft*. ³ His aim was to present, as it were in a picture, 'for the benefit of ordinary people who in the general confusion no longer knew whom to believe and follow,' 'the old and the new religions,' the good and the bad, to strengthen and confirm their belief in the Catholic truth and unity, and to point out the right ways and means of coming back to this truth and unity. ⁴ He painted the 'Babylonish confusion' inside

¹ Bl. 168^b-169.

² Wiedemann, *Reformation und Gegenreformation*, ii. 152-155, and Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 146-147, where there is also information respecting the further editions. See also Paulus, *l.c.* 81 ff.

³ *The Golden Fleece of the Christian Community and Society*, Ingolstadt, 1579. See Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 147.

⁴ *Zueignung an den Herzog Albrecht*, Bl. 2^b, 11 ff., 28, 332, 429.

Protestantism in still more glaring colours in this second part than in the first, and exhorted all Germans in the words of the Prophet: ‘. . . Ask for the old paths.’

To the question, ‘How in these days to deal with the new sects and all the erring Christians in order to bring them back to the right way and to preserve them in the right faith,’ he gave the answer: ‘We must begin from the beginning and deal with such people almost as if we were instructing an infidel, a Turk, a Hindu, or a heathen, and endeavouring for the first time to convert them to the Christian faith;’ for numbers of the new Christians had utterly lost every spark of religion and faith.¹

The Catholics could not, he said, reckon on toleration from the new religionists. ‘Wherever the new sects attack the old faith the Catholics are persistently denounced as heretics, seducers, idolaters, and blasphemers; they are condemned and persecuted until the old religion is at last entirely rooted out. In places where the Protestants have the government in their hands no Catholics are tolerated; they are banished from the land and driven in public disgrace with their wives and children from house and home.’ ‘But, on the other hand,’ he says pointedly, ‘if a Catholic ruler attempts to proceed in similar fashion against his disobedient, rebellious subjects, everyone flies off to the alarm-bell, and a murder cry is straightway raised as though the Religious Peace had been violated.’

That the Catholic Estates possessed the same rights as the Protestants seemed to Eder a matter of course, and he insisted emphatically that they should assert their rights undauntedly, and ‘at all times give their

¹ Bl. 26, 28.

support, without any temporising, to the Catholic doctrine,' and eradicate sectarianism from within their dominions.¹

At the same time, however, he did not, as he was falsely accused of doing by the Protestant sects, call in question the validity of the religious pacification of Augsburg as an 'exterior'—*i.e.* a political and civic treaty.² 'As regards the 'exterior peace,' he wrote, 'there is no doubt whatever that whereas there was at the time no other chance of altogether allaying the religious contention, the pious Emperor and the laudable Estates of the Empire not only had good reason to resort to such ways and means as might at any rate have a temporary effect in maintaining quiet in the realm until the full consummation and settlement of peace, and whereby worse disturbance might be averted, but also that they were impelled to this step by the most urgent necessity, and it was consequently quite fair and right that such a decision should be generally respected and fulfilled.'

'Nevertheless,' he added, referring as well to the charter of the treaty itself as to the frequent explanation of it by the Lutheran Estates, 'under this said peace those only who are included are the adherents either of the old Catholic religion or of the original Augsburg Confession, which was handed in to the Emperor Charles V. in 1530, by a few of the Estates at the Diet of Augsburg; and it follows that all other sects, the Zwinglians, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Schwenkfeldians, and all such separate factions are altogether excluded from it.'

¹ *Das goldene Fließ*, Bl. 399, 400.

² Already pointed out by Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 148.

Eder thus expressly acknowledged the validity of this religious pacification in political and civil respects. 'The religious pacification,' he reiterated, 'is left intact in its full bearing and value according to the true reading of it.'

With regard, however, to the 'interior' aspect of the peace, to that 'which concerned the soul and conscience,' there was no reason, he said, to suppose that the Imperial Majesty and the Estates had ever meant to encroach on the jurisdiction of the Church in this place or to curtail it in any way. For whereas these two religions, the old Catholic faith and the new Augsburg Confession, run diametrically counter to each other in important articles, and we cannot therefore say either that both are wholly good and true, or both wholly false, it must of necessity follow that there can be no means of effecting real peace or reconciliation between two such contradictory systems, unless we either admit both of them as good and lovable, or reject and condemn good and evil alike. The Emperor and the Estates had given a positive assurance at Augsburg that the religious quarrel should only be settled by amicable means. This being the case, and 'whereas the means of settlement were first of all to be considered and decided on, it followed necessarily that this religious pacification must be looked upon more as a "moratorium," a "dilation," or a compromise—that is to say, a truce or a temporary makeshift pending final settlement—than as a definitive decision or declaration.' ¹

This expression of opinion respecting the 'interior aspect of the peace' was later on interpreted by the

¹ *Das guldene Fließ*, Bl. 394 ff., 436.

Protestants as though Eder had disputed the validity of the Religious Peace generally, in civil respects also, and had 'incited the potentates to act in opposition to this peace,' and 'to exterminate the evangelicals.'¹

There had already been an idea of bringing forward complaints about Eder's '*Schandbuch*' ('scandalous book') at the Augsburg Diet in 1582; at that time, however, the Elector Palatine's ambassadors themselves had remarked that 'the papists would not be in such a hurry to upset the peace; there was no need to complain of Eder's book, for the other side were just as bad.'²

Another Catholic who was described by the Protestants as 'a bloodthirsty agitator aiming at the destruction of the Religious Peace and all the evangelicals' was Jodokus Lorichius, professor of theology at Freiburg in the Breisgau. This man was not a Jesuit; so little indeed was he a thorough-going friend of the Order that he hindered the appointment of Jesuits at the University of Freiburg in the Breisgau;³ at the same time he was denounced as an 'out-and-out *Loyolite*' who had 'proclaimed to all the world' how inordinately cruel and inhuman the Jesuits were, and how they longed to see all the Christians up to their knees in blood.'⁴

In 1577 Lorichius, in a Latin treatise, had combated the idea that it was the duty of the Catholic ruling

¹ See L. Osiander's *Verantwortung wider die zwei Giftspinnen*, pp. 11-15.

² v. Bezold, *Briefe Johann Kasimirs*, i. 496; see i. 467.

³ See St. Ehses, '*Jodokus Lorichius*, a Catholic theologian and controversialist of the sixteenth century,' in the *Festschrift zum 1100-jährigen Jubiläum des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom* (Freiburg, 1897), p. 243. Nevertheless, Lorichius cannot be called 'a decided opponent of the Jesuits,' as Stieve calls him in *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 158.

⁴ *Wölfe im Schafspelz*, Bl. 17^a.

authorities to use the harshest penalties for compelling the heretics to obedience to the Church, in order that thus they [the heretics] might be deprived of the opportunity of tearing the Christian flock to pieces like devouring wolves.¹ He did not attack the Augsburg Religious Peace either in this treatise or in a German pamphlet which he published in 1583 under the title 'Religionsfriede wider die hochschädlichen Begehren und Rathschläge von Freistellung der Religion' ('Religious Peace, against the pernicious Designs and Counsels concerning Religious Autonomy').² In the preface to this pamphlet he said that he wished most humbly to beg the Christian rulers of the German nation not to misinterpret his meaning and to think that he was advocating anything in the nature of opposition to or violation of the decrees and statutes made for maintenance of peace between the several

¹ *De vera et falsa libertate credendi e sacra potissimum scriptura instituta demonstratio, auctore Iodoco Lorichio* (Ingolstadt, 1577). In answer to the reproach that Jews and heathen were allowed to live as they pleased, and that this liberty ought all the more to be accorded to the heretics, he argued, Bl. 69: '*Judaei atque Gentiles Christianam fidem nunquam agnoverunt, nunquam professi sunt: ob id non debent ad eam compelli: credere enim voluntarium est, nec habet in eos animadvertendi ius ecclesia, quippe foris sunt, ut loquitur apostolus (1 Cor. 6). Ideoque Deus eos judicabit. At haeretici fuerunt aliquando ex ovibus. Sunt ergo quoque modo ad ovile reducendi, ne in lupos incident. Si vero ex ovibus in lupos transformati sunt, persequi eos, captivare, vincere, tollere oportet, ne oves invadant atque dilacerent.*' At Bl. 63^b-66, Kap. 24, he treats '*De justa compulsionem rebellium ad obediendum fidei legibusque praescriptis.*' In the following chapter, '*Quod non repugnet Christianae modestiae Dei et ecclesiae hostes atrocius persequi,*' the treatise is directed against those who assert '*liberum unicuique concedi debere, ut credat quod volet*' (Bl. 53^b).

² '*. . . für die christlichen Oberkeiten teutscher Nation zur Erinnerung und Warnung kürzlich beschrieben*' ('briefly described as a reminder and a warning to the Christian rulers of the German nation'). Cologne, 1583. Another edition: *Tractat von Freystellung und Religionsfrieden*, Freiburg in the Breisgau, 1610.

members of the Roman Empire. His object was merely to prove and establish openly that 'the religious autonomy which the Protestants demanded was an impossible and destructive measure.' Whereas, he reiterated at the conclusion, he had not treated the subject in any way from a 'civic or political point of view,' but only from the judgment-seat of conscience and with reference to the strict tribunal of God, he hoped that 'nobody would accuse him of any arrogance or want of modesty in the matter,' still less of 'a deliberate intention to arouse mischievous excitement and embitterment of Christian spirits against each other.' But he felt bound 'to admonish and warn all Catholic rulers not to pin their faith on, or acquiesce in, all the rosy language and the fervent assurances of peaceful good-fellowship which the Protestants would maintain with and among us if freedom of religion were granted them.' True it was that in some of the imperial cities, after the so-called Interim, the Catholic religion 'had again been openly preached and practised, but little by little not only had it secretly begun to weaken and decline, but it had been suppressed and driven out with open violence.' 'Who will any longer trust their painted language?' 'Although the Catholics and those who have separated themselves from the Roman Christian Church do and must maintain mutual fellowship in secular matters, it is nevertheless impossible that any real and reliable understanding of spirit should exist and be maintained between them.' The Religious Peace had not been observed by the Protestants; on the contrary, ever since its conclusion 'there had been neither peace, tranquillity, nor any sort of well-being'; 'numbers of churches and convents had been ravaged;

numbers of ecclesiastical holdings seized by violence, and in many towns the Catholic religion had been interdicted and suppressed.' The Church possessed authority to employ coercive measures against the renegades; 'for why,' asked Lorichius in the words of St. Augustine—'why should not the Catholic Church compel her lost sons to return, when others have compelled these lost sons to go to ruin?' Not force and violence, however, but earnest repentance and reform on the part of the Catholics themselves, 'were the best means towards the abolition of heresy and other evils, with which the Church was being more and more afflicted and assailed.' 'The greater number of both lords and subjects, spiritual and temporal, went on living just as if there were no trouble in the Church of God that we need concern ourselves about. There are but few people who at all take to heart the terrible apostasy of the sects and the heavy persecution which the Church has suffered and still suffers daily from them: few who weep and lament over our sins and over the falling-off of others from God, and who intreat for the grace of forgiveness and conversion.'¹

But if Eder and Lorichius were cited as proofs 'that on the side of the papists nothing less was contemplated than the overthrow of the solemnly contracted Religious Peace, and the cruel persecution of all the evangelical Estates in the Empire,' there was still clearer evidence 'of such inhuman plots' in a work which appeared in the name of the chancellor of the Elector of Cologne, Franz Burkhard, with the title 'Traktat von der Autonomie.' In this treatise, so it was said, 'it was frankly and freely stated that not

¹ Pp. 22 ff., 44-45. Last edition, pp. 19, 23, 32, 34, 41, 48, 53.

only must the Religious Peace be annulled, but that the whole body of evangelicals must be proceeded against with fire and sword.’¹ The Elector Palatine Frederic IV. on one occasion laid before the Elector of Brandenburg the draft of a document in which complaint was to be made to the Emperor that ‘the papists and Jesuits suggest in their books that the Religious Peace should be extinguished, the heretics rooted out with fire and sword, and that all rulers who do not help in the massacre, and who do not submit themselves entirely to the will of the Pope, should be put an end to by their own subjects. In the book of Burkhard it says: “The Catholics should punish all heretics with the ban, nay, with fire and sword; the adherents of the Augsburg Confession must be expelled from the country, and we must take their churches and schools away from them even at the risk of losing our lives and property.”’ Thus the *classicum* or summons to a religious war ‘had sounded in Germany also.’²

In reality matters stood quite differently as regards the book in question.

The actual author of the ‘Traktat von der Autonomie, das ist von Freistellung mehrerlei Religion und Glauber’ (‘A Treatise on Autonomy: that is, on granting liberty to adopt a different religion or faith’), which appeared in 1586 and went through several editions, was Andreas Erstenberger, secretary of the Aulic Council.³

¹ *Wölfe im Schafspelz*, Bl. 17^a.

² Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 477.

³ The Munich edition of 1593 is the one to which I refer. ‘The value of the book,’ says Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 162–163, ‘lay in the juridical arguments by which Erstenberger, on the strength of the Religious Peace and the transactions which occurred at the time of its settlement, defended

Inasmuch as the Emperor Rudolf II., like his father, Maximilian II., was averse to all doctrinal and

the ecclesiastical reservation and combated Ferdinand's declarations' (see our remarks, vol. viii. p. 352-359). The *Autonomie* appeared 'to the Catholics an invincible bulwark, and irrefutable defence against the Protestants' demand for religious freedom, and as a matter of fact the adversaries for the space of sixteen years did not once make a serious attempt to undermine its evidence.' Sugenheim, *Gesch. der Jesuiten*, i. 72, 75-76, writes: 'Erstenberger's work may, without exaggeration, be described as a very important publication, as an epoch-making event in the ecclesiastico-political life of those times. The tremendous noise which it caused on its first appearance was only too natural. Never before had the weaknesses of contemporary Protestantism, its glaring contradictions to its own principles, been shown up with so much penetration and clearness, and on such a solid basis of fact. With regard to the question of the day—viz. the abolition of the ecclesiastical reservation, so often and urgently called for by the evangelicals, and the redress of all their remaining grievances—the author denied them all and any competence and right to get up a case against the Catholic Estates of the Empire; his proofs were striking, and chiefly taken from the conduct of the Protestants themselves. It is scarcely possible to describe how much damage was caused to the evangelical portion of the Empire by the timely appearance of this work, shortly after the disastrous termination to the affair of Gebhard of Cologne had exposed the blindness, the want of unity, and the internal weakness of the new-religionist party. That which hundreds of thousands among both Catholics and Protestants had dimly felt, was now stated in plain language, and reasoned out with logical acumen; and while the respect and enthusiasm of the Catholics for their own Church were raised to a higher pitch by the immensely increased contempt which this book roused against the evangelical Church, there fell on many of the friends and adherents of the latter a leaden weight of indolence, indifference, and despair. Numbers who had long felt dissatisfied with and repelled by this deformed, disfigured Protestantism, now silently asked themselves whether, for the sake of this degenerate Church, so little in harmony with any reasonable religious feeling, so inconsequent and fanatical, it was worth while to forfeit all the advantages which the old Church—incomparably more logical at any rate—held out to her adherents, inviting them to become martyrs in her service and for her glorification.' Respecting *Erstenberger's Traktat von der Autonomie*, see now the article by Lossen in the *Sitzungsberichte der Münch. Akad., phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1891, Heft i. 128 ff. According to the account of the Bavarian secretary, Dr. Winkelmair (1571), *Erstenberger* was a convert, see Götz, *Briefe und Acten zur Geschichte des 16. Jahrh.* (Munich, 1898), No. 625; Riegler, iv. 639. The usefulness of the Latin translation of *Erstenberger's* work is accentuated

dogmatic discussion of religion, Erstenberger did not dare bring out this work in his own name, or have it printed at Vienna. Under the auspices of Duke William V. of Bavaria, who had promised the author strict silence, it appeared in print at Munich. 'At the imperial court,' the Duke wrote to the Archbishop of Salzburg on December 5, 1586, 'they will not vouchsafe their approval to the newly published work on freedom of religion, nor to any others which aim at saving, maintaining, and propagating our Catholic religion; while the other side are allowed to make use of any means they like without any scruple.' Erstenberger's fear that his becoming known as the author would not only injure himself, but also his wife and family after his death, was therefore probably not groundless.¹

Erstenberger distinguished between five 'kinds and manners' of religious freedom, which are in vogue nowadays.'

The first kind was the freedom of the Electors, Princes, and Estates of the Augsburg Confession who had been assured by the Religious Peace of Augsburg that 'until the final settlement of the religious strife they should be left undisturbed in their Confession, and should not be forced to renounce it against their will and conscience, or be molested and oppressed on account of it.' 'And this,' he said, 'is almost the sum and substance of the said Religious Peace, and therefore is not, nowadays, the subject of much discussion. In fact this first point does not appertain so much to religion

by Minutio Minucci in his memorandum on the condition of the Catholic Church in Germany (1588), in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 772.

¹ v. Aretin, *Maximilian der Erste*, pp. 249-252.

itself, but rather to temporal peace and to the political unity of the Estates of both religions, and therefore, properly speaking, it is not an affair of religious freedom but rather a treaty and injunction of peace.' 'Since the prospective settlement of the religious contest alluded to in the treaty has not been accomplished, this article on religious autonomy remains where it was, and it is therefore unnecessary, so far as concerns the political and the secular peace, to deal any more with the subject.'¹ The Augsburg Confession in and for itself, that is as regards its doctrine, had not by any means been 'approved and sanctioned' in the Religious Pacification; for this treaty, Erstenberger repeated, did not concern 'religion itself,' but 'only political peace and its guarantee, in order that peace and tranquillity might be maintained in the Holy Empire and that the Estates of both religions might dwell securely side by side.' The settlement of the religious strife 'was, in express language, deferred to some future time and opportunity' in the said treaty. But even if, which was not the case, 'this said presumed settlement had been included in the Religious Peace,' still no appeal could have been made to it, because the secular authorities had no power whatever to pronounce judgment in matters of faith, and because the general Christian council, to which the Emperor and the Estates had themselves deferred the decision of the religious contest, had been already held long ago and the new teaching publicly condemned and anathematised. This 'verdict of the Catholic Church is so authoritative in itself that it annuls and abolishes any secular approbation that may have preceded it'; but he remarks emphatically,

¹ *Autonomie*, Bl. 2^a, 4^b.

‘which of course means only in matters relating to the soul and eternity.’¹

According to this, Erstenberger acknowledged the binding nature of the Religious Peace as a civil and political treaty, openly and unconditionally, just as did Eder; in his opinion also this peace, in its civil aspect, had in no way been nullified by the Council of Trent.²

‘If, however,’ in spite of the decisions of the Council, ‘the advocates of religious autonomy persist in their multitudinous conflicting confessions, or rather *confusions*, in the teeth of all warnings against eternal divine punishment, they cannot at the same time be saved against their will, and we must end by leaving it to them—that is to the Estates holding immediately from the Empire—to take their own course at their peril, and to govern their subjects as they please; for they themselves will have to answer for themselves at the last day. But they must also leave the Catholic Estates and their subjects undisturbed in their ancient and alone-saving faith, and must not arrogate to themselves more than the political part of the religious peace allows them.’ So little did Erstenberger dream of calling the latter in question that he exhorted the ‘peace-loving princes and estates’ of the Augsburg Confession to take care that ‘the toleration of so many and various conflicting sects,’ whose existence could not be denied, ‘and the influence of so many wrong-headed fanatics did not upset the political peace and the course of justice.’³ Toleration of these sects, he

¹ *Autonomie*, Bl. 291^b–292.

² Already insisted on by Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 160–161.

³ *Autonomie*, Bl. 292^b–293^a.

said, above all of the Zwinglians and Calvinists, contradicted the express letter of the peace. In other respects also this peace was not observed with regard to the Catholics; the new religionists were not satisfied with the abbeys, prelacies, convents, and parsonages confiscated before the peace, but they went on making fresh violent seizures, appointing sectarian preachers everywhere, and stirring up the subjects of Catholic rulers to disobedience.

While Erstenberger fully recognised the validity and legality of the so-called 'first kind of religious freedom' as guaranteed in the Religious Peace, he enumerates four other kinds which were opposed to the terms of the peace. The second kind, he says, was the abolition of the ecclesiastical reservation, which was insisted on by the Estates of the Augsburg Confession; the third, the demand, first put forward in 1566, 'that not only should the apostate clergy be allowed to retain their benefices, their status, their dignities and emoluments, but also, on the other hand, that the princes, counts and lords of the nobility, whatever their rank, whether married or single, should be freely eligible to ecclesiastical foundations, bishoprics, prelacies, and benefices, and that to this end the ancient oaths and statutes of the benefices should be altered and should be made to apply only to obedience in secular, political matters.' The fourth kind of religious freedom which was claimed related to the Protestant subjects resident under spiritual rulers, for whom it was demanded that they should be left free in the exercise of the Augsburg Confession; the fifth and last was 'freedom generally for all subjects in matters of religion.'

Against these last four kinds of 'religious freedom'

Erstenberger directed his whole battery of arguments and proofs; he condemned them as altogether unjustifiable, inadmissible, and injurious both to Church and State, and tending to nothing less than the complete extermination of the Catholic faith in Germany. His reasonings and demonstrations are well-grounded and sagacious, both as regards historical and juridical aspects; but in the manner of his controversy he modelled himself to a great extent on the Protestant polemical writings. He attributed the schism in religion, with all its disastrous consequences—the ruin of ecclesiastical unity, the decay of religious and moral life, the dissolution of all social and political bonds—to the devil, and insisted that the Catholic overlords or landed proprietors should at least do as much in eradicating heresy and punishing heretics within their own dominions as the Protestants had done against the Catholics. The Catholic Estates, he said, were not bound to grant the Protestants in their territories free exercise of their religion, or even to tolerate their presence there; prescriptive rights could not be urged in favour of the latter, because according to the principles of Protestantism itself there was no such thing as prescriptive right in matter of religion, and nowhere under Protestant rulers had the Catholics ever enjoyed toleration, or free exercise of their religion. These rulers had renounced the Catholic faith, which had a tradition and prescriptive right of nearly sixteen hundred years' standing, 'and by means of their misleading preachers, and partly by seductive words, partly by violence, had coerced their unhappy subjects into renouncing it also.' 'Almost every year they concoct fresh creeds, repetitions, books of ritual, concords, and such like

things, which the subjects, the preachers, the schools, and the landowners are obliged to accept, approve, and subscribe to on pain of being expelled from the country, or at any rate forfeiting their positions, offices, professorships, or pulpits. In some places even things have come to such a pass that, whenever a new overlord or a new preacher comes in, a new religion is also set up. And so nobody is allowed to appeal to custom, or length of practice, or anything in the shape of prescriptive right; we are not allowed to take our stand on the religion of our ancient, pious German ancestors and forefathers, or on length of possession and establishment; we must not talk about mistrust, division, and discord, and other untoward consequences! It is enough that the rulers are satisfied and pleased, the Papacy opposed, and the Augsburg Confession conformed to, at any rate in word and outward appearance. It is enough that they can say: "We are the rulers to whom the Religious Peace gives power to enforce the Augsburg Confession and to alter and organise religion according to our pleasure, regardless of what our immediate predecessor, or our father and mother founded, established, and commanded." All this, forsooth, must be swallowed as representing the letter and spirit of the Augsburg Confession. But if a Catholic prince or Estate, whether temporal or spiritual, succeeds to the government anywhere, or inherits a lordship, or redeems a mortgaged property, the inhabitants of which have had the new religion forced on them by the late holder, he cannot take possession of his inheritance without first taking his oath that he will allow his subjects to continue in their errors. It is not right in this case that the prince or the Estate should alter the religion of the

land. The Religious Peace in such a case affords no further benefit. Yea, verily, if but one of his subjects, who has discarded such erroneous teaching, is willing to allow some slight reforms, inspection, or instruction, there is straightway fire and fury in all the streets. Such proceedings are utterly opposed to the Religious Peace; from pen and lips complaints are everywhere rife that innovations are being introduced and distrust occasioned, that the poor inhabitants are being coerced against their consciences, that they are being robbed of their gospel and their soul's food. Steps are then taken to fortify the subjects against their rulers; preachers are sent among them, messengers and counsellors are despatched to them, to abet them, to counsel them to oppose their rulers and support the evangelicals—in short, to do anything and everything that may serve to hinder the Catholic religion; and yet they will not have it said that they are acting in opposition to the Religious Peace, that they are championing the subjects of other rulers, and fortifying and encouraging them in their resistance to them! On the contrary, all their proceedings must be considered entirely right and exemplary, and must be imputed to “Christian love and conscientious zeal,” as though “the Catholics had no Christian love and no consciences.” But how can it be Christian love or even upright Christian conscience which makes the Confessionists refuse the Catholics the privileges which the Religious Peace grants them, while they themselves insist on profiting by these privileges?

‘Dear friend, which of them, I ask you, lets himself be dictated to in his own land, even by the highest ruling authority, with regard to alteration of religion?

Which of them would approve of an ecclesiastic who should espouse the cause of his subjects in opposition to himself, especially should the said cleric go so far as to assist them in rebellion, and attempt, as Protestants often do, to push the matter through by threatening language ?'

'If it seems to them so hard and unbearable that the Catholics should reform their heretical subjects, what must the Catholics have felt all these last fifty years at seeing their bishoprics, abbeys, and convents daily confiscated before their eyes, devastated and profaned ; at seeing their revenues used for private ends, the clergy and the religious orders mocked, despised, suspended, expatriated, or put to death ? Will all this tend to good-will and fellowship ? Or what must the Catholics think about it all ?'¹

Erstenberger's work was not refuted by the Protestants, but it was incessantly combated² and described as one of the 'vilest of lampoons.'³ The preacher Utzinger, at Smalkald, called it, in 1588, the 'book of a rogue and scandalmonger,' which 'dabbled, slabbered, cackled, and foamed about in wishy-washy goose sermons.'⁴

To Dommarein of Dissingaw this work was an in-

¹ *Autonomie*, Bl. 359^b-362^a

² See Justus Springer, *De pace religionis in imperio Romano sub regimine D. Caroli V. Caesaris an. 1555 in comitiis Augustanis commentatio* (s. l. 1607), and *Gründliche Widerlegung dess von D. Andreas Erstenberger aussgelegten Bericht wider den Religion-Frieden*, by Justus Springer, I. G. ; written in Latin, and now translated into German by Georgius Beatus F., 1607.

³ At the Westphalian peace transactions complaints were still uttered against the appearance of the *Autonomie*. See Lipowsky, *Gesch. der Jesuiten in Bayern*, i. 127 note.

⁴ *Erinnerung*, &c., Bl. D. 3^b, E. 2^a.

centive to enter the field against the 'infernal new Jesuitical heresy,' 'the Jesuitical red and bloody sedition-mongers.' In 1610 he published 'Eine kurze Information und Anleitung von der Autonomia,' in which he said that 'the accursed, turbulent, and bloodthirsty sect of the Jesuits, according to their disgraceful and wicked habit, had agreed to incense the people, under the pseudonym of Burkhard.' 'Those bloodhounds, the Jesuits, scream and write all the world through' that all those who fall away from the Pope and 'do not agree with him in all his abominations are not to be included in the benefits of the Religious Peace, but that all of them, of whatever rank or dignity, must be demolished and extirpated with fire and sword.'¹ From the history of ancient nations Dommarein cited both friends and enemies of religious freedom. Solomon was an example of tolerance in that he loved many strange women, and allowed them free exercise of their religion, until 'they turned away his heart after other gods; and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God. . . .' Priestly rule did not exist in Israel. The new King Jeroboam 'was the first to set up the worship of calves, and the priests did not counsel and dictate to him in the matter. On the contrary he ruled over them, appointed and deposed them at his will, as also did all the following kings who would not let themselves be governed by their priests.'²

The Egyptians, the Persian kings, the pagan emperors of Rome had tolerated Jews and Christians. But that, *vice versa*, Protestant princes were under very

¹ Dommarein, pp. 8-9, 12, 19, 55. On the other hand, at p. 363, the Jesuit origin of this work is spoken of as doubtful.

² Dommarein, pp. 38-39.

similar obligation towards Catholic subjects Dommarein does not say. As the ‘sworn enemy,’ on the other hand, ‘of autonomy,’ he cited the ‘bloodthirsty Antiochus,’ ‘prototype and precursor’ of a Nero, a Domitian, a Diocletian, and their counterparts, ‘until at last the devil incarnate, the Pope, as Luther calls the Roman pontiff in his lecture on the Prophet Daniel, finally gained the upper hand and ‘banished, tortured, strangled, and swept away everything and everybody that was opposed to him.’¹ When the Apostles Peter, Paul, Jude preach obedience to rulers, then the ‘author of the Autonomy’ strikes in and ‘wants to mix in the ecclesiastical rulers, like mouse-dung with pepper; but at that time there was not yet any such thing as ecclesiastical authority.’² The Emperor Justinian, who issued decrees against heretics, was in some measure priest-ridden, and he let himself be governed by his wife Theodora, ‘because he was a perfect simpleton, and could neither read nor write.’³ The Emperor Julian, on the other hand, who ‘had also great virtues’ and ‘many saintly gifts,’ deserved praise as the friend of autonomy.⁴ Sayings of Hilarius, Chrysostom, Ambrosius are quoted with approval by Dommarein when they appear to speak in his favour. When it is otherwise the ‘holy Fathers’ are described as ‘hot-headed fanatics’ at ‘whose instigation and solicitation’ several severe edicts and statutes were enacted against heretics. In particular, the ‘old gentleman’ Ambrosius is blamed when he speaks up for that ‘perturber of consciences Burkhardus.’⁵

Another ‘mischievous ranter and agitator against

¹ Pp. 66-76.

² P. 132.

³ Pp. 223-224.

⁴ Pp. 213-214.

⁵ Pp. 216-217, 233-234.

the Religious Peace' who was 'most fiercely denounced' by the Protestants was Johann Paul Windeck, canon of the collegiate church of Markdorf, in the bishopric of Constance. In the year 1603 he published, and dedicated to Archduke Maximilian, a 'Prognostikon' on the future of the Church,¹ in answer to a pamphlet by a Lutheran which had proclaimed the imminent downfall of the papacy, and other similar 'prophecyings,' for instance the prediction of a French Calvinist that Catholic doctrine would be utterly demolished, and that Calvinism would then obtain dominion everywhere.²

Six years earlier, in 1597, George Cäsius, pastor at Burgbernheim, had dedicated to the Margrave George Frederic of Ansbach a 'Prognosticon astrologicum oder teutsche Practik,' in which he predicted from the stars that in the years 1598 and 1599 there would be 'great and wonderful changes,' 'disastrous, devastating wars,' and that 'several exalted personages, both spiritual and temporal, would suffer ruin and imprisonment,' 'nevertheless, for good ends.' 'In 1598 the true faith would be acknowledged.' Concerning the 'two eclipses' which were to happen in the month of February, 'Hermes or Mercurius Trismegistikus, the Egyptian philosopher, priest and king, or, as the reverend and most learned scholar Herr M. Heinrich Bündig makes out in his "Chronologie," the patriarch Joseph himself, the son of Jacob, wrote 1,700 years before the birth of Christ: "*Wenn zwei Finsternus in einem Monat fallen, thut gross Unglück herein prallen*" (when two eclipses

¹ *Prognosticon futuri Status Ecclesiae*, &c. ; the full title occurs in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 700, note 2. Windeck was no Jesuit.

² See the *Epistola dedicatoria* of this work.

are seen in one month there will be great disasters).’ The eclipse ‘in the high heaven’ ‘related to religion,’ and would occasion ‘another great shock to the papal chair and to our bishops.’ In addition to this, the conjunction of Saturn and Mars in the third degree of Libra in the month of August boded ‘nothing good’ for ‘the House of Austria,’ even if the Turks did not appear before Vienna. Cäsius placed the papacy and Mohammedanism on the same level, and expressed the hope that ‘the soothsayings’ of Antonius Torquatus, who had prophesied the end of the Mohammedan and the Antichristian sects, which had their commencement together 1,000 years ago, would be fulfilled.¹ Ten years earlier, even, George Cäsius, in a ‘Teutsche Practik,’ which he dedicated to the same Margrave, on the strength of the fortunate ‘conjunction of the upper planets,’ addressed the following encouragement to the Protestant princes: ‘Our Christian potentates should, therefore, combine together all the more hopefully and unanimously to quell the power of the Pope, and they should ponder well over Luther’s admonition in the little book against the papacy at Rome, managed by the devil, which he wrote shortly before his death.’ ‘This is how the preachers proceed,’ the Jesuit George Scherer had said in answer: ‘They peer into the stars and use their observations to incite the peace-loving princes to take up arms against the papists.’ ‘To what does Luther exhort the princes in this same booklet? To surprise the papists with an armed force, to hang, burn, drown, and flog them alive. This, then, is the way in which Cäsius thinks the princes ought to

¹ *Prognosticon astrologicum, oder Teutsche Practik*, Bl. B^d, A³-A⁴, C¹, C. 2^b.

proceed with the Catholics at the present day ; this is the work in which he promises them all success and good fortune, and that the stars in their courses will fight for them.’¹

Over against Protestant prognostication of this sort Windeck set up the prognostication that the Nemesis of self-disintegration would overtake Protestantism, split up as it was into such countless different sects, but that the integral papacy, instituted by Christ, would endure unto the end of the world. While an endless multitude of Protestant controversial writers could tell of numbers of their opponents who through divine chastisement had met with sudden death, or had fallen a prey to desperation before their end, or had actually been carried away by the devil,² Windeck, too, had now similar tales of ‘divine judgment’ to relate concerning Protestant leaders of sects, princes, and lords. He asserted the right of rejoinder against the preachers, who persistently and incessantly slandered and vilified the lives and conduct of the Catholic clergy, by cataloguing the vices and criminal doings habitual among the preachers. He advocated at the same time resort to the severest penal measures—even the sword—in order ‘to keep all the sects far away from the territories of the Catholics, or, if they had intruded themselves, to root them out entirely.’ ‘Cruelty in this respect was the highest kind of piety. Nevertheless, the way of gentleness must first be tried, as this was the best means of eradicating heresies.’³ He declared emphati-

¹ Scherer, *Verantwortung*, &c., in the Munich edition of his works, i. 420.

² See above, pp. 75, 76.

³ Stieve, ii. 700-704, has drawn attention to particular statements. At p. 236 Windeck says : ‘*Si haereses jam radices egissent, severa et intem-*

cally that he was not combating the Protestant princes and ruling authorities ; but of the religious pacification he spoke disparagingly in several passages of his book. These, indeed, might be interpreted as evidence that he considered this treaty as having been done away with by the Council of Trent.¹

Windeck's book, a Catholic author wrote later on, became a regular standing dish for the preachers and the Protestant Estates to make complaints of in multitudes of books and at diets. ‘“ See, then,” they would say, “ what bloodthirsty intentions the papists are cherishing ; they mean to drive us out of the country with our wives and children, to kill and massacre us.” That the preachers should raise this hue and cry does not astonish me at all, for to most of them lying is a daily practice ; but when princes talk in this manner, I am verily driven to the conclusion that they have not read a word of Windeck's book ; for however sharply and incisively he speaks up for the old traditional laws, which, moreover, have been sanctioned by numbers of emperors in the Holy Empire, who can assert that his work contains that of which he is accused ? ’²

But even if Windeck had really written all with which he is credited, the indignation of the Protestants against the book of the canon of Markdorf must still seem unwarranted when we consider what swarms of books and pamphlets—many of them dedicated to Protestant princes—have appeared and are still daily

pestiva horum mandatorum executio bello civili atque turbis longe gravissimis viam patefaceret. Qua in re caute agendum et non temere decernendum. Omnia enim benignitate prius quam armis sapientem experiri decet.

¹ Stieve, ii. 703.

² *Von üblen Nachreden, &c., p. 4.*

appearing, in which the utter extirpation of the papacy is insisted on, and represented as a divine command.

Simultaneously with Windeck's 'Prognosticon' there appeared at Münster, in Westphalia, a pamphlet entitled 'Aufwecker der Geistlichen' ('Awakener of the Clergy'). The Protestants, it said, had no right to the posts and benefices of the Church, and must therefore be ejected from them. It was both the right and the duty of the ecclesiastical princes to compel their subjects to keep or to adopt their faith. Heretics must not be tolerated, but persecuted with fire and sword. The religious pacification of Augsburg, as had already been explained by Eder and Erstenberger, related only to political peace, but even in this respect it was an impious compact, soiled with iniquity, and, by reason of the irreconcilable enmity between truth and falsehood, it could not have a lasting existence. Although in earlier centuries Arianism had prevailed almost all over the world, the few right-thinking bishops, the Pope, and the Emperor had not let themselves be dismayed by it, but had risked life, property, and renown in order to exterminate it. Let the present-day champions of the Church take example by them. A refuter of this pamphlet, on the other hand, disputed the right of the papacy, which was itself full of error and idolatry, to the possession of any ecclesiastical posts or property.¹

As late as the year 1614 the Palatine Elector complained to the Elector of Mayence about the 'Aufwecker' and about Windeck's 'Prognosticon.' From these writings, he said, it was clearly evident that the intention was gradually to wear out and exterminate

¹ From Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 694-695. See Dommarein, pp. 16-17.

the heretics and non-Catholics. The Elector of Mayence replied that 'the libellous writings of which the Palatine complained were nothing whatever to him, but that they had been suggested by writings of a similar nature from the opposite side.'¹

The convert Caspar Schoppe, one of the most influential advisers of the Archduke Ferdinand of Styria,² instituted an inquiry into the question whether there was any foundation for the reproaches which were made against Eder, Lorichius, Erstenberger, Windeck, and other Catholic writers with regard to the Religious Peace. 'The preachers,' he wrote, 'accuse the Catholic writers of disputing the validity of the Religious Peace, and also of advising the Emperor and the Catholic Estates not to observe it any longer, and not to let themselves be bound by the faith pledged to the heretics. If this is really so, and if the Emperor as well as the Catholic Estates can listen to and tolerate such advice, I own that the Protestant princes and lords have good reason to put no trust whatever in the Catholics, and that they ought to keep a sharp look-out on the game and act upon the maxim, "It is better to forestall than to be forestalled." If, however, the Catholic writers not only do not advocate all this, but, on the contrary, admonish the Emperor and the Catholic Electors, princes, and Estates to strict observance of the Religious Peace, then indeed we must admit that such liars and defamers should be treated as sedition-mongers and disturbers of the general peace, and punished with all severity as an example to others. It is therefore well worth while for both Protestant and Catholic princes and lords to investigate the matter in

¹ Senkenberg, xxiii. 717, -725.

² See Kowalleck, 425 ff.

order to come to a thorough knowledge of what is the exact truth in this matter.’¹ To this end Schoppe collected from Eder, Lorichius, and Erstenberger a series of statements which he showed to be all of them in favour of the rigorous observance of the Religious Peace. Windeck, also, he said, had (p. 333) ‘emphatically declared that he only wished to prevent tolerance of the false religion in those places in which it had not yet gained the upper hand, and been sanctioned by public authority. Wherever, however, it had already taken root, and had been countenanced by the ruling authorities, there, in the opinion of sensible people, the tares must be allowed to stand in order that the wheat might not be rooted up with them—that is to say, that the pious people might not come to greater grief.’ The German Jesuits, also, were unjustly charged with having incensed the Emperor and the Catholic Estates against the Religious Peace.²

Among these were Gregory Rosefius, who, under the name of Christopher Rosenbusch, published several pamphlets, and George Scherer, one of the most active controversialists of the Order. Against both these men the Würtemberg court preacher, Lucas Osiander,

¹ Ungersdorff (the pseudonym under which Schoppe wrote), pp. 41–42.

² Ungersdorff, pp. 42–73, 74–83. The chancellor and prebendary Konrad Braun was also accused by a Calvinist of having stated in his pamphlet *Ueber die Hürtiker*, ‘in which he had dealt very thoroughly with the Religious Peace, as it was drawn up in 1555, that this treaty, being unbinding and invalid, must by no means be observed’; the Catholics who act in opposition to it can nevermore rightly be described as peace-breakers. Schoppe (p. 58) refuted this accusation with the simple statement that Braun’s pamphlet had appeared at Mayence in 1548; that is, seven years before the Religious Peace. Braun’s pamphlet appeared in 1549, but it was already written in 1542. See Paulus, ‘Dr. Konrad Braun, ein katholischer Rechtsgelehrter des 16. Jahrhunderts,’ in the *Hist. Jahrb.* 1893, p. 537.

brought the charge that their 'whole diabolical doing and writing' was directed to the one end of 'utterly extinguishing the Religious Peace to which they were pledged,' 'of perpetrating a general massacre of all pious Christians,' 'of drowning Germany in its own blood,' and of bringing about, not here only, but in other kingdoms also, 'a gruesome massacre and butchery.' 'How, indeed,' he says, 'can we expect the Jesuits, the children of Satan and the messengers of the devil, to have any respect for the Religious Peace when they openly teach and write that "towards heretics no contract, however solemnly sworn to, is binding, and that no faith whatever need be kept"?'¹

'It is not unknown to me,' Rosefius replied in 1588, 'that nearly all the heretics give out that we teach that no faith and honour need be kept with heretics. And with this announcement they proceed to robbery, plunder, theft, saying: "We cannot rely on any treaty with our antagonists, the papists; therefore we may just as well turn everything upside down." Faith and honour should be kept by one and all, for nothing preserves and knits together the community so well as faith and honour; and faith and honour must not only be observed in general matters, but also in private affairs, in conversation and in promises. Never at any time should we lie, for lies are opposed to truthfulness. It is, however, a specially serious offence to break faith in public affairs.' 'When a treaty of peace has been concluded without deceit and trickery, and with all due formalities, it should be religiously observed,

¹ See above, vol. ix. p. 117 ff, and the further catalogue of pamphlets and counter-pamphlets of Osiander and the two Jesuits in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 151-156.

whether with friend or foe, with believers or unbelievers.’ ‘Let us leave the Religious Peace out of account and imagine that it is only a political compact required by the times and circumstances.’ The punishment of heretics was, at any rate, in accordance with divine and human laws ; but ‘in the empire of the German nation the ancient imperial constitutions—even those against stiff-necked, dangerous heretics—no longer retained their efficacy, for they had been so tampered with and hedged in by the Religious Peace that nobody, on account of religion, might be impugned in his honour, nobody’s property must be touched, nobody must be made to suffer for anything. Even the Pope, who was only invested with power in order that he might build up the Church, not that he might despoil it, was not authorised to abolish the Religious Peace, because such a step would occasion much misery and the utmost perplexity.’ ‘And it is a fact, moreover, that ever since the time of the conclusion of the Religious Peace the Pope has sent his legates and nuncios to all imperial assemblies. And though the nature of the Religious Peace is well understood at Rome, the Pope has never been known to make the slightest suggestion with regard to its abolition, nor to cast any doubts upon it.’ ‘Yes,’ added Rosefius, ‘I have no doubt whatever that the pious emperor and the princes of the Catholic religion and faith have acted in these matters with his Holiness’s knowledge and consent, thereby ensuring greater safety to their consciences. And is it likely that the poor Jesuits, as Osiander’s fables relate, are now setting themselves up against the will of Pope, Emperor, King, princes, and lords to annul the Religious Peace ? What reasonable being can for a moment

believe such a tale? Fie, for shame, you scandalous scribbler!’¹

The Jesuit George Scherer had also ‘as little doubt that nobody ought to tamper with the Religious Peace which had been sworn to.’ ‘We are bound,’ he said in a sermon at Vienna in 1595, ‘to keep inviolate before God and the world, not with friends only, but with foes, not alone with our co-religionists, but also with the unbelievers, the oath and testament to which we pledged ourselves. Whosoever does not stick to his word and his colours does violence to his conscience, and is accounted a perfidious wretch.’²

The question was treated exhaustively by the Jesuit Martin Becanus, who had held a theological professorship for twenty-two years at the universities of Würzburg, Mayence, and Vienna, and who stood in as high esteem with the Catholics as did ‘Rosenbusch’ and Scherer. ‘The politicians of our day,’ said Becanus, ‘are commonly of opinion that it is justifiable to break a promise, or even an oath, when considerations of profit or advantage require us to do so.’³ The Catholic Church, however, teaches otherwise. She says: “The promise which you have given you are bound faithfully

¹ Rosenbusch, *Deklaration der unächtigen und unwahrhaftigen Abfertigung Osiandri*, pp. 87–97. Concerning the fact that not only the Jesuits, but also Catholic statesmen believed that the Religious Peace had been concluded with the knowledge of the Pope, see Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 262, and also the note in the *Anmerkungen*, pp. 93–94. According to a memorandum of the nuncio Delfinus to Duke Albert V. of Bavaria, which is quoted there, Pope Gregory XIII., in 1575, in order to prevent the grant of religious freedom, was anxious that the confirmation of the Religious Peace should take place at once on the day of election of Rudolf II. See above, vol. ix. p. 302, note 2.

² *Die zwölfte Predigt wider Mahomet und sein Alkoran*, in the Munich edition of the works of Scherer, ii. 291 ff.

³ *Opuscula theologica*, i. 1.

to keep." The assertion that "the Catholics teach that there is no need to keep faith with heretics is a miserable lie." ' 1

In a special pamphlet, ' Ueber die Treue welche man den Häretikern schuldet,' Becanus lays down the general rule: ' If you have concluded a treaty or an alliance with heretics, you must thoroughly and honourably fulfil that which you have promised, just as much as you would in the case of Catholics.' For ' we must never tell lies, never violate our neighbours' rights, never commit an act of injustice, never be guilty of perjury. In very deed, if you once admit that all such wrong-doing is allowable on the ground that you are dealing with a heretic, it follows that you also have the right to kill, rob, and hate heretics; but this would be contrary to reason and to the law of God.' 2 Even towards unbelievers and worshippers of idols, according to the testimony of Holy Writ, faith must be observed—how much more, then, to the Protestant sects? 3

He then brings forward some specially important cases to show how we are bound to keep faith even with outlaws, excommunicated persons, and heretics, in marriage, in war, and in case of having granted a safe-conduct. Charles V., for instance, did all honour to the name of a Catholic emperor when he refused at Worms to violate Luther's safe-conduct. 4 The most important section of the treatise bears the heading: ' Ob man den Häretikern Treue halten müsse, wenn es sich um die Freiheit der Religion handelt ' (' Whether it

¹ *Opuscula theologica*, i. 4^b-5^a.

² *De fide haereticis servanda*, *Opusc. theol.* ii. 1-79. The preface of the second volume is dated 1610. Concerning Becan, see also Duhr, *Jesuiten-fabeln*, p. 111 ff.

³ Pp. 35-39.

⁴ Pp. 46-49, 58-68.

is necessary to keep faith with heretics, when it is a question of freedom of religion'). Becanus begins by reminding his readers that Christ's ideal, according to the testimony of the Gospel, was that men should have but one faith, one Church, and one supreme shepherd. A variety of religions in a State was dangerous, and disturbed the peace of civil life, as is seen from the history of the Donatists, the Iconoclasts, the Albigenses, the Hussites, and the Calvinists in England, Belgium, France, and Poland. No Catholic prince, therefore, ought of his own accord to introduce religious freedom. The greatest emperors of Christian antiquity, Fathers of the Church, such as Ambrosius, Chrysostom, Augustine, had striven with the utmost zeal to preserve to the Catholic Church alone the right of public worship of God. 'If, however, the Catholic ruling authorities in any given place are unable to prevent the existence of other modes of belief and worship side by side with the Catholic faith, without occasioning still worse evil to the community, they must then be allowed to tolerate the unorthodox religions.' This was the emphatic teaching of Thomas of Aquinas, and in the same sense, says Becanus, spoke the scholars of the Jesuit Order, Maldonat, Gregory of Valentia, and Molina. If, then, he says, in concluding his typical instances, a Catholic authority seals a contract with heretics with reference to toleration of this sort, 'there is no question whatever but that the contract must be adhered to; for the obligation of faith and loyalty arises out of every legitimate, honest compact. At the same time, however, it is permissible, and in accordance with the moral law, that freedom of religion be tolerated in order to avoid greater evil, and a Catholic prince has full

right to make such toleration the subject-matter of a treaty; and, if he does so, he is bound in honour to keep his word.’¹

In 1593 Peter Stevart, professor of theology at Ingolstadt, entreated the Emperor, princes, and Estates that ‘for God’s sake and for the establishment of truth they would plainly state whether they had ever received from the Society of Jesus any such instructions and counsels for the extermination of all the Evangelicals and Protestants.’ ‘For if your Imperial Majesty and your princely graces do really declare that the Jesuits are contemplating sanguinary onslaughts of this kind, our German nation will then come forward and call on your Imperial Majesty and the princes for vengeance against these insurrectionary people, and insist that they shall be at once sentenced to death.’

Stevart wrote thus in a pamphlet entitled ‘Apologie oder Rettungsschrift der lobwürdigen Societät Jesu,’ which was a refutation of a so-called history of this Order, compiled by Polycarp Leiser from the papers of Elias Hasenmüller.²

If the Jesuits, as this history says, were really

¹ Pp. 49–58. ‘. . . nam fides servari debet in omni pacto licito et honesto. Atqui licitum et honestum est tolerare libertatem religionis ad maius malum evitandum, et de ea toleranda licite et honeste pacisci potest princeps Catholicus: ergo, si paciscitur, fidem servare debet. See vol. ix. p. 463, note 1. The Louvain professor, Johann Molanus, wrote three treatises in refutation of the statement that it was not necessary to keep faith with heretics. On the Protestant side Johannes Gisenius, professor of theology at the University of Giessen, defended in 1618, with repeated allusion to Becanus, the thesis that ‘with regard to heretics [*i.e.*, for Gisenius, chiefly Catholics] faith must be observed.’ *De Papismo, disputatio 20* (Giessae, 1618), pp. 389–390.

² The Latin title of the Apology of 1503 is in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 327, note 1. I make use of the German translation of Kleophas Distlmeyer (Ingolstadt, 1594). Concerning the *Hasenmüller-Leiserische ‘Geschichte,’* I give fuller details later on in chapter ix.

‘bestial creatures, sodomists, diabolical furies, sedition-mongers, open robbers, traitors of the whole Roman Empire,’ it was impossible ‘but that such crimes and enormities should be known to the Emperor and to the princes and towns in which and among whom the Jesuits not only dwell, but are also highly beloved and gladly entertained.’ ‘What else is the act of harbouring robbers, murderers, and traitors but a crime of *lèse-majesté*? If then the Imperial Majesty and all the leading princes and lords, as well as the imperial cities, house, harbour, and give maintenance to lewd, mischievous people of this sort, what else are they doing than compassing the downfall of the Roman Empire, and putting themselves on the level of perfidious public enemies?’ He declared Leiser guilty of the crime of *lèse-majesté*, and deserving of severe punishment.¹

The bitter hatred with which the preachers secretly pursued the Jesuits is easily explicable from the fact that the latter were the most valiant and undaunted defenders of the Church, and that they contributed the most to its preservation in Germany. But it is a baseless calumny, Stevart declares, that they aimed at overthrowing the Religious Peace, and that they thirsted after the blood of the heretics. In reality they were intent on other objects.

‘When we call to mind the happy, blessed, and peaceful state which was the lot of our dear ancestors, the ancient Germans, and then consider the wretched, disturbed, anarchical condition to which we have now been brought by our passion for innovation, neither I myself, nor the Society of Jesus, nor any good-hearted, pious Christian can refrain from tears. What happiness

¹ Stevart, vii. 56, 219 ff.

and prosperity prevailed in our German land, and indeed throughout the whole Roman Empire, when the people with one consent lived in submission to the will of the spiritual overseers and bishops, whom they obeyed as the ministers of God ; when in one body they attended one same Church service, participated in the same sacraments, recognised the same ecclesiastical overseer and pastor ; when with unanimous heart and voice they invoked God in heaven, when they joined in one uniform service, when all life and faith were united and harmonious, when things sacred and things secular, things earthly and things divine were kept separate. when the Church was enriched by the bounty of the wealthy and the alms of the poor : in return for which the divine blessing and favour vied, as it were, with the generosity of the pious God-fearing men and women in such a manner that it often seemed a matter of doubt whether those who despised riches and spent lavishly did not acquire greater abundance of possessions than those who toiled after them day and night with the utmost solicitude. But we have more reason to weep over our present miserable times than we have power to improve them. A Polycarpian satirist, however, might well mock and declare that the old times were not so happy as the present ones ; this is the real golden age ; for in these days the right and true gospel has been dragged out from its hiding-place and brought to the light of day ; just as if the wished-for peace and the Gospel, felicity and the true faith were opposed to each other, and could not exist side-by-side.’¹

Since, however, ‘ the general peace of Christendom has disappeared,’ we should at any rate strive to main-

¹ Stevart, pp. 193-195.

tain the unity of the faith in those lands which are still Catholic. This is the duty of princes and rulers. 'If in any such places an agitator should be discovered who is attempting to introduce a new form of worship, new rites and Church usages, a new evangel and new doctrine, such a one must be excluded and ejected from the Christian community. And if he should interfere with the general well-being, or it should be feared that he was likely to stir up sedition or mutiny, he must be driven out with contumely. If, however, after all these measures he should still refuse to keep quiet, he must then be punished in life and person for his impious, insurrectionary behaviour.'

But with regard to those districts where 'heresy has not only crept in to some slight extent, but has gained a strong and widespread footing, and where consequently peace and tranquillity cannot continue, the Catholics do not teach and require that the perverts should, either secretly or openly, be exterminated by soldiers or executioners. On the contrary, whereas they are bound by the treaties and the recesses of the Roman Empire to tolerate these said heretics and to connive somewhat at their doings, the Catholic doctors and the Jesuits recommend that it be, at any rate, required of the heretics and preachers that they should be satisfied with what they have already got possession of, and that they should not proceed any further in thwarting us in our church service, despoiling churches, pillaging or confiscating convents and nunneries, and dishonouring nuns. Also that influence should be exercised over them to keep them to one religion and to prevent their constantly changing the form of their confession; if they are Lutherans, they should remain

Lutherans, and not become Calvinists, or even perhaps atheists. And if those who are at liberty to profess and practise any religion they like, in opposition to the Roman Catholic faith, have recourse to the utmost violence to stir up all sorts of sedition, to drive the old-established lords from their possessions, the priests from their churches, the monks from their monasteries, why should not it be equally legitimate for us to put down such unlawful violence with a strong hand, to meet and to stem such agitation with force and with firearms, and to cut short the licence and insolence by which the ruin and destruction of such multitudes of human beings is being compassed ? ’

‘ The wish and aim of the Jesuits is—first, that all heresies be destroyed, root and branch, so that nobody may suffer injury either in body or soul, and that all the sects should return to and be reunited in the one Catholic religion. Secondly, they desire that the sun should not shine on a single evangelical preacher ; they desire that the preachers should either return to the true and saving faith or else be so effectively held in check that they will be content to mind their own business without inciting the common people against the Catholics ; and that if they should exceed these bounds and proceed to upset the general peace, they should live on more friendly, trustful, and peaceful terms with us Catholics than has, alas ! hitherto been the case ; and that the schisms which have destroyed the old Catholic unity and confidence in matters of religion should, at any rate, not interfere with Christian peace and unity in civic life : that is to say, that there be no violation of faith and honour and oaths that have been pledged, no transgressions against the treaties and

alliances contracted in the Empire. This is the feeling and the heart's desire of all Catholics and of all Jesuits.'

Stevart declared as emphatically as Erstenberger that the Protestants insisted on freedom of their religion in Catholic territories, but that they themselves would not grant the Catholics any freedom in the exercise of theirs; on the contrary, wherever the Protestants were in power they extirpated the Catholics entirely. 'Would to God that this were realised more fully and deeply. We Catholics repudiate freedom of religion in words, but for the sake of peace we allow it in fact. The Lutherans, on the contrary, in sugared words, make promises of great freedom and liberty; but in their actions—especially as regards the Catholic religion—they do away with freedom altogether.' In particular 'the impious, raving preachers bestir themselves to the utmost to deprive us Catholics of all our liberties.'¹

Like Martin Becanus, the Jesuit Matthias Mayrhofer, in 1601, also 'repudiated the slanderous outcry' that the Jesuits preached that faith need not be kept with heretics. It was, however, 'unjust and preposterous that on the strength of the Religious Peace the Lutheran overlords should be entitled to force their subjects into their heresies, while the Catholic Estates, who have undoubted and irrefutable knowledge of divine truth, should not be allowed the exercise of the same right; 'this "right" must be taken away from those caterpillar-like preachers who could preach of nothing but fleshly liberty.'² The bloodthirsty preachers, at any rate, deserved the most rigorous punishment. In this matter of punishing the heretics it was not a question of those

¹ Stevart, pp. 197, 200–202, 205 ff., 216.

² Mayrhofer, *Katholische Schutzschrift*, pp. 310, 364 ff.

who were 'quiet and harmless,' those of whom St. Gregory says: 'If any man does not tolerate evildoers, he shows by his intolerance that he himself is not good.' On the other hand, 'there were others as dangerous and as stiffnecked as their preachers; and it is with these that we are concerned.'¹

'In Christian antiquity, and still more in the Middle Ages, the existing law required that the most rigorous penalties should be enforced against public heretics. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Catholic and Protestant teachers and ruling authorities were still unanimously in favour of this rule.'²

The very mildest of the Jesuits, Father Canisius, expressed in forcible language his conviction that the Catholic princes were in duty bound to employ severe penal measures for ridding their dominions of 'the pest which had so lamentably disfigured Germany and covered her with ignominy in the sight of all pious people.' In a letter of June 18, 1558, he referred Duke Albert V. of Bavaria to the example of Charles V.: after his abdication Charles had manifested the greatest zeal in the defence of the true religion, and had been active in effecting that all Lutherans discovered in Spain should be taken into custody and severely punished as examples to others. 'I tell you this,' Canisius wrote, 'in order to afford your reverence consolation, and at the same time to hold up a mirror before your eyes and thus strengthen your princely heart against those craven spirits whose hesitation, connivance, silence, and concessions do not restore to us what we have lost, but, on the contrary, tend to the almost complete extinction

¹ P. 377.

² Hergenröther, pp. 543-616.

of religion among the Catholics.’¹ With still greater resoluteness a few Cologne Jesuits in 1560 urged Duke William of Cleves to take forcible proceedings against the heretics. Johannes Monheim, president of the gymnasium at Düsseldorf, had at the time published a catechism for his ‘Quartaner and Quintaner,’² which, under cover of Catholic orthodoxy, put forward all sorts of Protestant—essentially Calvinistic—doctrines.³ In a drastic refutation of this work—the so-called ‘Cologne Censure,’⁴ which caused a tremendous stir among the Protestants, and gave rise to a bitter pen-and-ink controversy—the Cologne Jesuits declared that ‘the stubborn heretics who spread dissension everywhere ought to be punished as thieves, robbers, and murderers are punished: indeed, more severely even than such criminals; for the latter only injure the body, while the former plunge souls into everlasting perdition.’⁵ The Catholic princes ought to drive out of their midst these wolves and foxes that ravage the Lord’s vineyard,’ they ought to ‘check their proceedings by stern decrees, or, failing all other means, expel them from their lands with fire and sword, or else punish the desperate villains by death.’⁶ ‘If, forty years ago, Luther had been executed or burnt at the stake, or if certain other persons had been put out of the world, we should not have been

¹ From Rome on June 18, 1558, in Braunsberger, ii. 281–284.

² Boys of the fourth and fifth forms.

³ *Catechismus, in quo Christianae religionis elementa sincere explicantur.* Düsseldorfii, 1560.

⁴ *Censura et docta Explicatio Errorum Catechismi I. Monhemii, &c.* Coloniae, 1560. See Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 608, note 1. The work dedicated to Duke William was not intended for the people or for the young students; but, as is seen from the title, the contents, the plan, and the mode of reasoning, for men of learning and research.

⁵ *Censura*, pp. 130–138.

⁶ *Censura*, pp. 313–317.

subjected to such abominable dissensions nor to these multitudes of sects who upset the whole world.’¹

‘O ye princes and lords,’ said the Munich canon Dobereiner in 1570, ‘it is no proof or act of mercy or kindness, but rather cruelty of the worst description, when a man of this sort, through whose instrumentality thousands may be ruined and brought to perdition, is allowed to go unpunished.’²

The same opinion was expressed in 1573 by the theologian Andreas Fabricius, the tutor of Duke Ernest of Bavaria, in a Latin work on the Augsburg Confession which he dedicated to the Bavarian Dukes Albert V. and Ernest, and in which he urged the Emperor and the Catholic princes to make use of the sword entrusted to them for the protection of the Church in order to enforce the decrees of the Council of Trent.³ Two years later this exhortation was repeated by the Salzburg jurist Johann Fickler; it was, he wrote, ‘a paramount duty’ of the ruling authorities ‘to use all means at their command’ in order to keep their subjects firm in the Catholic faith, and, if necessary, to root out the heretics with fire and sword. For this new evangel, so much boasted of, was ‘nothing else than a cloak for all manner of faithlessness, perjury, and insolence.’ ‘They bend, twist, and turn the Holy Scriptures entirely at their liking. Each one understands them and explains

¹ *Censura*, p. 136. The zeal of the Cologne censors did not confine itself to their opponents in the faith. The Catholic magnates, also, both lay and spiritual, were plied with solemn admonitions. They were reproached with the immense sums spent on the maintenance of quantities of servants, of horses and dogs, while the schools were neglected, and the poor little or not at all cared for, &c. See pp. 138-141, 313-315.

² *Der Calvinister Kehrab* (Munich, 1570), Bl. Q. 3^a.

³ Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 607, note 3. See the *Notwendige Besichtigung der hessischen Theologen*, p. 519.

them according as his wicked inclination dictates to him. If a man is inclined to commit adultery, he invents a meaning for some passage of Scripture by which he can justify and excuse his sin. If any have a passion for extravagance, gluttony, drinking, for spending days and nights in rioting, for despising and neglecting fasting and abstinence, they find plenty of fellows to tell them that "all things are pure, and nothing defiles which goes in at the mouth." With such words they give good cheer to drunkards and fast-breakers. If anyone has a longing to lay hands on another's goods, he can find evangelical teachers who will sanction such a proceeding from the Scriptures. If anybody causes an uproar or a rebellion against the rulers or against the heads of the Church, they have but to go to the leaders of the sects, and they will quickly learn to praise such impious proceedings and defend them out of the Holy Scriptures—and not these only, but all sorts of kindred offences—insolence, disobedience, and wantonness.¹ In the year 1588, Peter Muchitsch, provost at Pöllau, in Styria, said in a pamphlet against the Würtemberg theologians: 'The Augsburg Confession has been condemned by the highest ecclesiastical and secular ruling authorities; what more, then, can happen or be desired in the matter? Nothing, indeed, except that the preachers also, as convicted and condemned culprits, should be cast on a funeral pile together with this "Confession."' He dedicated the pamphlet to the Archduke Ferdinand in order to 'advise and admonish him to begin betimes in his tender youth to combat and

¹ *Theologia jurídica* (1575). See Stieve, *Ursprung*, pp. 61-62; *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 607, note 4; translated into German in '*Richtschnur rechter Lehr*' (1597), Bl. E. 3^a-F^b.

shun the enemies of God and of His divine word, and of the alone-saving Catholic religion; these enemies being—besides the devil, the Turks, and the heathen—the Lutherans, the Calvinists, and other heretics; he must be more on his guard against these than against all other dangers and disasters.’¹ In a second pamphlet, published in 1590, against the Württemberg theologians, Muchitsch exclaims: ‘O Moses, thou zealous servant of God, do thou come back again to this world and give us again a law by which these disobedient, proud, puffed-up Württemberg toads, together with all other Lutheran and heretical preachers, must die by the hand of the executioner.’²

Pamphlets of this sort were ‘like an echo of the vociferations of countless preaching agitators who raged and clamoured for the extirpation of all the Catholic clergy and of all Catholic, or, as they said, Baalith religion and worship.’³

The worst of these ‘vociferators’ was the Calvinist David Pareus, professor of theology at Heidelberg. In 1618 he published, with a semblance of immense erudition, a well-weighed and calmly reasoned-out explanation of the Apocalypse, in the course of which he

¹ *Paedagogia, oder Schulführung der württembergischen Theologen* (Ingolstadt, 1590); first edition 1588. See Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 607, note 5). First part, preface, and p. 41; cf. pp. 52–53.

² This pamphlet is only known to me from the quotation in Stieve, ii. 607, note 1, at the conclusion. On Peter Muchitsch and his polemics against the Württemberg theologians, see also Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 547 ff. What, however, is the meaning of Loserth’s remark ‘he belonged to the leading representatives of Jesuit scholars in the land,’ if he was not a Jesuit himself? Loserth expatiates indignantly on the coarseness of this man’s polemics, but is careful not to produce corresponding specimens of the ‘forcible replies’ of his Protestant opponent Wilhelm Holder, of Tübingen.

³ *Von neuen calvinischen Giftspinnen*, p. 13.

summoned all the Protestant kings and princes to a bloody crusade against the papacy. Rome, he said, was the seat of the Beast, the Sodom of the Apocalypse, where adultery and fornication reigned, and idolatry worse than that of the Egyptians. 'Is there anything more dreadful than the Pope, whose footsteps are worshipped by emperors and kings? What can exceed the rapacity of Rome? There is no crime, no deed of infamy committed anywhere in the world, which does not bring a cartload of ducats into the Roman treasury. Where do we find greed of gold greater than among the clergy? What can be more terrible than the Pope's indulgences, bulls, and breves, which are written, not with ink, but with blood?' 'Well, now, God expressly commands all pious princes to requite the Roman Antichrist and his kingdom with twofold measure what he has done amiss.' The princes must not be content with overthrowing his throne with a conquering army; in this onslaught of divine retribution they must not shrink from inflicting the most terrible deaths, they must stop at no torture and martyrdom; such is the divine command. It had been prophesied that a great king would arise who in a forty years' war would demolish all tyrants, conquer Spain and Italy, burn down Rome, slay the Popes, and also subjugate the Turks; after which peace would ensue for all pious Christians.¹

At that date the punishment of heretics was still

¹ *Opera theologico-exegetica* (Francofurti, 1647), tom. ii. pars 4, pp. 618-844: 'In divinam Apocalypsin.' See especially pp. 736, 788, 795-796. '... nulla poena, nullus cruciatus sat magnus' ... 'in ultione exercenda nullum severitatis aut supplicii genus praetermittant, non suo affectu, sed *Dei jussu*' ... 'Imperatur vindicta ... regibus et principibus piis, ad hos et ad *copias eorum militares* ista hortationis pars praecipue pertinet, et modus exponitur quo illud dederit Deus in corda eorum, quia, videlicet, *expresso mandato hanc eis vindictam imperavit.*'

considered by the Protestants themselves to be a law of the land. Even the theologian Johann Gisenius, one of their mildest spokesmen, declared it to be 'the duty of the evangelical ruling authorities to punish and excommunicate a simple sectary after he had been subjected to the verdict of the Church, in order to prevent his doing any further mischief by the propagation of his errors and by seduction of the people ;' it was only the execution of sectaries which was not allowed to the magistracy in the new compact.¹ But other theologians were in favour of execution. 'Tell us yourself,' wrote Jacob Silvanus in his refutation of a controversial pamphlet of the Elector Palatine's councillor Löfenius, in 1607, 'whether it is your opinion that heretics can or cannot be punished by the ruling powers ? What, then, must poor Servetus do on the funeral pile ? Hear what says Beza, your idol : "Those who deny that we ought to punish heretics are in league with the party which is introducing a thoroughly corrupt and pestilential conception of the Church of God. They are acting more senselessly and execrably than if they were to declare that it is wrong to punish sacrilegious persons and parricides ; for heretics are beyond all comparison worse than blasphemers of God and murderers." ' ' ²

Melanchthon emphatically corroborated Beza's statement that heretics should be punished by death. Zwingli, of course, regarded the slaughter of bishops and clergy as a God-ordained work. Martin Bucer gave it as his opinion that 'the civil authorities must not tolerate the exercise of false religion and popish idolatry side-by-side with the ministry of the Gospel.' If

¹ *De Papismo, disputatio 19* (Giessae, 1618), p. 372.

² J. Silvan, *Philippika* (Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 919, note 1), 18.

thieves, robbers, and murderers are subjected to severe punishments, the adherents of a false religion should be punished still more rigorously ; the civil authorities, he contended, had the right to extirpate them with fire and sword, and even to strangle their wives and children, as, indeed, God had commanded in the ancient covenant.¹

¹ See our remarks, vol. v. pp. 180, 290, 291. Respecting Bucer's opinion, see Paulus, 'M. Butzer und die Gewissensfreiheit' in the *Katholik*, 1891, ii. 44-71. See also *Hist.-pol. Bl.* 107 (1891), p. 793 ff. Concerning Melancthon's approval of the execution of Servetus, see also Galli, *Die lutherischen und calvinischen Kirchenstrafen gegen Laien im Reformationszeitalter* (Berlin, 1879), p. 129. How extraordinarily intolerant Melancthon was, not only towards the Catholics but also towards Anabaptists and other dissenters from the Church, is shown by Paulus in his 'Melancthon und die Gewissensfreiheit' in the *Katholik*, 1897, i. 460 ff., 534 ff. When Funk says in *Welzer und Wette's Kirchenlexikon*, viii. (2nd edition), 1213, 'Melancthon, thus, represents in this respect [intolerance] no other standpoint than that of the Middle Ages,' he overlooks one important distinction to which Paulus emphatically, and with right, draws attention (*l.c.* 463). Melancthon concedes to the civil authorities the right of decision in matters of religion, while on the Catholic side decision in matters of religious doctrine is claimed by the infallible Church. Dr. Conrad Braun drew attention to this important distinction as early as the days of Luther (see Paulus, *l.c.* 464). Thus arose a despotism, 'the like of which had never yet been seen. The new system, as it was now built up by theologians and jurists, was worse than Byzantine tyranny, for there, at any rate, the attempt had never been made to change the religion of the people. The Protestant princes, however, were not merely Popes in their dominions, they were much more ; they took upon themselves to do what no Pope had ever thought of doing. For every Pope knew well that his power was only preservative—power to guard and keep the doctrine committed to him, and that every attempt on his part to alter the teaching of the Church would inevitably be put down by general resistance. The Protestant princes, however, were told, and they themselves believed and proclaimed it, that their power in religious matters was altogether limitless, and that in the exercise of it they had only to reckon with their own consciences. Of course, they always protested that they wielded this power in accordance with "the Evangel" or the Holy Scriptures ; but it was the Scriptures as interpreted by themselves or by the court-preachers of their own choosing.' (Döllinger, *Kirche und Kirchen* [Munich, 1861], p. 55 ff.). 'Whereas formerly the State had exercised its power in subordination to the ecclesiastical authority of the Church, the religion of the subjects was now the divided domain of

Luther, who had at first strongly disapproved of the execution of heretics, began, after 1530, to advocate capital punishment for false doctrine and heresy.¹

lords of territories. At the word of command the inhabitants had to become Catholic to-day, Augsburgian or Lutheran to-morrow. If, then, the Reformation, for all its pains, brought no advantage, at any rate, with regard to individual freedom of conscience, it is responsible for immeasurable damage in respect of that other fundamental principle of Christianity, the freedom of the Church.' (Fr. Maassen, *Neun Kapitel über freie Kirche und Gewissensfreiheit* [Graz, 1876], p. 279.)

¹ This comes out clearly (as Paulus, *Katholik*, 1897, i. 539 ff., has shown) in Luther's explanation of the 82nd Psalm, as well as in a pamphlet of 1536. In the explanation of the Psalm (*Der LXXXII. Psalm, ausgelegt von Mart. Luther, Wittenberg, 1530, C^a-F¹, Luther's Werke, Erlanger Ausgabe, Bd. 39, pp. 250-258*), he deals exhaustively with the questions 'whether the secular rulers ought to check and punish objectionable doctrines or heresies.' 'There are two sorts of heretics,' he says: 'first, those who are turbulent and seditious; these must undoubtedly be punished. Then there are others who teach in opposition to some recognised article of faith which is manifestly grounded on Scripture and is believed by good Christians all over the world, such as are taught to children in the Creed: as, for instance, the heresy which some of them teach, that Christ is not God, but only an ordinary man, and just the same as any other prophet of the Turks or of the Anabaptists; heretics of this sort must not be tolerated, but punished as open blasphemers. Moses in his laws commands that blasphemers of this sort, and indeed all false teachers, are to be stoned to death. And there must not be lengthy disputation on the subject; such blasphemy must be condemned without that or examination. . . . For articles of belief of this sort, held by united Christendom, have been sufficiently inquired into and thoroughly established by the Scriptures and by the unanimous assent of all Christians.' Sermons calculated to disturb the unity of the faith, Luther goes on, must not be tolerated, still less must private preaching and secret ceremonies be allowed. It is the duty of the burghers to give information of any of these clandestine proceedings to the civil authorities and to the clergy. 'If anyone wishes to preach or to teach, let him make known the call or the command which impels him to do so, or else let him keep silence. If he will not keep quiet, then let the civil authorities commend the scoundrel to his rightful master—namely, Master Hans [hangman].' In the [injunction] of 1536 (published in the *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* xxviii. [1358], p. 560 ff.), a distinction is again drawn between seditious and purely heretical doctrines. 'That seditious articles of doctrine should be punished with the sword needed no further proof. For the rest, the Anabaptists hold tenets relating to infant baptism, original sin, and inspiration which have no

‘Never,’ wrote the Kolmar Augustinian prior Johannes Hoffmeister in 1539, ‘has there been greater coercion practised than in the case of the evangelical faith, where nobody is allowed to preach or to do anything but what Dr. Luther and his apostates dictate. And if we had acted according to what Bucer wrote to the Augsburg Confessionists, there would long ago have been another flood in our German lands ; but a flood,

connection with the Word of God, and are indeed opposed to it. . . . Concerning such tenets, this is our answer : As the secular authorities are bound to control and punish open blasphemy, so they are also bound to restrain and punish avowedly false doctrine, irregular Church services and heresies in their own dominions ; for this is commanded by God in the other commandment where He says : “ Whoso dishonours God’s name shall not go unpunished.” Everybody is bound, according to his position and office, to prevent and check blasphemy, and by virtue of this command the princes and magistrates have power and authority to put a stop to irregular Church worship. The text in Leviticus xxiv. goes to show the same thing : “ He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death.” The ruling authorities, however, must suffer themselves to be properly and correctly instructed in order that they may be certain how to proceed, and that nobody may do wrong. Now there are some among these articles of faith which signify very much. For think what disaster would ensue if children were not baptized ; what would be the final outcome but thoroughly heathenish existence ? *Item*, infant baptism rests on such sure foundations that the Anabaptists have no legitimate grounds for rejecting it. *Item*, if they say that children do not need forgiveness of sins, that there is no original sin, such statements are downright and very dangerous errors. Besides this the Anabaptists separate themselves from the churches, even in those places where pure Christian doctrine prevails, and where the abuses and idolatrous practices have been abolished, and they set up a ministry and congregation of their own, which is also contrary to the command of God. From all this it becomes clear that the secular authorities are bound to suppress blasphemy, false doctrine, and heresy, and to inflict corporal punishment on the offenders. In the case of Anabaptist tenets which are opposed to the secular government the matter is easier to deal with ; for there is no doubt that in such cases the stiffnecked recalcitrants are sure to be punished as sedition-mongers. Also when it is a case of only upholding some spiritual tenet, such as infant baptism, original sin, and unnecessary separation, then, because these articles are also important . . . we conclude that in these cases also the stubborn sectaries must be put to death.’

not of water, but of blood.’¹ The representatives of the new Church system, almost without exception, contended for wholesale intolerance of all who thought differently from themselves. In the year 1554, the ‘Reformer’ Jerome Zanchi in Strasburg, taught that Catholics who would not become Protestants should be expelled from the country, thrown into prison, or even sentenced to death. With regard to heretics, Zanchi proclaimed, both at Strasburg and, later on, at Heidelberg, that the ruling authorities were in duty bound to pronounce sentence of death on them; this, he added, was the opinion of all the truly pious and learned men of the time. ‘It is the teaching of the churches of Zurich, Bern, Geneva, Lausanne, in short of almost all the churches of Switzerland and of South Germany. Bullinger, Bucer, Melanchthon, all taught the same.’

The Protestant professor Peter Martyr, Vermigli,² and the well-known Urban Rhegius also confessed to the same principles. The latter taught that it was the duty of rulers ‘to have recourse to the sword to prevent the name of the most holy God being blasphemed by heresy’; avowed heretics should be punished with the sword. In the church-ordinances which were compiled for the town by Urban Rhegius, and were published in 1536, it says: ‘Not only every schoolmaster among us, but also every father and mother must be prohibited from inoculating their children with false doctrine.’³

¹ *Katholik*, 1891, ii. 71.

² See Paulus, ‘Die Stellung der protestantischen Professoren Zanchi und Vermigli zur Gewissensfreiheit,’ *Katholik*, 1891, i. 201-228, and the valuable monograph: *Die Strasburger Reformatoren und die Gewissensfreiheit. Strasburg. theol. Studien* (Freiburg i. Br.), Bd. 2, Heft 2.

³ See the interesting article ‘Urban Rhegius über Glaubenszwang und Kirchenstrafen,’ in the *Hist.-pol. Bl.* 109 (1892, pp. 822 ff. 827). This article fills an important gap; but, nevertheless, in the otherwise admirable

Johannes Benz also considered it the duty of magistrates to 'exterminate false teachers.' This did not constitute coercion of conscience, he argued, for wherever there was conscience there must first have been science, and there can be no science without truth. 'Therefore all persons who are led astray by devil's deceit and who wallow in lies and deception have, as a matter of fact, no true conscience, but only a false, blurred, counterfeit one, just as false coin is no coin, and a painting of a man is not a real man. When faith is lost, then heart, wisdom, and understanding are lost also, and therefore to thwart such people is not to thwart conscience. Where there is no faith, there is no conscience to be looked for or to be respected. Where there is no faith there is nothing that need be spared.'¹

When, in the year 1570, the sentence on the two Arians of the Palatine Electorate, Neuser and Johann Silvan, was under discussion, the Heidelberg Calvinist theologians gave it as their opinion that both these men should be put to death either by the sword or the gallows. The Elector Frederic III. signed the death-warrants with his own hand, although Silvan had recanted. The Elector Augustus of Saxony and his political councillors had also, at Frederic's request, advocated the execution

pamphlet of Irenicus, *Die grundsätzliche Unduldsamkeit der Reformation* (Vienna, 1890), Rhegius is not in any way mentioned. Schlegel, in his *Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte von Norddeutschland und den hannoverischen Staaten*, ii. (Hannover, 1829), p. 77, remarks: 'To what a preposterous height intolerance had then reached is seen from the fact that according to these [the town regulations of 1536 and 1544] the Anabaptists were to suffer capital punishment; Zwinglians and Papists were to be scourged with rods and condemned to perpetual banishment; and blasphemy and attendance at Mass were classed together as regards punishment.'

¹ F. Bidenbach, *Consilia theologica, Decad. III. et IV.* (Francof., 1608), pp. 168-173; cf. *Hist.-pol. Bl.* 110 (1892), 85 ff.

of heretics because 'their terrible blasphemy and their highly reprehensible proceedings ought to be severely punished as an example to others.'¹

In Saxony, in July 1574, the court of sheriffs condemned a linen-weaver at Leipzig to death because he had sinned against baptism, and had defended errors concerning the Holy Trinity. If 'no signs of mental aberration were detected in him,' he was, 'on account of his stiffneckedness, his heretical errors and blasphemies, in accordance with justice and the customary usage, to be punished by loss of life by fire; and, furthermore, his goods and chattels were to be rightly seized and sold by the chief secular authorities.' Nine years later, in October 1583, the court of sheriffs was again called upon to pronounce judgment on another offender who was charged with being guilty of 'heretical errors' against the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the merits of Christ, and other articles of the Christian faith. 'If,' ran the verdict, 'he still persisted in these heresies before the court, and if also no symptom of insanity was found in him, then for these offences, in accordance with the common, written imperial law, and the sentence previously passed of loss of life, and according to the usual general custom, he must be punished with fire.'²

¹ See our remarks, vol. viii. pp. 156 161, and Paulus, 'Joh. Sylvanus und sein tragisches Ende,' *Hist.-pol. Bl.* 121 (1898), 250 ff.

² Both verdicts are given in full in Carpzov, *Practica nova*, pars 1, pp. 245-249. Carpzov himself in 1635 expressed his opinion as follows on the punishment of heretics: '*Nefandum crimen haereseos est gravissimum atque atrocissimum, quippe quod non in homines, ut pleraque iniquitas et malitia, sed in autorem Deum communemque omnium parentem ac Dominum, detestabilis et execranda perfidia est*' (Carpzov, *Practica nova*, pp. 19, 44, note 2, p. 241). '*Haeresin autem appello pertinacem in articulis fidei errorem*' (note 4). '*. . . Tantum itaque abest, magistratum politicum in haereticos animadvertere non posse, ut potius hoc facere eidem omni jure incumbat, si alias officio suo fungi et cultum divinum sartum tectumque*

In Ansbach-Bayreuth also they proceeded according to the common usage. The criminal court ordinance of the Margrave George Frederic decreed in 1582 that 'All persons who were recognised as heretics by the regular ecclesiastical tribunal, and handed over to the civil tribunal for judgment, must suffer capital punishment by fire.'¹

conservare velit. Idque tam apud nostrates theologos quam pontificios atque Calvinianos minus dubii habet. Ast illud controversum est, an haeretici ultimo supplicio afficiendi (note 19). The Papists and the Calvinists, says Carpzov, answer this question in the affirmative. '*Hi [Calviniani] enim quando liberiori fruuntur aura et praesidio potentiorum sese tutos esse animadvertunt, in hasce tyrannicas voces erumpunt, haereticos esse occidendos* (Beza, vol. i. fol. 153 sq.; Danaeus in *Ethica Christian.* i. 2. c. 13, fol. 159; Francisc. Jun. in *Defens.* 2 de *S. Trinitate*, p. 4); *quin Luc. Osiander in Responso ad apolog. Heidelbergens. dixisse quondam Ecclesiasten Calvinisticum quemdam testis est: si Romanus Imperator foret, se omnes interfectorum, qui suam religionem non amplecterentur* (note 28). But the '*Evangelici Orthodoxi*' are milder; first of all admonition, then excommunication, and if that does no good, banishment (notes 30-31). Then follows a modifying clause which almost neutralises this 'mildness': '*Quod si vero haeretici aut facinorosi et seditiosi, pacis publicae et civilis violatores existant, alios ad seditionem commoventes; vel si sint blasphemi, qui absque fronte et manifestis verbis Deum Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum blasphemant, his capitis poenam seu ultimum supplicium decerni, nulla prohibet religio. Et in hoc fere conveniunt omnes . . . ; sic Bernae de Valentino Gentili, Genevae de Serveto supplicium fuit sumptum . . . Usu ac consuetudine Saxonica obtinuit, ejusmodi haereticos seditiosos aut blasphemantes igne comburi*' (notes 41-45, pp. 242-245). Carpzov himself considers capital punishment by the sword sufficient.

¹ *Peinliche Halsgerichtsordnung*, fol. 27, no. 132.

CHAPTER VI

ATTEMPTS TO DISSOLVE ALL FELLOWSHIP BETWEEN
CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS

DURING the last thirty odd years of the sixteenth century the controversy between Catholics and Protestants had gathered more and more bitterness, and 'the number of controversial writers had grown so large—larger indeed with every year—that it might truly be said that all force of mind and of learning spent itself in strife and wrangling.' 'It is a source of distress to me,' said Perellius in 1576, 'that most of the pamphlets which are publicly printed, and which come out under such imposing and ostentatious titles, are so empty of understanding and judgment, so reckless and ill-considered, that worthy, pious people cannot read them without being shocked. It grieves me that the licence of these maniacs of the pen—I dare not say their unbridled behaviour and manners—prevails almost everywhere nowadays, so much so that there is scarcely a single individual who does not, so to say, touch sacred matters as well as secular ones "with unwashed hands"; yea, verily, who does not scribble and prate just whatever pleases him about, and out of, the word of God. It also distresses me that the flames of dissension which are raging so fiercely, and which have consumed a large portion of Europe, should be fanned by all the tricks and artifices of malicious authors, who, as it were,

throw oil on the fire, and cause it to spread and increase from day to day, while fresh errors and absurdities bubble up continually as from a perennial spring. And lastly, it grieves me greatly that the Estates and magistrates of the Empire, through all these causes, have occasioned wider and wider estrangement and separation in our German nation, so that there can be no hope of emerging from all this misery and dissension, and of restoring true uniformity of religion in the Empire.' 'Any and every doctrine, however preposterous and impious, finds writers to defend it and disciples to swear by it, disciples "to whom the bread of lying is sweet," and to whom it is a pleasure to follow senseless leaders and to fall down at the feet of masters who flatter and caress them.' 'Oh the miserable times, the degenerate morals which have introduced such countless evils and abuses into our once flourishing and highly esteemed Germany!' ¹

Forty years later a 'simple layman,' who had given special attention to the publications of the book trade, wrote: 'What true-hearted German and friend of the Fatherland is there, be he Catholic or not, who, if he turn to consider what is the influence that since the beginning of the religious quarrels has been most fruitful in embittering hearts, in producing yearly greater and greater perplexity of mind, wider and wider division between the Estates, citizens, and people of one and the same nation, will not at once declare that the largest share of blame attaches to the multitudes of scribblers and libellists who, against all reason, Christian love, justice, and equity, have carried on a traffic in lies and calumnies which cannot be sufficiently bewailed?'

¹ *Ein Gespräch*, &c., Bl. C¹-C².

‘Under the old Catholic Church our forefathers dwelt together, through many centuries, in one faith and in one mind, joining together in the exercises of piety and in Christian works of beneficence, filling the land with countless institutions for the poor, the sick, and the needy, with schools of high and low degree, with fine architecture, with paintings and statuary, so that we were admired by all other nations; and these ancestors of ours also attained to so great power, honour, prosperity, and well-being, that Germany stood in the first rank among the nations of the world. But what has come of it all? Our country is annihilated and forgotten, and the Catholic Church has become a horror and an abomination to many Estates of high dignity and to multitudes of people; and those who are still loyal to her are as much despised and detested as though they were the lowest dregs of all wickedness and infamy. And this state of things has been brought about by these writers, who, without cessation, pour out the vilest of calumnies and abuse against the Church and Church people, and so effectually pervert the minds of the lower orders that we Catholics have become as scapegoats to the masses, and in many places they will scarcely have any business or other relations with us.’¹

‘The multitudinous scribblers and screamers’ set about consciously and systematically to represent every single Catholic dogma and religious practice as ‘the very scum of all idolatry and blasphemy,’ and to fill the people with disgust of the ‘popish synagogue of the devil and of Satan’s satellites.’ All Protestants who returned to the Catholic Church, and who made known the reasons of their return, stated as the first and prin-

¹ In the passages referred to above, vol. ix. p. 522, note 1.

cipal reason that 'in consequence of diligent research they had come to see that the Church taught wholly different doctrine from what had been falsely represented to them by Protestant theologians and preachers, especially with regard to the doctrines of justification and good works, of the sacraments and sacramentals, of invocation of saints and prayers for the dead. Among other sources from which we may learn what false representations of Catholic doctrine were circulated abroad, even among the cultivated classes, is the autobiography of Lucas Geizkofler. This man was by no means fanatical; he was of a philanthropic disposition, and in relation with Catholics in manifold ways. Nevertheless he put forward, among other things, as Catholic doctrine that 'Christ had only died for original sin; *item*, just as Christ had attained to heaven by His own merits, so, too, each one of us must attain heaven by his own merits; *item*, that the Holy Scriptures, according to the practice of the Church, had had at one time to be interpreted and understood in one way, and at another time in a different way. *Item*, that those who receive communion in both kinds as instituted by Christ, not only get no benefit or fruit of salvation from their participation, but that they "eat and drink" to their everlasting shame and perdition. *Item*, that the Holy Virgin Mary should be venerated in all times of need as an almighty helper.' ¹

It was obviously some such caricature of Catholic teaching which the Protestant theologian Christopher Pezel had in his mind when he wrote, in 1599, that

¹ Wolf, *Lukas Geizkofler*, pp. 11-12. See p. 20, where he cites among other 'gross errors and heresies in the papacy' that 'the greatest crimes and most abominable sins can be atoned for by payment of a few florins.'

the Roman Church was 'a synagogue of evildoers, the kingdom of Antichrist, a den of thieves, the greatest mother of whoredom.'¹

The preacher Echart, in 1605, undertook to demonstrate from 'seventeen proofs' that the papists 'neither worshipped the true God, nor possessed Him, nor had any fear or reverence for Him.' 'The faith of the Catholics is in verity monstrous, chimerical, heathenish, philosophic, unnatural, diabolical . . . an abyss of despair, a refuge for sodomites, thieves, and adulterers.'² The same sentiments had been uttered by the theologian James Heerbrand in the year 1589: 'The Church of the Pope is a renegade, a vagabond harlot . . . who is mistress in the house, has keys, bed, board, cellar, and everything under her command, but is so wicked that in comparison to her common harlots are almost saints; for she is the veritable arch-whore and whore of the devil.'³

'All that emanates from the Pope and the papists,' so another 'faithful minister of the Word' asserted in 1588, 'is dung and stench and bespecked with blood, as the new indulgence bill of the firebrand of hell and the Antichrist, Sixtus Quintus, will at this very moment easily convince all intelligent persons acquainted with papistical practices.'

Sixtus V. had at that time issued an indulgence to a brotherhood at Augsburg. This simple, purely spiritual dispensation, was made use of to show up

¹ *Jesuiticorum Catechismorum Refutatio* (Bremæ, 1599, pp. 276-277) The most extravagant perversion of Catholic teaching came from the pen of Leonhard Hutter in his work *De lamentabili, &c., Statu Ecclesiae*, published in 1608.

² *Papa pharisaizans*, pp. 24 ff., 161-168. See *Vorrede*, A 2^e.

³ *Ketzer-Katzen* (Tübingen, 1589), p. 58.

to the Protestant people the enormity of ‘popish senselessness and open or secret bloodthirstiness.’ ‘This accursed, antichristian indulgence,’ said ‘the faithful minister of the Word,’ ‘is an excrement of the devil, who will manage that all the papists who are thus brought to the confessional will be secretly bound over by their father-confessors to massacre all the evangelical Christians, above all the Council of Augsburg, for which the Antichrist is hypocritically causing prayers to be offered up. For it is well known, from wide experience, that the Roman bear-wolf considers this sort of thing the most acceptable form of divine worship, or rather I should say of his devil-worship.’¹ William Holder also, cathedral-preacher at Stuttgart, devoted a special pamphlet to this indulgence brief. This publication deserves notice as it affords a specially clear illustration of the nature of the anti-popish controversial literature of the day. Holder gave exact calculations respecting the amount of grace conferred by the different indulgences. A fifty days’ indulgence, he said, would be granted to those ‘who called devoutly on God and prayed for the removal and extirpation of heresies, and for the extension of the Catholic Church.’ That the Pope did not grant more for such cause showed him to be ‘a niggardly miser’ who had but scant zeal in his heart for his Church. ‘Might one not say indeed that the Pope was an epicure, or even a mere child, to whom neither one religion nor the other was a serious matter?’ ‘But two considerations may perhaps excuse him : first, that he really thinks that fire, sword, and gallows-rope are more efficacious than prayer for

¹ *Ein christlich heilsam Gespräch über einen päpstlichen Blutbrief, genannt Ablassbrief. Einblattdruck, 1588.*

rooting out heresy. Secondly, that without doubt he knows right well from God's Word that he himself is the greatest heretic in the world.' Ten days' indulgence was granted by Sixtus V. to every member of the fraternity who said a Paternoster and an Ave Maria for the council and the burghers of the town of Augsburg in order to procure their prosperity, peace, and unity. 'See then,' says Holder, 'to those who pray for the destruction of heresy he promises fifty days' indulgence; but to those who pray for the peace and prosperity of the community he only promises ten, in order to show that the extirpation of the citizens would be five times dearer to him than their peace, prosperity, and concord.' By a similar process of meting and reckoning Holder arrived at the conclusion that in the Pope's estimation the 'new brotherhood was of ten times more value than an honourable council or a whole community of burghers;' the Pope attached so little importance to the office of ruler that 'he was quite likely to go over to the Anabaptists.' 'For my part,' said Holder, 'I am quite ready to believe this.' The fact that the Pope only granted fifty days' indulgence to those who prayed for pregnant matrons showed how lightly Popes thought of the holy estate of matrimony and of the divine blessing that followed on it; 'unmarried women in a state of pregnancy were not taken into account in the indulgence bill. Finally, that the Pope promised a rich reward to all who devoutly invoked the Name of Jesus was no proof of sincere Christianity, but only hypocrisy and pure deceit.' ¹

¹ *Bericht, welchermassen Papst Sixt, der fünfte dieses Namens, die neue Augsburgische Bruderschaft des H. Bergs Andex, mit Gnad und Ablass bedacht, auch was von solchem Ablasskram zu halten* (Tübingen, 1588),

James Heerband, in this same year, gave out that it was 'Catholic doctrine' that 'the Pope at Rome, with his indulgences, forgave the most heinous sins even for the sake of money'; 'the Catholics were, the whole lot of them, in the clutches of the devil.'¹ In a 'Christian song for children' the little ones were made to sing in mid-Lent:

Now let us drive the Pope and rout
Him from Christ's Church and God's house out;
He governed in a murderous way
And souls unnumbered led astray.
Get thee gone, thou damned son,
Thou scarlet bride of Babylon;
Crime and Antichrist thou art,
Lies and cunning fill thy heart.
Thy pardon-brief, thy bull and thy decree,
In water-closets only men now see.²

'Augiä Stall,' said 'a lover of divine, and therefore of Lutheran truth,' in 1615:

*Augiä Stall hat nicht so viel Mist,
Als ins Papsts Stankloch noch ist.
Damit nun dieser greulich Gstank
Des Papst Sekret mach kein Abgang,
Hat er gar viel Dekret gemacht,
Dass seine Diener kein Ohnmacht
Ankommen mag; darzu Weihrauch
Täglich vielfältig hat im Brauch,
Welcher zwar für die Götzen gericht,
Die Nasen haben und riechen nicht;
Ist aber gut für Götzenknecht,
Schwefel und Pech wär ihn recht.*

The next ten lines tell in untranslatable verse how the Pope's brain, infected, maddened, and melted by

pp. 8, 15, 35-39, 41-42, 48-51, 70-74. The Jesuits, like the Pope, get their full share of abuse.

¹ Heerbrand, *Propffung*, &c., pp. 5, 7, 9, 14; *Ausklopfung*, &c., pp. 1-12.

² *Ein christlich Kinderlied, damit die Kinder zu Mittfasten den Papst austreiben*. D. M. L. (Luther). Cf. David Maier, *Omnium sanctorum jubilaeus evangelicus* (1617), p. 109.

infernal vapours, ran down into his stomach and thence into his hose.

All the Catholic clergy and monks were 'birds of prey,' and ought to have pitch poured over them :

Your idolatry is open to the day,
Evidenced by idols and by altars
In your churches, and also in the streets ;
They are enough to turn a black man white.

'The Pope causes the kings who are not entirely subservient to him to be put out of the world by means of Spanish soups, sharp knives, and powders,' and 'he understands this art much better than does a Sicilian tyrant :'

In short, the Pope is the worst bloodhound
Anyone will find the whole world round.

And papists in general are all as bloodthirsty as he is. In the following twelve lines the papal thirst for blood is fathered on the devil ; the papists, however, laugh and grow fat ; their fat ought to be drawn from their bodies by the executioner and used for cart-grease, &c.

The poet cherished yet other wishes for the papists. Since they were no better than buffaloes and donkeys, they must have 'the same burial as donkeys, so that their flesh might have no rest.' First of all, however :

Ein blutdürstiger Henkersknecht
Sollt euch den Buckel fegen recht,
Denn ihr dessen wohl würdig seid,
Erzketzer bleibt in euer Häut.

A bloodthirsty hangman's servant ought to strip your backs of their skin, for as long as your skin is on you you are always arch-heretics.

After this manner the Protestant people were to be instructed :

Let this with glosses be made plain
To suit the common people's brain.¹

¹ *Ventilatio . . . Erleuterung . . . der B päpstischen Gloss* (1615), pp. 10, 12, 17-20, 23, 24, 32, 35, 36-37, 47-48.

On the Catholic side 'they did not accumulate yearly debts by tardiness in answering all the scurrilous writings directed against them.' 'Whereas we are so cruelly and persistently persecuted,' wrote a Catholic in 1588, 'we too must persecute these ranting villains and all the heretical scribblers, and show them up to the common people as they are in reality—namely, as arch-liars, wolves, and cats.' 'There is nothing in cats,' said the author of a '*Ketzerkatz*,' 'which is of any use to their slaughterer after he has killed them. And likewise a heretic is not only of no use in his lifetime, but also, and above all, after his death, except to be thrown for evermore into hell, where all fomenters of confusion are cast, as cats are thrown into the carrion-pit.' 'Eating the flesh of cats is very dangerous, because they have poison in their tails and heads, and without doubt also in their bodies; and with heretics also one must always be on one's guard against hidden poison.'¹

'The heretics go about in sheep's clothing,' wrote the Bavarian court secretary Aegidius Albertinus, the most important popular author of the Catholic Restoration period,² 'but inwardly they are ravening wolves. They urge evangelical freedom as their pretext; but at the same time they drive all virtue out of the world, throw open the door to all sorts of iniquity, and give the rein to vice of every description. They give such prominence to, and so greatly exaggerate, the enormity of original sin and the tendency to evil of our corrupt nature as utterly and entirely to deny free will; they

¹ Quoted from J. Heerbrand, *Ketzer-Katzen*, p. 11; see *Vorrede*.

² See v. Reinhardstöttner in *Forschungen zur Gesch. Bayerns*, ii. (1894), 86 ff.

altogether eliminate individual freedom, impugn the rights of nature, and say that good works are not necessary to salvation. While really bent on nothing but stirring up fresh confusion and anarchy in the world, they go about in sheep's clothing as though they were anxious to remove the abuses which have crept into the Church ; under this disguise, however, they do nothing but tear down altars, strangle priests, desecrate the holy church utensils, condemn the Sacrifice and prayers for the dead, call funerals fools' work, and make fun of purgatory. Besides which they mock at the unanimity and unity of the holy Fathers, reject the authority of the bishops and overseers of the Church, and take no pleasure in any higher or better pursuit than vilifying the Catholic preachers, prelates, and monks, undermining their honour, pouring out scurrilous books and lampoons against them, and in this way bringing the Catholic faith everywhere into odium. Although they are everlastingly talking about God, and have the Name of Christ and the faith for ever on their lips, they do nothing else than stir up rebellion among subjects, disturbance in the Empire, embitterment among the Estates, disobedience against appointed authorities, destruction of bishoprics, churches, and convents.' ¹

‘The heretical preachers,’ wrote another Catholic. ‘are like unto cats and wolves, and they rend and tear each other to pieces like cats and wolves, and they deserve on this account to be loaded with all manner of abuse, for they undoubtedly proceed from hell.’ Abuse was lavishly heaped on them by the Franconian pastor Andreas Forner. In a publication entitled ‘Evange-

¹ *Lucifers Königreich*, pp. 61–63.

lischer Hafenkäs,' issued in 1617, he ascribed to 'King Pluto' the character of 'chief of all the preachers.' Pluto is described as sending forth an 'incense-bearing angel,' who carries with him a 'large and disgusting pot of brimstone and pitch,' in which there is 'a foul, stinking, mangy, rotten pot-cheese alive with crawling worms and insects, and which is called pot-cheese by the populace because it is made up of all sorts of broken remains of cheese, which cats and dogs have nibbled at, and which has been thrown together in a heap and dirtied by flies and insects until the whole mass has become putrefied and stinking, when the peasants place it on their tables and consider it a most dainty confection.' This 'Pot-cheese' is 'a lifelike sketch, portrait, and counterpart of the Augsburg Confession.' The preachers are represented as falling on the cheese with ravenous hunger, 'licking, biting, sucking, tearing at it.' Finally, it is carried in a solemn procession, with hymns of praise, to the charnel-house of St. John. 'The glorified cheese was carried by the four pillars and wardens of the *Hafenkäs*,' a Zwinglian, a Calvinist, an Ubiquitist, and a Schwenckfeldian, all dressed differently. They sang :

*Erhalt uns Herr beim Hafenkäs,
Ganz lieblich ist er und ganz räs,
Ihm weichen Zucker und Konfekt,
Selig der dran leckt und gelect.*¹

Preserve us, Lord, by the *Hafenkäs*,
Quite exquisite it is and rare :
Sugar and confects are nothing to it,
He who licks and eats it obtains salvation.

¹ *Evangelischer Hafenkäs*, pp. 39-40, 42, 115-169. Forner told all sorts of stories about the preachers; for instance, of Lucas Sternberger, who had written on the subject of the Trinity, he said that 'he did not know whether it was a woman or a man, but he thought it was a woman who had had three husbands' (p. 119). Gottfried Rab, an Augustinian, had

On the other hand, Jakob Bobhard¹ brought out in 1617, under the name of 'Publius Äsquillus, Bachelor of the Society of Jesus,' a publication in rhyme, entitled '*Eygentliche gründliche und warhafte Beschreibung des heiligen römischen und katholischen Hafenküis, wie derselbige auf das Allerheiligste und Künstlichste präpariert und zubereitet worden, reimenweise verfasst*' (Real, authentic, and veracious account of the holy Roman and Catholic *Hafenküis*, showing how the latter was prepared with the greatest reverence and skill, and composed in rhyme). As a contribution to the *Hafenküis* which the Pope had commanded to be concocted, a man from Treves brings

A few tears from the eyes of Christ
Which the pain and agony of the cross
Had pressed out of His eyes. . . .

From Ravenna comes a man with a pitcher from the wedding at Cana :

Which he had filled full of milk
Which had flowed from the breasts
Of the pure Virgin Mary,
When she was still suckling her infant Jesus,
And which from year to year
Had been preserved until now.

They used a little sack 'made out of the trousers of St. Joseph,' a shirt of the holy Virgin, and so forth. The pious hymn, 'In the name of God we march,' was

been guilty at Prague of adultery, of dishonouring young women, and of incest ; he had seduced the wife of a burgher, and had then come to Wittenberg, where he had turned Protestant. His 'Recantation' appeared in print, and also his 'Revocation sermon' ; the whole theological faculty and the whole college of preachers issued a bombastic preface to it. The author was depicted in woodcuts and copper-plates, and medals with his image were actually struck in lead and silver, and circulated abroad, especially in Nuremberg. Before long, however, he fell into such contempt with the preachers themselves that he was abandoned by them, and came to a miserable end (pp. 120-122).

¹ Weller, *Annalen*, 369, No. 465.

subjected to insolent mockery. At the church service an indulgence for the *Hafenkäis*, signed by the Jesuit Bellarmin in the name of all the cardinals, was read out :

Whoso comes unto this *Käis*
Obtains for all his sins remission,
And procures God's love and grace,
Although before he had not felt contrition.
Has he some deed of evil done,
Or is he contemplating one,
To the *Hafenkäis* let him repair,
He'll be absolved and all made square. . . .
Commit adultery even in church,
Then buy of this *Käis* and be without smirch.¹

In the following year Bobhard, posing as 'a poet and historiographer specially commissioned thereto by the Pope,' supplemented his earlier 'Beschreibung' by a new publication, 'Jubelkram und Mess des heiligen römischen und katholischen Hafenkäis' ('Jolly store and sale of holy Roman Catholic pot-cheese'). All the servants of the Church are represented as extortioners of the people, as gluttons and whoremongers; the Capuchins and the Jesuits are specially singled out for vilification. The Holy Scriptures are depicted as being trodden underfoot by one Jesuit, thrown on the ground and spit upon by others, lashed with rods, and condemned to the flames. From the bottom of his heart the author sings of the *Hafenkäis*—that is to say, the Catholic religion :

The *Hafenkäis*, O Lord, root out,
Because it causes all that's fell;
And hurl it with a mighty shout—
It and its doctor²—into hell.³

¹ *Eygentliche . . . Beschreibung*, pp. 21, 22-24, 39-52, 67-70, 71-84. The publication is full of obscenity and indecency; see pp. 48-51, 60, 95-105 ff.

² Forner.

³ *Jubelkram*, pp. 32-49, 79-81, 91, 97, 113, 118-119, 135-143. For the
VOL. X. R

In devotional books for the people, also, 'the papistical idolatry and all its antics' were painted in glaring colours. Martin Spiess, in the year 1603, made known, by quotations from the preface of a *House-postille* of the Wittenberg scholar of divinity Ägidius Hunnius, how the latter had 'removed the mist-cap from the abominable papacy, so that the bare, naked animal, the real and veritable Antichrist, was left exposed to view.'¹ Hunnius delivered himself in the customary manner concerning 'the terrible abominations' of the papacy: 'Christ had only made atonement for original sin; actual sins must be atoned for by their authors through their own good works; the papists adored saints and images; evil lusts were not regarded by them as sins,' and so forth. In the papacy, he said, 'those who had most money could expiate most largely, and there was no greater sin or disgrace among papists than to be poor. The most unnatural atrocities, also, and the very worst sins could be obliterated by payment of money.' Everything connected with the papacy was altogether sheer idolatry: the Mass, the Eucharist, confirmation, 'in which all horrors and devil's works' were combined; extreme unction was 'a bewitched chrism.' It seemed all the more necessary to Hunnius to spread teaching of this sort because he scented a suspicious inclination to the papacy among the Protestant people. 'Many of them,' he said, 'might very likely begin to inoculate their children with popery, to place them in the Jesuit schools, or in

paragraph (omitted here) following the above verses and describing another 'object of Catholic worship' see the German, vol. v. p. 499, and see also *Eygentliche Beschreibung*, p. 50; Wolfius, ii. 354; *Oratio de quadruplici facie Ecclesiae* (Wittenb. 1610); which works are referred to in the omitted passage.

¹ *Nebelkap*, Bl. B 2-3.

the popish universities and convents.’ ‘The true teachers must therefore do the Lord’s work faithfully,’ and utter warnings against the devouring wolves, especially at the present time, when the devil, by means of the papists, was labouring unintermittently at the re-establishment of his empire through ‘secret blood-thirsty intrigues,’ and also ‘through open violence.’¹

The people were also similarly instructed in sermons. Erhard Lauterbach, for instance, superintendent of the (former) diocese of Naumburg, preached that ‘in the papacy the devil sits enthroned, and bellows out nothing but hellish and Romish lies and rubbish.’ ‘We, on the contrary, are the people of His pasture and the sheep of His flock, to which the Roman wolf, the Pope, with his hellish, stinking rams, the cardinals, bishops, and all the parsonhood, do not belong; for we are as far apart from them as heaven and earth.’ ‘Next to the devils themselves there are no worse creatures than the Pope and his belongings.’ ‘At the day of judgment we shall help to pronounce sentence on the Pope, and we shall say: “Go hence, thou accursed beast, with all thy followers, into condemnation. There shalt thou be tormented with fire and brimstone: that is, with the most exquisite and refined martyrdom, and publicly, moreover, in the presence of Luther and all other true angels, messengers, and servants of God.”’²

The manner, also, in which, from the pulpit itself and on the most sacred festivals, the Catholic Church service was delivered over to the contempt and ridicule of the populace is exemplified in a ‘Recht evangelische

¹ Bl. C. D. 1-2.

² *Vier Jubelpredigten im Naumburgischen Stift zu Zeit gehalten, &c.* (Leipzig, 1618), Bl. C. F. 3.

Predigt' (preached by Polycarp Leiser at Dresden on Ascension Day, 1608). In a coarse, vulgar manner, almost in the language of the 'Bienenkorb,' he ridiculed all the customary usages and benedictions of the Church from the Mass down to the consecration of bells. He made fun of 'the way in which the young Mass priests read the Mass, now mumbling and muttering in whispers, now calling out loudly, anon thumping themselves on the breast or stretching out their arms as though they were measuring out two ells or a brace and a half.' The publication of this sermon was regarded in the light of a Christian work, profitable to the Church of Christ.¹

'It must always be remembered,' so another pulpit orator declaimed, 'how the divinely inspired theologian, James Heerbrand, had written concerning the accursed, devilish Mass priests: "You oiled and greased idolaters think and give out that by virtue of your filthy chrism and carriage-grease you can fashion the body and blood of Christ out of bread and wine. Oh, you God-forsaken shavelings, with all the magic of Egypt you could not even make a little louse, how much less the body of Christ." This is reverently spoken, and

¹ *Eine recht evangelische Predig, &c.* (Leipzig, 1608), pp. 8-10, 19 ff. A pamphlet on the death of Luther which came out at Wittenberg in 1610, *Bericht zum christlichen Abschied Doktor Martin Luthers samt sechs Leichpredigten bei dem Begräbnis vornehmer Theologen*, contains the most virulent attacks against the Roman Antichrist, 'the traffickers of the Babylonian whore who put up everything for sale,' 'the courtesans and chamberwomen of the harlot,' 'the bloodthirsty schemes of the papists,' and so forth. Cf. pp. 57, 58, 68, 74, 82, 178, 180. The Superintendent Nathaniel Tilesius, in his *Achtzehn Passions- und Achtzehn Osterpredigten* (Leipzig, 1611), is less fierce in his attacks on the Catholic Church, but he too does not scruple to assert that the papacy with outrageous idolatry exalts the Virgin Mary into a goddess, that it has borrowed the doctrine of purgatory from the pagans Plato and Virgil, and so forth (i. 179, 238, 273).

applies to the whole of popedom. "They cannot make lice, and yet they produce nothing but lousy rot. There is scarcely anything connected with them that is righteous and well-pleasing to God, as anybody can see who enters a papistical town. Their church service is rank idolatry, their sacrifices impious hypocrisy, their prayers mere pretence and sanctimoniousness (especially those of the devout, whorish women); their fasts are a mockery of God and a travesty of His Divine Word, for in secret they gorge themselves full." On this point, also, James Heerbrand has spoken admirably. He says: "It is indeed a laudable thing that they should fast till eleven o'clock for afterwards they fill their stomachs so full of excellent fish that they are like to burst; they become distended and swollen out like kettledrums." The papists are worse than the worshippers of serpents and other animals, for the latter, at any rate, pray to living creatures, while the papists, like senseless blockheads, invoke dirty cloths, bones, and other rubbish, which they dignify with the name of relics.' 'Their Antichrist, the Pope, has given his approval to the story of the Virgin Mary milking into the eyes of a blind monk and committing carnal sin with another; and to such stories the papists give more faith than to the Holy Scriptures and to Christ, Whose Divine Word they flee or even trample underfoot.'

The pulpit-orator imparted all this information on the festival of the Passion and Death of our Lord Jesus Christ, and accordingly he took the opportunity also of 'reminding his hearers, in a Christian and brotherly manner, that the papists, being hostile to Christ, were for the most part friendly to the Jews who had nailed Him to the Cross, and that the Roman Antichrist

himself was the foremost protector of the blasphemous Jews.' 'Pious Christians will take all this in good faith, and will know how to act upon it.'¹

'The charge of befriending the Jews' was, indeed, a favourite dodge of the preachers and writers for incensing the Protestant people against 'the Antichrist and all his followers.' After the method of the Magdeburg Centuriators,² they were pleased to regard as a mark of the Antichrist the fact that the Pope tolerated and protected the Jews. In a summons to proceed against the blasphemous Jews and their aiders and abettors,³ it was said in 1611: 'It is plainly manifest that it is the Antichrist who is sitting on the chair of pestilence at Rome, for he is the friend of the bloodthirsty, accursed Jews.' 'This is also the reason why the Roman Antichrist and all his followers in the Empire cherish such a deadly hatred against Luther, for the latter wrote, with divine inspiration and wisdom, that the Hebrew synagogues and schools must be demolished and burnt, that the Jews must be deprived of the goods they had gotten by usury, and that they must be driven like mad dogs out of the land. The papists and Jesuits, on the contrary, are blasphemous friends of the Jews; they associate with them, do not scruple to employ Hebrew doctors and other sorcerers in case of illness; they curry favour with the extortioners, are ready to protect them, and even contribute to the building of their synagogues and devils' temples.' While the evangelical Christians were never left at rest by the Pope, wrote

¹ Mengerling, pp. 3, 7, 9-10. Besides these passages from Heerbrand the preacher also quoted from a pamphlet which had appeared at Giessen in 1614, under the title of *Legendarum Papisticarum Centuria*, &c.; *Vorrede*, pp. 3-4, 183, 197-198.

² See above, p. 12.

³ 'Einblattdruck' of the year 1611.

Peter Dötschmann, Lutheran dean at Schwäbisch-Hall, in 1617, ‘the Jews, who daily blaspheme the honour of Christ and who suck the blood of the poor people by their ungodly usury, are gladly tolerated in the dominion of his Holiness.’¹

In the same year a Calvinist writer complained that ‘the iniquitous Jews, who pour out abominable blasphemy against our Lord and Saviour Christ, and who suck the blood of the poor man, are not only not persecuted by the Pope and the Romanists, nor coerced into the Christian religion, but their iniquities are sanctioned by the Church. The canon law decrees that their schools, synagogues, and ritual shall be respected, and their conversion only attempted by means of the most lenient instruction. “Heretical Christians,” on the other hand, were by the Pope’s command to be forthwith executed.’² John of Münster had before this proclaimed to Protestant Germany that ‘as Antichrist the Pope condemned all Christians to hell-fire, and gave the devil power and authority to rend and devour the members of Christ, he turned healthy, well-made human beings into lame and deformed ones, strangled all who were disobedient to him—yea, verily, he gulped them down whole, like a regular hellish wolf, with their skin and hair.’ But he gladly tolerated the Jews, in spite of their abominations and idolatry, in all parts of his empire. ‘The papists and the accursed, Christ-blaspheming Jews stood in the same category.’³

There was no shrinking from any sort of means

¹ *Die Lehre der Papisten*, pp. 79–80.

² *Gegen-Erinnerungen gegen Ungersdorf*, pp. 96–97.

³ Maximilian Philos of Treves, *Examen und Inquisition*, Vorrede, Bl. 1–2, p. 2.

which would serve to produce among the Protestant people irreconcilable hatred and ineradicable disgust of the Catholic Church, and to stir up their passions against Rome and the 'satellites of Satan.'

'Our doctrines and our Church ritual and usages,' a Catholic complained, 'are represented as idolatry and blasphemy to the poor deceived people; everything that is called Catholic is dragged in the deepest mire and given over to the insolence of the populace. The Popes are depicted as the most consummate villains, sodomites, and devil's tricksters that the sun has ever shone upon. There is not a single crime which is not imputed to them. All convents, in the opinion of Protestant writers and preachers, are hot-beds of immorality. Monks and nuns are fattened hogs of the devil; the priests are tonsured stallions and greasy, oiled idolaters. All Catholics are crazy blockheads, insensate fools, idolaters, ministers of bones and images, and fit for nothing but to be driven out of the country like Jews and Turks. The ruling authorities are incensed by being made to believe that the papistical teachers reject all secular rule, that the Popes have been guilty of treading emperors and kings underfoot, and of making them crouch under their tables bound in chains. The nobles are made to believe that their poverty has been caused by the Pope and the papists, who have grabbed to themselves all worldly goods and revenues; the poor of the land are told that the papists have fattened on their sweat and blood. Thus the fire is stirred incessantly, oil is thrown on the flames, and no calumnies are spared.' 'Not to omit one instance, how can anything more hateful and more egregiously false be said against the Roman Catholic Church than the slanders of

preachers and writers respecting the so-called Catholic doctrine of matrimony—viz. that, far from being pleasing to God, it is sinful and unholy. And they employ such shameful tricks and silly inventions as this to set married’ people against the Church; and, verily, I know not how a greater lie and cause of offence could be invented. This sort of thing, however, is quite habitual with those lying preachers, who live by lies; and whole books might be filled with their falsehoods, which they actually consider a necessary part of their preaching.’¹

There were, indeed, preachers who considered it ‘a principal duty of the office of teacher and preacher to proclaim incessantly to the people how disgracefully and outrageously the Roman Antichrist and the whole popish church dealt with the holy estate of matrimony both in teaching and practice, treating it with as much contempt as if it had been instituted by the incarnate devil and not by God.’² Just as the Pope ‘reviles all human conditions,’ George Miller preached in 1595 to the burghers and students of Jena, ‘so has he cast contumely on the sacred state of marriage, which he condemns as a carnal, sinful, and unholy state. He has written publicly concerning this estate. Whosoever lives in the flesh—i.e. in the state of marriage—cannot please God.’ ‘How could anything more abusive, scandalous, and dishonourable be said about holy matrimony, and how could it be treated with worse dishonour?’³ Similarly it is said in the ‘Heiliger Brotkorb der heiligen römischen Reliquien und Heiligthums

¹ *Von neuen calvinischen Giftspinnen*, pp. 19–20.

² Mengerling, p. 12.

³ Georg Mylius, *Bapstpredigten*, pp. 305–306.

Brocken,' edited by Johann Fischart, 'The papacy condemns the conjugal estate, and repudiates it as a carnal state in which a Christian cannot live with a good conscience or attain to salvation.' The moral of which was 'such people were not worthy of having come into the world by lawful marriage, or fit to live under Christian government. Yes, that is the true mark of the Antichrist, that he has no respect for the love of woman, nor for anything that is of God.'¹

'With the papists,' wrote Jeremiah Viotor, pastor at Giessen, in 1587, 'adultery, fornication, and incest are not reckoned vices, and would not be, though they were forbidden ten times over in the sixth commandment.' On the other hand, 'it is notorious that in the papacy matrimony, even among the laity, is considered a sinful state.'²

The papistical teachers, so James Heerband said emphatically two years later, call marriage 'carnal wantonness.' 'O Sodom, with thy sins which cry unto heaven, these people make thee out to be pious.'³ The Elector of Saxony's court-preacher, Matthias Hoe, reiterated, in 1607, in an 'Evangelisches Handbüchlein' for the people: 'The papists say that marriage is an unholy state; the Pope despises marriage, calls it a fleshly condition in which we cannot please God.'⁴ The Lutheran dean Peter Dötschmann had the same

¹ Fischart, in 1580, brought out, under the title just mentioned, a new edition of the translation, made at an earlier date by James Eysenberg, of Calvin's *Traité de Reliques*. The passage quoted above is in the edition of 1601, *Vorrede*, Bl. B 8².

² *Gründlicher, wiederholter Bericht*, Bl. 47¹, 55^b. See also E. Lauterbach, *Vier Jubelpredigten*, Bl. D. 2^b.

³ *Ketzer-Katzen*, pp. 118-119.

⁴ *Evangelisches Handbüchlein* (1607), where also other 'popish abominations' are to be found, Bl. 9^b, 18^{a-b}, 273, 298, 302.

tale to tell. To his knowledge it was ‘popish teaching’ that ‘the conjugal state is an unclean and carnal one, in which it is impossible to please God and to serve Him with a good conscience.’¹ The Dortmunder preacher Hermann Empsychonius, also, who, according to the words of a eulogist, like a ‘German Achilles, with Herculean strength overthrew the Roman citadel from its foundations,’ expressed his opinion that Catholic doctrine represented marriage as a hindrance to piety, as something quite carnal and worldly, and displeasing to the Lord God.’² Another preacher went still further in his assertions. The Pope, he said, ‘not only sanctioned incestuous connections between others, but actually indulged in them himself. Fornication and contempt of marriage were regarded by the papists as a glorification of God.’³ The Würtemberg theologians James Andreä, James Heerbrand, Johann Magirus, and others, had made similar statements in the year 1584.⁴ Johann von Münster spoke still more strongly. He said that ‘to be legally married was a great crime in the eyes of the papists, but that whoredom, incest, vice, and sin were the highest glory and boast of the Popes.’ Such had been the teaching of the Jesuit cardinal Robert Bellarmin.⁵

‘Seeing, then, that the papists, both clergy and laymen of high and low degree,’ said a preacher of the

¹ *Die Lehr der Papisten, Calvinisten, u.s.w.* (1617), p. 34.

² *Apologia Orthodoxae Doctrinae contra Pontificios* (Giessae, 1612), Bl. 8^b, 189.

³ Echart, *Papa pharisaizans* (1605), pp. 139, 141.

⁴ ‘. . . Synagoga Romana . . . probat libidines vagas in praecipuis membris . . .’ *Acta et Scripta Theolog. Wirtembergensium et Patriarchae Constantinop.* Bl. 3.

⁵ Maximilian Philos, *Bäptischer Triumph* (edition of 1607), pp. 9, 10, 49, 67 ; see also the register.

Divine Word, after an exhaustive enumeration of all the crimes and misdemeanours of said clergy and laity, 'one and all of them stand out before the world as such blasphemous, disreputable, murderous scoundrels, it behoves every pious Christian to remember that he must not trust them in any way in trade and business, and that he must avoid and shun them as he would the devil himself.'¹

All relations between the Catholics and the Protestants must be dissolved.

'I willingly grant,' wrote, in 1617, a Catholic 'who was in favour of every-day dealings between the members of the different religions'—'I willingly grant that we, on our part, who have been so cruelly and disgracefully attacked by writers innumerable for now more than eighty years, have allowed our pens to pour forth much bitterness of all sorts against these scandalous scribes and libellers, who have invariably appealed to the Divine Word and the Evangel, and I allow that meekness and peaceable Christian language would have become us better than gall, abuse, and words of insult. But who among our party has ever anathematised and vilified the Lutherans and stirred up the Catholics against them, in the way that your Protestant, peace-hating preachers and writers of all sorts have done?' 'We are pelted with hailstorms, snowstorms of furious calumny and insults. The whole body of papists is insensate; they venerate images, pictures, sticks, and stones; they are in league with the devil; they worship the Roman devil, the Antichrist; all papists must be shunned and fled from like disreputable people; they must not be trusted in any way; they will massacre all the evangelicals if we are not beforehand with them;

¹ Mengerling, p. 14.

and so on, and so on. Such raging and calumniating must lead to a bloody end, and that which Luther prophesied—from which God preserve us—may well come to pass, and “Germany be seen swimming as it were in blood.” ’¹

‘We cannot sufficiently warn against the papists everybody who wishes for security of life and property,’ said a preacher in 1589, ‘for they themselves betray their origin from the devil, more plainly even than do the heathen. No respectable person can believe in them or place any confidence in them. They believe no more in our Redeemer than do the Jews and Turks; they are an epicurean, godless lot, as the most learned Lucas Lossius said, for they declare that when a man dies no part of him survives, any more than with an unreasoning beast—a sow, a cow, or a horse; they all die alike, and neither body nor soul remains. Who could ever have any dealings with such bestial creatures? Who could eat, drink, trade, or traffic with them?’ ‘Among thousands of papistical rascals and whoremongers such as the Church is full of, and who bow down before idols, bones, and images, who weep and howl in the churches and eat up the Lord God made by the priests, especially among the smeared and tonsured heads, there are not as many as three who believe in the immortality of the soul. This is true and indisputable.’ ‘Therefore, my brethren,’ the preacher exhorted, ‘beware of these filthy epicureans and devouring wolves, as Christ admonished you in His Holy Word, which should be a lantern unto your feet. Amen.’²

¹ *Ein heilsam Erinnerung an Christi des Herrn Wort : Der Friede sei mit euch* (Einblattdruck, 1617).

² *Ein hochnottürfftige Predig wider den römischen Antichrist und seine Rottgesellen* (1589), Bl. B³.

A similar warning against all dealings with the Catholics was uttered in 1588 by Alexander Utzinger, preacher at Smalkald. The papacy, he said, was 'the mother of fornication and of all the abominations on earth,' it was 'a frightful abyss of hell,' 'an execrable den of murderers'; yea, verily, 'the very most execrable den of thieves and robbers.' The truth of this had now been 'so thoroughly proven, demonstrated, and made public, that no right-minded, veracious person could contradict it.' The Catholic priests were all of them 'priests of idols and jackanapeses. It was safer for an evangelical Christian to dwell among Turks and heretics than among papists, even though the latter should leave them free in their faith and consciences.'¹ 'Let no one forbid or hinder me from wishing the hardened, insolent, and bloodthirsty papists both temporal and eternal ruin, and that of the most terrible description; nor let me be hindered from praying incessantly to God, from hoping for and expecting their ruin, and from consoling myself and other pious Christians with this hope. I cannot do otherwise, let befall me what God will. And here I openly confess that this is my daily practice in conjunction with my office of preaching.'²

In the same year (1588) a general synod in Hesse had issued a 'Christian and godly memorandum' to the effect that 'the avowed adherents of the papacy were blasphemers, idolaters, and servants of the Antichrist, and that we must follow the example of the Apostles and avoid all outward fellowship with them; we must flee from them, shun their conversation in

¹ *Notwendige Erinnerung*, Bl. C 1-C 3^b, E 3^a.

² *Notwendige Erinnerung*, Bl. J^a.

external, mundane things, and also refuse to eat and drink with them, and not salute them if we meet them.’¹ A synod in Cassel enacted in 1593 that first and foremost the common people must be exhorted from the pulpit to ‘keep themselves far removed from the idolatrous abominations of the idolatrous papistical religion.’² ‘The papists are enemies of the Cross of Christ,’ thundered out Jeremiah Vietor in 1587; ‘they have a brazen harlot’s forehead, and are ashamed of nothing; they look upon God’s Word as a book of fables.’ Therefore ‘we must be on our guard against the papists as against the devil himself.’ All those who submit to the papacy testify their approval of it, and cast in their lot with an institution of which the Apostle says that its nature is diabolical, and that devil’s works are defended by it, and worse than pagan sins committed in it. What else are its adherents doing than breaking the vows which they pledged to Christ, and giving themselves up to the service of Satan and his tools? Even where the Protestants were allowed to carry on the exercise of their religion in Catholic districts, it was still advisable for them to remove from the land with their wives and children, and goods and chattels. Those, however, who remained must ‘above all things recognise the papacy to be the dregs of all idolatry, lying and murdering, they must hate and detest it with all their hearts, seeing that God does not wish us to love those whom He hates, or who hate Him.’³

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. der hessischen Generalsynoden*, i.; *Urkundensammlung*, pp. 3–10. See Ritter, *Deutsche Gesch. und Landeskunde*, vi. 322–323.

² *Zeitschr. für hessische Gesch. und Landeskunde*, vi. 322–323.

³ *Gründlicher Bericht*, &c., Bl. 13^b, 46^b, 47^a, 55^b, 75^b, 76^b, 78–80.

CHAPTER VII

ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE LUTHERANS AND THE
CALVINISTS SINCE THE PROCLAMATION OF THE
FORMULA OF CONCORD

WHILE the Protestant controversial theologians and preachers of all denominations were conducting their campaign against 'the Roman Antichrist, the Babylonish whore, and the whole idolatrous, papistical rabble,' they were all at the same time pitted one against the other in the fiercest warfare. They carried on this intersectarian contest with the same weapons of personal 'vilification and bedevilment' which they used against the Catholics. All the iniquities of which they accused the Catholic Church—seduction of the people, idolatry, service of the devil—they laid with equal virulence at each other's doors. Each of the combatants appealed to the Word of God and to his own true interpretation of it, each looked upon the other as 'an emanation from the devil,' and all of them mutually relegated each other to the devil. 'Those raging theologians, drunk with fury,' wrote the Protestant Dommarein, in 1610, 'have so greatly aggravated and augmented the disastrous strife between the Christians who have seceded from the papacy, that there seems no hope of all this screaming, scribbling, blackguarding, slandering, abusing, damning, anathe-

matising, &c., coming to an end before the advent of the last day.' ¹

The mass of controversial writing was so immense that it was complained that 'the controversialists had, as it were, darkened the sun with their books.' 'Twice a year,' wrote Stanislaus Rescius in 1592, 'the Frankfort list of publications is issued, and we have noticed for several years past that the books written by Protestants against Protestants are three times as numerous as those of Protestants against Catholics.' ²

The controversies which the different Lutheran parties had carried on at times with each other were thrown into the background by the general campaign of all the whole body of Lutherans against Calvinism, which had made greater and greater progress in Germany during the last thirty years of the century.

¹ *Kurze Information* (1610), p. 335. The Dutch Calvinist theologian James Arminius wrote to Grynäus in 1591: '*Confusio opinionum et haeresium apud nos est incredibilis; nihil tam certum olim, quod non in dubium vocetur, nihil tam sanctum, quod a blasphemia immune.*' '*Religiosius sane prisci illi patres sacra tractarunt, quam nos facimus, nec non illi nos superant, quos Pontificios appellamus, sacrorum reverentia.*'—*Brantii Vita I. Arminii* (Mosheim's edition of 1725), p. 24. 'Before the change in religion,' wrote the learned Danish imperial chancellor, Harald Huitfeld, 'we had only one single bishop, the Pope, over all of us; now instead of one, we have multitudes; every so-called reformed prince in Germany is a separate pope. Each separate district has its own rites, teachers, and writers, and these last are not engaged in combating the enemies of Christianity, but in fighting among themselves.'—Pontoppidan, iii. 5-6. Concerning the reciprocal vituperations of the new religionists, see the complaint of Geldenhauer, in the year 1537, in Döllinger's *Reformation*, ii. 205.

² *Ministromachia*, p. 32. In the catalogue of the Frankfort Easter fair of 1616 there are no Protestant polemical writings against the Catholics, whereas there are thirty of Protestants against Protestants. See Köhler, *Lebensbeschreibungen merkwürdiger Gelehrter und Künstler*, i. (Leipzig, 1794), p. 240. Respecting a comic song ridiculing the Calvinists in the tone of the 'Lindenschmidt' (1605), see Distel in Sauer's *Euphorion*, iv. (1897), p. 102.

‘If anybody wishes to be told in a few words,’ it says in a Lutheran pamphlet of 1590, ‘concerning which of the articles of the faith we are fighting with the diabolical Calvinistic brood of vipers, the answer is: all and every one of them, for the Calvinists reject and overthrow every single article of the Christian faith, and they are no Christians, but only baptized Jews and Mohammedans.’¹ Melchior Leporinus, preacher at Brunswick, also declared in the year 1596, that ‘the unholy Calvinists had devastated the garden of God’s Paradise like wild boars,’ that they had in such wise ‘trampled through, defiled, and perverted our beloved catechism that not a single atom of our Christian doctrine, not a single article of our faith was left that was not permeated, bedaubed, and poisoned with their venomous breath.’²

‘For us Germans,’ said boastfully the above-mentioned pamphlet of 1590, ‘it is a great consolation, and much to our credit, that the devilish Mohammedan Calvinists, who crush out and destroy all that is Christian, did not have their origin in Germany, but were hatched in France, and we will not allow ourselves to be contaminated by foreign Mohammedan uncleanness.’ ‘O Germany, whither art thou drifting? Thou sleepest with wide-open eyes, and seest not how the accursed wolves are creeping in further and further, and with the help of foreign potentates—always on the watch for thy ruin—are contriving the bloody destruction

¹ In proof of this Johann Modest, pastor of Döpperschitz, had already in 1586 brought out a ‘*Beweis aus der Heiligen Schrift*.’ Strobel, *Miscellaneen*, iv. 157.

² Leporinus, in the preface to his translation of Elias Hasenmüller’s *Jesuiticum Jejunium* (Frankfort a. M. 1596), Bl. A 3.

of all those who do not participate in the Calvinistic devil's poison. Will you not hear, O you Germans, how the Calvinists are mocking and blaspheming you?'¹ 'The Calvinists,' Adam Crato wrote in the year following, 'regard us Lutherans as arrant German fools, of whom it must be said that any booklet coming from France is accepted by them as a thing to be worshipped and as pure Gospel.'²

'When the Calvinistic wolves first effect an entrance, they put on peaceful faces, and talk of toleration and love; as soon, however, as they have established a footing and gained power, they set to work to root out us Lutherans utterly and entirely, as though we were still altogether subservient to the idolatrous papacy. It has been proved by experience in every place and country that they will not endure anybody near them who is not attached to their rabble, and it will be just the same with them in Germany if we do not array ourselves against them with all our might and with the help of the ruling authorities: verily time will show.'³

Appealing to this same teacher, experience, Daniel Jacobi wrote from Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1615: 'So long as the Calvinists have not got the government in their own hands, but, on the contrary, are under rule and dominion, they remain pious and tolerant, and will suffer both religions,' the Lutheran and the Calvinist,

¹ *Kurze Warnung an die lieben Deutschen und Mitbruder in Christo* (1590), Bl. A 2.

² *Sendbrief gegen Grundmann und Berssmann* (1591), Bl. A 2^b; cf. C 3^b, C 4^b. 'The papists themselves know,' Laurence Lälus said emphatically, 'that Calvinism did not have its origin in Germany or in the Roman Empire, but that it comes from elsewhere,' *Rettung Luthers wider Sixtus Sartorius* (1614), p. 502.

³ *Kurze Warnung*, &c. (see note 1 above), Bl. B.

‘to exist side by side.’ ‘Whenever, however, they get the sceptre in their hands in any place, they can no longer tolerate the least particle of Lutheran doctrine ;’ ‘then everything must be done away with, doctrine, ceremonies, church ordinances ; it all reeks, stinks, and tastes of popish leaven ; it must all be reformed according to French Calvinistic methods. If any refuse to accept and introduce the reformed doctrine, such persons are told, as the old Calvinistic Amaziah told the prophet of the Lord, that they’ve only got to withdraw into another land and eat their bread there and prophesy there : eat, my bird, or die ! It is notorious throughout the Empire, indeed throughout the whole world, that such French and foreign practices have become the vogue in Germany to the great detriment and injury of numbers of Christians.’ The books of the Calvinists, he said, were full of ‘idolatrous, blasphemous abominations.’ ‘One could tell from the first word that their teaching was heathen and blasphemous, and did not need much refuting.’¹

‘O German people,’ exclaimed another voice of warning, ‘do not let yourselves be enslaved by the outlandish Calvinists ; not only are they bent on robbing you of your freedom and your honour, but, which is still more inhuman and diabolical, of your one Saviour and Redeemer ; for they regard your Christ as an impotent Baal, while their God is the devil and the accursed

¹ *Zwei Bedenken*, &c., pp. 42, 44–47. On the other hand there was published a ‘*Kehrab für Daniel Jacobi*,’ in which it was said of the latter that he had a brain as subtile as a stockfish, a long misshapen head like a donkey, and that for simulating and dissimulating he was an accomplished adept. The Calvinists were generally called ‘*Spitzköpfe*’ by the Lutherans. Luther had himself spoken of the ‘*Spitzköpfe*—pointed heads which got their points from rubbing one against another.’ See A. Hunnius, *Widerlegung der ungegründeten Auflagen Dr. Hoffmans* (1597), p. 28.

Leviathan, as Philip Nicolai has sufficiently demonstrated, and as all our theologians can produce evidence to prove.’¹

After evidence of this sort had been brought forward in numberless publications, David Rungius wrote in 1617: ‘We complain that the Calvinistical fanatics are blasphemers of Christ, who mangle and mutilate our most dear Jesus and His Word, who distort and overthrow all the articles of faith, and forcibly impose on us as God a wanton, lascivious, cunning, bloodthirsty Moloch and advocate of sin, the very devil incarnate, and who, in short, as Dr. Luther said, have “in-devilled, through-devilled, be-devilled hearts.” And from this charge, which our party has brought forward times without number, the new reformers have not so far been able to clear themselves.’²

‘Any simple, healthy human understanding could see for itself that the Calvinists were shameless, coarse, rascally devils, blasphemers, lying fiends, and wolves incarnate.’ ‘People who are not on their guard against their terrible, cruel wolves’ claws,’ said the Jena professor Johann Friedrich Celestinus, ‘must be totally

¹ See above, pp. 223-225. Again in the *Treuerherzige Warnung von Meister Johann Cuno, Perlebergischen Superintendenten in der Priegnitz* (Hamburg, no date), Nicolai ‘sounded his evangelical watchman’s horn against the devil and his followers.’ He gave an account ‘of the fellow Cuno, a bird of many adventures, who for his malignant Calvinism was punished by Pastor Schelhamer at Hamburg with a blow on the snout.’ Erdmann Neumeister of Hamburg wrote later on in the same strain as Nicolai: ‘The Calvinists worship, instead of God, the originator of all sin, the god of this world, the great dragon, the old serpent which is called the devil and Satan.’ (*Calvinische Arglistigkeit*, pp. 4-5.)

² *Neues Jahr* (1617), Bl. A 6^a, A 4^a, where it says: ‘Calvin wrote expressly that James and the other Apostles, at the first synod at which the Holy Ghost had presided, in order to conciliate the Orientals, had included fornication among the “indifferent things,” *adiaphora*, which might be done and permitted without sin.’

ignorant of the Christian faith, and even wanting in reason and natural intelligence.’¹

‘There were more than twenty characteristics of wolves that could be named,’ said Johann Modest, pastor of Döpperschitz, ‘which also exactly fitted the Calvinists, so that even a child must see that they proceeded from the devil.’ But the Luckenwalder pastor Nivander was not even satisfied with this number. In his ‘Wölfler Schafspelz der Calvinisten und Sakramentierer,’ he enumerated in 1582 more than forty qualifications of wolves, and ‘applied them to the detested adversaries.’² ‘We will now,’ he proceeds, ‘set forth sixty-five reasons on account of which every pious Christian ought carefully and loyally to be on his guard against the Calvinists and Sacramentarians, as against the devil himself.’ ‘St. Paul (2 Timothy, iii.) has already given plenty of these reasons, not sixty-five, it is true, but at any rate twenty-two. One can see clearly from the writings of the Apostles that the Calvinists and Sacramentarians were “deniers of Christ, blasphemers of God, and teachers sent by the devil.”’³ Their own consciences are seared; otherwise, what reason is there for their having roared and raged so terribly and disgracefully when they were dying? Nivander then goes on to describe ‘what dreadful deaths they had.’ Carlstadt, for instance, was put an end to by the devil; Zwingli ‘was cut into straps, and the lanzknechts used his fat—for he was a corpulent man—to grease their boots and shoes.’⁴

The people were not only told of ‘the frightful deaths which befell the popish teachers and writers’;⁵

¹ *Prüfung des sakramentierischen Geistes*, Bl. F. 2, F. 3.

² Nivander, Bl. A 4-B 4, and pp. 5-78.

³ Bl. D 4, pp. 168, 185, 194-196.

⁴ 5, pp. 195, 309 ff., 316.

⁵ See pp. 75, 76.

‘ the judgment of God on the Calvinistic devil’s teachers ’ were also made known to them. Times innumerable they were informed of ‘ what had happened to the Sacramentarian villains, Carlstadt and Zwingli, of what a terrible end Oekolampadius, Viktorinus, Strigel, Neuser, Stössel, and many others had met with.’¹ When Stössel’s wife had wanted to read to the desperate man from a book of religious consolation, he had answered : ‘ Do *you*, little devil, want to comfort *me*, a great devil ? I am damned both in soul and body.’²

Still more fiercely than the earlier ‘ God-inspired ministers of the true and alone-saving Lutheran faith ’ did the preacher Johann Praetorius, from Halle in Saxony, inveigh against the Calvinists in 1591 in his ‘ Dreiköpfiger Antichrist ’ (‘ Three-headed Antichrist ’). On the reverse side of the title-page the three-headed monster is depicted—big-bellied and thick-legged ; a large head in the middle wears a tiara, and on the right a small head with a turban has grown out, while on the left is the peaked head of Calvin with the three-cornered preacher’s biretta ; of the three hands in the picture the middle one holds a double-edged sword, the right one a crooked Turkish sabre, the left one a pen with bat’s wings. The head with the tiara, Praetorius said, uttered whatever it fancied ; sometimes it denied altogether that there was any God, devil, or hell ; sometimes spoke up for Mohammed’s followers, for Mohammed and the Pope were twins whom the devil had begotten at one birth ; ‘ the Roman Cerberus believed

¹ See, for instance, Toxites, *Die Lehre des Heiligen Geistes*, &c. (1602) ; *Anhang*, Bl. D.

² A. v. Helbach, *Reus trepidans*, p. 257 ff. ‘ The Elector of Saxony has the whole story of Stössel’s desperation by him in writing ; for the pastor of Senftenberg and the Superintendent of Hagen were obliged to write down all the circumstances for him as eye-witnesses ’

that God distributed salvation according to the merits of each individual.’¹ As for the Calvinists, they were all full of iniquity; they were ‘assassins, reprobates, and hypocrites.’ ‘Woe unto you, you Calvinists, for that you feed and fatten on the flesh and blood of innocent lambs, and make a parade of great wisdom and sanctity;’ ‘woe unto you, you will-o’-the-wisps, you blind leaders and liars, you nincompoops.’ ‘You are brimful of avarice, greed, and gluttony, and inwardly you are full of murder, secret houndish biting, stabbing, and diabolical disdain.’ ‘Your writings are like whited sepulchres; outwardly they seem to be spiritual and holy, but inwardly they are full of horrors, lies, and calumny.’ ‘They are Pope-eaters. And after having devoured the Pope voraciously with skin and hair, they puff up and swell out, and grow from smeared shavelings into unbelieving Calvinists.’²

Seven years later Praetorius completed his description in the pamphlet entitled ‘Calvinisch Gasthaus zur Narrenkappe.’ On the title-page he painted the devil with a javelin in his hand, his tongue projecting a long way from his mouth, and riding on a monster with a dragon’s head and a serpent’s tail. Under the picture are the following verses, among others:

What long ago the wicked one
Through many heretics has done,
With doctrine false and man’s inventions
Spreading through church and lands dissensions,
He does now infinitely more
By shallow Calvinistic lore.
Ah, flee this beast, or you will find
’Twill rend and stab you from behind.³

¹ *Dreiköpfiger Antichrist*, Bl. D 2^b-D 3^b, E 2^a. ² Bl. O 1^b, O 2^b-O 3^b.

³ *Calvinisch Gasthaus* (1598) Titelblatt. Ein anderes Bild vom Calvinismus Bl. M^b.

‘The watchword of all the arch-Calvinists’ was :

With false Scripture teaching,
With blasphemous preaching,
With lies and deceit
The pious to cheat.

‘That precious instrument of God, Luther, and his faithful disciples,’ said Praetorius, quoting passages from Calvinistic books, ‘are decried by the Calvinists as teachers without understanding who throw blue mist in everybody’s eyes, and deceive the people scandalously,’ ‘as murderers, wolves, and bears, people who contradict themselves, tools of the devil,’ and so forth. From all such ‘outrageous, dreadful, altogether diabolical calumnies, it is manifest to every Christian and pious German that the Calvinists are, first, liars, and secondly, the most impious villains on earth.’ Their doctrine emanates ‘from the stinking miasma of the Cainish synagogue;’ Christ called them ‘prickly heads, hypocrites, serpents, and vipers;’ Judas, the traitor and son of perdition, was their precursor; and after them came Berengar, the Waldenses, the Picardians, the Albigenses, and Wycliffe, that little shrew-mouse that came from England.¹

Andreas Engel, a Kurbrandenburg pastor, attempted also, after the manner of Praetorius, to prove in his ‘Calvinischer Bettlersmantel,’ published in 1596, that the ringleaders of Calvinism ‘had borrowed their doctrines from the ancient heathen and heretics, and now, nearly at the end of the world’s history, had foraged them up from the dirty, stinking caldrons of the heretics, yea verily from the lying jaws of hell.’²

In the same year Albrecht of Helbach, Lutheran

¹ Bl. A-A 2, A 2^b, N-N 2^b, N-N 2.

² Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 373, note 2.

court-chaplain at Pfalz-Simmern, became involved in a violent contest with the Palatine superintendent Theobald Meusch. 'You call our party,' Helbach wrote, 'cannibals, bloodsuckers, eaters of the Lord God, Cyclops, Pelagians, swine-herds, hounds, and epicures, and whatever other titles of distinction your brotherly, Cainish hearts can invent.' Meusch further asserted that 'the Lutherans associate with the papists, they are Pelagians, Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, villains. This unblushing liar also goes on to declare that the Book of Concord covertly teaches that Christ in His human nature was incarnate in all creation, in foliage, in grass, in stones, apples, pears, in all unclean pots, in cheeses; that He was actually present with the same body, and while still in his mother's womb, in Herodias and in all other women.' While Meusch declared that 'the doctrine of the Lutherans produced libertines and epicures,' because they regarded 'all epicurean sows as recipients of the grace of God,' Helbach asserted: 'Your Calvinistic predestination belongs to the pit of hell; for it produces epicures.' 'They write openly, indeed, "Even if one of the elect be ever so sinful, yea even if he commit murder and adultery, still he is not cast out from grace, but lies like a spark of fire hidden in ashes"; this doctrine is indeed heard daily from Calvinist pulpits.' At the Calvinistic celebrations of the Eucharist 'much scandalous procedure' went on; for instance, 'the dogs seized the bread from the table, or dragged the remains over the floor of the place where the Lord's Supper had been celebrated; old men would put by their share of bread, because they had no teeth to masticate it.'¹

¹ *Reus trepidans*, 61, 254-255, 287, 289, 294, 297.

On the other hand, the Calvinist 'Innocentius Gottfriedus,' in 1601, entered the field against 'the Ubiquist Antichrist,' and the masters and disciples of the Formula of Concord, armed with innumerable citations from Scripture. He said that 'by the Lutheran process of manufacturing peace and concord the evangel had been day by day weakened and minimised.' 'With harlots, thieves, usurers, adulterers, idolaters, blasphemers, drunkards, and robbers they might keep up friendship; but the sons of the mother and the true Christians,' *i.e.* the Calvinists, 'they would not recognise as brethren;' 'they held them to be worse than heathens and publicans.' 'Their princes,' he said, 'are heroes of the wine-bottle and warriors in debauch. They rise up early to follow strong drink, and continue until night time till wine inflames them, and the harp and the viol, the tabret, the pipe and wine are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord;' no less also 'the priest and prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink;' 'for all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean.' 'They preach themselves of how they drink and carouse, and such erring spirits and preachers of lies are preachers for the people.' The author concludes with a hymn entitled: 'Vom Schiffelein der christlichen Kirche, welches Satan gern ersäusen wollte' ('The small boat of the Christian Church which Satan wishes to wreck').¹

This doctrine of the omnipresence of the Body of Christ, which had had its rise chiefly in Würtemberg, and had found harbour in the Book of Concord, was

¹ *Klügliche Supplikation an Christus Jesus* (1601), pp. 17-22, 32, 35 ff. 46, 57, 80 ff., 373.

fiercely attacked by George Altenrath from Herzberg, who hoped to root it out altogether by his 'Ubiquistischer Katechismus,' published in 1596. Altenrath, in this work, quoted the most preposterous utterances of Ubiquist theologians, in order to make known 'the gross, execrable doctrine' to the whole world. For instance, from the printed sermon of the Würtemberg court-preacher Johann Parsimonius he cites the following statement: 'The Body of Christ is in all places and in all creatures, not only in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, but also in all kinds of wood, in stones, in air, fire, and water, in apples, pears, cheese, and beer.' Another Würtemberg court-preacher, Lucas Osiander, wrote in 1581: 'Although the Body of Christ is present in all places, in all taverns, platters, beakers, cans, &c., nevertheless, it does not allow itself to be eaten or drunk up in these vessels, but it can in such wise extricate itself that the shell is left behind but the kernel is not touched.' Doctor Simon Paulus, at Rostock, says in his comment on the second Easter day: 'Christ is a marvellous Proteus who can clothe Himself in all sorts of forms, and becomes to each individual that which he himself wishes Him to be and considers Him.' There are some really learned people still living who, when they were studying at Tübingen heard Doctor Johann Brenz, son of the old Brenz, say in public conclave, pointing to the professorial chair, 'Here in this chair is the Body of Christ.' In a pamphlet against Sturm, in Strasburg, Jakob Andreä, 'who had the chief hand in concocting the Book of Concord,' undertook to show from Luther's writings that the Body of Christ existed in all beer-cans, wine-glasses, taverns, and gallows-cords.'¹

¹ Altenrath, pp. 9-7. See *Reformationswerk in Kurbrandenburg*,

'We are denounced, abused, vilified, and condemned as false teachers and heretics,' said Andreä; 'however, it certainly is a dogma of faith that Christ is also present as man in all creatures, but only in a supernatural manner; we do not mean to assert that Christ, with skin and hair, with flesh and bone, fills all creatures like straw in a sack or bread in a basket.' 'That is a diabolical calumny of the Calvinists.' 'They want to make us detested, by this means, not only among the learned, but also among the uneducated people, and the farm servants in some places are made to believe their slanders, and one of them is made out to have said to another: "Mind what you're about when you cut the grass with the sickle, lest you should chop off Christ's head, since the body of Christ is in each separate blade of grass, as the Lutherans declare."'¹

'The Calvinistic spirit' was 'the devil.'² 'Andreä,'

pp. 206-207. By the theologians of Tübingen, says Tholuck (*Geist. der Theol. Wittenbergs*, p. 64), the opinion that an actual *omnipraesentia substantialis* and *omnipotentia* of the humanity of Christ existed in the condition of abasement, an opinion already definitely repudiated by Andreä in his disputation with Beza and also in other quarters, was maintained with a tenacity which did not recoil from the necessary logical deduction that the 'humanity of Jesus existed outside the limits of his mother's womb, and was also present—not indeed *localiter*, but nevertheless *illocaliter*—in the bodies of all women, girls, men, and children; that Christ's body was present *indistanter* in all creatures, even in His own soul in Paradise.' Respecting the controversy which the Würtemberg and Helmstadt theologians carried on about the omnipresence of Christ, see the catalogue of pamphlets since 1535, published by Walch, *Introduction*, iv. 503 ff. The Helmstadt professor Daniel Hofmann was a specially zealous champion of this opinion. See Walch, iv. 507 ff.

¹ *Bericht von der Ubiquität* (1589), Bl. B^a, C^a, C 3^a. In an anonymous letter from Wittenberg in 1576 there is the following remark on the Ubiquity controversies which exactly hits off the case: '*Ecce jam apparent verae controversiae, quarum πρόφασις tantum quaedam fuit illa de coena Domini.*' In Riederer, i. 471.

² *Antwort auf die Protestation eines grimmigen Calvinisten* (1589), p. 2.

wrote the Count Palatine John Casimir in 1589, 'denounces everybody who does not acquiesce in his accursed doctrine [of the omnipresence of Christ's body throughout creation] as a creature of the devil.'¹

The poet Nicodemus Frischlin also took part in the controversy. In the year 1589 he produced the following rhymes :

What murderers are you Calvinists
Thus to condemn us Ubiquists !
With us you hold no fellowship,
You arrant, wicked drunken knaves
Well known you are and here it is ;
On God you play your monkey tricks.²

In like manner as the Calvinists exploited 'the utterances' of Lutheran theologians on the doctrine of ubiquity to their own benefit, so did the Lutherans incessantly 'quote and repeat veritable Calvinistic statements,' especially on the subjects of predestination and the Eucharist. In a pamphlet entitled 'Von der calvinischen Prädikanten Schwindelgift,' Samuel Huber said in 1591 that their 'chief doctrine' consisted in the statement that 'it was a lying, false, and cursed invention to say that Christ had died for all men ; He had only died for some ; by far the larger portion He had condemned to shame, misery, wrath, gruesome punishment and everlasting death, and this indeed with great delight and satisfaction ; He had never wished that they should be saved ; God led on all these reprobates with secret ropes and cords, so that they were of necessity drawn into sin and death, and must inevit-

¹ Büttinghausen, ii. 68-69, 72. See i. 373-376.

² *Deutsche Dichtungen*, p. 165. Melancthon is described by the Doctor as a Mameluke ; the Wittenberg parsons, he said, were 'apes of the Zwinglian Philip,' and so forth, pp. 166-167.

ably perish eternally in their wickedness.' 'Such was the teaching of Theodore Beza, David Pareus, George Spindler, and others; first and foremost also Daniel Tossanus at Heidelberg was a Calvinistic firebrand and lying spirit.' 'These and many other such doctrines, which are the devil's horrible flames of hell,' said Huber, 'I have forcibly and unanswerably proved against you, oh you Calvinistic teachers, from your own books, in your own words out of your own throats; yea, I have shown up your very own opinions and exposed them to the light of the mid-day sun, and at the same time I have laid bare and refuted all the abomination of desolation and denial of the blood of Christ as to the bulk of mankind.' 'God has already revenged Himself on the Calvinists, and has knocked down their throats "the grinders" with which, in their blasphemous fury, they have assailed the wounds of His only-begotten Son.'¹

'The Calvinists,' Huber maintained in a later pamphlet, 'treat the Bible like a bagpipe, which they tune, play on, and sing to just as they like; and it may easily come to pass that with this new legerdemain they will be able to turn the Holy Testament into an Alcoran, and the Alcoran into a Testament.'² 'The Calvinists answered: 'All the time that the Christian Church has existed the Holy Scriptures have never been so much falsified, despoiled, and cut to pieces by any heretics as by the Lutherans, who give themselves out as true

¹ Pp. 3, 8, 9, 49-51. For the last years and the death of Paul, son of Daniel Tossanus, see Lamey in the *Zeitschr. für Gesch. des Oberrheins*, Neue Folge, iv. 330 ff. The history of the father was dealt with by Albert Müller in his work *Über Daniel Tossanus' Leben und Wirken. Programm des Gymnasiums zu Flensburg*, 1882.

² *Rettung*, &c. (1598), pp. 27-28. Cf. p. 17 and *Vorrede*, Bl. A 3^b.

prophets of the Lord, and who lead all the people into error and perplexity, most especially with their cyclopean eating of the Lord God, which proceeds no less from the devil than the abomination of papistical hosts and all other devil's dirt.' ¹

The passages on the subject of the Holy Eucharist which were quoted by Lutheran theologians from Calvinistic books were of such a nature as to justify the question whether 'anything so outrageous had ever before been heard in any nation, and whether any spark of honourable feeling remained in the land?' 'Has not Sturm,' wrote the Rostock professor, Johann Affelmann, 'compared the words of the Holy Communion service taken with their literal meaning to a snail-shell and its dirt and slime, and written concerning us that we do not take into our mouths the body and blood of our Lord, but that we bite snail-shells with our teeth and eat dung? Does not Beza say in opposition to Hesshus that our Christ is a god of bran, a false Christ, who would no more hear us than Baal heard his priests? Does not Blyttershagius, so highly prized by the Zürich theologians, say in his libellous pamphlet the 'Pseudo-Christus,' printed at Hanau in 1596, that our Christ is a senseless donkey, an idolatrous calf, a raging wolf, a soul-murderer, an empty phantom of the brain, a tyrant, a Baal, fit only to be mocked and ridiculed, and worthy of condemnation greater than can ever be bestowed?' ²

¹ *Ein christlich Gespräch zwischen einem Landpfarrherr und einem Gelehrten des Rechts* (1599), Bl. A 3.

² *Calvinische Heuschrecken*, Bl. C², H⁴. The passages quoted from Beza, on p. C², are not fit for reproduction. Unintermittently it was reiterated in the Lutheran controversial writings that 'the ruthless Beza had called the Lutherans "Cyclops, Capernaïtes, enemies of the Gospel,

‘Whereas, however,’ said the Lutheran theologians, ‘the Calvinists do so scandalously, and in worse than Turkish manner, blaspheme and revile the living God and our only Saviour, it is the highest duty and obligation of Christian princes and town councils to bring all their might and all possible means to bear on opposing them, as the very devil himself, and on rooting them out utterly from their dominions, if they do not wish to incur everlasting damnation.’ ‘Wantonly and fearfully,’ wrote Johann Schelhammer, preacher at St. Laurence at Nuremberg, in 1597, to the doctor of the place, ‘does that blasphemous Calvinism outrage God and His Son. It will not sit at the feet of Jesus, but presumptuously exalts itself over His head and pretends to have more knowledge and power than Christ Himself.’ ‘In the name of God let us open the eyes of the masses and let them see the monstrous iniquity of the Calvinist spirit which dares, by cunning and deceit, openly and in secret, to carry on its blasphemous work and to impose upon the simple-minded people, here and at Altorf, in the school, where the poor young people are being woefully misled. The Turk is not so insensate as to allow his Mohammed or his Alcoran to be spoken against, although it contains nothing but devil’s doctrine, but a Christian magistracy here allows the Calvinists to pour out open blasphemy against Christ’s Testament and sacred blood.’ Terrible punishment, he said, awaited the magistrates if they did not repulse the incarnate devil. ‘Just as the blood of the

Lastrygones, monsters, defenders of devilry.”’ See, for instance, Wolfius, ii. 953 ; M. Hoe, *Tractatus luculentus anticalvinisticus* (1618), pp. 18–20 ; and Hoe’s *Gründlicher Beweis von den gottesklüsterlichen Reden der Calvinisten* (1614), pp. 184–185.

righteous Abel cried from earth to heaven, so the blood of Christ would cry eternal woe, not only on these the revilers and blasphemers of His word, but also on all who tolerated them and had patience with them.’¹

The Nuremberg preacher Sebastian Rodegast ‘attracted crowds of hearers because he denounced and abused the Calvinists in a masterly manner from the pulpit.’ He said once in a Whitsuntide sermon that these people should ‘all be buried in a carrion-pit.’ Another proclaimer of the Divine Word in that place wanted ‘the Papists and the Calvinists to be all handed over in a heap to the devil.’²

As in print, so also ‘from the pulpit there was incessant invective and abuse,’ and ‘whosoever preferred to preach the Gospel in a more peaceful manner was denounced as a miserable time-server, a turn-coat, a peace-at-any-price parson.’ This was the case with the Ratisbon preacher Christopher Donawer. He could not bring himself, he told the town council in 1610, to insult and damn the Calvinists from the public pulpit. In order to ‘fill the common people with hatred and indignation against them,’ they were told, among other things, that ‘the Calvinists made God out to be a liar and a hypocrite, and that they denied that there was any efficacy in baptism.’³

¹ Waldau, *Neue Beiträge*, i. 393–412.

² Soden, *Kriegs- und Sittengesch.* i. 149, 157. See p. 320 ff. The Nuremberg preacher Joh. Himricus, a Melanchthonian, complained on November 20, 1598, of the intolerance of the Lutheran officials; they had called him a senseless dog and an accursed Calvinist, they had dogged his footsteps, and finally they had falsely accused him of having given vent to blasphemous utterances while administering the Holy Eucharist. Hummel, *Celebriorum Virorum Epistolae ineditae* LX. (Norimb. 1777), p. 76 seq.

³ Donawer, pp. 9–10, 32.

‘By far the greater number of the preachers,’ it says in a ‘Christliches Klagewort’ of 1605, ‘are so wickedly absorbed in wrathful hatred’ ‘that no towns and very few villages are to be found where the sermons on Sundays and high festivals are not chiefly taken up with calumniating and bedeviling, or, at any rate, with all sorts of subtle disputations, which the masses cannot understand and which only afford them matter for ridicule, or else opportunity even for the young of the place to fight and dispute together.’¹ ‘We hear everywhere complaints of the unruliness, the love of disputation, the insubordination, and all the vices of the young, and indeed all this lies open before our eyes; but those who complain thus are themselves chiefly to blame, because they make a point of cashiering, anathematising, and sending to the devil everybody who will not dance to their piping, and they teach the young to do the same. And every tenth word they utter is “devil,” by which means they work untold mischief and evil; and if the princes and magistrates and other ruling authorities attempt to put the bit in their mouths and to forbid slandering and reviling from the open pulpit, they all cry out in chorus that we are interfering with the government of the Holy Ghost, and they must not refrain from exercising the Christian office of punishment. Then there ensues between preachers and rulers and councillors as much fighting

¹ The preachers at Frankfort-on-the-Main complained in 1580 that ‘the boys in the school disputed together over original sin’ (Kirchner, ii. 295). ‘With sorrow we have become aware,’ writes a preacher of the Saxon Electorate in 1582, ‘that nowadays, whenever two ignorant drunken youngsters who can scarcely decline and conjugate meet together, one takes the part of the Calvinists, the other of the Lutherans, and they proceed to set to rights their pious teachers’ (Nivander, p. 319).

and quarrelling as among the preachers themselves, and everybody everywhere can hear what honourable titles they bestow on each other, and it is a shame and a disgrace that such things should happen openly before the common people.’¹

In the pamphlet entitled ‘*Der Sabbatsteufel*’ there are fuller details concerning ‘the proceedings of the godless jurists, chancellors, syndics, and councils’ against the preachers. The author says: ‘They persuade the high secular potentates, the great burgo-masters and councillors in the towns, and especially the young lords, that the preachers are the most scandalous men, the very most mischievous people under the sun; that they stir up tumult, discord, and sedition in town and country; that they set princes and lords, neighbours and relations against each other; that they are Westphalian blockheads, Illyrian frogs, coarse, unruly Saxons, mad Italians, runaway Silesians, rabid Slavs, untutored, reckless Meissners, rude, gossiping Suabians, bawling, stiffnecked, spouting Franconians, a pack of lewd fellows from the Harz mines, and so forth.’ ‘Owing to these preachers it was impossible to arrive at any unity; such hard heads must first be got rid of.’

¹ *Christliches Klagewort*, ‘Einblattdruck’ of the year 1605. The princely prohibitions of pulpit controversy are very numerous. Duke Frederic of Schleswig-Holstein, for instance, issued in 1617 the decree that ‘all ministers of the Church must avoid the cursing, abusing, and damning which form the topics of sermons; for it caused great scandal, perplexity, and distress among the hearers.’ The preachers must proclaim the pure Word of God, and set their congregations an example of good conduct, ‘above all in abstinence from gluttony, drunkenness, and avarice, which vices, with many others, were practised by the servants of the Church.’ In *Neocorus*, ii. 418–419. The Duchess Barbara of Liegnitz-Brieg expressed herself admirably on the subject of the pugnacity of the preachers in a letter of February 4, 1591, *Zeitschr. des Vereins für Gesch. und Altertum Schlesiens*, xiv. 429–430.

‘But God the Lord is at last making it openly manifest,’ the author retaliated, ‘how it has happened in some cases—God for ever be praised—that these same haughty and covetous jurists and accursed popes in princely clothing are the greatest seditionmongers in the Holy Roman Empire, and that they would gladly foment all sorts of dangerous discord between the high secular potentates.’¹

It was a specially regrettable feature in the controversies of the theologians and preachers, and one that had particularly evil results, that the disputants not only attributed to each other the most unworthy motives, but also frequently spread the worst possible calumnies about each other. ‘What respect or reverence can the people possibly entertain for the preachers, teachers, superintendents, and other officials of the Church,’ asked the author of the ‘Christliches Klage-wort,’ ‘when they hear and read of the manner in which these men bedevil each other and drag each other in the dirt? There is nothing scandalous that they will not say or write about each other.’² The preacher Schelhammer, at Nuremberg, begged the Council to assist him in vindicating his honour against the preachers Sigelius and Melissus, who had pursued him with personal abuse.³

‘My superintendent, Hermann Hamelmann,’ wrote John, Count of Oldenburg, in 1594, ‘has complained to me of the manner in which Dr. Pezel, at Bremen, has abused and slandered him, in several of his books, making out that he spent his days in gluttony,

¹ In the *Theatrum Diabolorum*, Bl. 471–471^b.

² See p. 276, note 1.

³ In the letter quoted at p. 274, note 1.

drunkenness, and debauchery, that he swallowed huge beakers of liquor, was seldom sober, and, further, that he was a sycophant, a flatterer and fawner, an Arcadian donkey, a wicked prevaricator, a veritable Haman in fact, a downright sheep-devouring wolf, a serpent, a he-goat, an abortion, a creature half goat and half man, and so forth, and that he must be got rid of either by hanging, drowning, or imprisonment, by the wheel or by the sword.’¹

The superintendent and court preacher of the Elector of Saxony, Polycarp Leiser, complained in 1605 that ‘almost throughout the length and breadth of Germany it has been falsely reported that I earn large gilded goblets in drinking matches; that, moreover, I so fill myself with wine that to be removed I have to be propped up or laid on a waggon and carted off like a drunken calf or sow.’ ‘I am reliably informed that it is for the most part only the enemies of the Majesty of Christ’ (opponents of Christ’s ubiquity) ‘who amuse themselves with calumnies of this sort; that it is, indeed, probably from them that they first proceed.’² The Superintendent Nicholas Selnekker reported again and again on the diabolical manner in which his life and conduct were slandered by his theological opponents. The Calvinist Gregory Berssmann, school rector at Zerbst, wrote of him, in a public pamphlet, as a money-grubber, a traitor, a Judas Iscariot, a swindler. At the instigation of some of the Calvinists his daughter had been dishonoured by a nobleman from Carinthia, and Berssmann now cast this in his teeth, Goliath that he was. ‘After this infernal Goliath had himself raised

¹ Strobel, *Neue Beitr.* v. 402–404.

² Moser, *Neues patriotisches Archiv*, ii. 226–227.

this stench in my house, he runs off and rubs his snout in the dirt, and calls out to everybody: "See what dirt and stink it is!" He has heaped on me, an old, worn-out, infirm man, and withal a sorely tried and tormented Lutheran, the most devilish and abominable calumnies that could be invented, and it may truly be said that if Beelzebub himself, with all the demons of hell, had scraped together all their comrades, poetasters, and scholars, they could not have produced anything more diabolical and scandalous.' Selnekker was at the same time compelled to defend himself against 'Beelzebub's servant,' Christopher Pezel, from Bremen.¹ He himself carried out the 'official duty of punishment' against others with such zeal that he could scarcely still recognise anything as good within the new Church. 'Wherever one goes,' he wrote, 'one finds quarrelsome, envious, crazy pates in the churches, hypocrites, conspirators, inconstant weathercock triflers, no one of whom holds to any faith. Gluttony, drunkenness, avarice, and adultery are also found among preachers in great excess. The bulk of the people make game of the Gospel, gossip and dispute about it when they are full of wine, and sing songs about it when they are out of their senses.' 'There are, however, numbers of pious souls who are rightly much distressed when they hear of all the biting and snarling among the scholars, and oftentimes do not know what to do and whom to believe, especially as at

¹ *Antwort auf M. Gregor Berssmanns greuliche Lästung* (1591), Bl. A 2^a-B 2, B 3^{a-b}; *Ungeföhrliche Entwerfung, &c., gegen Pezel* (1591), Bl. A 4^{a-b}, B^a. A comprehensive list of abusive and insulting terms used by preachers and theologians against each other is to be found in Rescius, *Ministromachia*, pp. 3, 8, 9-11, 15, 20, 23 25, 26, 29, 51, 58, 86, 133-137, 140-141.

one moment they are instructed in one way, at another moment in another way.' 'We scarcely know what we ourselves are, whether Christians, pagans, or mame-lukes.'¹

In utter desperation the preacher Johann Praetorius wrote of his colleagues in the ministry: 'The greater number of them are given up to pride, avarice, gluttony, and wine-bibbing.' 'The common people follow them lustily, live in sin and iniquity, and commit all the damnable deeds of darkness. Then they say, "Our lord, our squire, our parson does the same. If it is right for them, it cannot be wrong for us."'²

'Our doctrine'—so the preacher Valentine Weigel declared—'is of men and men's books, and our manner of life is of the devil; for pride, selfishness, sloth, with which almost all theologians nowadays are possessed, do not proceed from God, but from the devil.'³

¹ Döllinger, *Reformation*, ii. 346-348.

² *Eine christliche Predigt* (1589), Bl. C 2-4. 'Many preachers in their sermons bluster and storm about the hundreds of tons of heretics whom they boast of having done to death with their screaming and writing, even at the risk of their own lives; but when it comes to the point, and they must leave off talking, and begin to fight, their tongues turn into bats, and, like the peasant of the tale, they know not whether they are "*Leppisch* or "*Lippisch*," "*Martinisch* or "*Lutherisch*," and when it comes to the scratch their best Latin and noblest craft are confined to *subscribo*.'

³ *Kirchen- und Hauspostille*, i. 124.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DISSENSIONS BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND CALVINISTS
AGGRAVATED BY THE INTRODUCTION OF CALVINISM
INTO HESSE AND ELECTORATE OF BRANDENBURG

THE struggle between the Lutherans and the Calvinists increased continuously in strength. The sum of controversial pamphlets multiplied year by year, and the steady advance of Calvinism threatened wholly to displace Lutheranism. 'The blasphemous Calvinistic doctrines introduced from abroad,' wrote Nicholas Selnekker in 1591, 'will bring all Germany to ruin, in body, soul, and property.' 'Ah, the wicked seed of children that are corrupters, that have forsaken the Lord and blasphemed the Holy One in Israel. The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. What is left is as a cottage in a vineyard, as stalks left standing in the stubble. Except the Lord of hosts had left us a very small remnant we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah.'¹

Since then Saxony had again become a strong bulwark of Lutheranism;² but in many small districts 'the pure doctrine was crumbling away,' this process being especially assisted by the influence of the Palatine court, 'concerning which it was known to all Lutherans' that it 'had everywhere its emissaries who were commissioned

¹ See the quotation at p. 279, note 1.

² See above, vol. ix. p. 160 ff., 226 ff..

to work for the extermination of the Augsburg Confession.' Since the year 1595 John George, Prince of Anhalt, had been engaged in supplanting Lutheranism by Calvinism in order to 'cleanse the Church of his land from the gross remnant of Baal worship and Antichristian idolatry.' From the knights and the burghers there arose serious complaints that the pictures and organs were being removed from the churches, that the ceremony of exorcism was left out in baptism, and the catechism altered. 'Many are of opinion that the Sacrament is nothing more than mere bread and wine; the people of neighbouring States are so greatly shocked at all this that they will no longer allow their children and servants to take situations in this principality.' All expostulations were useless with John George. The Lutheran municipal authorities who would not submit to his ordinances were removed. Refractory preachers, church officials, and teachers were compelled to leave the country, and their offices were filled with Calvinists.¹

In the year 1596 the Lutheran Count Philip Louis of Hanau joined the Calvinist sect, and in 1600 Count Simon of Lippe did the same. The year before the Lutheran Margrave Ernest Frederic of Baden-Durlach published a 'new confession of faith,' which rejected

¹ Beckmann, vi. 135-136; Schubring, *Die Einführung der reformierten Confession in Anhalt*, p. 78 ff. Even in private houses the Anhalt theologians would not tolerate any images and pictures. See the *Württemberg Abfertigung der zu Amberg ausgesprengten Anleitung etlicher calvinischen Blindenleiter* (1597), pp. 11-12. See also H. Duncker, *Anhalts Bekenntnisstand während der Vereinigung der Fürstenthümer unter Joachim Ernst und Johann Georg, 1570-1606*. A contribution to German Church history from unprinted documents of the Zerbst State Archives (Dessau, 1892), respecting the narrow Lutheran standpoint of Duncker see Zarnacke's *Litter. Centralblatt*, 1892, p. 1195 ff.

as heretical many of the dogmas of the Book of Concord, and was therefore zealously opposed by the theologians of the electorates of Saxony and Würtemberg.¹ Preachers who refused to accept the Margrave's 'Confession' were obliged 'to seek the bread of poverty;' the people were to conform to the will of the territorial prince. The town of Pforzheim, however, opposed a stout resistance. The burghers swore in the market place 'to live and die in conformity to the Confession of Augsburg.' A violent earthquake, which occurred in September 1601, was declared by the Margrave's bailiff to have happened 'because the people of Pforzheim would not become Calvinists.' Notwithstanding that several of the Margrave's councillors pointed out the danger of a rising, as the country-people also were good Lutherans at heart, Ernest Frederic, on April 14, 1604, advanced against Pforzheim, with soldiers and armed peasants, in order to constrain the town by force to embrace Calvinism. The burghers had already barricaded the gates and seized arms, when the news came that the Margrave had died of apoplexy on April 14.² The Lutherans regarded this sudden death as a judgment of God. The Margrave George Frederic, who inherited the land, re-introduced Lutheranism everywhere.

The county of Isenburg also had to undergo a variety of religious changes. In the year 1585 Count Wolfgang of Isenburg-Ronneburg removed all the Lutheran Church functionaries from their posts, caused images, crucifixes, and altars to be taken out of the churches, and introduced Calvinism. His successor,

¹ Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 623.

² Pflüger, pp. 365-374.

Count Henry, on the other hand, immediately after his brother's funeral in January 1598, informed all the Calvinist preachers that they must leave his territory within a few weeks. In cold winter weather, some of them suffering from want and sickness, they were ruthlessly driven out. Then, when, three years later, after the death of Henry, Count Wolfgang Ernest of the Birstein line succeeded to the government, the Lutheran preachers underwent a similar fate, and once more the people had to exchange their Lutheran faith for that of Calvinism. In his territory of Birstein, Wolfgang Ernest had already imposed by force a Calvinistic Church system in 1597, thereby occasioning disturbances and alarming risings in many parishes. In the pulpits the true religion was virulently discussed. At Sprendlingen, against the will of the Count, a Lutheran pastor was again installed by force of arms by the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, who was the patron of the living.¹ 'Because we will not apostatise from the true religion,' wrote one of the banished Lutherans, 'we are obliged to make way for the Calvinist fanatics. However long we have occupied the office of preacher, serving and teaching faithfully in accordance with the will of the authorities who have ruled hitherto, we have to turn out, we ministers of the Word, with our wives and children, and the doctrines that have been hitherto preached are regarded as heretical and blasphemous.' 'And those Calvinistic muck-flies, hypocrites, reprobates, blasphemers, and enemies of the Cross of Christ, have the insolence to denounce our dear Father in God, Dr. Luther, from

¹ Fuller details in the *Zeitschr. des Vereins für hessische Gesch. und Landeskunde* 9 (Kassel, 1862), 26, 29 ff., 48-54.

their pulpits as a senseless donkey, an inconstant weathercock, a paunch-belly, and a fellow past salvation. May God strike them down with thunder and lightning, and all temporal and eternal punishments, as the hell-hounds have already long since deserved for their foul, blackguard jawing.’¹

The most violent religious agitations sprang up in Hesse.

Landgrave William IV. had positively refused to accept the Formula of Concord, and had spoken so strongly respecting the person of Luther² and the ubiquity of the body of Christ that he came to be denounced by the Ubiquists ‘as a man possessed with the devil and a veritable mameluke.’ ‘I cannot see,’ wrote the Landgrave, ‘how they can make out that it is doing honour to Christ to assert, as some people have the audacity to do, that He is corporeally present in the devil; *item*, that hell is in God, and that heaven—namely, the abode of the saints—is no definite place, and was not created by God. We do not know whether there has ever been a devil in hell so daring as to put forward such propositions.’³ ‘It is the habit of the Ubiquists,’ said the Electress Anna of Saxony, on March 24, 1581, ‘instantly to denounce as Calvinistic, indeed as worse than Turks and Jews, everybody who does not agree to their absurdities, as, for instance, that heaven, as well as Christ’s human body, are present in all creatures and substances, in foliage, grass, coal, and beer-cans.’⁴ When the Hessian

¹ *Wehruf eines Exul Christi* (1600), pp. 2, 7.

² See our remarks, vol. viii. 419, 420.

³ Heppe, *Generalsynoden*, i. ; Urk. 75–78.

⁴ Heppe, *Generalsynoden*, ii. 163.

court preacher Johann Winkelmann preached once, in 1583, on the doctrine of ubiquity, the Landgrave interrupted him in the middle of the sermon and ordered him to 'hold his jaw.' The episode caused excitement all over the country. He had acted quite rightly, William said, for Winkelmann had preached that 'the mere humanity of Christ had not been able to extinguish the smallest spark of sin. But this did not sound very unlike the words of Osiander—viz. that the death of Christ in His human nature was of no more profit to us than was the cutting of a calf's throat by a butcher.'¹

The Ubiquists became 'more and more talked about.' 'It is impossible to describe,' we read in a report of 1599, 'the way in which both the thorough-going and the semi-Calvinist preachers in Hesse inveigh from their pulpits against the pure Lutheran doctrine and the Book of Concord.' 'Many people are fascinated, against their will, with this devilish Calvinism.' 'God grant it may not altogether gain the upper hand.'

'Calvinism is, indeed, the most diabolical concoction which the infernal regions have produced in our latter days, and every preacher is bound by Christian duty and by his office to utter warnings against it, in the pulpit and elsewhere, as he would against the devil himself.' Such warnings were not without effect. 'No Turk, no Jew, no heathen, no papist,' wrote the Calvinist preacher Fabronius, in 1607, 'is so much hated, reviled, and persecuted by the common people in Hesse as are the Calvinists. Whenever the people catch but sight of a student, they call out: "Calvinist, Calvinist!"'

¹ Müller, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, ii. 420; Hepppe, *Generalsynoden*, ii. 268; Münscher, p. 58.

In a certain tavern there was a book from which I heard such abominable things read about the Calvinists that it makes me shudder to think of it all.' ¹

In Hesse-Cassel Calvinism had had 'the upper hand' ever since the Landgrave Maurice had gone over to it in 1604, and 'was bent on making the whole land happy by its means.' 'The episcopal right,' he assured the Lutheran preachers, belonged to him because the Landgrave Philip had 'acquired it' from the Archbishop of Mayence. 'As my forefathers had authority to regulate the Church system according to the Word of God, so have I also.' 'I stand like a torch to lighten, to teach, and to protect.' In justification of his proceedings against Lutheranism he appealed to the example of the ancient kings of Israel, especially of Hezekiah, who had had the courage to put away the brazen serpent, the idol of the people, and to establish a pure worship of God. 'The freedom of conscience,' of which Maurice talked, was to consist in subjugating the whole country to his 'episcopal will.' ²

The Landgrave's measures extended also to Upper Hesse, where he made his entry as the new territorial prince in 1604, and where, according to the will and testament of Ludwig the elder, he was to have maintained the established Lutheran religion, on penalty of forfeiting the succession. ³

But 'might gave right.' The truth of this adage was experienced also by the Catholic imperial abbey of Hersfeld. Unmindful of the Religious Peace, Maurice

¹ Fabronius, pp. 8-9, 10.

² Vilmar, *Konfessionsstand*, pp. 67-68, 84, 85, 87, note 111. See p. 164 ff.

³ Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* ii. 136 ff.

brought this abbey under his power in 1606 by placing the ten-year-old Prince Otto there as Administrator, after which, in spite of all the opposition of the clergy and the people, Calvinism was introduced, and, as everywhere else in Hesse, hopeless religious confusion created.¹

Maurice began his 'highly necessary work of reform' with the town of Marburg. Preachers and theologians who declared that 'the maintenance of the Lutheran Catechism was a duty imposed on them by the laws of the land, and that any alteration of traditional doctrine and Church forms clashed with their consciences,' were removed and replaced by Calvinists. When one of the latter, the Superintendent Valentine Schoner, preached at Marburg on August 6, 1605, in the presence of his colleagues Schönfeld, Pfaff, and Cellarius, a fearful tumult arose in the church. 'The burghers,' Schönfeld informed his wife, 'invaded the church with shouts and threats of murder. Princes, councillors, burgomasters, rector, and professors all fled panic-stricken and left us poor people alone. The ruffians tore my clothes from off me; five hundred ferocious men surrounded me, all crying out, "Strike him dead, strike him dead!" Those who could get at my face struck it with their fists; others seized me by the hair; others pommelled my head; others knocked me down and trampled me under their feet. In short, it is impossible for anyone to describe the fury that

¹ Fuller details in Heppe, *Einführung*, pp. 135-170. Respecting an earlier unsuccessful attempt of the House of Hesse-Cassel to help the Catholic imperial abbey to obtain a Protestant superior, see G. Winter's article, 'Die Wahl des Protestanten Krafft von Weissenbach zum Abt von Hersfeld' (1588), in Maurenbrecher's *Hist. Taschenbuch*, sechste Folge, Jahrg. 9 (Leipzig, 1890), p. 115 ff.

has raged here about and against us preachers.’¹ Schöner and Schönfeld were kicked down from the top of the stairs at the church door, and owed their lives to some students who caught them in their cloaks and their arms. Cellarius, pursued by the infuriated mob, saved himself, with torn garments, by precipitate flight out of the town; Pfaff was compelled to promise that he would never again preach at Marburg.

On the news of these proceedings Maurice hastened up with his halberdiers, besieged the market place, the churchyard, and the town gates, and placed troops in the houses of the burghers. On August 9 he himself led the preachers, still disfigured by their wounds, into the church, and delivered a severe castigatory address to the people. Whereas this uproar, he said in conclusion, had happened in consequence of the removal of the images, he would take care that there should be no fear of anything further of the kind on account of these dumb idols, and he ordered them all to be cleared away on the spot.² Even the crucifixes were smashed up as ‘dumb idols.’ The carrying of the cross in funeral processions was an ‘idolatrous practice,’ Maurice said, and must not be allowed ‘under the reign of the pure Gospel.’

All resistance in Marburg gave way before the Landgrave’s troops. Twelve town delegates sued for mercy on bended knee.

‘In the country it was just as if civil war was going

¹ Strieder, *Hessische Gelehrten-gesch.* xiii. 173; *Historischer Bericht der im neulichen Monat August zugetragenen Marburgischen Kirchenhändel* (Marburg, 1605). See Vilmar, *Konfessionsstand*, pp. 28–32.

² In the church of St. Elizabeth the images were left untouched, because the Teutonic Order, which had the guardianship of this church, successfully opposed this vandalism.

on.' In Upper Hesse about sixty preachers who would not abjure their Lutheran faith were obliged to leave the land.¹ But their parishes 'remained all the same, fixed and firm in their old belief.' The Calvinistic preacher appointed at Frankenberg only saved himself from the fury of the populace by hasty flight.² 'On December 8, 1605,' another Calvinistic preacher reported to Cassel, 'early in the morning I was pelted with stones.' A third preacher complained that 'a nobleman had threatened him with his rapier. The parishioners had violently attacked his house. Almost mortally wounded by a blow from a stone, he had fallen on the floor in his bedroom.'

On the borders of the Werra especially, the whole of the nobility, together with all the Church functionaries, rose up against the innovations of the Landgrave, and asserted their right of patronage in nominating the preachers. But Maurice ordered that his command should be ruthlessly enforced. 'My sword,' he said, 'cuts more sharply than the swords of the young noblemen.' The nobles who had interfered with his God-bestowed 'bishop's staff' he declared to be guilty of high treason. The refractory preachers were deposed, and pronounced offenders against the imperial majesty. The recalcitrant pastors were deposed, and, on their continuing to fulfil ministerial avocations in private houses, they were punished with chains and imprisonment. The churches came to be entirely deserted; the sacraments were no longer received. As recently as

¹ For the number of the exiles, see Leuchter, pp. 309-312, and also the corrections and additions of Vilmar in the *Zeitschr. des Vereins für hessische Gesch. und Landeskunde*, Neue Folge, ii. 174-181.

² Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* ii. 572.

in 1609, and that in the most populous places, there were scarcely ten or fifteen communicants ; in twenty parishes, up to that date, nobody had yet partaken of the Eucharist.¹

Most melancholy of all was the devastation in the lordship of Smalkald. At the end of November 1608 matters were brought to a climax in this region by a tumultuous uprising. The preacher appointed by Maurice informed the people that ‘ his princely Grace has sent his councillors here with instructions to organise the work of Church reform. The images are to be cleared out of the churches, and on the following Sunday breaking of bread will be initiated.’ On hearing this men and women precipitated themselves out of the church with wild screaming and uproar. In four places in the town notices were stuck up to the effect that ‘ all who intend to remain true to the doctrine of Luther and the Augsburg Confession and the Smalkald articles, and to live as worthy Christians and abide by the Word of God in body and life, are desired to betake themselves to-morrow to the church. We mean to put to death all the parsons who rob us and our children of our souls’ salvation.’ A mob of infuriated ruffians marched to the church. But the Landgrave had already despatched seventy musketeers and arquebusiers, and he ordered 2,000 men, with six field-pieces, to advance in forced marches on Smalkald, in order to put down the tumult by force, and to punish the rioters severely. The ringleaders were to be put on the rack ; the burgher accomplices to deliver up all their weapons, to pay compensation for damages, and to give hostages. The soldiers entered the town with drums beating and

¹ Heppe, *Einführung*, pp. 50 ff., 88, 106-109, 113.

torches burning, planted themselves in front of the church, and pointed their muskets ready to fire. The iconoclastic riot began in the presence of the prince's plenipotentiaries. All the images, carved, molten, and chiselled, among them works of art of great value, were broken up, the paintings were daubed over with white-wash, and the whole lot of them carted away. No less than eight waggonloads of 'idols' were conveyed to the castle, where some of the pictures were burnt. All the weapons of the insurgents were seized. The land-gravian 'reformation' seemed assured. Nevertheless, Maurice was resolved to follow up his success to the bitter end. The troops despatched against Smalkald had already occupied all the villages in the neighbourhood. Every company had been attended by an executioner brandishing a naked sword. The Landgrave, it was reported, would quarter himself on the town at the head of 2,000 men, and wreak a fearful vengeance. In dire trepidation the burghers sent out a deputation to the prince, but they had hard work to appease his anger. The originators of the riot were punished. But the new divine service and the reformed Communion service were attended by a very small number. Out of 300 boys only fifty went to the school. Even in the year 1614 the ancient 'stiff-neckedness' still prevailed among the Smalkaldians, and then, as before, the preachers were in a state of deplorable strife with their congregations.¹

The attachment of the Lutheran populace to the

¹ Heppe, pp. 133-154; W. Rohnert, *Die Mauritianische Kirchenreform in der Herrschaft Schmalkalden* (Steinbach-Hallenberg, 1879), pp. 1-24. The usual term of abuse bestowed by the Smalkaldians on the reformed Protestants was 'bread and cake gobblers' (*Brot- und Weck-fresser*). Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* ii. 580.

old monuments of its Catholic past was as living as ever. As at Smalkald eight waggons had been required for the removal of the 'idols,' so nearly everywhere else the 'carting away' was a great business. In the church of Haina, for instance, there were still twenty-eight altars adorned with images of their patron saints. 'Hew down, burn, destroy all this idolatrous lumber,' were the watchwords. 'Away with your St. John, Maria, and Ursula,' was Maurice's answer once to a petition of the Smalkalders. 'If I were to erect two crucifixes for you I should be your beloved lord. Athalia, the protectress of idols, would be a welcome ruler for you. Sacred groves—that is, small woods in which idolatrous sacrifices were offered—are to my mind the same as your altars. You would be delighted if exorcism and the copes were reintroduced.'¹

But it was especially 'in matters connected with the Communion service,' the Calvinist complained, that 'the people were as senseless as in the days of the papacy; they would gladly have had the disgraceful sacrifice of the altar restored, and the ringing of bells accompanying the Host to the sick. They prostrate themselves when worshipping, which is nothing else than accursed idolatry; and numbers of the preachers are still saturated with the sort of popish idolatrous reverence for the accursed Hosts.'

This complaint of the Calvinists was not heard only in Hesse. 'Almost all over the Empire,' it says in a pamphlet of the year 1509, 'the Lutherans, together with numbers of preachers, hold still with tremendous obstinacy to the old popish dogmas, ceremonies, and usages, as though no evangel had come;' 'it would,

¹ Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* ii. 570 ff., 578 ff., 583; Münscher, pp. 59-90.

indeed, be by no means difficult to bring the people back to popish idolatry again, if the ruling authorities and many watchful ministers of the Word did not resist this with all their might.’¹

In 1616 a Calvinistic ‘Lover of truth and honesty’ inveighed indignantly against the Lutheran people who still ‘from old custom babbled their auricular confessions under the impression that it was piety,’ and who ‘still played the hypocrites with images of saints and crucifixes.’ It was a crime, he said, as well as gross ignorance, to stand up for those images and crucifixes, and ‘in sorrow or joy, as it was still practised, to appeal to idols and crosses.’ Moreover, it was a piece of insanity handed down from the papacy to believe that the clergy had power to forgive sins, and that Christ was present in the Host, in the chalice, or in the tabernacles.²

¹ *Ein Christlich Gesprech* (see above, p. 272, note 1), Bl. B 2. ‘Numbers of evangelical preachers,’ wrote Micron in the year 1554, ‘contend as fiercely about their Mass-garments, altars, tapers, images, tabernacles, bells, confessionals, organs, prostrations, genuflexions, Latin hymns, and other superstitions that have survived, as the bankrupt Pope did before’ (Göbel, ‘Gesch. des christlichen Lebens,’ &c., in *Rheinland und Westfalen*, i. 337).

² *Reformatio Evangelicorum*, p. 18 ff. What numbers of Catholic usages were still retained in the Lutheran territories was shown, for instance, in the year 1575, at the solemn opening of the university founded by the Council of Nuremberg at Altorf. The Prince Apostles Peter and Paul were chosen as ‘patrons’ of the school; the opening ceremony took place on their festival, June 29, and was accompanied ‘with all the Church rites and processions; all the open places of the town were decked and strewed with trees and boughs, and also with grass, so that the town looked like a forest.’ As the procession entered the church, the choir-master and his cantors and five town pipers, with their fine trombones and other musical instruments, played the *Veni Creator Spiritus*; after which a Mass in beautiful figured chant was begun. After the Pater and the common suffrages a sermon was preached, and then ‘the service was finished with singing, organ playing, and trombones, and a few motets from the Word of God, and then the benediction was given.’ In the afternoon the council, the professors, and scholars, numbers of pastors who had

It was imperatively necessary to abolish the Hosts, the Calvinist theologians assured the Landgrave Maurice, for the people were under the belief that in partaking of them they fed on the body of Christ. The Hosts were replaced by heavy round biscuits made of so-called mill-dust, or coarse flour, and which could be broken into four thick pieces, very hard to divide, and still harder to bite and chew, so that the people might be sure that they were eating 'bread, bread, and nothing but bread.' 'When anyone who believes in Christ's presence in the bread,' said the theologians, 'sees the consecrated bread broken in pieces, and it is given into his hands, taken by him into his hands, bitten with the teeth, and thoroughly chewed and eaten, he will at last consider and realise for himself that the body of Christ is not actually present in the bread.'¹ The heavy Communion cakes baked in Cassel became notorious.²

The publication by Jeremiah Vietor, Superintendent at Giessen, and one of the most virulent opponents of the papacy, of a pamphlet opposing the Landgrave's innovations and defending the use of the Hosts, called forth, in 1604, a work 'by a great and distinguished personage in Hesse,' probably Maurice himself,

come to the ceremony, princes, lords, and others repaired 'with equal solemnity' to the church for Vespers, 'and sang praises to God with six or eight voices, and with all the instruments in unison' (Waldau, *Neue Beiträge*, i. 344-359).

¹ Vilmar, *Konfessionsstand*, p. 178.

² Valentine Schoner complained to the Superintendent Schönfeld on July 18, 1605. that he had heard from several people that 'panem Casellannum ad vescendum non satis aptum esse, quod dentibus, quibus conteritur, inhaereat, et in ventriculum dimitti difficulter possit, atque ab iis, qui dentibus carent, imminui nequeat et ideo integer deglutiendus sit' (Heppe, *Einführung*, p. 8, note).

which hurled against Vietor the charge of papism. 'The accursed Hosts,' it said, 'were an outgrowth of the Roman Antichrist.' 'The Antichristian lying devil, Pope-devil, had evolved them out of his own imagination merely to satisfy his avarice, and had introduced them by force into his idolatry.'¹

Whereas Vietor had expressed disapproval of the iconoclastic riot a '*Notwendige Abfertigung*' (necessary remonstrance) was addressed to him, in which among other things it was said: 'Your zeal concerning the images and idols redounds to the glory of the devil and the shame of God, to the scandal and hindrance of the Church of God, and to the consolidation of the kingdom of Satan, to which you have yielded yourself up.' Vietor's desire for 'ornamentation in the church' was 'the true spirit of fornication of which God had said: "Thou hast a whore's forehead; thine eyes are full of whoredom."' As whores scold and abuse the good people who openly reproach them with their secret whoredom, so you damn and vilify the good people who refuse to have part in your whoredom—that is, in your love for images and idols.'²

The Superintendent Gregory Schönfeld was indicated as the author of this '*Abfertigung*.' This man, in conjunction with several theologians, had declared in another pamphlet against Vietor that 'spiritual forni-

¹ *Anatomia D. Jeremieæ Victoris* (Marburg, 1606), pp. 116–124. For the supposition that Maurice was probably himself the author, see Vilmar, pp. 311–312. The Belgian Eremita who, in 1609, visited the German courts in company with a Florentine ambassador, praised the learning and the many-sided culture of the Landgrave; but even in the presence of these visitors Maurice could not conceal his inveterate hatred of the Pope and the Catholics.

² *Notwendige Abfertigung D. Jeremieæ Victoris* (Kassel, 1606), pp. 67, 69.

cation and adultery had been committed at the Lord's Table with images,' that 'images ought to be abominated as they caused the greatest iniquities in the land.' The images on the altar at Marburg used to be adored when marriages were blessed there.¹

'The perpetual reproach of fornication' which was calumniously levelled at the Giessen Superintendent, and which was 'in like manner discharged from the pulpit almost every Sunday against him and all faithful ministers of the pure doctrine, to the scandal and disgust of all right-minded people,' evoked from himself, 'and from numbers of rejected pastors, loud and indignant counter-protests against the Calvinistic devil's rabble.' Vietor on one occasion enumerated all the 'titles of honour' with which he had been dignified in the writings of two 'clerical gentlemen.' 'I was a liar, a blasphemer, a coxcomb, a fool, a Jew, a romancer; I gave false witness, I was hostile to the Christians, I neither loved nor kept faith with my neighbour, I had no true faith in Christ, I had antichristian horns, I was bloodthirsty, I contradicted the Apostle Peter, and so forth.'²

This was the way in which they went on fighting. 'The common people who looked for Christian instruction and salutary admonition from the pulpit, and also from books, met only with wicked calumnies and mockery.' As once on a time in the Electorate of

¹ *Abenötigte Antwort auf den Gegenbericht D. Jeremiae Vietoris* (Kassel, 1606), pp. 163-164, 168, 182. Concerning the author of the pamphlet, see Vilmar, p. 314, No. 29.

² Vietor, *Rettung*, &c., Bl. B 2^b. An exact catalogue of the controversial writings called forth by the innovations of the Landgrave Maurice is given in Vilmar, *Konfessionsstand*, Beil. 5, pp. 306-335.

Saxony, so now in Hesse, the Lutherans gave vent to their feelings in singing the Church hymn :

Maintain us in Thy truth, O Lord,
Frustrate the Calvinistic horde
Who Jesus Christ Thy Son
Would hurl down from His throne.

In a pamphlet entitled ‘Augensalbe für etliche übelriechende Propheten in Hessen’ (‘Eye-salve for some ill-smelling Prophets in Hesse’) the preacher Leonard Rechtenberg said that, ‘Out of the Church innovations of the Zwinglian reformers, the creatures and successors of St. Hulderich [*i.e.* Ulrich Zwingli], there had grown up in many places mischievous errors, terrible abominations, and cursed ideas and fancies,’ and ‘the prophets of ill-odour, in palliation of the anarchy and scandals in Hesse,’ actually gave out that the teachers in Saxony would soon follow their example. The Landgrave Maurice had been so greatly misled that he assumed to himself the right and the power to alter and innovate in spite of the supplicating entreaties of the loyal provincial Estates, of the teachers of pure doctrine, and of the Christ-loving subjects. ‘The Hessian Inquisition’ was carrying on its work by means of violence. They had begun in the first place with stringent orders and coercion by means of bailiffs, tax-gatherers, rent collectors, and secretaries, and now they were endeavouring to govern souls with sword and shot. ‘The people had been terrorised with mandates and warrants; they had been compelled to hear from the officials that they were disobedient fellows who deserved to be sent to the devil; they must expect disgrace and punishment from the chief authorities.’ ‘Theologians and laymen who would not at once agree to “breaking bread,” to the

removal of images, and so forth, were denounced as popish idolaters and stiff-necked apostates, and coerced by punishment.' The churches were scenes of Zwinglian ruffianism carried on with axes and hatchets. Heavy responsibility, it was said, attached to all parents who 'gratuitously placed their children in danger, and, under cover of the saving faith, launched their offspring on the way to the pit of Calvinistic horrors with its sequel of eternal damnation.' 'Even the idolatrous Jews had not yet gone to such lengths, for though they sacrifice their sons and daughters in the fire to Moloch, they do not hinder their children from salvation.'¹

The Calvinists, on the other hand, declared that it was a cause of gratitude to God that in the Landgrave Maurice 'He had resuscitated, as head of the House of Hesse, a new Josias who 'would sweep away and extirpate all the idolatrous remnants of the papacy.'² In Magdeburg there appeared a portrait of the Landgrave with the inscription :

He visited the schools and churches,
With God's pure Word he garnished them,
And rid them in an exemplary way
Of human doctrine and idolatry.³

The Heidelberg theologian David Pareus, who was regarded in Germany as a sort of 'Patriarch of the whole of Calvinism, called the Landgrave a 'godlike hero ;' the work he had undertaken was, he said, 'a work of the Lord ;' 'cursed be he who was negligent in the work of the Lord, and who withheld his sword from shedding blood.'⁴

¹ Rechtenbach, *Augensalbe*, pp. 2-4, 9, 31, 41, 48, 52-54, 59, 96, 144-145.

² *Notwendige Abfertigung* (see above, p. 296, note 2), p. 71.

³ Fabronius, p. 59.

⁴ 'Macte Heros divine ; age opus Domini, quod agis, fidenter. Maledictus

While the religious controversies were going on in Hesse, Calvinism was making further progress in the north of the Empire. In 1610 the Dukes Adolf of Schleswig-Gottorp and Hans Albert of Mecklenburg-Güstrow, and in the following year the Silesian Dukes of Brieg and Leignitz, espoused 'the reformed doctrine,' and turned all their strength 'to removing from their lands the abundant popish dregs and idolatrous rubbish that still remained in Lutheranism.'

'It was enough to make one despair,' wrote Leonhard Hutter, professor of theology at Wittenberg, 'to see how the Calvinistic wolves were forcing their way in everywhere, and how cruelly they were deceiving princes and people with lies and cunning wiles, making out that they were the true exponents of the Augsburg Confession.' A fine specimen of these public arch-liars was Johann Münster. He had dedicated to Duke Adolf of Schleswig-Gottorp a book in which he stated that 'it was out and out untrue that the reformed Church had diverged from the Augsburg Confession; the Calvinists,' he said, 'ought to be regarded as genuine Lutherans in their doctrine and in their rites; Luther himself had died a Calvinist.' Hutter answered that 'the exact opposite of this had, among other ways, been forcibly demonstrated' by the sermons which Luther had preached shortly before his death, 'in which he had uttered most serious warnings against the Zwinglian sacramentarian devil.' 'The French Confession' was trying to insinuate itself under the German, and, in order to gain a following, was making itself out to be genuinely Lutheran, although Calvin had written

nimirum est, qui facit opus Domini negligenter et prohibet gladium suum a sanguine.' See Friedberg, p. 16; v. Ungersdorff, pp. 166, 180.

that 'the Augsburg Confession was a hellish torch which would consume France with its flames.'¹

A new pen-and-ink controversy was set going when, through the efforts of the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse, the Elector of Brandenburg also went over to Calvinism.

In the Electorate of Brandenburg, 'as everywhere else in the Empire, ever since, by God's especial decree, Joachim II. had introduced the evangel, strife and contention had never ceased, and the spirit of Andreas Musculus rested on the disputants.'² 'I have been much surprised to hear,' it says in a letter from Berlin, 'how terribly our clergy fight, wrangle, and quarrel; it is a sin and a disgrace. In the Church of St. Nicholas they fought each other with candlesticks; the clergy of St. Martin threw stones at each other in the open market place, and it was a hard matter to separate them. Methinks God will not be good enough to them to allow pestilence to carry them off, but the devil in all probability will fetch them bodily.'³

Under the Elector John George the Formula of Concord had been forced upon the preachers, 'and everything at court was at deadly enmity with Calvinism.' To carry Calvinistic books about one's person was forbidden under penalty of corporal punishment. The electoral chancellor Diestelmeier, in the year 1593, at a synod at Stettin, said in the name of his sovereign lord: 'The Calvinists in their articles on the person of Christ, on predestination, on the Eucharist, and on baptism, are leading us from the service of God to

¹ Hutter, *Calvinista aulico-politicus* (1609). Edition of 1615. Bl. A 3-4, 2^b, 127, 152-153, 265.

² Concerning Musculus, see our remarks, vol. vii. pp. 294-301.

³ Moehsen, *Beiträge*, p. 124; Gallus, pp. 137-138.

contempt of Christ, from comfort to despair, from heaven to hell. Therefore may God fill us with hatred against Calvinism.’¹ The Elector himself said: ‘I possess but one university, that of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and I regard it as my great treasure; if, however, I knew that my professors were Calvinistic I should wish the whole teaching staff to be consumed by fire.’²

John George’s successor, Joachim Frederic, ‘adhered no less firmly and faithfully to Lutheranism, and stipulated in 1600, in an agreement with his brothers respecting inheritance, that in all Brandenburgish lands, henceforth and for ever, the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession should be maintained, with full exclusion of all popish and Calvinist errors.’ In January 1593 his son, John Sigismund, had been obliged to take a solemn oath to his father in writing that ‘he would remain constant and true to the Augsburg Confession, as it was delivered over to the Emperor Charles V., and to the apology thereof, and also to the Smalkaldian Articles, to the great and the small Catechisms of Luther, and the Book of Concord grounded thereon, and that he would make in churches or schools no changes that were at variance with all the above statements.’³ The hereditary prince also took this oath before the provincial Estates in the year 1602.⁴ Immediately after his accession, however, on his father’s death in 1608, ‘there was heard, more frequently than before, the venomous talk about its being wrong to anathematise the Calvinistic devil’s rabble in print and

¹ Leuthinger (ed. Kuster), lib. xxviii. 591.

² Gallus, pp. 176–177.

³ The text of the oath is in Hutter, *Calvinista aulico-politicus alter*, pp. 22–24.

⁴ Hering, pp. 12–13.

from the pulpits, and that there ought to be good fellowship with them, which could be regarded in no other light than that Christ the Lord and His Divine Word should be denied, as Judas the traitor had denied them, and that we should associate and hold commerce with a Belial who was even worse than the Antichrist at Rome.' Accordingly the preacher Christopher Jordanus issued in 1608 a 'Treuerhizige Warnung vor calvinistischer Brüderschaft' ('A well-meant Warning against associating with Calvinists'). Since the accession of Joachim II., he said, 'the evangelical form of worship had been maintained pure and unfalsified, as well against all antichristian tyranny as against the heresy of all the antichristian plotters in the Mark Brandenburg,' and it had thence been carried into the archbishopric of Magdeburg. But the purity of the land in this respect was not in favour. The Calvinists were at work with secret manœuvres; the Palatine theologians had written publicly that the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ was denied in the Mark; a treatise, also, which the Superintendent-General Pelargus had published on the question of 'breaking bread' had been befouled with Calvinistic glossaries. There could be no question of brotherhood with people whose schoolmaster was Satan. 'Against all spirit of brotherly love the Calvinist rabble accuses us of placing the humanity of the Lord, by some process of natural extension or inclusion, in beer-cans and in the most base utensils.'¹

By the agency of the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse and his court preacher Fabronius, John Sigismund was won over to Calvinism, and in 1613 he published his

¹ *Treuerhizige Warnung*, Bl. 3^a, 5^a, 258.

confession of faith, which was henceforth to be the recognised faith of Brandenburg. 'For eight years and more,' the Elector informed his provincial Estates a year later on, he had been inclined to Calvinism.¹ In his Confession, however, he was guided by Holy Scripture. 'This Empress, Holy Scripture,' he said, 'must govern and rule, and all other powers, by whatever names they may be called, must be subject and obedient to her; be it the Pope, Luther, Augustine, Paul, or an angel from heaven.' The Elector acted in the matter like all the other teachers who had separated themselves from the Catholic Church, and who mutually condemned each other; his interpretation of the Bible was to be the only true one.² 'Princes,' said John Sigismund, 'shall rule in judgment, as it says in the Prophet Isaiah.' He had therefore 'pondered in his mind that whereas God Almighty had ordained kings to be governors, and princes to be nursing mothers of His beloved Church, the foremost and most urgent among all princely aims and considerations was to take earnest heed that the pure, undefiled Word of God, straight from the fountain of Israel, without any leaven of false doctrine, should be taught in the churches and schools, and that the Holy Sacraments also should be administered according to the institution of the Lord Christ, without any popish superstitions or idolatry, or any rites devised by mere human piety; and that by this means the real worship of God should be rightly and truly performed solely according to the requirements

¹ *Reformationswerk in Kurbrandenburg*, p. 32.

² The reformed theologian Samuel Werenfels, at Basle, wrote concerning the Bible:

*Hic liber est, in quo sua quaerit dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.*

of holy Divine Scripture, and should be handed on to posterity.'

Since it had pleased God to give him such great possessions in land and people, he was moved by gratitude to God and the laudable pattern of pious kings and princes of old, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, Constantine, Theodosius, and many others, and by the working of the Holy Spirit, and also by the express command of God, to undertake what was more dear to him than anything else, and also more important—viz. to get rid altogether of all that remained of popish superstition in churches and schools, and to reorganise everything according to the regulations of the Divine Word and the primitive apostolic churches. He did not intend, however, to force 'any subject against his will' to adopt his own confession of faith, but only to enjoin that 'the truth of God should have free course.'¹

In vain did the provincial Estates remind the Elector of the written assurances which he had given his father and themselves respecting the maintenance of pure Lutheranism.² 'In the things of God,' rejoined John Sigismund, 'no such agreements are binding. What an unpardonable sin it would be if we were to close all access, bar all doors and gates, to the Holy Spirit by human agreements, and hinder His carrying on His work in us and leading us to the truth of God's Word.' In justification of his action the Elector appealed to the example of Joachim II. and his brother, who had promised their father on oath to maintain the Catholic religion in their lands, and had nevertheless gone over to Lutheranism.³

¹ *Reformationswerk in Kurbrandenburg*, pp. 1-2, 2-4, 14.

² *Reformationswerk*, pp. 20-23.

³ Compare also the letters which the Margrave John George wrote to

Though the Elector had before solemnly sworn faithfully to observe and protect 'the pure doctrine' of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, he afterwards spoke as follows to the provincial Estates: 'We are not a little surprised that you should insist so strongly on the unaltered Augsburg Confession, seeing that we are inclined to think that there are none among you who have so much as read it. For had you done so, you would at once have discovered that this Confession approves of popish transubstantiation, which execrable and withal blasphemous abomination you will never countenance.' 'The altered Confession,' he said, 'had been published with the approbation of Luther and all the Estates.' Then as to what concerned the Formula of Concord, it was known 'that the object of the ambitious parson James Andreä, in publishing this book, had been not simply and solely to further the glory of God, but to establish a primacy or Lutheran papacy over the Church and community of God. The Elector Augustus of Saxony had himself complained that he had been vilely deceived by the parsons through the publication of this Formula of Concord; had it not, indeed, been sufficiently shown up by friends and foes as a *concordia discors*, and had not its founders and followers wrangled, quarrelled, and fought over it like very Cadmean brothers; were they not indeed still doing so at the present day?' Luther himself, although 'a chosen instrument of God,' had still been deeply sunk in the darknesses of Papacy; his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in particular, was not derived from the Holy Scriptures. 'Luther was also guilty in that he

Gedicke in justification of his brother the Elector (*Reformationswerk*, pp. 44-46, 50, 235, 238-239). See Hering, pp. 54, 222 ff.

had not been willing to own his error in this respect, although another view of the matter stared him plainly in the face out of God's Word; hence it came that he maintained one thing in his doctrinal, another in his controversial, writings, and that in both equally he sanctioned at one moment what he had rejected at another, and *vice versa* rejected what before he had approved of. The writings are there, and you can read them for yourselves; you will not find it otherwise than I have stated.' ¹

That Luther's credit had sunk to such a low ebb everywhere in Germany was the constant complaint of the defenders of his doctrine. 'Almost all over the land,' wrote Cyriacus Spangenberg as early as 1594, 'it has come to this that it may well be said as in Exodus i. 8: "There arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph;" for scarcely anybody cares to hear or know anything more concerning the saintly Luther.' ² 'The ungrateful cuckoos,' so Matthias Hoe, chief court preacher to the Elector of Saxony, complained in 1606, 'although without Luther they would still be sunk in papish abominations, delight in improving on, censuring, blaming, condemning, and slandering the great teacher and divinely enlightened evangelist of Germany.' ³

The Elector sent out to the Lutheran preachers, 'as unto the high officers appointed by God to keep watch over the two tables of Commandments,' a stringent order to 'conform to the improved Confession of Augsburg, without any falsification, and without the glosses

¹ March 28, 1614. *Reformationswerk in Kurbrandenburg*, pp. 32-34.

² *Adelsspiegel*, ii. 73.

³ *Kurze Antwort*, &c., pp. 2-3.

of certain vain, presumptuous, conceited theologians,' and to leave off all reviling and calumniating from the pulpit. Whoever did not obey this command was to be deposed, and proceeded against 'by any means whatever by which he could be brought to submission.' 'All such unseemly agitators and fanatics' were advised to quit the electorate and betake themselves to places where 'this unchristian raging, reviling, slandering, bedevilling, and damning was allowed.'

John Sigismund based his peace enactment on an appeal against the 'Roman Antichrist,' who, he said, was now 'more than ever before thirsting for the blood of true Christians.'¹

Among these 'true Christians,' however, the mutual 'damning and bedevilling went on persistently in spite of the electoral prohibition. The Superintendent-General Christopher Pelargus, who did not oppose the Elector's regulations, was branded by the Lutherans as 'a renegade mamaluke' and a 'murderous Christian.' 'In order to please men you have scandalously denied the Lord Christ.' Dr. Conrad, Superintendent and professor at Stralsund, said to him in September 1614: 'Let the Calvinists go their way, like the devil's servants that they are, and do you join with us in defending and fighting for the heavenly truth reiterated in the Book of Concord, and formerly acknowledged by you yourself.' Conrad Schlüsselburg drew his attention to the 'disastrous end of Berengar and Ökolampadius, of whom it was believed that they had been killed by the devil.' Doctor Cramer also, pastor and professor at Stettin, warned the Superintendent-General that he

¹ February 24, 1614. *Reformationswerk in Kurbrandenburg*, pp. 15-20.

was 'in very truth too great an apostate or renegade to escape the thunderbolts of God.'¹

The duty which Pelargus 'neglected in so mama-lukish and devilish a manner' was executed by Simon Gedicke, 'a veritable God-commissioned servant of Christ and an enemy of all the Satanic rabble of accursed Calvinists.' 'Gedicke's sermons,' wrote the Calvinist Martin Füssel, 'are gruesome and bloodthirsty; he does all he can towards the fulfilment of his wish to see us swimming in blood.'²

In the preface of a pamphlet, 'Von den Ceremonien bei dem heiligen Abendmahl,' Gedicke compared the friends and advisers of the Elector, by whom, he said, 'he was shamefully misled and lamentably deceived,' with Haman under Ahasuerus, and Ziba in the reign of David. And he wished for these councillors, the Elector wrote to the provincial Estates, 'Haman's gallows and Ahitophel's rope.'³ 'Over and over again,' Gedicke complained, 'Calvinistic devil's servants had called out to him publicly, "How many Lord Gods have you still got in your pocket? Have you perchance eaten them all up? Short work should be made with a devourer of the Lord God."' He felt that his life was no longer safe, and in 1614 he left the town under cover of night. He made known to the people that the new Calvinistic court preacher appointed by the Elector, Solomon Finck, was a new Ecebolus who, in matter of religion, changed his coat with the wind. As recently as March 1613, as several thousands of people could testify, he had offered up a public prayer

¹ *Die drei Briefe bei Simon Gedicke, Calvinisterei*, p. 594 ff.

² *Fortgesetzte Sammlung*, &c. (1746), p. 359.

³ Hering, pp. 242-252.

in a sermon against the Calvinists, beseeching God 'to preserve us from their fanaticism.' When, however, he perceived that at court the wind blew from Calvinistic quarters, he became an apostate. 'Not long ago, indeed, he had revealed his impious heart and brazen fornicator's forehead in the presence of an honourable company by saying: "When I belonged to the Lutherans I went with them six times to the Communion. I knew very well, however, that I was not partaking of the Body of Christ in reality. In my own mind I recognised what our [the Calvinist] religion lays down." Is not this the depth of Satanic iniquity which this bird reveals?' Now this bird has let fly a trashy pamphlet called 'Bespiegelung,' in which he says, among other things of us Lutherans, that we proceed from the devil. For, says the Prussian devil, 'whoever is against Christ is of the devil; but whosoever makes Christ's ordinances of no value in order to honour and maintain human theories, that man is against Christ, and consequently is of the devil.' 'We, on the other hand, conclude unmistakably from the article on the Holy Scriptures that Finck and his companions are of the devil.' Likewise 'from the articles on the holiness, love, mercy, and compassion of God, which make God out a fiendish, tyrannical, and cruel God, for they say that God has predestined some people to eternal torment and damnation . . . that God is not more indissolubly connected with us than with unreasoning beasts, oxen, fleas, or gnats. As little as we men are unjust if to-day we slaughter this head of cattle, to-morrow that other one, so little is God unjust if He condemns some people of His own arbitrary will.' 'In the article on the Person of Christ' the Calvinists say: 'Just as little as it follows

that a criminal or a murderer is exactly the same length as the gallows on which he hangs, so little does it follow that Christ extends as far as the right hand of God on which He sits.' In the article on the Holy Ghost they make out ' . . . a newly-born Christian cannot commit a deadly sin, or lose his faith, or forfeit God's grace and the Holy Spirit. David retained the Holy Spirit in the midst of adultery and murder. Indeed, when a Christian commits adultery it is as little a sin in the sight of God as when a bull serves a whole herd of cows and heifers.' In the article on the justification of poor sinners before God, 'they speak from the devil.' In the article on the sacrament of holy baptism they write: 'it is better that the devil himself, if only he were an appointed preacher, should baptise, than that a Christian woman should do so.' In all these cases, altogether fifteen in number, Gedicke settles that Finck and his followers are incontestably the mouthpiece of the devil, and he sums everything up in the words: 'Let me conclude this little treatise with the following argument against Finck: "Whosoever is against Christ is of the devil. The Calvinists are against Christ in the articles enumerated; therefore they are of the devil."' ¹

By this work Gedicke 'had avenged the honour of Christ.' He was quite a different 'fighter for God' than Pelargus, whom the provincial Estates had vainly implored 'to combat that sneaking wolf Finck.'²

Gedicke was strongly supported by Matthias Hoe,

¹ *Abfertigung der sakramentierischen Bespiegelung Salomon Finckens* (1615), pp. 1-6, 8-10, 42-60. He accused Finck of inordinate wickedness and premeditated deceit. Falsehood and frightful unbelief dwelt in this Finck, pp. 11-13.

² See *Reformationswerk in Kurbrandenburg*, pp. 240-244.

court preacher to the Elector of Saxony, who could 'take no more pleasure in life if compelled to be silent concerning the Calvinistic horrors and soul murderers in the Mark Brandenburg.' In 1614 he wrote: 'An indispensable and true-hearted reminder in the Name of God to all zealous Lutheran Christians' in the Mark, 'by no manner of means to allow themselves to become associated with the Calvinistic poison of souls and the newly-published Stimpel Confession.' The Calvinists had made Lutheranism disgusting to the Elector; the Borlin Confession falsely asserted that they (the Calvinists) did not deny the Godhead of Christ. In the doctrine of the Person of Christ, 'the Berliners say they believe that Christ is the eternal Son of God. The other Calvinists, also, in the main, talk in the same manner. At the same time, however, they use words by which the divinity of Christ is denied in genuine Turkish, Jewish, and Arian fashions.' It is a scandal that they should disturb the dead Electors in their peaceful graves by accusing them of having left remnants of 'popish abominations' in their schools. He prayed that God might 'frustrate the machinations of the devil and his tools,' and preserve in their steadfastness the orthodox Christians who had not bowed the knee 'before the Calvinistic Baal.'¹

The Calvinists boast, said Hoe in another pamphlet, of never having been rejected in a general Church assembly; but they ought rather 'to be heartily ashamed of this circumstance.' For Zwingli, Carlstadt, Calvin, and other Sacramentarians had been false prophets. God, however, never said that the doctrine

¹ *Unvermeidliche Erinnerung*, pp. 3-8, 43-44, 45-46, 73 ff., 104, 106, 110, 162 ff.

of a false prophet was to be referred to a council. Christ had not held any council in opposition to the Pharisees and Sadducees, nor had Peter held a council against Simon the sorcerer, but he had simply declared the latter to be an arch-heretic, both in Samaria and at Rome. 'How comes it that the Calvinists so furiously condemn the anabaptist doctrine, the synergist doctrine, the Flacian doctrine, antinomiansm, the new Photinian doctrine, when none of these doctrines have been ventilated or investigated at any single regular council? Could not the Turks by such reasoning free their Alcoran from reproach?' Hoe uttered urgent warnings against a religious conference which the Elector had called for. The Berlin Calvinists, he said, put the horse behind the waggon. After having carried out their Calvinistic deformation at Berlin, and when the cart is already sticking in the mud, they begin to ask whether the proceeding is just or unjust. Moreover, none but preachers from Berlin and Cologne-on-the-Spree are to take part in the conference, and they are first of all to be intimidated by having to report themselves to the court. 'They may hold conferences as often and as long as they like: not one of the Calvinist heretics will let himself be easily converted.'¹

In a 'Gründlicher Beweis von den gotteslästerlichen Reden der Calvinisten' ('well-grounded proof of the blasphemous talk of the Calvinists'), Hoe insists that 'a true Calvinist must learn how to slander and revile the Lutherans.' 'He must learn to call us cannibals, blood-suckers, men-eaters, as Calvin and Beza call us repeatedly, and as we are also called in their public

¹ *Kurzer Diskurs, ob die calvinische Lehr ohne ein Konzil zu verdamnen sei* (1614), pp. 7-9, 11-12, 22, 33-34.

confession.' 'He must call us eaters of the Lord God, as Beza does. He must learn, with Beza, to call us God-gobblers. He must learn to ring the changes on all that is foul . . . also to ask the young boys and girls whether there can be anything left of Christ since the Lutherans have been eating Him for such a long while? Whether they will not soon have quite eaten Him up? Whether any morsels of Him are left sticking on their teeth? Lying, denying, and slandering are their daily bread.'¹

'The Berliners' were not behindhand in answering, but they evinced great moderation in so doing, and they endeavoured to show from Luther's works that the latter had himself propounded several dogmas which Hoe anathematised as Calvinistic. Thus, for instance, Luther, as well as Calvin, had persistently taught that God had purposed the fall of Adam and Eve.² In the book on the 'Slavish Will,' Luther taught the same doctrine as Calvin, 'and if Calvin had expounded it in this way all Lutherans would have decried it as the worst possible heresy and sacrilege; but because Luther had written it, they were obliged to hold their tongues and reflect somewhat, for in the Formula of Concord it was said that this was his best book.'³ On the other hand, Hoe drew attention to 'the godly zeal against the sacramentarian abominations in which Luther, the

¹ *Gründlicher Beweis* (1614), pp. 20, 184-185.

² *Frei Peter, ein christlich und ernst Gespräch von den zwei Artikeln, nämlich von Gottes Wort und von Gott selbst, mit welchen Dr. Hoe . . . sich unterstanden die reformierten Kirchen zu beschweren, gehalten im freien Felde zwischen Berlin und Brandenburg* (Berlin, 1614). *Das ander Gespräch* . . . 1615.

³ Theodorus Lazarus, *Synopsis doctrinae Lutheranae et Calvinianae* (1615), p. 16.

saintly man, had died, to the energy and skill with which he had refuted them, and condemned them to the abyss of hell.' Through the Berlin defamers, he said, the devil had shaken out an incense-powder and left a stench behind him.¹

As in Hesse, so also in the Mark of Brandenburg, the controversy about the Hosts became an opportunity for passionate invective and abuse. To the Calvinists it seemed incomprehensible that the Lutherans, although they had 'divested themselves of the popish anti-christian devil's works,' should nevertheless stand up so zealously for the use of the Hosts. 'It was to these Hosts and their elevation during divine service' that people attributed the fact that, 'although the Gospel had already been preached in all its purity for so many decades, the people both of the upper and the lower classes still at heart clung steadfastly to the popish abomination of veneration of the bread.' James Fabricius, rector at Dantzic, put the question, 'How it could come to pass that in such a small bit of bread, which had neither the taste nor the smell of bread, Christ, a man of six and a half feet, could possibly be contained.'²

The Hosts, Theodore Lazarus declared, were introduced by Pope Sergius, surnamed *Os porci*—i.e. swine's snout—in the sacrifice of the papists, as a target for contempt and ridicule. 'They could not be regarded as real bread, for they had neither the name of bread, nor its form and substance, nor its qualities, neither were

¹ *Wohlgegründete Verantwortung auf das calvinische Lüstergespräch aus Berlin* (1614), Bl. B. 3^a-^b, D 4^b.

² Tholuck, *Das kirchliche Leben*, i. 264. Such was the grossness of the conception of the holy mystery.

they to be got from bakers' shops. The crucifix on the Hosts was enough in itself to warrant their abolition, for the people were befooled by this sign into thinking that Christ was present in them in His own substance.' ¹ In order to effect the gradual introduction of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist, the same means were employed as in Hesse. 'The Hosts,' wrote George Frank, in a scheme for an inspectoral council (*Entwurf eines Visitationsskonsilii*) drafted for the Elector, 'are baked tolerably thick in some places, in order that those who wish to swallow them should be obliged to grind them with their teeth.' ²

The Wittenberg professor Leonard Hutter also ranged himself on the side of Hoe as a zealous fighter for 'the holy, pure, infallible Lutheran doctrine.' The Calvinists, he said, wickedly endeavour to persuade God, angels, and men that black is white, and that lies are truth. We must beware of them even at the risk of vexing the devil and his grandmother. If the Berliners believe that the Calvinists are one with the Lutherans in the fundamental truths of the faith, why do they call us 'Nestorians, Eutychianers, Capernaïtes, idolaters, popish hypocrites, flesh-eaters, blood-suckers, and so forth? Why have they driven the Lutherans out of the Palatinate, out of Hesse, and so forth?' Christopher Pezel says in his missive to the licentiate Hamelmann, that the Lutherans are no Christians, nor sheep in the fold of Christ. George Hanenfeld 'hands us over, with our fundamentals of the faith, to the devil and eternal damnation. Yea, verily, the Palatine theologians write in their Confession, p. 167 :

¹ *Synopsis* (see above, p. 314, note 3), p. 161 ff.

² Tholuck, *Das kirchliche Leben*, i. 263.

“The foundation of the Christian doctrine and religion is markedly falsified by our opponents and the door opened for the wolves—*i.e.* the heretics and enemies of Christ—to rush into the fold.”¹

In a ‘*notwendige Antwort*’ (necessary answer) to the Berlin ‘New Tidings’ of Hans Knorr and Benedict Hobrecht, Hutter expressed the fear that ‘it almost seems as if God now, as in the days of the impious King Ahab, was allowing the devil to trouble the whole of Israel, and as if a false spirit of lying were in the mouths of all Calvinistic prophets and preachers.’ ‘Not to please the devil, who is not worth answering,’ but for the instruction of perplexed souls, Hutter felt bound to take up the cudgels against the ‘New Tidings.’ If Hobrecht said that cursing and slandering were common among the Lutherans, these and other vices could not be laid to the charge of the Lutheran doctrine; for, ‘to judge by Squire Hobrecht’s method of disputation, the Calvinistic doctrines might equally be condemned as false and erroneous simply and solely on this same ground, for it showed plainly that gross sins, such as cursing, swearing, blasphemy, gluttony and drunkenness, fornication and profligacy were just as much, if not more, in vogue in the Calvinist Church as in the Lutheran.’² The Berliners had asserted that ‘the Lutheran preachers impose auricular confession as a strict obligation, that they forgive sins for half a thaler, which the penitents are compelled to pay down,

¹ *Calvinista aulico-politicus alter*, that is: *Christlicher und notwendiger Begriff von den fürnehmsten politischen Hauptgründen, durch welche man die verdamnte Calvinisterei in die hochlöbliche Chur- und Mark-Brandenburg einzuführen sich eben stark bemühet* (Wittenberg, 1614), pp. 151–161, 174.

² *Notwendige Antwort*, p. 10.

and that they do not concern themselves as to whether the receivers of the Sacrament understand the faith. If only the half-thaler is paid, the father confessor will lay his hand on the head of the penitent and say: "Thy sins are forgiven." Thereupon Hutter replied, without denying the payment of half a thaler as a confession fee: 'When the pamphleteer tries to convince the people that our penitents imagine that the payment of half a thaler to the confessor gives efficacy to the absolution, he is inventing a wicked, diabolical lie, and villainously calumniating and degrading our Church. We would advise the present-day Calvinist priests, such as Flinck, Füssel, Clotho, and others, to look into their own consciences and to consider well what it is that they have chiefly had regard to hitherto, in their own public confessing and absolving, and which of them, as the tale goes, has received a confession fee of several hundred, if not thousand, imperial thalers, and what bad blood this has made, so that Flüssel and Flinck, it is said, wrestled together and bravely pommelled their Calvinistic heads about it.'¹

When the Elector, during the Lent season of 1615, commissioned his brother John George, governor of the Mark, to have the altars, crosses, and images removed from the Berlin cathedral church, Dean Stuler inveighed indignantly in the Church of St. Peter against this 'sacrilege,' and then informed his adherents that he should be taken to prison on account of his sermon. Thereupon the burghers and young men collected

¹ *Notwendige Antwort*, pp. 12-13, 14-16, 51-52. For the slandering of Lutheran ceremonies by the *Leidiger calvinischer Teufel*, and the *berlinische Spiegelmacher und Brillenreiner*, see p. 192, *gegen die berlinischen neuen Zeitungen*, Bl. D.

together, some of them providing themselves with fire-arms. The governor, who, in company with some armed men, attempted to restore quiet, was wounded in the thigh with a stone. The alarm bell was rung, and the house of Martin Füssel, who had become court preacher in place of Gedicke, was completely looted. After the tumult had been allayed, Füssel appeared in the pulpit on Good Friday 'in unusual apparel—namely, in an undergarment and a green camisole, which was all the clothing left him.' He had only with difficulty saved his own life and those of his wife and children from the infuriated mob.¹ The Lutheran-minded Electress, it was reported, had said, concerning the rising, that 'the people ought not to let themselves be robbed of the preacher Stuler.'

In other towns of the Mark also riots occurred. At Lindau, in the county of Ruppín, the burghers and the Lutheran nuns opposed the installation of a preacher appointed by John Sigismund, and only gave in when a captain came to them with the threat that 'the Elector would avenge this disobedience in the most summary manner on clergy and laity, on young and old, in order to make an example of them to others.' At Stendal 'evil-disposed people tore about at night with torches, and indulged in blasphemous jesting by holding Communion services after the manner of the reformed Church.'² In the town of Brandenburg also there was dissatisfaction with John Sigismund. He had prescribed the use of a Church prayer in which God was invoked 'to strengthen this land and people through the might of His Spirit and His Word, that they might

¹ Fuller details in Hering, pp. 279-299.

² Hering, pp. 275, 320 ; cf. pp. 310-311.

fight with pure hearts for the evangel.' The Brandenburg preachers sent in a petition against this enactment in 1616. 'If,' they said, 'prayer was offered up for the strengthening of the followers of both religions, a great confusion of both religions would ensue; but if only one religion was meant, then one would be praying against the other.' 'With their antagonists in doctrine,' they said in an address to the town council, 'they could have no fellowship in prayer, and they could as little obey this injunction as faithful shepherds could obey the wolf's orders.' The Brandenburg Archdeacon Ulrich Nagel turned the Superintendent Joachim Garcäus 'away from the Communion' in the presence of the whole congregation, because he wanted to receive the Sacrament without having first made private confession. Nagel was deposed from his office. But the other preachers also stood out for the necessity of private absolution, until John Sigismund threatened them with the severest punishment. 'Luther himself,' he said, 'when he went to the Communion, never confessed beforehand.'¹ 'Illumined with the light of divine truth,' wrote the Elector in 1616, 'he abhorred with his whole heart' 'the dogma of ubiquity,' as also 'the popish abomination of eating the Body of Christ with the mouth.' He would not have these dogmas taught and advocated in his schools and churches.²

Accordingly, he altered with his own hand the statutes of the theological faculty at the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and placed reformed professors there. 'The Calvinist dragon,' wrote John Affelmann,

¹ Hering, pp. 313-320.

² Cyprian's *Unterricht von kirchlichen Vereinigung der Protestanten*. Beil. No. 5.

professor at Rostock, 'will henceforth ravage the fold of Christ at Frankfort.' 'The locusts' spoken of in the Book of Revelation 'were nothing else than the Mohammedan sects that had sprung up at the present day out of the papacy—namely, the Calvinist Zwinglians and the Zwinglian Calvinists—for St. John spoke of locusts that had left the smoke and darkness of popish power and had gone out from the papacy.'¹

'How greatly the minds of men were everywhere inflamed' became evident also in Königsberg, where the elector attended the Communion in the hall of the castle on Easter Day 1617, in the presence of a number of Calvinist converts. The court preacher and professor, John Behm, was so indignant that on the following day he preached a sermon in the castle church on the text, 'I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation' (Amos viii. 10). 'This threat,' he said, 'concerns us all now at this moment, inasmuch as the Calvinistic rabble held their Calvinistic bread-breaking here yesterday, and people flocked to it from all corners, so that they have grown to a great multitude, and they will now proclaim and boast that such and such a number have joined their religion in our land. Anyone who does not see this harm done to Joseph is dishonoured and deceived.' He attacked the Elector personally. 'It is stated in plain words,' he said, 'that the grievances in the land are going to be redressed; but how far this is being done the actual proceedings clearly show. More and more fresh grievances are introduced, so that the misery becomes greater and greater. We shall be reduced in the end to "sitting on hard stools." They promised

¹ *Calvinische Heuschrecken*, Bl. A 3.

us that they would maintain the constitution of the land, but the way in which this is done is a sin and a shame. The constitutions of the land require, among other things, that no Calvinistic doctrine should be tolerated and propagated in it. This was sworn with a solemn oath under the open heavens. But God have mercy upon us, how has this oath been kept! Consider well, dear Christians, the heavy grievances of your country. It is high time we should pray to God that He would overmaster the devil, and prevent him proceeding any further with the work he has in mind.’¹

‘In the Mark of Brandenburg’—so the Saxon court preacher Matthias Hoe declared in 1618—‘the devil has now established a Calvinistic stronghold.’ In another pamphlet he maintained that ‘in twenty-nine points the Calvinists are in agreement with the Arians and the Turks.’ Zacharias Faber, Lutheran elder and pastor at Hohenleime, went still further than Hoe. He ‘could bring forward two hundred, if need be three hundred, proofs to show that the Calvinistic doctrine was far worse than that of the devil.’²

If the Protestant theologians and preachers could everywhere denounce each other with such vehemence, it is easy to understand the way in which they opposed the Jesuits, against whom they united all their polemical forces.

¹ Hering, pp. 339-342.

² Hering, pp. 93-97.

CHAPTER IX

CONTROVERSIAL WRITINGS AGAINST THE JESUITS—‘THE
ORIGIN OF THE ORDER’—‘PRIVATE CRIMES OF THE
FATHERS’¹

THE opinions held by the Protestants in general about the Jesuits were summed up briefly by the theologian Conrad Schlüsselburg at the end of the sixteenth century, in the following words: ‘I firmly believe that the race of Jesuits was not created by God, but by the devil.’² ‘What, however,’ argued another theologian, ‘has come forth from the devil, what has been called up and promulgated by his vice-regent, can only act and proceed in a devilish fashion, and the Jesuits are themselves devils incarnate, the principal wicked angels of the ninth chapter of the Apocalypse, which sting like snakes and scorpions, as the Apocalypse itself testifies. Whosoever trusts in these angels cannot be master of his reason; whosoever does not hate them has no love of God; and whosoever holds fellowship

¹ A large collection of writings, poems, and caricatures, which appeared in Germany against the Jesuits, catalogued by De Backer, i. 74-78, and iii. 1890-1891. M. Lipenius, *Bibl. realis philosophica* (Francofurti, 1682); pp. 707-711. Numerous supplements to these are found in the first and second volumes of Weller's *Annals*. Numbers of publications are discussed by Stieve in the first and second volumes of the *Politik Bayerns*; see the *Register* under ‘*Jesuiten : Angriffe und Hass gegen sie.*’

² Schlüsselburg, viii. 12. Concerning Schlüsselburg (†1619), see *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, xxxi. 606 ff.

with them exposes himself to everlasting damnation in the pit of brimstone.’¹

Language of this sort was held against the Jesuits as early as in the first decade of their labours in Germany. Already in 1556 the theologian John Wigand declared that the Fathers were ‘the very worst and most infamous betrayers and persecutors of Christ,’ intent only on robbery and plunder and on seducing the people into everlasting hell-fire. Father Canisius in especial was a worshipper of idols, an execrable blasphemer, and a shameless devil. In the German translation by the preacher Zanger of the Chemnitz pamphlet on the Jesuits it says, a few years later: ‘These scoundrels vomit forth their abominable obscenities from their stinking jaws in order to besmirch, annul, cancel, and repudiate the Word of God.’ The Fathers, he said, were ‘treacherous, perjured, oath-breaking, dishonourable, abandoned, infamous villains.’ Tilmann Hesshus, Wilhelm Roding, and Paul Scheidlich expressed themselves in a similar manner.² ‘The blasphemous Jesuits,’ wrote Flacius Illyricus, ‘these new false prophets are indeed the new frogs which the Antichrist vomits up, as is written in the Apocalypse, and the locusts of which this same book prophesies that they will come forth from the pit of hell in the time of the Antichrist and will befoul and pollute everything in the world, yea even in the Church itself. They have a very harlot’s brow and are ashamed of nothing.’³ After the Dillinger Jesuits had published a series of ‘theo-

¹ Mengerig, p. 12. See what the astronomer Lambert Floridus Plieninger says in his short memorandum on the *Emendation des Jahrs* (see above, p. 63, note 1), pp. 82-85.

² See our statements, vol. viii. pp. 237-239, 282-292.

³ *Etliche hochwichtige Ursachen*, &c., Bl. C 4, C 7^b.

logical propositions' which they based on the first epistle of Paul to Timothy, two Stuttgardt doctors of theology, Wilhelm Bidenbach and Lukas Osiander, directed a 'pious rejoinder' at them in 1566 which ran as follows: 'You have resolved to extirpate all religion; up then, plunder the Holy Scriptures, burn them on funeral piles, throw the ashes into the water.' They accused the Fathers, 'openly before the whole community of the Son of God,' of being 'Jews, Turks, and heathen.' 'Beware,' they exclaim to their readers, 'of what the wicked spirit vomits forth through his slaves from his pit of hell.' 'The "Jebusites" have no scruple whatever in referring to the sham Council of Trent as to a synod of undoubted authority—that council at which the Antichrist and his satellites presided, and whose judges were people burdened with the most execrable crimes, with worship of idols, with blasphemy, lying, sacrilege,' and so forth.¹

The poet Johann Fischart was regarded as one of 'the manliest Christian combatants against the Jebusitish, diabolical wickedness.' His poem '*Nachtrab oder Nebelkrüh*,' which appeared in 1570, is in its outward form a pasquinade against the convert Jacob Rabe, but in substance it is essentially intended to drag the life and teaching of the Jesuits in the mire, and, while undermining all respect for them, to put a stop also to their further activity in Germany.² Fischart describes the origin, the spread, and the labours of the Order in a detailed rhyme chronicle, but feature by feature the portrait is

¹ *Ad Jesuitarum Assertiones . . pia Responsio* (Tübingae, 1566), pp. 30, 53, 69, 91, 150, 184, 192, 200, 209, 213, 229–232.

² *Kurz*, i. 1–97; not less than 3,755 doggerel rhymes.

degraded into the most frightful and indecent caricature. The humane, benevolent, loving labours of the Fathers in the hospitals, their night-watches by the sick-beds, are perverted in the most abominable manner.¹

Fischart gained special renown in the year 1580 on account of a satire on a French poem² entitled *Das Jesuitenhiittlein*, which consisted of 1,140 abusive verses.³ In these he describes how the devil, for the advancement of his dominion, first of all formed the one-horned monk's cap out of idleness, false simplicity, hypocrisy, and deceit; then the two-horned bishop's hat, the wearers of which 'devour widows' alms and feed their pomp and pride on the sweat and blood of others.' Thirdly, the devil fashions the three-fold papal horn, made up of every imaginable vice and crime: avarice, envy, lust, poisoning, sedition, treachery, perjury, sodomy, and sorcery.

The horn is brought to Rome, where a pope is chosen :

And all is done as Satan bids,
The world henceforth invested lies
With the threefold horn, and nought
But crime to perpetrate, it's taught.

After this has been done all hell is requisitioned to work at the four-horned Jesuit hat, which 'must have four times as much poison in it as the others, because it is to be commissioned with four times as much villainy

¹ Most of these rhymes are not fit for reproduction. The reader who wishes to make their acquaintance is referred to the original German, vol. v. p. 553 ff.—TRANSLATOR.

² See Kurz, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, pp. 35, 61-78. Kurz, *Fischart's Dichtungen*, ii. xxxv-xliv.

³ Kurz, *Dichtungen*, ii. 241-271.

of the worst description, and those who wear it are to be called after me (Satan) "Satanites," because they, too, rage against Jesus.'

The thread of the biretta was stiffened with wax
'and pitch from Gomorrah':

Weave into it idolatry,
Bedazzlement and sorcery,
The devil's cunning and deceit,
Soft flattery and poison sweet;
The hindmost horn by fiends galore
With devil's trimming was decked o'er,
With cruelty and blood-intrigues,
With murder and seditious leagues . . .
With secret sins, with treachery,
With Mamelukes, with roguery . . .

Then followed the consecration of the hat by Lucifer:

Fetch from Vulcan's chamber dark
Hell-filth, fire, brimstone, smoke and spark;
Fetch Babylonish-Romish venom,
Purgatory's fetid vapours;
Into this hat infuse them well
That evermore their stench may smell.

Such a poem could not minister to the elevation of the people. At the consecration of the hat Lucifer speaks as follows:

Work wonders in my power and might,
And all my qualities preserve.
To mutiny the land incite,
Cause persecution, tyranny,
Heighten the Pope's infamy,
His cursing, excommunicating;
Be thou the agent who secures
Worship for this beast's high power.

and so on in the same strain.¹

¹ Verses 419 ff. This satire went through several editions, and has

Even learned theologians adopted the same method in their writings. For instance, Christopher Pezel, in 1599, prefaced his 'Widerlegung der Jesuitenkatechismen' with a Latin poem which bore the title: 'True origin of the most execrable Satanic rabble, that is the new sect of arch-monks who, at the instigation of the Spanish pig, Ignatius Loyola, have falsely usurped the most sacred name of Jesus and rejected the name of Christian.' 'God in His fury,' sings Pezel, 'sent horrible spirits of vengeance from hell. Before Satan let them loose he called out to them three or four times: *Procul ab Iesu ite*, go far away from Jesus! Then Father Ignatius rushed up and caught up this phrase, saying: 'Yes, you sprigs, worthy of your father, *procul ab Iesu ite!* Henceforth they were called Jesuits. And in fact, among all the many

even found admirers in later times. Vilmar himself, in his *Geschichte der deutschen Nationallitteratur*, i. (7th edition), p. 380, calls these rhymes, which reek with coarseness and indecency, 'the most pungent, witty, and admirable satire which was ever written against the Jesuits.' Kurz, *Fischart's Dichtungen*, ii. 43, reiterates Vilmar's praise concerning the 'masterpiece of satire.' Wackernagel, p. 89, says: With Fischart 'satire first appears in its true character when ridicule—and in the main this legend [of the origin of the four-cornered Jesuit hat] is a case in point—rises and is exalted into crushing irony.' Fischart's 'speciality,' he says, was humour. Of genuine sarcasm and humour there are no traces in Fischart's religious polemical verses. The opulent talents of this man were blackened by the curse of hatred, which could plentifully destroy, but was impotent to build up. The same spirit which incensed him against the Jesuits prompted his invectives against the Jews. In 1575 he informed the German nation that on December 12, 1574, a Jewess had given birth to two pigs (Kurz, iii. 70–72). Concerning Fischart's defence of the utmost brutality in the persecution of witches in a work intended for national reading, see vol. vi. 250 ff. (German edition). K. Goedecke, in *Dichtungen von Joh. Fischart* (Leipzig, 1880), xvi. ff., says that the polemical writings of Fischart against Jak. Rabe, Joh. Nasus, and the Jesuits can attract attention at the present day only because they proceed from Fischart. Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 72, speaks to precisely the same effect.

swarms of false brethren, none had wandered so far from Jesus as this rabble.' ¹

A 'Katechismus oder gründlicher Bericht von der Lehre und Leben der Jesuiten,' ² translated from the French, could discover 'nothing but deceit in this rabble from the very beignning of the Order'; even the Bull of confirmation of the Order issued by Paul III. had been obtained by fraud, and was therefore invalid. The Jesuits were 'hypocritical heretics,' he said, 'a fresh lot of monsters and prodigies,' 'atheologists'; their sect, in which, moreover, an anabaptism lurked hidden, had 'been condemned even in Rome.'

With a view to undermining the efficacy of the Order, the Fathers were accused of the most heinous crimes.³ As early as 1573 Duke Albert of Bavaria had written: 'We are well aware from constant experience that the most absolutely outrageous, and also most absurd and utterly baseless reports, are circulated among the people concerning the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, and that many sensible and learned men believe the things said of them to be true. And yet, in the interest of truth, it must be declared that all such reports are unscrupulous and abominable inventions, as is invariably

¹ *Jesuiticorum Catechismorum Refutatio, tradita in Gymnasio Bremensi* (Bremæ, 1599).

² Printed 'at Freystadt' (1603), pp. 29, 108, 123-140, 328, 344, 428, 695.

³ Even the saintly Father Canisius did not escape the attacks of calumny. What Flacius had written in 1565 concerning 'a canine marriage,' said to have been celebrated between Canisius and an abbess of Mayence (*De Sectis, Dissensionibus, &c., Pontificiorum Liber* [Basileæ, 1565], p. 771), was repeated in the year 1600 by the Lutheran jurist Johann Wolf (*Lectiones*, ii. 707), and again twelve years later by the Dortmund preacher Hermann Empsychovius (*Apologia Orthodoxæ Doctrinæ* [Giessæ, 1612], pp. 672-673). See the refutation of the fable in Raderus, *Vita Canisii*, pp. 59-61, and Braunsberger, ii. 800-801.

seen whenever the reports are thoroughly investigated. We and others have never found otherwise than that the Fathers of this laudable society have in these unhappy times done all that they can for the establishment of justice and righteousness, and for the building up of a Christian people by teaching and preaching, by ministry in the hospitals, and by loving benevolence to the poor and the lepers. All this is evident to all eyes ; but nothing serves to convince the antagonists of our holy religion.' ¹

Since that date the circulation of outrageous and absurd calumnies had gone on with increasing malignity. 'Quantities of scurrilous poems, caricatures, and rhymes,' wrote Peter Hansonius from Saxony in 1586, 'have been published against the Jesuits ; at Munich they are said to have castrated young boys for abominable purposes ; at Vienna, some of them, who disguised their sex, were made pregnant ; they have even been accused of persuading a poor man to pretend that he was dead and let himself be carried to church, and afterwards raised to life again by the Jesuits in confirmation of their doctrine, but afterwards he was found dead in the coffin ; again, that some of them were stabbed and killed at Augsburg whilst revelling at night in masquerades, that the same happened at Dillingen to a Jesuit sorcerer and his sorceress ; that at Prague the Jesuits tried to hoist a shameless woman in a cask up to the college windows, but that the bottom fell out of the cask and woman and Jesuits were put to public shame ; and there were many more libels and caricatures of this scurrilous, indecent nature, which were everywhere hailed and

¹ See our statement in vol. viii. 315-320.

devoured by the people with loud laughter and acclamation. And although it is always afterwards discovered that all such accusations are shameless lies and, moreover, that in the places mentioned nobody either among the rulers or the subjects has heard or knows of such stories, nevertheless the scoundrelly, lying spirit of the devil cannot desist from instigating his filthy, carnal preachers, who are full of uncleanness, and therefore suspect and judge others according to their own wicked natures, to go on with their evil imaginings and inventions of lies.’¹ Thus, for instance, in the year 1604 the Augsburg preacher Bartholomew Rüllich announced in a ‘New Jesuits’ Tidings’ (‘Jesuiterische neue Zeitung’) that the Jesuits at Munich had murdered young women in their church, and that in punishment of this crime the council of the place had condemned five Fathers to be tortured with red-hot tongs, and to have slices of their flesh torn out. The Munich town council replied in a public printed document that the whole report was a deliberate lie. ‘On the contrary,’ they said, ‘it is well known to ourselves and all belonging to our town and laudable company of burgesses, as also to all those, of whatever nation or religion they may be, who have been settled here for any length of

¹ *Offenbarung der neuen erschrecklichen und teuflischen Landtlügen, so diss 1586, gar wider die Societät Jesu im Reich und anderen Landen hin und wieder aussgesprengt worden. Durch Petrum Hansonium Saxonem zu Schutz der Wahrheit in Druck verfertigt* (Ingolstadt, 1586), Vorrede, pp. 1–4. This pamphlet contains a reproduction of the alleged murders by, and execution of, Jesuits in Cracow, and a well-grounded refutation of this widely circulated fable. See Adam Walasser’s *Christliche Vermahnung von dem grossen Laster der Nachreder und Verleumder* (Dillingen, 1570), Bl. C 2^b. See also v. Reichardstöttner in the *Forschungen zur Gesch. Bayerns*, ii. (1894), 51 ff., 58 ff., 83 ff., where it is maintained that Walasser’s poetry in some passages rises to a height of sentiment which is quite remarkable for the time in which he wrote.

time, in what an honourable, pious, upright, chaste, irreproachable, and truly priestly manner, the reverend Fathers of the laudable Society of Jesus have lived among us here for many years, how assiduous they have been in holding divine services, in preaching, hearing confessions, teaching children, giving instruction and learning to our dear young people, and doing everywhere immense good; how, too, they have succoured and relieved the sick and dying, watching day and night assiduously by their bedsides.’¹

The town council at Graz felt itself bound to make a similar declaration respecting ‘a false and scurrilous libel’ published in Dresden in 1602, and making out that ‘certain Fathers of the Society of Jesus had allowed themselves to be employed there as hangman’s servants, and had applied the torture to a preacher who was lying in prison’; also that Father Scherer ‘had been condemned to languish day and night in prison in punishment of a crime.’ The council, ‘on its honour,’ refuted these ‘gross and notorious falsehoods,’ and, on the ground of long experience, bestowed the highest praise on the conduct and the labours of the Jesuits.

Father Scherer, in particular, they declared, ‘had been most zealous in ministering day and night to the sick and dying, and also to the prisoners, and in giving them every possible assistance.’²

With equal decision did the councillors and burghers of Freiburg in the Üchtland (August 18, 1616) contradict the calumny circulated against the Jesuits there, that they had dishonoured young women and murdered them, and that they had consequently been expelled

¹ *Einblattdruck vom 12. Juni 1607*, with the Munich town seal.

² *Der amtliche Erlass*, in Gretser, xi. 838.

from the town. 'The reverend Fathers,' they said, 'are faithful models to the people in their teaching and in their lives, and for this reason they are very dear and precious to us.'¹

Two years before, when the Jesuits at Constance had been impugned in their honour, 'the governor, the burgomaster, and the council' made the following declaration: 'We must not, will not, and cannot leave unspoken our testimony that among the Fathers there is nothing else to be observed but exemplary, blameless, and priestly conduct'; also that they 'show reverence to the secular authorities,' that 'they abound in good deeds to their fellow-men, and that 'all their care and energy are directed towards holding church services, preaching, visiting the poor and the sick, and promoting pious and useful works.'²

'There have passed under my eyes,' wrote Dr. Christian Gudermann from Mayence in 1615, 'more than a hundred pamphlets, folios, lampoons, caricatures, and rhymes, wherein the Fathers of the Society of Jesus are accused of all the most disgraceful acts and vilest crimes which have been committed or invented in our day: adultery, sodomy, murder, pederasty, poisoning, and every sin that has ever been named. And all these disgraceful lies and calumnies which are circulated, to the degradation of the noble arts of printing, painting, wood-cutting, and poetry, serve no other end than to incense the princes, the lords, and the common people, and to stir them all up to violent persecution and annihilation of the Jesuits. And all this is put down in great books, which are called histories of the Jesuits,

¹ *Einblattdruck vom 18. Aug. 1616*, with the Freiburg town seal.

² *Einblattdruck vom 12. Dezember, 1614.*

but which are full of nothing but slander and abuse, and which are proclaimed openly before all the world.’¹

Among works of this sort the first rank is assigned to the History of the Jesuit Order which the renowned Lutheran theologian Polycarp Leiser published in 1593. The author, so he said, was Elias Hasenmüller, a former novice of the Order, who had died at Wittenberg in 1587. The book in its original Latin form was frequently reprinted, and a German translation of it by the Brunswick preacher Melchior Leporinus appeared also repeatedly in fresh editions.²

There were many members of the Order, Hasenmüller declared, who, having become acquainted with the hangman’s claws, the bloodthirsty intrigues, the treachery and idolatry, the impious and scandalous doings of the Jesuits, would gladly have left the Order; but they could not do so. ‘For when it becomes known that they want to break away they are separated

¹ In the preface to the pamphlet, *Von den sieben Werken Christlicher Barmherzigkeit*, 1615.

² I have made use of the translated edition of 1596; see *Bücherverzeichnis*, ‘*Historia Jesuitici Ordinis*.’ For the earlier Latin and German editions and for Hasenmüller, see Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 322 ff. See also Krebs, *Publicistik*, pp. 23 ff., 130 ff., and for criticism by Krebs, see the article in *Hist.-polit.* Bl. 109 (1892), 184 ff. Krebs himself says of Hasenmüller’s work: ‘Any connected train of thought or opinion is either entirely wanting, or else disappears in the chaos of anecdotes, gossip, and scandal. Frequent repetition is the necessary result of utter want of arrangement in style. At p. 458, for instance, we are told for the third time the story of the girl at Vienna from whom 12,652 devils were expelled, and I cannot positively assert that this same tale does not occur several times more. The whole book is crammed with odious attacks—some of them childish, others coarse and low—on the Jesuits and the Catholic Church in general. The “baked bread-God” is the standing name for the Host. Obscenity and indecency are narrated and described with evident gusto. But in spite of these faults the book at once acquired great prestige among the Protestants. They accepted all that Hasenmüller said as pure gospel truth.’

from the rest, they are subjected to torture, or else burnt to death, or drowned, or hanged, or secretly poisoned.' He (Hasenmüller), however, had fortunately 'escaped from the strong fetters of their fiery, devouring god Vulcan,' and was alive to write 'with a good conscience' the history of 'all that he himself had heard and seen,' when he was 'a witness of all the doings and sayings of the Jesuits.'¹

This 'history' begins by stating that 'the blood-thirsty' Ignatius of Loyola, inspired by his 'spiritual father' the devil, was the founder of this new Order, and that all Jesuits accordingly, by reason of their diabolical origin, are bent only on devil's works; they are Reubenites, Pharaonites, workers of all iniquity, thieves, and murderers. In their rules and regulations 'there is not a single syllable which is in accordance with the teaching or the life of Jesus;' on the contrary, it is their deliberate aim 'to do away altogether with the name of Jesus and to put themselves in the place of the Saviour.' 'They blaspheme God, but they honour the devil; they despise Christ and they worship the Antichrist—that is, the Pope at Rome. What Priapus was to the Lampsacenians, the Pope is to the Jesuit doctors.'²

'As soon as they enter the society they become not only worse than the heathen, but much worse and more inhuman than wild beasts; they even heap up

¹ Pp. 277, 519. Polycarpus Leiser said in his preface, Bl. 2-3, that he was convinced 'that Hasenmüller had written the whole and bitter truth;' therefore it was that he published his *History*, because 'it was of the utmost importance to all Christendom to be thoroughly informed of the wickedness and deceit of this hypocritical, sneaking sect.'

² *Historia*, pp. 1-22, 110 ff., 170, 301. Concerning the pamphlet of the Heidelberg professor Simon Stein against St. Ignatius, see Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 25.

all sorts of calumny and impiety on their parents. Whether or no they would seek to justify themselves by the example of the scorpion, which is said to kill its parents, I must say this, that the Jesuits are guilty of far more abominable and terrible villanies against their parents.' 'Fit were it that they should be called Neronians after Nero, who also loved his mother so dearly that he had her cut up and dissected alive in order to see the womb which had borne him during ten months.¹ And just as these Jesuits behave worse to their parents than mad dogs and unreasoning beasts, so too, they perpetrate the self-same godless iniquities against all Germans in general, acting as public assassins and devil's messengers, as wild boars and plunderers in the dear Fatherland, as traitors, serpents, and vipers; showing themselves far more inhuman than the Turks in all sorts of bloody plottings and doings. For every single Jesuit is a bloodthirsty, fiendishly cruel wretch, whose patrons and patterns are the devil himself and the bloodthirsty, iniquitous soldier, Ignatius Loyola, both of whom have learnt nothing else and can do nothing else than propagate lies, and strangle and massacre the people.' 'Even the infernal Pluto himself is not so audacious as to attack and to plague the Church and the Son of God in the manner that the Jesuits have begun to do. And it is verily more than certain that no single Jesuit can be found who does not desire with his whole heart to wash his hands in the blood of the Protestants.' 'In particular the professed members of the Order are the hunting hounds of the Roman Pope, which he, the mightiest hunter of the devil and Antichrist, sends out

¹ *Historia*, pp. 111-115.

to track out, with their wicked wiles and trickery, the evangelical Christians, to drive them into their hellish nests, to ensnare, betray, catch, strangle, kill, and devour them.' 'These men it is who strengthen and support the conspirators, the sworn enemies of the German princes, who foster the Pope's bloodthirstiness, and whose aim and object is to effect the obliteration and destruction of the names and the sovereignty of all evangelical princes.'¹

In their private lives, according to this historian, all Jesuits are 'unclean hogs, filthy, epicurean sows,' who practise and defend the most scandalous vices, who actually extol the sin of sodomy, and who, moreover, have received from the Pope full licence to commit the grossest acts of immorality.² If people only knew them as they are 'they would be spat upon by everyone, and nobody would entrust even a pig, let alone a son, to them for education.' 'For the schools of the Jesuits are veritably nothing else than the hollowed-out body of Moloch in which the children are roasted, stewed, and baked.'³

'When once at Augsburg I was walking through the streets with some Jesuits the evangelical boys called after us: "*Jesuwider, Jesuwider* ['Anti Jesus'], where are you going? To the devil perhaps?" The Jesuits walked on, however, as though they were deaf and dumb, for they knew well in their consciences that they were indeed such as these boys had called them. And verily, if the children held their tongues, the stones would be forced to cry out.'⁴ For all these reasons these 'swarming

¹ *Historia*, 13, 144 ff., 119, 181 ff., 184, 265.

² Pp. 142, 147, 289, 309.

³ Pp. 21, 303 ff.

⁴ P. 19.

devils, these godless, scoundrelly, diabolical legates of the Pope, must not be tolerated any longer in Germany.’¹

‘It is certain and more than certain,’ wrote George Heckel in 1596, ‘that what was written by Elias Hasenmüller (who lived so long among the Jesuits) and was published by Polycarpus, is the infallible truth, whatever the Jesuits may say about it.’²

Whereas, however, this ‘History of the Jesuit Order’ was not considered sufficient for the enlightenment of the people, there appeared in 1596 a second German work under the title ‘Jesuiticum Jejuniū, das ist notwendige und zuvor unerhörte Erzählung des unchristlichen Fastens der verdächtigen Jesuiten,’ ‘written first of all in Latin by M. Elias Hasenmüller, and put into print to please the Jesuits by Polycarp Leiser, doctor of the Holy Scriptures and court-preacher to the Saxon Elector at Dresden, but now done into German by Melchior Leporinus, preacher of evangelical truth at Brunswick, for the good instruction of all German Christendom, and for a warning to them to beware of the Jesuits.’³

In the preface Leporinus extolled the ‘pious Israelite’ Hasenmüller as a man sent by the providence of God. ‘God has ordained,’ he says, ‘that this man should come forward in order that we may learn how much

¹ Pp. 187–188.

² *Gründlicher Bericht, welcher Gestalt die Jesuiten mit den Bispsten . . . umgehen* (1596), p. 5. Heckel, at p. 7, reprints an ordinary Obedience-formulary for Hasenmüller, and proves from it in what high esteem Hasenmüller stood with the Jesuits, although he was still a novice! Respecting the polemics connected with Hasenmüller’s *History*, see Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 324–333. The Jesuit Gretser said that only a person possessed who raved blindly could have written this *History* (ii. 324, note 2). See Marx, *Protest. Kanzel*, p. 30 A 1.

³ Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1596.

crime and insolence these dragon-frogs the Jesuits are guilty of in those caverns and robbers' dens of theirs which they call colleges, schools, and temples.' ¹

The language of this book is, if possible, grosser and more obscene even than that of the so-called History of the Order. The Jesuits are described in it as 'down-right devilish stinking rams,' as 'devil's blood-hounds' and so on.² 'On Ash Wednesday they begin to visit their idols, or rather the stinking bones of the dead, which they call the sacred relics of their dead saints; they fall down before their wheaten and baked god, which is made by a priest of the Mass by means of a magic mass-sacrifice; they bend their knees and pray to the Host enclosed in the tabernacle, the Host being both covered with cobwebs and well sprinkled with fly-dirt.' ³

Speaking of the penitential exercises which the Jesuits carry on during Lent, he describes the *Ferularii* or flagellants, who, because Christ was scourged, scourge themselves until the blood flows down their backs. The *Cloaciani*, or cesspool cleaners, an exercise of extreme humility, performed in imitation of Christ washing His disciples' feet, and considered the only way 'of attaining to true humility.' Then there are the *Cultrini*, who hold a knife constantly pointed to their breast as if they intended to stab themselves, in order to verify the words 'A sword shall pierce through thine own soul.' 'There are also the Basilisciani: these fix such a terrible and murderous gaze on all whom they meet as though they meant to eat them up or strangle them, and proclaim that they are acting like Caiaphas,

¹ *Vorrede*, p. 8.

² Pp. 15, 16, 18, 20, 41, 61, 101, 103.

³ Pp. 28-29.

who, when Christ declared Himself to be the Son of God, rent his clothes, saying, "He hath spoken blasphemy." ' ¹

'Even among the Protestants,' wrote Dr. Christian Gudermann, 'I have heard honest folk say that it was quite inexcusable for a court-preacher of the Saxon Electorate, and a preacher of evangelical truths in Brunswick, to introduce so more than low a book among the people, who had already become beyond measure debased and demoralised through the incessant cursing and calumniating of innumerable scribblers and sedition-mongers.' ²

Polycarp Leiser, however, did not allow himself to be disconcerted. In a 'truly evangelical sermon' which he preached on Ascension Day at Dresden, he made an onslaught on 'the marks of the Beast,' and expressed the hope that the final result would be the expulsion of the Jesuits—that brood of serpents and vipers—from the empire. ³ The theologian Philip Heilbrunner went still further in his hopes. He declared the Jesuits to be 'stiffnecked idolaters, brothers of the devil, sorcerers; their sole cry is blood, fire, sword, war, coercion, strangle, hang, burn, and so forth'; 'they seduce the people into the worship of idols; if, then, we want to put an end to idolaters, we must massacre the Jesuits and their associates.' ⁴

Earlier even than Heilbrunner another 'genuine poet' had incensed the people against the Jesuits

¹ Pp. 129, 137, 139, 166-167.

² See above, p. 334, note 1.

³ *Eine recht evangelische Predigt, gehalten auf Christi Himmelfahrt 1608 zu Dresden* (Leipzig, 1608).

⁴ Heilbrunner's *Jesuiterspiegel* (1601), Bl. 97, 115, 128.

by means of ribald verses in a publication called 'Der Jesuiterspiegel.'¹

Among those who combated the Order there were many who made it seem as if their attacks were directed solely against the Jesuits, and not against the Catholics and the Catholic Church in general. Thus, for instance, Polycarp in his preface to Hasenmüller's History of the Jesuit Order, pretended that it was neither his nor Hasenmüller's intention 'to attack anybody except the Jesuits, either of high or low degree;' for 'this History was not concerned with any other people, but solely with the Jesuits.' In reality, however, the book is full of the most virulent invectives and calumnies against the whole Catholic Church, against its teaching, its worship, its constitution, and against all who belong to it, beginning with the Pope, 'the Antichrist and head-servant of the devil.' The holy Mass is described as the most execrable idolatry; the sacrament of confirmation as a low, popish piece of dirty work; sacred unction as a quack ointment, a sorcerer's trick, with which the papists 'had befouled the precious service of Christ as with flies' eggs.' The bishops were 'nothing but fornicators, adulterers, sodomites, beasts,' &c. And not the bishops only: 'with the whole lot of the papists it is the most common thing for them to be defiled with all manner of the most utterly abominable sins and vices. . . .'²

In most of the pamphlets of the time the 'idol Moloch' was used as 'a remarkable type of the

¹ For this and quotations of a similar nature from other rhymesters, see German original, v. 565.—TRANSLATOR.

² *Historia Jesuitici Ordinis*, pp. 158, 266-267, 479, 484, 492, 493. See above, p. 334, n. 2, the judgment of Krebs, who is certainly no friend of the Jesuits.

Jesuits,' and the height of renown in this respect was attained in the seventeenth century when Johannes Rüdinger, poet laureate to the Emperor and pastor at Weyra, enumerated from the pulpit 'in ten well-grounded sermons' the individual points of resemblance between the members of the Order and Moloch. 'As the god Moloch,' he said, 'had been set up by the heathen Amorites at the instigation of the devil, so the Order and School of the Jesuits was the result of the devil's inspiration, given in a dream to the Spanish soldier who had almost lost the use of his hands and feet.' Further, 'just as Moloch was the idol of the Amorites, so the Jesuites were the invention of the Roman Amorites the Popes, hitherto themselves idols. And as the idol Moloch was made of hard, smooth, shining, brass metal, so, not only are the Jesuit colleges and houses hard, well-preserved, shining buildings, but the Jesuits themselves are hard, stubborn, merciless, cunning hypocrites, rightly typified by the hardness, smoothness, and shininess of brass.' When one goes into the temples and churches of the Jesuits one always sees overhead a perfect panoply of gunnery and fighting gear; and what is still stranger and more noteworthy, there are always holes with secret bolts underneath these buildings, in which are kept exquisite and choice collections of all sorts of cords, executioners' blocks, instruments of torture, swords, hatchets, tongs, pikes on which evildoers are speared, ladders and such like contrivances, to which they fasten the unhappy wretches who fall into their hands, and torture and put them to death.' Other murderous instruments of the Jesuits, the preacher said, were also well known to him. 'They have also in their keeping all sorts of executioner's hats

adorned with long, waving, black plumes, and garments made like those which executioners wear, which they put on to make their victims quake and tremble.' 'With devices and instruments of this sort they take captive the reason and obedience of their disciples and pupils.'

Rüdinger discovered still further points of similarity. 'The Jesuits also resemble Moloch as regards their nature, and the manner, the object, the place and the time of their first origin.' 'As, for instance, Moloch glowed with fire, so the Jesuits burn with all sorts of evil lusts and desires, and not content with burning themselves, they inspire their pupils with like consuming passions, and so they slay before Moloch the children committed to their care, not corporeally only, but also spiritually.' They instruct these children in all sorts of immorality, and when the poor young things want to withdraw themselves from all this iniquity the Jesuits apply 'severe discipline and punishment; if the children attempt to escape and run away, they are despatched out of life by means of poison.'¹

All these 'terrible reports' were just as true as the 'new and veritable information' which was circulated concerning the 'scandalous and more than brutish immorality' of the Jesuits James Gretser and Robert Bellarmin.

Gretser was one of the most prolific controversial writers in Germany; he kept up an almost incessant fight with the chief Protestant leaders, with James and Philip Heilbrunner, Aegidius Hunnius, Polycarp Leiser, Samuel Huber, David Pareus, Daniel Cramer, Melchior Goldast and numbers of others. No less than 150

¹ Rüdinger, *Decas Contionum secunda de Magia illicita*, pp. 24-25, 27-37, 68, 87.

pamphlets against the religious innovators issued from his pen.¹ He showed his strength especially in the depth and versatility of his learning, and in exposing the inaccuracies which the opponents were guilty of in their quotations.² To the libels and abuse directed against him he frequently answered in the same strain; the co-operation of Father Conrad Vetter in some of his pamphlets had an unfavourable effect on Gretser's language. We scent the influence of Vetter, for instance, when Gretser goes so far as to say 'Luther has a rose, a heart, and a crown on his coat of arms: why not rather a snout, a pig, and a dandelion?'³ He relegated Luther to everlasting fire.⁴ Descanting on the offensive libels and attacks which were in vogue between the Lutherans and Calvinists, he added: 'Here we must give an ear to both parties.'⁵ But it was with Melchior Goldast, above all, that he used the right of retaliation.⁶

The result was that, in spite of his immaculate conduct, 'the most execrable crimes' were attributed to

¹ *Gretseri Opp.* i. iv.

² See, for instance, the exposures of Hospinian, Danäus, Junius, Goldast, *Opp.* iii. 209 and 3^b, 30, 32, 40, 216-217, 306-333, and vi. 298-299.

³ *Opp.* i. 12. Also some distichs.

⁴ In a parallel between Luther and the holy Bishop Martin, *Opp.* i. 161-169.

⁵ *Opp.* vi. 355.

⁶ Goldast had asserted that the Jesuit Order taught, sanctioned, and committed deeds of murder against the nearest relations, that the Jesuit James Gretser was a '*parricida perjurissimus*,' an '*incarnatus diabolus*, *Beelzebubi malitia dementatus*,' and so forth. Thereupon Gretser produced, from the Strasburg Town-book, the verdict on the execution of Sebastian Goldast, a brother of his opponent, who had run away from his wife and had murdered the woman with whom he had committed adultery, and had consequently been condemned to death on the wheel. '*Neque hacc dixissem*,' Gretser added, '*nisi Goldastina impudentia me coëgisset, qui proinde, si parricidas quaerit, domi suae quaerat et inveniet*' (*Opp.* vi. 303, 306, 315).

him. 'This Jesuit Gretser,' a preacher proclaimed from the pulpit in 1615, 'is a true and veritable heretic, one who carries a demon about with him in a glass; he is a confirmed adulterer and sodomite, and given up to the most bestial profligacy, as has been thoroughly proved against him by genuine facts, and similar iniquity has also been established respecting his devil's brother and associate Bellarminus, who was a monster of depravity such as is never even met with in any pagan histories.'¹

Bellarmin, the greatest Catholic controversialist of the time, whom none of the Protestant theologians came up to by a long way, was the butt for more virulent hatred than Gretser.²

In the year 1614 there appeared a publication entitled 'Eine wahrhaftige neue Zeitung,' of which a contemporary said, 'In these pages insult and calumny reach such a diabolical pitch that every right-minded person must blush with shame and be scandalised. We learn from this pamphlet what in general to think of all the abuse directed against the Society of Jesus, one of whose most distinguished members, the learned Bellarminus, is scandalously and calumniously attacked. In these unhallowed times shameless lying and falsehood have become the best and sharpest weapons that can be directed against their adversaries by combatants who are unable to master them by learning, truth, and straightforward action.'³

The Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmin, 'the Pope's most

¹ Mengerling, p. 14.

² A catalogue of the immense quantity of pamphlets published against Bellarmin is given by Gretser, *Opp.* viii. Bl. C. 3 ff., and ix. Bl. C. 3 ff.

³ Chr. Gudermann in the passage cited at p. 334, note 1. See also Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 76.

favoured privy councillor, especially in matters of religion and faith,' said this 'Wahrhaftige neue Zeitung,' 'has shown himself princely in pomp, epicurean to the last degree in eating and drinking, and sodomitish in his life and demeanour. He sinned with 1,642 women. Of these 563 were married, and with them he committed adultery 2,236 times; eighteen were the wives of Italian counts and noblemen; fifteen were virgins whom he had gained over to his lust by magic arts, in which he was very proficient. Such as were not found virgins he secretly killed by sword or poison and had their bodies thrown into the Tiber.' All this, he said, could be verified by perusal of Bellarmin's own 'Book of Confessions,' which his secretary, Johann de Montgardo, had published.

Bellarmin, a model of all the virtues, lived on in apostolic poverty up to the year 1621; but the 'Wahrhaftige neue Zeitung' of 1614 was able to inform the public that 'he had died a miserable death in utter desperation;' 'he had continually cried out and roared like a raging lion, and when he knew that his hour had come he described beforehand how he should be carried away on a flaming he-goat of hell, and should be installed in the infernal regions as chief among Popes and bishops, monks, nuns, and parsons. And so, denying God and His Son Christ, he died miserably and like one bereft of his senses, and he has perished eternally. For as these people live, so do they die. Moreover, this most infamous of all Jesuits, this Bellarminus, appears in broad daylight, even at the present day, on a burning, fiery horse with wings, flying in the air, and his execrable screams and wails of lament are heard in his palace.

He causes the Pope great fears in the Castle of St. Angelo and on the bridge of the Tiber. And numbers of Masses for the dead are therefore said in all the churches and convents, but all in vain; it is all of no use, for his screaming goes on continuously, and many people are so terrified by it that they die of fright in a few hours.'

'It is most piteous,' said a Protestant physician of Amberg, who had formerly written against Bellarmin under the name of Johann Angelus Politianus, 'that they should be allowed to print such things.'¹

On this scandalous pamphlet it was announced that it had been printed at Basle 'by Ludwig König, 1614.' König, however, issued a public denial of the statement, saying that he did not possess a printing-press, and adding that not his own reputation only, but also that of the laudable town of Basle, had been scandalously and unpardonably impugned by the defaming publisher of the lampoon.² Nevertheless, the second edition of the pamphlet of 1615 bore this announcement, 'Printed first at Basle by Ludwig König.'³

¹ *Gretseri Opp.* xi. 918.

² *Gretser*, xi. 918.

³ '*Ehrenkränzelein der Jesuiten*: that is to say, a new and veritable account or historical report of the manner in which the Jesuit Robertus Bellarminus, late Cardinal of Rome, of unholy memory, in his angelically chaste life ' The Jesuit Conrad Vetter wrote in 1616: 'This libellous pamphlet against Bellarminus was printed at Lauingen.' 'The evangelical printer who printed and sold such infamously insulting lies at Lauingen, received a fitting reward, was expelled from the country, and is now reduced to misery.' *Gretser, Umstürzung des ketzerischen Schlafkämmerlein, deutsche Übersetzung von Vetter* (Ingolstadt, 1616), pp. 104-106. Vetter openly confessed to the opinion that the theologian James Heilbrunner, or one of his abettors in calumny, was the author of the pamphlet. *Gretser*, in his rejoinder, '*Libelli famosi, quo vix post hominum memoriam impudentior prodit, adversus illustrissimum Card. Rob. Bellarminum, Castigatio*' (*Opera*, xi. 900-923), sees in the pamphlet a cunning adaptation

The author of the 'Wahrhaftige neue Zeitung,' however, was not only at pains to blacken Bellarmin. 'This is the Jesuit stem,' he said; 'what, think you, will the branches be? This we learn from everyday experience; more especially is it learnt by those unhappy husbands and fathers who, wherever such fellows have had a hand in affairs, see the results in their wives and daughters, but nevertheless are obliged to be silent and long-suffering.' 'Bellarmin's fearful and abominable example should fill all Jesuits with horror and shuddering, and make them give up their false hypocritical sanctimoniousness, and cease so stiffneckedly to oppose the Divine Majesty. But they are children of the devil, and therefore they do honour to him, and he too does them honour in their last extremity, according to all accounts.

Arch-rogues, assassins, men of sin
Are Jesuits in their bones and skin.'

A contemporary speaks of the age of the politico-clerical revolution of 1518-1618 as being 'throughout history the century *par excellence* of lies and calumnies.'¹

'If the Jesuits,' we read in a 'Kurze Laufschrift,' of the year 1612, 'as is universally known and indisputably established, are the most scoundrelly rogues and criminals that in all ages the sun has ever shone on, and if, under the pharisaical semblance of piety, chastity,

of that libellous publication on Luther's death, which, in the year 1545, was composed and circulated by Lutherans themselves, and was also printed in the eighth volume of Luther's works with an Italian text, and was reputed to have emanated from the papal legates at the French court (xi. 920). When Bellarmin received information of the pamphlet directed at him, he caused a notary at Rome to prepare a document stating that he was still alive (xi. 913). See Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 202.

¹ K. L. Eyntziger, *Zwei Predigten von den Sünden wider den Heiligen Geist* (1618), p. 3.

and self-mortification, they are more given up to every inhuman and bestial vice than even their father the devil, from whom they come, who then can be so miserably and blindly infatuated as not to believe and accept as truth what is brought plainly before our eyes in so many fresh and trustworthy reports and communications: namely, that the Jesuits are at the bottom of all political quarrels and contentions, that they are bloody traitors, sedition-mongers, fomenters of war, incendiaries, assassins of kings and princes, and masters of all murderous, poisonous, enchanter's arts. These devils incarnate have no dearer wish in their hearts than to organise a bloody massacre through the whole of Christendom, to put all Christians to death, and to see all Germany drowned in its own blood, as indeed the Holy Scriptures and Divine Word bear testimony.' ¹

¹ *Augenscheinlicher Beweiss*, &c. (1612), Bl. 2^a. See Echart, *Papa pharisaizans*, p. 397.

CHAPTER X

‘PUBLIC CRIMES’ OF THE JESUITS—TYRANNICIDE

‘EVERY conceivable lie,’ wrote George Scherer in 1586, ‘is invented and told about the Jesuits, and everything wicked that is done in the whole world must have been done by the Jesuits.’¹ ‘We are the cause, according to the heretics,’ said another Jesuit, Gregory Rosefius, in the same year, ‘of all the wars in France and the Netherlands; kings and princes are in our power; wherever we go and whatever we want, everything must be done as we wish.’²

‘Have kings and princes,’ asked a friend of the Order, ‘all become puppets and their councillors fools, that they should let themselves be led by a few Fathers and scribblers and act entirely at their bidding? I call such princes and councillors to witness, whenever and wherever have the Jesuits of their own accord interfered in mundane matters, or shown any desire to manage the affairs of secular Estates according to their own notions? Nothing of the kind will ever be found to be true. If, however, they happen to be asked for advice they are ready to give it, to the best of their understanding, to high and low alike. But who could blame or find fault with them for so doing? And if

¹ *Rettung der Jesuiten Unschuld*, p. 27.

² Christoph Rosenbusch, *Wohlbegründete und erneuerte Antwort und Ehrenrettung*, &c., p. 64. See Keller, *Tyrannicidium*, pp. 4-5.

in the counsel they tender there should chance to be anything amiss here or there, this is not greatly to be wondered at in view of human short-sightedness and imperfection, for all men are not equal in understanding and cleverness. Which of us would be so senseless as to declare that there are not faults and infirmities in Jesuits as well as in other men? But to blacken the whole society, and cry "Murderer!" at it, because of the imperfection of one or more of its members, is not any less senseless. Leave them to their preaching, their Christian teaching, their scholarly instruction to the young, their visiting the sick and other such spiritual labours, and do not trouble them with worldly consultations.' ¹

Canisius, from the beginning of his activity in Germany, had persistently spoken most strongly against any participation of the members of the Order in affairs of State. 'There is nothing,' he said, writing on the subject to the General of the Order, Mercurian, 'which is so deteriorating to the simplicity of the Order, or more likely to draw down more odium on the Jesuits, or bring them into greater peril.' Inasmuch as Duke William V. of Bavaria used to summon the Jesuits to the sittings of the State-Council and insist that they should be 'as it were his privy court-councillors,' Canisius begged that the General 'would find ways and means' to prevent the Fathers from being any more in future burdened with such mundane business, and that the Duke 'would leave them free to perfect themselves in their sacred calling, for the edification of their fellow-creatures.' ² Nowhere, said Canisius,

¹ *Calumnien und Ausstreuungen wider die Societät Jhesu* (1589), p. 13.

² See our remarks, vol. viii. p. 314.

‘was the ground so slippery as at the courts of the great: in company with princes and courtiers the utmost Christian watchfulness was needed in order not to become tainted with the worldly court spirit and entangled with worldly matters. As, however, it was infinitely difficult to preserve such Christian watchfulness at all hours and in all circumstances, it was best to avoid all such intercourse and to keep the Fathers away from the courts of princes and great men.’ Canisius, in this respect, was in agreement with the opinion of the Jesuit General, Francis Borgia, who gave the following admonition: ‘Our members must tread with wary feet in palaces, and deal with princes as a wise hand deals with adders.’¹ Mercurian, in replying to Canisius, wrote: ‘With regard to your urgent entreaty that I should keep our members away from courts, I can assure you for my part that nobody is more warmly imbued with this idea than I am myself. If all the members of our body were of the same mind as yourself, they would not prepare so much trouble for us in all directions, and we should have little or nothing to do with the princes themselves.’²

Hoffäus, to whom Canisius had handed over the provincialate in 1569, was as urgent and emphatic as his predecessor in deprecating all interference with political affairs. ‘Our Father Ignatius, of holy memory,’ he said in a memorial addressed to the Munich Jesuits, ‘foresaw that much harm might accrue to the society by its becoming involved in worldly affairs. For not

¹ ‘... que el trato con los Principes fuesse al modo con que la mano advertida trata los aspides.’ Cien-Fuegos Alvaro, *La heroyca vida, virtudes y milagros del grande S. Francisco de Borja* (Barcelona, *Quarta impresion*, 1754), p. 324.

² Riess, pp. 467-468.

only do these affairs greatly distract our minds and hamper us in our duties and obligations, but they also make us strongly detested, and thus rob us of the fruits of our work for our neighbours. We have been taught by most important examples and experiences that God is not with us in such affairs; for wherever any of our Order have been requested—nay rather compelled—not alone by potentates but even by Popes, to take part in any such business, the matter has invariably taken a bad turn. 'And this contrariety has brought on our society much calumny and ill-repute both among Catholics and heretics, and has never tended to edification. Even our present Pope, through whom, as is the pious belief, God speaks as through His representative, has publicly brought the reproach against us that we mix ourselves up in the affairs of princes and States and want to govern the world according to our own notions. Consequently the last General Congregation has issued the most stringent orders that we are to keep aloof from all business of this sort. If all the many disasters which have happened hitherto do not frighten us into our senses, it is to be feared that to our far greater suffering we shall one day come to know God as an avenger.'¹

The regulations drawn up by Hoffäus in this respect certainly left nothing to be desired as regards severity. They were issued by the fifth General Assembly of the Order, in 1593, and were to the following effect:

'Our society has been raised up by God in order to spread the faith and win souls for Him. The duties

¹ Huber, *Der Jesuiten-Orden*, p. 99, note. Also the further passages in A. von Druffel's *Ignatius von Loyola und die römische Kurie* (München, 1879), p. 44, note 105.

and occupations rightly belonging to the Order constitute a spiritual equipment by means of which it is rendered capable, under the banner of the cross, of successfully accomplishing its ends to the profit of the Church and the edification of its fellow-men. But the Order would fail in these grand aims and would expose itself to the greatest danger if it took to mixing itself up in worldly affairs, in politics and in the management of the State. Most wisely, therefore, did our forbears declare that we are the soldiers of God, and that we have no right to entangle ourselves in quarrels and disputes which are altogether foreign to our creation. In these most disastrous times, however, it is precisely in this way, either through the ambition or the untactful zeal of some of the members of the Order, that our society has fallen into bad odour in numbers of places and with some of the princes. Our revered Father Ignatius, of sacred memory, was of opinion that for the sake of serving God we must forego the friendship and favour of the princes; and our work can indeed be no fruitful one if we do not diffuse around us the sweet savour of Christ. The Congregation therefore has resolved that we must avoid every appearance of evil, and also, as far as is possible, put to silence those accusations against us which rest on false grounds of suspicion. To this end, in the decree herewith issued, all members of the Order are strictly and sternly forbidden to take part in any such public affairs, even should they be invited or urgently solicited to do so; no amount of entreaty or persuasion must have power to induce them to disobey the rules of their Order. Furthermore, the Congregation has commissioned the Definitors to consult over and draw up a code of most

stringent remedial measures, to be enforced, in case of necessity, against such transgressions.’¹

Paul V. gave special confirmation to this decree.

The Definitors came to an agreement concerning the desired ‘remedial measures’ even before the close of the General Assembly, and these measures were annexed by the latter to the above decree. They were as follows: ‘To all members of the Order it is herewith commanded, in the name of sacred obedience, and on penalty of deprivation of all offices and dignities and loss of the right both of active and passive voting, that they do follow the 63rd decree, viz. that no one of them shall take upon himself to interfere or take part in the public, secular affairs of the princes, the so-called State affairs, or to undertake the management of political business of this sort, how urgently so ever and by whomsoever he may be solicited or entreated so to do. And the superiors are herewith earnestly implored not to allow our people in any way to involve themselves in such transactions. Should they observe that any member is inclined to such a course, they must as soon as possible draw their provincial’s attention to the fact, in order that he may transpose the person in question should there be opportunity or danger of his becoming entangled in such worldly matters in his present place of abode.’²

¹ Congreg. 5 Decr. 47 (63 according to the original numbering), *Institutum Societatis*, i. pp. 254-255.

² Congreg. 5 Decr. 79, *Institutum Societatis*, i. 265. In the year 1604 the Jesuit Provincial Bernard Oliverius drew up for the Jesuits ‘in the Dutch mission’ a code of rules and regulations, which was enlarged by the Provincials Florentine and Verannemann, and issued to the members of the Order in this later form in 1612. In the fifth rule it says: ‘Our members must all take good heed, and the superior must be watchful to see that they in no wise mix themselves up in the affairs of State (*rebus*

As early as 1592, even before the issue of this order to the society, Simon Hendl, Rector of the Munich Jesuit College, had refused to comply with the wish of Duke William V. that he would advise him in secular matters. He could not, he said, burden himself with such things; for if once he began he would have to go on, and he would be drawn into neglecting his own vocation.¹

Then, after the decretal had been issued, the Rector and Father Gregory of Valencia again refused to support the Duke with their counsel in his state affairs; the Duke in consequence complained to the General of the Order, Aquaviva.² Canisius represented to the Duke that every appearance of his being even influenced in the government of his subjects and in his decisions by the advice of some favoured Jesuit must be avoided, for otherwise his princely dignity would be impaired.³

Special difficulties for the Jesuits and 'special incentives to the bitterest libels, complaints, and defamation' arose out of the position occupied by some of the Fathers as confessors to spiritual and temporal princes. Canisius deeply regretted that the members of the Order had been allowed to undertake such parts; for they were a source of danger to the confessors themselves, and were sure to involve the Order in fresh

statuum'); they are only to occupy themselves with things which relate to the salvation of souls and are in harmony with the organisation of our Order.' See the pamphlet attacking the Jesuits, *Jesuitica Negociatio*, p. 9.

¹ v. Aretin, *Maximilian der Erste*, p. 403, note 4; see B. Duhr, *Die Jesuiten an den deutschen Fürstenhöfen des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Erläut. und Ergänz. zu Janssens *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, herausg. von L. Pastor, Bd. 2, Heft 4): Freiburg, 1901.

² *Die Antwort Aquavivas bei Stieve, Ursprung, Anmerkungen*, p. 37.

³ Sacchini, *Vita Canisii*, pp. 296-303.

odium.¹ Whereas, however, 'it was impossible to give downright refusals to the numerous and oft-reiterated appeals addressed to the Society for advice in matters of conscience,' it was thought desirable at any rate 'to safeguard the brethren as much as possible by framing precautionary measures.' Accordingly, in 1565 the second General Assembly of the Order passed a resolution to the effect that 'no members of the Order were to be installed as permanent residents at the courts of the princes, or of any other secular or spiritual lords, either as father-confessors, or domestic chaplains, or in any other capacity; only very brief stays—one or two months at the outside—must be permitted them at any court.'² In the year 1600, the General, Aquaviva, sent the superiors of the different houses of the Order a detailed code of instructions as to the ways and means by which they were to treat and heal the spiritual sicknesses of those placed under them. Among these complaints he included 'worldlymindedness and haughtiness of spirit,' and he devoted a special section to this dangerous condition. This evil, he said, crept in gradually and almost unnoticed, under the semblance of promoting the service of God among princes, prelates and great lords, and making them friendly to the Order; while in reality it was mere self-seeking and caused the members to grow more and more worldly. If a superior observed anything of the sort in a court-confessor he must at once recall the individual in question.³

¹ *Gutachten für Aquaviva*.

² Congreg. 2 Decr. 40, *Institutum Societatis*, i. 188.

³ 'Industriae ad curandos animae morbos,' cap. 15, *Institutum Societatis*, ii. 357-358.

Two years later there followed a special injunction from Aquaviva concerning confessors to princes. If it was necessary for members of the Society to undertake this office, care must be taken that by so doing they further the spiritual welfare of the princes and the edification of the people, and that no injury accrues to the Order. For this reason the father-confessors must live in the house of the Order and not at court. Even when they accompany the princes on a journey it must, if possible, be arranged that they should not lodge in the same hostel as the prince, but in a convent, or with some secular priest; also they must always be accompanied by another member of the Order. Money, or other presents, must not be accepted or given by them. While dwelling in the house of the Order the court father-confessors must conform to the common ordinances and rule of life, and must not claim exceptional privileges. Interference in politics is strictly forbidden them. They must by no means go to court without being summoned, unless any necessity should compel them to do so. In no case whatever must they ever intercede with a prince to procure for anybody a token of favour, an appointment, or anything of the sort; 'for even in cases where, in the abstract, there is no question of anything illegitimate, scandal is apt to arise when a father-confessor—especially one of our Order—interests himself in such matters.' The father-confessors must also be careful not to commend this or that matter of business to the attention of the prince's officials, or to administer rebukes or admonitions to them in the name of their prince; should the prince propose anything of the sort to them they must refuse point-blank. On the other hand, the confessors must

be at liberty to admonish the princes themselves unreservedly, and this not only in matters which they learn of from the princes' own lips in the confessional, but also in other things which they happen to hear talked about, and which require setting right ; ' for it happens not seldom that through the fault of officials cases of oppression and scandal arise which the prince does not know of and will not acknowledge, but which, nevertheless, are put down to his account and which must be put right by him.' In difficult cases, when the prince finds no comfort in the advice of his confessor, the latter must call two or three other theologians in to counsel. Finally the court-confessors are exhorted to special fervour in prayer and to searching examination of their own consciences, in order that they may suffer no spiritual injury at court, and may always be worthy instruments in the hand of God.

These instructions, says Aquaviva, must be submitted to every prince who wishes for a Jesuit as father-confessor. At the same time the prince must be informed that it must at all times be in the power of the provincial to remove a court-confessor to another post.¹

The sixth General Assembly of the Order ratified these regulations and added yet another injunction. Because, as was stated, it was not easy to refuse the requests of princes who occasionally applied to the society to supply them with confessors, care must always be taken to proceed with the utmost disinterestedness and singlemindedness, in order not to run the risk, while ministering help to others, to sacrifice in any way the purity of our poverty. The

¹ *Ordinationes Generalium*, cap. 11, *Institutum Societatis*, ii. 225-228.

Congregation, accordingly, approves of the ordinances of the General, ratifies them with its authority, and adds moreover the further stipulation that 'It shall not be permitted to any of our people, either in consequence of intercourse with princes or great lords, or by virtue of their position as confessors to the aforesaid, to accept anything for their own advantage or their own expenditure; the superiors must not give their sanction to anything of the kind.' This injunction was likewise communicated to all other father-confessors, preachers, and so forth.¹

All these regulations point to the fact that abuses of many kinds had cropped up, but they show at the same time the earnest desire of the leaders of the Order vigorously to oppose and prevent such abuses. 'We punish all wrong-doing among our members,' said the Jesuit Gregory Rosefius in 1586, in answer to a pamphlet by Lucas Osiander, 'whoever and how great soever the offender may be, even should it be the General himself. But altogether to prevent any evil occurring or being perpetrated is an impossibility in this life, for even Christ in His band of disciples had a Judas. To let wickedness, however, pass unnoticed and, as Osiander said, to "cover it up with the mantle of heaven" will never, God grant, be our way of proceeding.'²

¹ Congreg. 6 Deor. 21, *Institutum Societatis*, i. 274.

² Rosenbusch, *Replica*, p. 102. In the year 1612 there appeared at Cracow the '*Monita privata Societatis Jesu*;' this publication went through a number of reprints, and in the course of the sixteenth century a new and enlarged edition was brought out under the title '*Monita Secreta*.' The work purported to be a secret code of instructions concerning the procedure to be observed in matters affecting the interests of the Order, and to be communicated only to a few chosen and trustworthy members under the seal of strictest silence. At one moment it was said to have been discovered by Duke Christian of Brunswick in the Jesuit College at Paderborn; at another, by the Jesuits at Antwerp; then again by those at Padua, then at Prague; and finally to have been carried off from a ship

‘Not among the least of the crimes attributed to the Jesuits, as intriguing politicians and auricular confessors of princes and great potentates, is the Parisian bloody wedding, and he must be of dull and simple understanding who will not believe that the many thousands who were then massacred at their bidding were a hundred times too few to satisfy those murderous jesuitical blood-hounds; they would gladly have seen the whole of France, the whole body of papists also, who were not on their side and of their devil’s company, drowned in blood.’¹

Further, the Jesuits were held accountable for the overthrow of King Sebastian of Portugal and were accused of having brought Portugal into the hands of King Philip II. of Spain in return for a fat yearly income. This same Philip, however, had ‘allowed himself to be so completely entangled in the snares of these inhuman cyclops and monsters’ that he ‘sacrificed to their wild beast cruelty, Don Carlos, the son of his most sanguine hopes, and allowed him to be killed by cutting open his veins. Thus he suffered violence in his own blood in order to satisfy the rapacious hearts of his associates in murder.’² The Jesuits—so a poet sang—‘caused the son of the King of Spain to be executed:’

*Durch Aderlassen das Blut verbrennt,
Welches sie ketzerisch Blut genennt,
Dieweil sie wohl vermerkten dass
Er gar nicht jesuitisch was.*³

going to the East Indies. The author is supposed to have been the General Aquaviva. Gretser (1618), Adam Tanner and Forner attempted to show it up as impudent falsehood. The book is a satire on the Order. See Huber, *Jesuiten-Orden*, pp. 104–108. This satire will engage our attention later on in another volume.

¹ Mengering, p. 17. See L. Osiander, *Verantwortung*, p. 71.

² *Stupenda Jesuitica*, Bl. A².

³ Scheible, *Fliegende Blätter*, p. 25.

‘ By bleeding they shed his blood, which they called heretical because they were aware that Don Juan was not favourable to the Jesuits.’

‘ Then, because the King was deeply grieved at the death of his son, they concluded that he too was inclined to Lutheranism, and Philip was consequently forced to submit to having a vein in his forehead bled, in order to remove the heretical blood.’ The following is what a *Wahrheitsfreund* reported in 1597 for the warning of Germans who might thus be enabled to picture to themselves what the Jesuits had done outside Europe. In Peru they made a practice of piercing the natives with red-hot needles and compelling them by all manner of tortures to reveal the place of their hidden treasures. In the art of murder the Jesuits were far greater masters than the Popes. Through the agency of the latter only nine times a hundred thousand human lives had been destroyed within the last thirty years ;¹ the Jesuits, on the other hand, in India alone, had brought up the number of innocent victims slaughtered to over two millions, ‘ for which reason many of the Indians preferred first to slay their wives and children and afterwards put themselves to death.’ ‘ What may not Germany expect from them ? In the towns where they have colleges it is to be feared that in course of time they will dig secret mines, through which they will bring numbers of soldiers into the towns, and thus one day get the government of every town into their own hands. They are incessantly exhorting and stirring up their preachers to persecute, banish, kill, burn, crucify, and drown the Augsburg Confessionists. Therefore the Jesuits must be swept out of Germany and persecuted to death.

¹ Mylius, *Papstpredigten*, p. 116.

While nature accords to other wild beasts—to lions for instance—only one young one, the tyrannous, bloodthirsty race has already multiplied by hundreds of thousands.’¹ ‘So many daggers,’ said another writer, ‘so many drops of poison, so many horns of powder, so many instruments of martyrdom, so many knives and all other such things as can be reckoned up, even so great is the number of the misdeeds of the Jesuits.’² The chief court preacher of the Saxon Electorate, Matthias Hoe, said also in 1606 that ‘the Jesuits were the very worst of firebrands : they and other venomous papist parsons could hardly sleep or rest for bloodthirstiness.’³

‘And how could anything else but the most execrable public crimes proceed from these terrible Jesuits, seeing that they had the devil for their father and godlessness for their wet-nurse, and their whole teaching was nothing but sacrilege and every imaginable form of idolatry?’

‘They feed on blood, they drink blood, as is credibly reported, at the high festivals, and murder and robbery are their only trades.’⁴

Some verses composed in the spirit of Fischart, an ‘echo to the’ Jesuits’ ‘*Raub und Mord* :’

Watch they’re keeping night and day
 All men to slay.
 By them the folk are stirred
 To murder and sedition,
 To extirpate all Christians
 Together with God’s Word.

¹ Wolfius, *Lectiones*, ii. 1044–1053.

² *Stupenda Jesuitica*, p. 4.

³ *Christliches Bedenken, wie sich die Protestanten in Österreich zu verhalten* (1606), Vorrede, Bl. A 3^b–4^b, pp. 4, 6, 8–10.

⁴ Mengerling, p. 18.

These devil's messengers must be
 Rooted out entirely ;
 Straight to hell they must be sent :
 It's time they went.

The devil's trump-card, that's the way
 The people name them, and right are they.
 Bloodhounds and murderers they be,
 That's plain to see.
 Rabid as mad dogs that scare
 In very truth they are.¹

'All Jesuits,' said the Calvinist Conrad Decker, professor at the '*Sapienz College*' at Heidelberg, in 1611, 'at the present day proclaim to the Catholic soldiers that it is their duty to kill all Protestants, and that if they shirk this duty they will be forfeiting their faith and their salvation.'²

Earlier even than this the Calvinist Innocent Gentillet, who assumed the false name of Joachim Ursinus 'the Anti-Jesuit,' had had printed at Amberg a '*Jesuitenspiegel*,' in which he represented the Fathers as devil's lackeys and murderers, and, in the accustomed way, heaped all possible deeds of iniquity upon them. Their founder Ignatius, he said, had been 'the most brutal of soldiers, thirsting only for Christian blood ;' their dogmas were such monstrosities that sun and earth must be aghast with horror at them.³

¹ *Ein gar neuer Lobspruch von Ignatio Loiolä, der Jesuwider ihrem Stamm, Ursprung und Herkommen in einem Echo oder Widerhall gestellt*, &c. (1615), Bl. A 2-3.

² *Tractatus de proprietatibus Jesuitarum* (Oppenheim, 1611). Dedication to the Protestants of Aix-la-Chapelle, Bl. 4^a, 5, 7^b. That the Jesuits are enemies of Christ can be known from the fact that 'they worship a Christ made out of bakers' dough.'

³ '*Speculum Jesuiticum, Pontificum Romanorum erga Imperatores Germanicos perfidiam, insolentiam ac tyrannidem repraesentans*,' &c. *Edente haec Joachimo Ursino anti-Jesuita* (Amberg, 1611), fol. 2^{a-b}. '*Ad haec et id genus alia Jesuiticorum dogmatum portenta quid mirum, si ipse etiam sol obstupescat! si terra contremiscat! Nae pectus huic sit vel ipso Caucaso*

In the year 1612 he said in a pamphlet against the Jesuits: 'In order that the godless arts and Catiline attacks of these swindlers and blockheads might be brought to light, God had ordained that the letters written by the Jesuits from Belgium to the King of Spain should be captured.' To give the names of the authors, and the text and dates of these letters, Ursinus did not consider incumbent on him: 'substantially,' he said, the contents were as follows: 'As many as were the colleges opened and held by the Jesuits in Germany, so many were the bulwarks of the King of Spain in the Empire, so many were his footholds in Germany—footholds sure and firm. And thus with little trouble he will end in obtaining that sole supremacy which he has so long striven after with great zeal, astounding energy, with incredible outlay and with Punic faith.'¹

'The accursed sect of the Jesuits,' another pamphleteer declared simultaneously, 'have no better intentions towards the King of Spain than towards other potentates; they are lying in wait for his life and crown also, and if he had a grain of intelligence he would protect himself against these Baalitish sodomists and assassins, no less than against some others, inasmuch as they are bent on overthrowing all the kingdoms of Christendom and immersing them in blood, as indeed their father, the devil, has strictly commanded them to do. Oh, you short-sighted, blinded princes and leaders, you are nourishing the vipers in your own bosoms; the princes of Bavaria will one day learn

durius, necesse est, qui ex nobis protinus in stuporem, si ista audierit vel legerit, non rapiatur.' That the *Speculum Jesuiticum* appeared first in 1609 is shown by Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 170; see *ibid.* p. 61 ff., concerning the contents and the author of this libellous pamphlet.

¹ *Flosculi blasphemiarum Jesuitarum* (1612), p. 2.

this to their own and their country's bloody ruin and deadly downfall.' 'Regicide and murder of princes and lords lurks in the vitals of these bloodthirsty, pharisaical villains; they cannot help themselves; it is their nature and being. Who would not shrink from enumerating all the many individuals of their number who have been consecrated to the service of poison and the dagger? And their methods of poisoning, moreover, are of more drastic and thorough-going a nature than anything that has ever been recounted in any histories of the past. Now, however, it has been made known, from the book of a Jesuit, by the instrumentality of Johann Pfeiffer of Altzen, who has divulged the secret to the German people and who writes: "The murderous agents selected by them are not only to slay the evangelicals, but also to put to death and poison the papists. These men have been so thoroughly initiated in the art of poisoning that they can inoculate plates, spoons, beakers, saucepans, salt-cellars, dishes, and all other utensils used in daily life so effectually with poison, that even if such articles are rubbed, scrubbed, and washed ten times over, and even oftener, there still remains ingrained in them so powerful a poisonous element that they are the means of death to large numbers of people." It is indeed a matter of wonder,' the pamphleteer concludes, 'that we can enjoy even a single hour of our lives, inasmuch as nobody knows for certain in what form the Jesuitical villains, by means of servants, merchants, shopkeepers, pedlars, butchers, bakers, and so forth, are lying in wait for us poor unhappy Christians.'¹

¹ *Augenscheinlicher Beweis*, &c. (1612), Bl. 2^b. See our remarks, vol. viii.

Fear of the Jesuits, like the fear of heretics, became a dominant complaint of the time.

A principal grievance against the Jesuits was that they preached the doctrine of tyrannicide.

Already in the Middle Ages individual theologians, such as the Englishman John of Salisbury in the twelfth century, and the Frenchman Jean Petit, among others, in the fifteenth century, had spoken in favour of tyrannicide; but the Council of Constance in 1415 had rejected as heretical the doctrine that it was permissible and meritorious for any vassal or subject to put a tyrant to death by stratagem or by secret lying in wait.¹

After the ecclesiastical revolution in the sixteenth century the question of tyrannicide became the subject of dispute as well on the Catholic as on the Protestant side. Shortly after the defeat of the peasants in 1526 Luther had maintained with the utmost decision that it was not permissible to rise up against a tyrant and put him to death; all punishment, he said, must be left in the hands of God.²

Later on, however, he had said in his 'Table-talk: ' 'If an overlord is tyrannical, and acts in opposition to justice, he lowers himself to the level of other people, for by his conduct he forfeits the essence of rulership, and thereby justly loses his rights over his subjects.' 'If a tyrant attacks and persecutes one of his subjects,

¹ Hergenröther, pp. 478-484. For the manner in which, in the fifteenth century, Italian Humanists, imbued with the spirit of antiquity, expressed themselves concerning tyrannicide, see L. Pastor, *Gesch. der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance*, i. (2nd edition, Freiburg, 1891), pp. 459-460, and ii. 465-466. (There is an English translation of this work.)

² Collected Works, pp. 22, 257 ff.

it is as likely that he will attack and persecute them all, or one after the other: thus, if his conduct were countenanced, it would follow that he would proceed to disturb, disorganise, and destroy the whole government and empire. The rights of justice are higher than rulers and tyrants, therefore we are more bound to rights and to laws, and more pledged to obey them, than to submit to tyrants.' To the question 'whether, then, it was justifiable to put to death a tyrant who should act according to his own pleasure in defiance of law and justice?' Luther answered: 'It would not be right for an ordinary private individual, holding no public post or office of authority, to do so, even if he could; if, however, the burghers and subjects, unable any longer to endure the oppression of a tyrant, should band together to resist his power, they would be quite justified in putting him to death like any common murderer or highway robber.'¹

Melanchthon went even further than Luther. 'In the name of human reason,' he said in an exposition of the fifty-ninth Psalm, 'resistance to tyranny which is a public and a gross injustice is allowable. And if in the course of such resistance the tyrant is killed, we must pronounce the verdict that the resisting party has acted rightly.'²

'Whosoever assassinates a tyrant,' Melanchthon says elsewhere emphatically, 'offers up a sacrifice to God'!³ 'The English tyrant,' he wrote concerning Henry VIII. in 1540, 'has put Cromwell to death, and is seeking a

¹ Collected Works, pp. 62, 201-202, 206-207.

² *Corp. Reform.* xiii. 1128.

³ *Victimam immolat Deo, qui interficit tyrannum*; Loesche, *Analecta Lutherana et Melanchthoniana* (Gotha, 1892), p. 159; see also *Corp. Reform.* pp. 16, 105.

divorce from Ann of Cleves. But how truly is it said in a certain tragedy: no pleasanter sacrifice can be offered up to God than the death of a tyrant. May God inspire some strong man with this sentiment!'¹

At that time nothing was yet known in Germany of Jesuits.

The leaders of Zwinglianism and Calvinism spoke as decisively as Melancthon on the subject. Zwingli declared in 1528, that in order to plant the pure Gospel, it was necessary to massacre the bishops.² 'If kings, princes, and rulers,' he wrote, 'act in an iniquitous manner, and not according to Christ's commands, they may be deposed with a good conscience. If the Jews had not let their king Manasseh go unpunished in his crimes, they would not have been so severely punished by God. We must put out the eye and cut off the foot that offends.'³ Calvin taught: we must obey even an unjust and tyrannical ruler, but only in so far as the obedience which we owe to God is not thereby impaired. 'When a king, a prince, or a magistrate,' he wrote, 'exalts himself so high that he diminishes the glory of God and the honour of the law, he is no better than other men; whosoever outsteps the limits of his office, and opposes himself to God, must be deprived of his title to honour, so that he may not practise deceit under a mask.' And he spoke still more incisively in another place: 'Secular princes who rise up against God are not worthy to be reckoned among the ranks of men; it is therefore far more our duty to spit at them

¹ *Corp. Reform.* iii. 1076. Similar utterances from the new-religionist theologians concerning tyrannicide are found in Ruchat, *Hist. de la réforme en Suisse*, vi. 59.

² See our remarks, vol. v. p. 180.

³ Gretser referred to these and other utterances (*Opp.* vii. 55).

than to obey them.' Now, according to Calvinistic opinion, all rulers were setting themselves up against God and His honour who did not join the ranks of Calvinism, which was the only true and trustworthy form of Christian teaching. All such persons, in the eyes of Calvin, were 'opponents of divine wisdom,' 'instruments of Satan,' 'unclean dogs,' 'hissing snakes,' 'wild beasts,' men who in their stubbornness acted against their better knowledge, and who could not be punished severely enough. All the same, however, the right to rise up against a tyrannical ruler and to attack the majesty of the throne by no means belonged to each individual subject; but 'God often called out some of His servants and invested them with His authority to punish the offences of a despotic ruler and to rescue an unjustly oppressed nation from misery.' 'The Lord fulfilled His work by breaking the bloody sceptre of the haughty kings and overthrowing the insupportable dominion; the kings shall hear it and tremble.'¹ With statements of this sort it was easy for all those who considered themselves called by God to the work, to justify all the methods they resorted to for removing out of the way 'the persecutors of the true Church,' those 'enemies of God.' In Geneva the lawfulness of tyrannicide was frequently taught. When Jean Poltrot, in 1563, assassinated the Duke of Guise, that 'greatest of tyrants and enemies of God,' the Huguenot Hubert

¹ See Kampschulte, *Calvin*, i. 272-276. '*Si rex aut princeps aut magistratus eo usque se extollat, ut Dei honorem ac ius diminuat, non nisi homo est. Idem et de pastoribus sentiendum. Qui enim munus suum transgreditur, quia Deo se opponit, spoliandus est honoris sui titulo, ne sub larva decipiat.*' *Comment. in Acta apostol.*, *Opp.* vi. 44^a. '*Abdicant se potestate terreni principes, cum insurgunt contra Deum; indigni sunt, qui in numero hominum censeantur, ideoque in capita potius eorum exspuere oportet, quam illis parere.*' *Comm. in Daniel*, c. 6.

Languet spoke of that 'glorious deed;' the assassin, after expiating his deed with death, was enrolled in the martyrology of the Church of Geneva. The Calvinist theologian, Theodore Beza, pronounced the murder of the Duke to be a judgment of God; he himself, he said, had he been the assassin, should not think it necessary to excuse himself; on the contrary, he should consider that he had done a lawful action in ridding the world of such a malefactor either by treachery or by open violence. The Calvinist jurist, Francis Hotoman, had already boasted, on the strength of a Scripture text, that 'all the scions of the Houses of Lorraine and Guise would be massacred.'¹

The Calvinist advocate Charles Dumoulin, the 'French Papinian,' and, according to the verdict of de Thou, 'a distinguished citizen who loved his Fatherland

¹ See our remarks, vol. viii. 6-9. Concerning Languet, see Waddington, *De Huberti Langueti vita* (Paris, 1888). See also *Rev. Hist.* 42 (1890), p. 243 sqq.; Jean Bodin (†1596, see H. Baudrillart, *J. Bodin et son temps*, Paris, 1853), French parliamentary councillor and member of the so-called middle party, in a pamphlet 'on the State,' which appeared first in 1576, and was reprinted later on, expounded in greater detail that according to most exponents the right of tyrannicide was recognised. A legitimate, unlimited monarch, like the Sultan, for instance, or the King of France, who should set himself up as a tyrant and be universally known as such, must not, indeed, be put to death by one of his own subjects; but any foreigner, whoever he might be, would be justified in taking his life either by open violence or else secretly. If it is a question of the ruler of a state, whose authority is limited in a democratic or an aristocratic sense, as, for instance, the Doge of Venice or the German Emperor, in such cases a burgher would be allowed to put the tyrant to death by open violence, or by order of the Senate. This book was printed in 1601 on German soil, at Ursel, and moreover 'with imperial privilege' as the title-page says: '*Cum privilegio S. Caes. majest. ad decennium.*' We are justified in emphasising this fact because in so many directions so much importance was attached to the fact that the book of Mariana was accompanied with the permission of the King of Spain and the Spanish censors of the Jesuit Order).

unspeakably,' said out plainly that it was glorious to kill tyrants.¹

Under the feigned name of Stephanus Junius Brutus, Duplessis-Mornay, in 1579, produced his 'Claim in Law against Tyrants.' When a monarch, he said, suppressed the true religion, the people were called upon to resist and to punish him; for God had said, 'Who-soever does not call on the name of the Lord shall die the death.'²

In Scotland John Knox and his colleague Goodman advocated the same principles. The nobles, the judges, and the people, said Knox, must not only withstand Queen Mary Stuart, this new Jezebel, and all her priests and followers, but they must also put her to death as an avowed suppressor of the true Gospel. No idolater—that is to say, no Catholic—must be allowed to carry on the government; no oath could oblige the Christian people—that is, the Calvinists—to obey the tyrants—that is the Catholic princes—in opposition to God and His declared truth.³ Christopher Goodman made the following proclamation to the Scotch: 'To the people is the sword of righteousness committed. When a sovereign, or any ruling authority, acts in opposition to the laws of God, then the men of the land must put forth all their strength and power to defend

¹ *Annotationes ad Clementinas*, lib. 3, tit. 15. The citation is taken from Crétineau-Joly, ii. 238-239.

² *Vindiciæ contra tyrannos*. See Huber, *Der Jesuiten-Orden*, p. 269. That the *Vindiciæ* was not written by H. Languet, but by Philip Duplessis-Mornay, is shown by Thieme (*Disput. juridic. inauguralis de opusculo Vindiciæ c. tyrannos*, Groningæ, 1852) and by Lossen (*Sitzungsberichte der Münch. Akad.* 1887, p. 215 ff.). Waddington, in the *Rev. Hist.* 42 (1890), pp. 243 and 51, 65-69, adopts this opinion.

³ In the pamphlet *Appellatio ad nobilitatem et populum Scotiae*. See *Gretseri Opp.* vii. 53.

the righteousness and the laws of God ; this is God's express command. All who are guilty of idol-worship must be punished by the people, no matter whether they be kings or queens or emperors. Rulers who seduce the people from the true worship of God must be sent to the gallows and hanged.' ¹

Another zealous advocate of tyrannicide was George Buchanan, tutor to James I. of England. In a political dialogue dedicated to the King he wrote : A tyrannical sovereign ' must be accounted an enemy of God and of mankind, and to my thinking deserves not so much to be reckoned in the category of human beings as in that of wolves and other dangerous beasts. The man who puts to death a ruler of this sort confers a benefit, not on himself only, but on the whole community. Were I to venture to frame a law I should ordain, as the Romans were wont to do with regard to monstrosities of all sorts, that such tyrants should either be transported to some uninhabited land, or else sunk in the bottom of the sea, as far as possible from the coast, to prevent any risk of their corpses breeding a pestilence. To the agents, however, who have been the means of getting rid of these tyrants rewards similar to those given for killing wolves or bears, or taking captive their young, should be given not only by the nation, but also by individual citizens.' ²

Paul Sarpi, that most ferocious enemy of the Jesuits, did not dare actually to advise his republican countrymen, the Venetians, to assassinate a royal tyrant ; but as councillor of state he submitted the

¹ ' *Ad furcas arripiant et suspendant.*' From the pamphlet, *Quando superioribus magistratibus obediendum sit.* See *Gretseri Opp.* vii. 54.

² *De jure regni apud Scotos* (edit. 2, Edinburgi, 1580), p. 50-51.

following proposition to the 'Council of Ten': 'If any party leaders are found among the inhabitants of the continent, they must at all costs be exterminated; if they are very powerful, it will be useless to resort to the regular course of justice; in such a case poison must do the work of the sword of the law.'¹

'You grant,' said the English poet Milton in a pamphlet against Salmasius, that 'some of the Reformers' have taught that a tyrant "must be removed; but that the decision as to what constitutes a tyrant must be left to the wise and learned." You do not name the particular Reformers who have spoken to this effect. But I will name them for you, since you say "they are far worse than the Jesuits." They are Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Bucer, Pareus, together with many others.'²

On the Catholic side there appeared in 1592, under the name of William Rossäus of Antwerp, a pamphlet which spoke out unreservedly in favour of tyrannicide and the right of the people to depose an heretical prince.³ 'A book beyond measure scoundrelly and diabolical,'

¹ *Opinione del P. Paolo Sarpi, consultore di Stato, &c.*, quoted from Hergenröther, p. 493.

² *Joannis Miltoni Angli pro populo Anglicano defensio* [prior] *contra Claudii anonymi, alias Salmasii, defensionem regiam* (Londini, 1651), cap. i. 16.

³ 'De justa reipublicae Christianae in reges impios et haereticos auctoritate.' Huber, p. 259, falsely makes Rossäus out to be a Jesuit, and asserts that the book was published with the approval of the Order. Its author, according to Stieve (*Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 609, note 1), was William Gifford. Reusch (*Beiträge zur Gesch. des Jesuitenordens* [Munich, 1894], p. 27) pronounces this to be only 'probable.' The statement of Reusch, *l.c.* and of Stieve, that the Englishman William Gifford had been professor at Pont-à-Mousson, is erroneous. Gifford merely studied at the university there; in 1623 he became Archbishop of Rheims (†1629); see E. Martin, *L'Université Pont-à-Mousson* (Paris, Nancy, 1891), p. 368. Gifford was an opponent of the Jesuits, see Vic. de Meaux, *La Réforme et*

a Protestant polemical writer said of it, ‘whereby the Jesuits, the servants of Satan, for the first time inform us conclusively that they intend to clear out of the way, by poison and by the dagger, every single German evangelical prince; for without doubt the villain who has written the book is a Jesuit.’¹ The author of the pamphlet was no Jesuit. When Father Conrad Vetter, at a religious conference, asked the Lutheran theologian, James Heilbrunner, why he had described William Rossäus and other writers, who had called all heretical princes tyrants, as Jesuits, when it was known that they had never belonged to the Order, Heilbrunner answered that these writers were at any rate papists; ‘now papists and Jesuits held the same doctrine, and so it was of no consequence that he had made out Rossäus and others to be Jesuits.’² It was an absurd falsehood, said Father James Keller, to say that Rossäus had been a Jesuit.³

As a matter of fact the first Jesuit who advocated false and dangerous doctrine concerning tyrannicide was the Spaniard, Juan Mariana, and his teaching was condemned by the General of the Order and by the General Assembly.

Mariana was one of the greatest linguists and most learned men of his time; as professor of theology at Rome and in Paris he had gained great renown; his ‘Universal History of Spain’ won him the name of a Spanish Tacitus; his fearless impartiality in condemning Spanish state management under the contemptible Count Lerma led him into captivity.⁴ Through

la politique française en Europe jusqu’à la paix de Westphalie, ii. (Paris, 1889) 75.

¹ Mengerling, p. 19.

² Flotto, 3, 20.

³ *Tyrannicidium*, p. 84.

⁴ A. S. Peregrinus (probably the Jesuit Andrew Schottus) writes in

the practice of voluntary poverty and renunciation of the world he had acquired a proud independence of spirit which could dally with no injustice, and which did not shrink from telling the bitterest truths even to the mightiest of the earth, and referring the latter to the ten commandments of God and the everlasting laws of justice and right. His great desire was to organise the whole State system in conformity to these commandments and laws. 'Burning love for his nation and his Fatherland,' and genuine eagerness to serve his king, moved him in 1599 to the publication of a work in three books on 'The King and the Education of a King.'¹ The State press censor found nothing to object to in this book; on the contrary, he 'especially recommended it to those who held the State rudder in their hands;' the inquisitor of the Jesuit Order for the province of Toledo, Stephen Hojeda, sanctioned its being printed because it had been approved of by learned and serious-minded men;² King Philip III. protected it by a

his *Hispaniae Bibliotheca* (Francofurti, 1608), p. 285, of Mariana: 'Scripsit 30 annalium Hispaniae libros diserte admodum gravique stylo, ut Thuecydidis prudentiam ac Taciti acumen unus complexus esse videatur.' Mariana himself he describes as 'concionator facundus, corporis forma egregia, fronte lata gravique aspectu.' See further F. Sacchinus, *Hist. Soc. Jesu*, pars 2, lib. 5, No. 23, and pars 3, lib. 6, No. 71. The numerous and varied writings of Mariana are catalogued by De Backer, ii. 1083-1092. His treatise on currency is discussed under the title 'Un Jésuite économiste,' by Pascal Duprat in the *Journal des économistes, revue de la science économique et de la statistique* (Paris, 1870), janvier, pp. 85-91. 'C'est un traité de la monnaie,' says Duprat, 'dans lequel l'auteur, devançant les maîtres de la science qui n'existait pas encore, a su découvrir et exposer les véritables principes sur la matière.' See De Backer, iii. 2333.

¹ *De rege et regis institutione*. I make use of the original edition of 1590.

² '... do facultatem, ut imprimantur libri tres . . . quippe approbatos prius et viris doctis et gravibus ex eodem nostro ordine.'

privilege against reprinting and gave permission for it to be dedicated to himself. In Germany also, after it had been several times reprinted, the work excited great interest. Mariana's opinions on tyrannicide were to become for all ages a chief source of complaints and accusations against the Jesuit Order. 'Away with the regicides,' exclaimed the Protestant Bonacasa; 'away with the miserable, execrable arch-criminals, these most accursed war-trumpets and firebrands. They must be swept off the face of the earth, these monsters of iniquity, these villainous Jesuits;' they were worse, he said, than heathens, Turks, and devils. 'Oh, you blind princes who give maintenance to your false pastors.' 'It is astounding that such villains should be met with in Germany—yea, even in the Electoral lands.' Because a fresh edition of the work appeared in Mayence, Bonacasa concluded that this place was the home of the author. 'He has come forth from hell, he is the devil's son and Beelzebub's nephew, and yet he is allowed to hold divine service in Mayence. Oh that the earth might vomit away this arch-rogue, and the fire devour him! The Rhine sheds tears for that a false monster like this has been found in Mayence.' 'Oh, godlessness most accursed! The soil of Germany has produced a monster, of the most terrific, abominable, and execrable kind! There is no language which can describe this degradation, no intelligence that can comprehend its enormity; say what I will, it is still too little.'¹ In such wise did Bonacasa vent his feelings

¹ *Ficta Juditha*, pp. 55-56, 64-65. According to Placcius, *De script. anonym. syntagma*, p. 166, and Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 187, the chancellor of Duke Julius of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Eberhard von Weihe, is concealed under the pseudonym *Mirabilis de Bonacasa*.

in a theologico-political treatise parading in the garb of learning.

In the first part of his work Mariana dealt with the doctrine of State management ; in the second he gave more detailed instructions for the education of princes ; and in the third he discussed the various virtues and accomplishments with which a prince should be furnished for the benefit of his people. The whole object of the work was to put before the reigning king and the Infante the ways and means by which they might govern the country for the welfare of their subjects, and protect themselves against every danger of degenerating into tyrants.

Monarchy, Mariana maintained, was the oldest form of government—hereditary monarchy the best form. But, according to a theory widely disseminated at that period, he showed that all monarchies had originated in the transference, or handing over, of power on the part of the people ; it is in the people that the chief power resides. He set forth admirably the truth that it is not by the self-seeking, tyrannical will of one individual that the State must be governed. Kingly power is restrained by the laws of the land and dependent on the advice of the best minds of the nation. The maxim that ‘ the king is lord over the laws ’ is a veritable pest for the machinery of State. Rather should it be said that the king is only the highest guardian of the laws, and quite as much subject to them as any of his subjects, especially as ‘ most laws are not enacted by princes but by the will of the whole community, whose power to bid and forbid, and whose sovereignty is greater than that of the prince.’ As leading to certain ruin, the king must reject the counsel of those courtiers who, from

hope of favour, would try to persuade him that he possesses authority higher than that of the law and the nation, and that everything ought to be subservient to his will. On the contrary, the obedience which he exacts from his subjects he must himself first observe with regard to the laws.¹

To impress principles of this sort on the minds of princes was a most praiseworthy act at a time when the old heathen and Byzantine law of slavery, with its doctrine of the unlimited power of princes, was penetrating further and further and annihilating all the rights of the people. 'O men born to slavery,' Mariana exclaims to these supporters of the unlimited power of princes, 'shall the people for ever be doomed to be slaves?' He it was who was to blame for the charge brought against the Jesuits that 'they mislead the people by their rebellious and diabolical doctrine that the princes, who derive their sovereignty from God alone, and are answerable to no one else, are not to be obeyed in all secular matters.'²

A true prince, Mariana said, must, however, not only conform strictly to the laws, but he must be in all things a father to his people, in particular a protector

¹ ' . . . Non ergo se magis liberum putet a suis legibus, quam singuli populares aut proceres ab iis essent exempti, quas pro jure arreptae potestatis ipsi sancissent. Praesertim cum plures leges non a principe latae sint, sed universae reipublicae voluntate constitutae; cujus major auctoritas iubendi vitandique est majus imperium quam principis. . . . Princeps omnibus praestet probitatis et modestiae specimen et quam a subditis obedientiam exigit, legibus ipse exhibeat. . . . Aulicorum voces certissimam pestem arbitretur, qui placendi studio regem praedicant legibus et patriae majorem potestatem habere, quaecunque publice et privatim a subditis possidentur unum eorum dominum esse, ex ejus arbitratu pendere universa, in eoque jus omne versari ut principis voluntati serviatur. . . . O homines ad servitutem natos!' (lib. 1, cap. 9, pp. 102-103).

² Predig von jesuiterischer Lehr, &c. (Ursel, 1609), pp. 5-6

of the working classes; he must rule over his subjects not as over servants, but as over children. Far, above all, from suspicion of falsehood and misrepresentation, he must stand forth always as the friend of truth and straightforwardness; he must choose none but men of thoroughly blameless conduct for his ministers, and in his choice he must have regard to the opinion which his people has formed of them. 'A prince must confine himself to rewarding virtue; but he must reward it wherever he finds it, in the hut as well as in the palace. Behaviour of this sort will win for him the esteem and love of his people, and the more a prince is enthroned in the hearts of his subjects, the more secure will be his seat of government.' An army is necessary for the safety of a State; but it must not be allowed to become a burden. In the maintenance of his court the prince must set an example of thrift, he must allow no extravagance in State expenditure. He must always bestir himself zealously in the furtherance of justice, in the advancement of trade and commerce, and in the encouragement of the arts; above all he must devote all possible care and attention to the peasant class. Fresh means of intercommunication must be opened up, bridges built, rivers connected with each other. Heavy taxes must only be imposed on objects of luxury, not on the indispensable commodities of life—wine, corn, meat, and so forth. The ruling prince must guard himself as from the pestilence, from those who would constantly suggest to him fresh objects for taxation.¹

Mariana's warmest sympathies were bestowed on the poor and the helpless classes. These, before all

¹ ' . . . vaniloqui assentatores, fallaces, quorum est magnus numerus, certa pestis, quia blanda ' (lib. 3, cap. 7, p. 329).

others, he said, should be the objects of a true king's entire energy and devotion. Whereas superabundant riches in the hands of a few persons, side by side with distress and perjury among the masses, led to the most disastrous results for the commonwealth, care must be taken that possession and power among the few did not increase indefinitely, with concomitant spoliation of the many. A certain amount of moderation in the wealth of the burgher class was most advantageous to the State. An organised system of poor relief must be contrived for diminishing the immense number of itinerant beggars ; benevolent institutions of all sorts, sick-houses, poor-houses, orphanages, foundling hospitals, must be provided for the benefit of those whom the Christian law made it the duty of the well-to-do classes to support. And not only must the rich among the laity spend a portion of their treasures and incomes in befriending the poor, but the clergy also must of their own free will give part of the Church revenues for the same object. Mariana expressed himself strongly against anything in the nature of forcible confiscation of Church property, and demonstrated the sinister effects of such robbery ;¹ but he was an equally resolute opponent of all waste and squandering of such property through the luxury of the clergy. 'It never entered my head,' he wrote, 'to think that it would be advantageous to the common interest that the sacerdotal class should be deprived of the goods handed down to them by their forefathers ; at the same time I do maintain that it might be very salutary if the clergy themselves were to arrange that this property should be applied to better uses, to uses more in correspondence with the intention of their

¹ See lib. 1, cap. 10.

ancestors. Who, for instance, doubts that it would be far more profitable to the commonwealth and to the priesthood that in future the revenue from these goods should be applied to the necessities of the poor, and thus, as it were, by right of reversion, be restored to their true owners?' Multitudes of poor and needy persons might be fed and housed and cared for out of the incomes of all the property which for the most part is dissipated in wanton luxury.¹

Everywhere frankly and fearlessly giving utterance to his convictions, Mariana persevered in his labours with no other aim than 'to establish a commonwealth that should be the most excellent possible in kind and the happiest for the people, under the most exemplary possible king.' In his enthusiasm for the general freedom of the citizens, and the welfare of the people, he not only advocated the national right of self-defence against an incorrigibly tyrannical ruler, but he actually let himself be carried away into the utterly pernicious doctrine that if there was no possibility of the people themselves rising in rebellion, a tyrannical ruler who was pronounced by the nation to be a public enemy might be put to death by a private individual. 'When a prince brings the country to ruin, abuses State property and the possessions of individuals, spurns public laws and holy religion, begins to assert himself arrogantly, insolently, and impiously,' then it is permitted to his subjects, after general consultation and agreement, first of all to warn and admonish him, and finally, when all hope of improvement is given up, to depose him; in the conflict which will ensue the people will have the right of defence; it will be free to each one to

¹ Lib. 3, cap. 13, pp. 381-387.

attack and slay the declared enemy of the Fatherland with 'weapons in hand.' 'The same reasoning, in my opinion at least, applies to the following case: The State has been ruined by the tyranny of its ruler, the burghers have been deprived of the possibility of assembling for general deliberation, but they are earnestly minded to put an end to the existing tyranny, to avenge the criminality of the sovereign—supposing it, of course, to be notorious and unendurable—and to prevent his ruining the Fatherland by, for instance, robbing it of its religion and setting the enemy at its throat. If in such a case any individual comes forward who responds to the general desire and offers to put such a ruler to death, I for one shall not regard him as an evil-doer.' Murderers of tyrants have at all times been dignified with renown. Of Jacques Clément, who assassinated the French King, Henry III., a very monster on the throne, Mariana said: 'Most people regard him as an eternal honour to France;' 'many people consider his deed worthy of immortality; while others, pre-eminent in wisdom and learning, think it blamable.' He gives the reasons of these opinions; he himself, however, is not on the side of those who blame the regicide.¹ He maintained, with the Englishman Buchanan, that a tyrant 'like a ferocious wild beast, is a butt for everybody's firearms.' 'When all hope is at an end, and the public welfare and the sanctity of religion are in danger, who then will be so wanting

¹ In the original edition of the work (p. 69) there occur the following words omitted in the later editions: '*Clemens perit æternum Galliae decus*;' Ranke has reproduced them in an article on Mariana (*Sämtliche Werke*, xxiv. 236), and they have been used since then, times without number, as weapons against the Jesuits. But Mariana adds to them: '*ut plerisque visum est*,' and these words Ranke has left out.

in insight as not to recognise that it is a divine right to shake off such tyranny by means of human justice, laws, and weapons?' Mariana's aim was to frighten and deter princes from all tyrannous action by such statements as these. 'It would be a salutary thing for princes, if they knew for certain that their tenure of office was of such a nature as to make it not merely legitimate, but even praiseworthy and glorious, that they should be put to death if they oppressed the commonwealth, or made themselves intolerable through vice and iniquities. Fear of this sort would perhaps restrain a prince from abandoning himself wholly to vice and flattery; it would put a curb on his passions.'

Mariana takes care to state that his opinion on tyrannicide is purely personal. 'This is my opinion, which I hold verily in all sincerity; but I am only a man, and may be mistaken. If anybody can show me a better one I shall be grateful to him.'¹

In 1599 the superiors of the French province brought

¹ *An tyrannum opprimere fas sit*, lib. 1, cap. 6, pp. 65-80. Thirteen Jesuits are mentioned as opponents of tyrannicide in the *Erklärungs-schreiben* of Fr. Cotton, in *Von der Jesuiten, wider König- und Fürstliche Personen abscheuliche, hochgefährliche Practiken*, &c. (Hanau, 1611), pp. 18-30. The French Jesuit, Claudius Matthieu, wrote on February 11, 1583: 'The life of a king cannot be attempted with a good conscience. Pope Gregory XIII. has condemned all those who dare to cherish or put forward the opposite opinion' (*Mémoires de Nevers*, i. 657, quoted by Crétineau-Joly, ii. 348). Bellarmin defends the right to depose a king, arguing from analogy with, and by way of antithesis to, the right of the head of a family. (The father has a natural right, and cannot, therefore, be deprived of it; the king has only a delegated right; he can, therefore, be deprived of it.) In his *Controv.* ii. lib. 2, cap. 16, he says: '*Constat enim, patremfamilias non habere a familia ullam auctoritatem, sed ex se; quia non ipse a familia constituitur pater, sed ipse facit sibi familiam gignendo filios, emendo servos. Unde paterfamilias, etiamsi pessimus sit, nunquam potest a familia judicari vel expelli, sicut potest rex, quando degenerat in tyrannum.*'

Mariana's work to the notice of the General of the Order, Aquaviva, and he at once expressed his regret that the book had been published without his being consulted. He forthwith issued directions that the book should be corrected, and he said he should certainly take good care that nothing of the sort ever appeared again.¹ In an enactment of July 8, 1610, Aquaviva, 'in the name of sacred obedience,' under threat of the ban, deprivation of office, and other punishments, forbade any member of the Order 'openly or secretly, as professor or councillor, in any written publication whatever, to have the audacity to maintain that anybody, be he who he may, had a right, under any pretext of tyranny, to put kings or princes to death, or to attempt their lives. Otherwise, he said, the pretext of tyranny might be made use of to ruin princes, to disturb the peace, and to endanger the safety of those to whom rather, in obedience to God's command, all honour ought to be accorded, as to consecrated persons whom God the Lord had exalted to their posts of dignity in order that they might rule the nations beneficially.' The provincials were then enjoined, under pain of deposition, to provide for the enforcement of this decree 'so that by this means everybody should learn what was the opinion of the Society in this matter, and that the error of a single member should not bring the whole Society into contempt; for it is the firm conviction of all right-minded persons that the shortcomings of a

¹ ' . . . *Primum collaudare se studium judiciumque Provinciae; deinde aegerime tulisse, quod libri ii ante emissi essent, quam ejus rei quidquam ad se deferretur. Ceterum et ubi primum rem accepisset, mandasse uti corrigerentur, et sedulo daturum operam, ne quid ejusmodi in posterum accideret.*' P. Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, pp. 1924-1925. note; Iuvencius, *Hist. Soc. Jesu*, pars 5, lib. 12, No. 86-87.

portion, or of one member, of the corporate body should not be laid to the charge of the whole company.’¹

After Mariana’s work had become known in Germany, it used to be constantly affirmed throughout the Empire that ‘the Jesuits insist that all tyrants shall and must be put to death, and they regard all evangelical princes as tyrants, and denounce them as rulers who ought to be killed, and aver that those who take their lives, whoever they may be, deserve the praise of God, and are worthy of the highest honour.’ Thus the Jesuit Matthias Mayrhofer was also accused of preaching tyrannicide, and of denouncing every prince who had abjured the Catholic faith as a tyrant. He defended himself in 1601, in a ‘*Katholische Schutzschrift*,’ against ‘calumnies of this sort and malignant attacks.’ At any rate, Mayrhofer said, he was convinced that the prince existed for the sake of the commonwealth, and not the commonwealth for the sake of the prince. Now if a prince wanted to force his subjects into heresy, the latter might oppose resistance to him, and, indeed, were bound to do so. ‘And if he goes to the length of murder, robbery, plunder, and suchlike tyranny, and the people are unable to hold their own and to defend themselves, except by taking up arms, they have per-

¹ The entire decree is given in Iuvencius, *Hist. Soc. Jesu*, pars 5, lib. 12, No. 157. On August 1, 1614, Aquaviva renewed the decree, and it is under this date that it stands in the latest official edition of the *Institutum Societatis Jesu*, ii. (Romae, 1870), 51. In the *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche von Harless*, Jahrg. 1838, i. 103, the passage ‘quocumque praetextu tyrannidis’ is translated ‘under the next best pretext of tyranny.’ Anything so monstrous was never taught by a Jesuit, and did not therefore need to be guarded against by so stringent a decree. Concerning the Jesuits and tyrannicide, see also Duhr, *Jesuiten-fabeln*, p. 659 ff., and Michael in the *Innsbruck Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 16 (1892), p. 556 ff.

fect right to depose their ruler and to deal further with him as necessity requires. Even in the end, should they be compelled thereto, and he will not desist from murder, spoliation, infamy, and so forth, and if they have had recourse to all moderate measures in vain, they are free in such a case to take their ruler's life.' 'But,' he adds, 'let me be rightly understood.' 'First of all, in speaking of heresy, it must be made clear that there is undoubted proof and certainty of heresy in the ruler.' 'The decision of the collective Church must always be taken in the matter. Secondly, recourse must first be had to all possible means of gentleness, for it is not permissible to seize the sovereign straightway by the throat. Thirdly, my remarks apply to cases in which there is no other way of help. Such an extreme measure is not fitting in all communities. For instance, when the lord is subject to another overlord, king or emperor, the case must be brought before this supreme head,' and 'arms must not be resorted to without the approval and sanction of this higher authority.' 'Fifthly, there must, of course, be reasonable assurance that rebellion of this sort will not lead to still greater disaster. This is my doctrine, which I confirm with legitimate demonstration.'¹

The question was still more exhaustively treated by Father James Keller, rector of the college at Munich, in a pamphlet of the year 1611, dedicated to all the princes of the Empire attached to the Augsburg Confession. In this publication he demonstrates in detail that the Jesuits held no other opinions on tyrannicide than those of the Catholic divines before them, and of

¹ *Des neulich ausgegangenen Prädikantenspiegels Katholische Schutzschrift* (Ingoldstadt, 1601), pp. 267, 270-274.

the most distinguished Lutheran, Calvinist, and Anglican theologians and politicians. Mariana alone, he said, went further, in one point, than the Catholic theologians and his own brother Jesuits commonly did. In this point, however, no Jesuit had upheld him.

‘We wish,’ says Keller, ‘to distinguish between tyrants and tyrants. Some there are who, without any right or title, without any warrant, contrary to all recognised and public authority, invade, take possession of, devastate a commonwealth or a country, massacre or expel the inhabitants, and behave in the most iniquitous manner. Men of this sort, whom it is impossible to withstand in any other way, might quite legitimately be got rid of, or put to death, by anyone who chose.’ On this point Keller shows there is but one opinion among divines and jurists. Among the Jesuits, Azor was the only one who sought to throw doubts on the matter. If, however, a tyrant of this sort was already established in secure possession of his lordship, and the subjects willingly recognised him as their lord, then it was not lawful for anyone to lay hands on him.¹

‘Other tyrants there are who possess an empire, a land, or a lordship, either because it has come to them through inheritance, or because they have purchased it, or because they have been elected to the government, or by some other legitimate title. Men of this sort who are lawful rulers, although tyrannical ones, must by no means be put to death, either by their own subjects or by outsiders. In this doctrine all Catholics, Jesuits,’ with the exception of Mariana, ‘and non-Jesuits, agree unanimously.’ ‘To this, however, some-

¹ *Tyrannicidium*, pp. 13-19.

one may object: "But how is a country to be helped when tyranny has grown to such enormity that the whole community is in danger of ruin?" There are undoubtedly means at hand, for every ruler is either himself independent and supreme, or else subservient to some overlord. If there is someone else to whom this supposed tyrant is subject, then there is still a chance for justice in the land; there is still a way of escape; the door is open to the great alarm-bell. Let some individual, let the State or the province complain of the tyrant. Means will be found for proceeding against him. In case, however, of the supreme lord being as tyrannical as the underlord, and of there being no possibility of arriving at justice, there is one only means, and that is patience.' Although Dominicus Bañez, Keller goes on, teaches differently, we must nevertheless follow Thomas Aquinas, who recognises no other way of rescue than 'to fly to God, the King of kings, in whose hand are the hearts of monarchs.' 'Rightly and well spoken, for it is permitted to no one, so he value his soul's salvation, to undertake a murderous deed.' 'If, however, the tyrant has no other suzerain over him, and has become altogether insufferable, then, according to the advice of many, he should be deposed and deprived of his power, provided the estates of the country have the means thereto.'¹

Keller quotes quantities of passages from Protestant books to show how far removed from sternness were the opinions of Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, Knox, Junius Brutus, Goodman, the Lutheran Superintendent John Gerhard, the jurist John Althusius,

¹ *Tyrannicidium*, pp. 21-22.

and others, on the questions of deposition of a sovereign and of tyrannicide.¹

‘According to Jesuit teaching, it is forbidden to touch a single hair of the head of any of the princes of the Empire; for they are all legitimate princes, with lawful titles and possession. And even supposing that any one of them should develop into a tyrant, no private individual would have the right to lay hands on the said tyrant, for there would still be a higher authority over him, as over every prince of the Empire—viz. that of the Imperial Chamber and the Emperor.’ ‘This I know well, that rulers of this description who govern by virtue of legitimate titles, although they may be godless tyrants, cannot be put to death by private individuals.’ Keller concludes his pamphlet with the following remark addressed to the Protestant imperial princes: ‘Your electoral and princely Graces must be on your guard against death from other quarters. As far as the Jesuits are concerned you may live on for ever. Hitherto the Jesuits have suffered at the hands of hangmen, but have never been hangmen themselves.’² In reply to numbers of leaflets in which, either anonymously or pseudonymously, generally also without giving the name of printer or place, the Protestants denounced the Jesuits as foes of the Empire and regicides, Keller remarks:

‘If it is true that the Jesuits seek to compass the downfall of all kings and princes of the Empire who are hostile to their religion, it seems to me that that man must be an abandoned villain who, possessing such information, does not straightway come forward with it, lay the case publicly and juridically before the proper

¹ Pp. 51-78.

² Pp. 40, 115.

authorities, and make known his own name and standing. It would be an honour to him, a glory, if he were to bring these scoundrelly hypocrites and dangerous assassins out of the darkness into light.’¹

Keller complains bitterly that numbers of Calvinist preachers not only slander the Jesuits in countless anonymous tracts, but that they actually ‘write books purporting to come from Jesuits, in which they impute to the latter, not their own true doctrines and opinions, but what the Calvinists themselves would gladly find and read in their books.’² Also, ‘there are not a few

¹ Pp. 2-3.

² Pp. 8-12. As examples, Keller cites the ‘Apology’ of Jean Chastel and the ‘Quæstion’ which, it was pretended, had been found with the French Jesuit Jean Guignard. Among the books ostensibly written by Catholics against the Jesuits was, for instance, one which appeared in 1595, entitled *Prob der Jesuiten nach romanischem Schrott und Korn, in sieben Gesprächen zwischen einem Jesuiten und einem Domherrn* (‘A test of the Jesuits according to the Roman standard, in seven dialogues between a Jesuit and a canon’). See the complete title in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*. ‘I announce myself as a Catholic,’ said the cowed Calvinist and pretended canon, ‘and would to God that all my utterances might serve to increase and multiply the number of Catholics.’ He speaks of the superstitious worship of the Jesuits, and accuses them of having introduced a new usage into the ceremony of dispensing the Sacraments, like veritable church-robbers, and of bringing in great heresies and errors. He calls the ‘spiritual exercises’ of the Fathers ‘secret magic arts by means of which, on certain days, they bring to pass heaven knows what extraordinary things, in private apartments from which, after performing their sorcery, they emerge white as death and looking as though they had been terrified by a ghost’ (Bl. 52^b, 78, 83, 92). The Jesuits have accomplished nothing; the Protestants ‘carry out more in one day with their teaching and preaching than the Jesuits effect in their churches in a whole year with all their precepts and schoolmasters.’ ‘The writings of the opponents show plainly that the arguments and the trump cards of the Catholics in matters of faith are not strong enough for the defence of their doctrine.’ In such wise was a Catholic canon made to speak. The author of the pamphlet aims craftily at exposing the other Orders also to shame, and this not through the mouth of the canon, but by the Jesuit who converses with him. The latter, for instance, is made to say concerning the Franciscans that they are ‘blackguard, lazy fellows, stupid

Calvinistic soothsayers who, though they do not themselves write any books under our name, nevertheless attribute to us certain works which we have neither composed nor had printed.' Thus, for instance, Wilhelm Rossäus, Alanus Copus, Paul Windeck—authors who are proclaimed to be members of the Order—are not Jesuits at all. Finally, there was a species of Calvinists who took up the Jesuit writings but only in order 'to distort them maliciously,' 'to make white black, and to turn honey into gall.'¹

'God be praised,' exclaims Keller to the Protestants, 'we Jesuits, up to the present date, have done nothing in the Empire on account of which we should have reason to fear the exile with which you menace us. We, too, are just as much Germans as you are; we, too, are lovers of the Fatherland just as much as you are; we, too, come of quite as honourable a lineage, or, rather, since much of the ancient blood of Germany is incorporated in the society, of an even better one than yourselves!'² It must in fairness be said, with regard to the Protestants, that the lords and the common people among their numbers were merely dupes; but the preachers undoubtedly deserved the reproach of heresy and wickedness.³

In the same year, 1611, in which Keller's pamphlet

donkeys, ruffianly lubbers, that they are filthy and impudent, always overfilled with soups and bread; that most of those who are called lay-brothers sleep day and night; that if they are prelates they are the most desperate and insolent scoundrels;' 'the Jesuit' actually charges them with parricide and fratricide. At the end of the preface the author says that 'the attacks of the Jesuits are aimed at the overthrow of the whole of Christendom and the slaughter of Christian princes' (Bl. 40-41, 46, 49, 64, 66).

¹ P. 11.

² *Tyrannicidium*, p. 5.

³ In the *Protestatio ad lectorem*.

appeared, Melchior Goldast took up the cudgels against the 'jesuitical bloodhounds and regicides.' In a pamphlet dedicated to the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse, and directed against Father James Gretser, he compared the Jesuits with the 'ruthless assassins' in the East. These last, he said, had introduced into Mohammedanism a new sect whose leader had lived in Muleta, a place held sacred by them. Their articles of faith were as follows: Mohammed is the prophet of God, the Redeemer of the human race; his representative is the Prophet and Prince of Muleta, the supreme lord of all peoples on the earth, the only authorised interpreter of the revelations of Mohammed. All princes who refuse to hear his word deserve to be, and must be, put to death by violence or by treachery. Whosoever slays such a prince will obtain in Paradise the place nearest Mohammed. The chief seminary of this sect was located in Muleta, and within its walls bands of picked youngsters were trained for the service of Mohammed's vicegerent. All manner of sense-beguiling arts were employed to inflame and stir up these youthful votaries to the utmost audacity in the cause of their prince.¹ After the assassins in the East had been extirpated, new sectaries arose in the West, who were called first of all Jebusites, then Jesuats, and lastly Jesuits, and who resemble the assassins of the East in all points, both as regards their founder and head at Rome and their doctrines. Thus, for instance, they, like the assassins, look forward to joys in Paradise which shall correspond to all the sensuous pleasures of earth. Also, in respect to the murder of princes, their tenets are the same as those of their precursors in the East. They

¹ . . . praesto erant et puellae formosae varium libidinum . . . '

teach, for example, that every subject wins for himself celestial reward if he kills a prince denounced by his people as a tyrant. Subjects of heretical princes are absolved from all duty to their rulers. After the pattern of the assassins they excite chosen youths to every kind of murderous deed.¹

Goldast was so fortunate as to be able to contribute, from a book which had appeared in Delft, quite accurate details concerning the solemn ceremonies with which the Jesuits inaugurated the assassination of monarchs.² These ceremonies were made known to the people in the German language, in the same year, 1611, as '*Mysterium oder Geheimniss, dessen sich die Jesuiten nach der Resolution, einen Potentaten umzubringen, gebrauchen*' ('Mysteries or secret rites performed by the Jesuits after it has been resolved to assassinate a potentate'). They are described as follows: 'When the Jesuits command anybody to put his lord or ruler to death, and after the monster chosen for the murderous deed has been admitted to their chamber of meditation and prayer, the hellish court produces a knife wrapped up in a veil and enclosed in a little ivory case, with an Agnus Dei and painted characters inscribed around; and as they draw out the knife they let fall on it a few drops of holy water, and hang a few consecrated coral beads on the handle to signify that "as many thrusts as are made with the knife, so many souls will be released from purgatory." The knife is then put into the murderer's hands with the following words: "Thou chosen child of God, take the armour of Jephthah, the sword of Samson, the sword of David with

¹ Geldast, *Replicatio*, pp. 1-8; see Krebs, *Publicistik*, pp. 190-202.

² *Replicatio*, pp. 8-10.

which he cut off Goliath's head, the sword of Gideon, the sword of the Maccabees, the sword of Pope Julius the Second, with which he rescued himself from the hands of the princes with so great shedding of blood in the towns. Go forth, and be wise and courageous. May God deign to strengthen thine hands!" After this they fall down on their knees, and the chief among them repeats the adjuration: "Come, ye cherubim! Come, ye seraphim," &c. After this they lead the man up to an altar, where they show him the pictures representing the angels protecting the Dominican monk Jacques Clément, and present him also before the divine crown, saying: "Lord, behold here Thine own arm and the fulfiller of justice. Let all the saints stand up to make place for him."'

After this four Jesuits enter into conversation alone with the 'consecrated murderer.' They tell him that they believe they recognise in him the divine afflatus, and that this impels them to kiss his hands and feet. They say that they no longer look upon him as a man; they and others would gladly be chosen in his place, for they should then be certain 'of going straight into Paradise and not first to purgatory.'

If, however, anyone who has been selected for the murder is still troubled with scruples, 'they attempt either by means of nocturnal ghosts or by thrusting horrible monsters before his eyes to coerce such a one to take the assassin's oath, or else to encourage and bring him up to the scratch by false mutterings and by apparitions personifying either the Holy Virgin Mary or the holy angels, or other saintly persons who have died in the Lord. Sometimes even Ignatius and his associates are made to play this part.'

‘And thus it is that these wicked, murderous schoolmasters . . . get round the young and ruin them.’

‘Of their schools the most celebrated is the seminary at Rome, from which the Lateran Pope sends forth his elect swarm, armed with insolent steel, as from a hellish pit and abyss, to ravage and lay waste the land like a pest of frogs and toads.’¹

‘Who could be otherwise than terrified by reading such tales, which are undoubtedly true, and are taken from the Jebusites’ own secret books?’ said a ‘minister of the word of the true Gospel,’ on the strength of the above pamphlet. ‘How can any class of people, above all, potentates and evangelical princes, have a moment’s peace?’ Goldast received a special eulogy from this preacher. ‘There is scarcely,’ he said, ‘a single German writer and scholar of eminence in our day who has painted the whole godless popish crew and devilish sect of the Jesuits so truly, so plainly, and so subtilely as the highly-renowned Melchior Goldast has done in a pamphlet against the arch-scoundrel and heretic Gretser, a celebrated leader of the Loyolites in the Empire. In these pages it is made manifest to the dullest understandings of what super-abominable vices the whole devilish jesuitical crew are guilty. It is shown unmistakably that they are worse than the assassins among the Turks, and that every single Christian prince and private individual will have to succumb to their daggers, swords, poison, and all their inhuman intrigues and machinations if they do not rally all their strength and

¹ *Von der Jesuiten, wider König- und Fürstliche Personen abscheuliche, hochgefährliche Practiken und Thaten* (Hanau, 1611), pp. 191–194. See Goldast, *Replicatio*, pp. 8–10.

energy to drive the gang and sect out of the country, to confiscate their goods, and to inflict on them severe and drastic punishment according to law and justice.' 'These villains plot the death of everybody who will not become a tool for their murderous intrigues. It is truly terrific.'¹

Demütige Supplication an Jesum Christum und Aufmahnung an alle friedliebenden christlichen Herzen gegen die Mordpraktiken der Jesuiten. 'Getruckt in diesem Jahr,' Bl. 5^a, 6. In the year 1615 there appeared a '*Kurzer Discurs, darinnen die Janizaren in Turkey, und die Jesuiten im Bapstthumb wegen ihres Ordens können und mögen miteinander compariert und verglichen werden.*' 'So long as the world has lasted,' it was said in a leaflet '*Über die höllischen Jebusiter schreckliche landesverrätherische Mordthaten*' (1615), 'such hellish furies as the Jesuits—men far surpassing the janissaries of Turkey in murder, bloodthirstiness, robbery, and double-distilled profligacy—have nowhere been known. They proceed, as has long ago been proved, from the devil, or rather from Beelzebub the chief of the devils, who patrols about in their colleges, as is universally known, for he has oftentimes been seen.' An '*Einblattdruck*' of 1618, '*Genealogia vera Antichristi*,' contains the following verses :

*Ein höllisch Weib Megära lang,
Die ärgste Furie, schwanger gang
Mit einer Frucht, die mächtig sie
Thät immer kränkeln spät und früh.
Und als sie nun gebären sollt,
Ihr Hebam ward der Teuffel hold :
Durch dessen Hilff aus Taglicht zart
Loiola geboren ward.
Als sie das Monstrum und Suit
Ersah, und sein grausam Gesitt :
Du ärger dann dein Mutter bist,
Sprach sie, wurd schamroth zu der Frist.*

Occasionally, however, the devil came forward against the Jesuits, as, for instance, in a 'great marvel' at Molsheim, which was made known in 1615 in a '*Wahrhaftige neue Zeitung.*' At their college at Molsheim the Jesuits had acted a comedy in which Luther, got up as Judas Iscariot, was to be carried off by the devil, as an example of the way in which all the Lutherans in the world ought to be treated. 'When, however, the eleventh devil (the Apostles were all dressed as devils) wanted to tear Luther in pieces, the thirteenth horrible devil came up with loud screaming and with terrible fierceness seized the devil who wanted to tear Luther in pieces, and tore him in pieces instead in the sight of all the people, so that his heart and entrails fell at their feet.' This was visibly witnessed 'with great horror, trembling and quaking by the people standing round,

Andrew Lonner was gifted with still more vivid power of imagination. In a lecture which he delivered before 'the honourable and learned gentlemen of the University of Giessen on the occasion of the opening of a student's house,' and which he had printed in 1612, and had the audacity to impute to the Count Palatine Wolfgang Wilhelm, he gave vent to the following effusion: 'Oh, ye princes of the Roman Empire, champions and guardians of the evangelical doctrine, do you believe yourselves to be safe from the Jesuits? They have sworn to massacre you all, together with your councillors. Already they have marked out some of you for death and sent out commissioners of murder. But, let me tell you, they do not mean to slay only a few, but to massacre the whole lot of you, to leave no single one of you alive to weep and bewail the unhappy fate of the State and the Church.' 'They are engaged in bringing about your downfall, and it is not only your lives at which they are aiming, but also your honour, your goods, your wives, your subjects—everything that belongs to you. Do you know what sort of death they deserve? They deserve to be hung on the trees, these regicides, so long as there are branches on which to suspend them, or else to be cast out of the land.' 'Their colleges are workshops of the devil himself, dens of every kind of iniquity. Let all such houses of infamy be burnt down, and their inmates also be destroyed by fire.' 'Their secret crypts and caverns and underground chambers are filled with coats of mail, and although they were forbidden by the civil authorities, on pain of death to say a word about it, nevertheless, there was not wanting a Nicodemus to tell the tale abroad' (*Ehrenkränzlein der Jesuiten*, see above, p. 347, note 3). Added, as the second 'True Great Tiding,' to the one concerning Bellarmin.

swords, lances, halberds, axes, daggers, cannons and cannon-balls. This is no mere lying invention. Fabulous tales would, indeed, be unworthy of an audience 'consisting of the professors of the University of Giessen. 'No, we have received from Prague reliable information that a quantity of muskets have been found in the college there.' ¹ The Jesuit Christopher Ziegler, according to Lonner, cherished the hope that after the death of the Duchess Dorothea Ursula of Würtemberg, the Duke also would soon die, and then all the monks and canons, all the clerics, and all their pious followers would make an inroad on Würtemberg, take possession of the land, and massacre the opposite party. The Jesuits maintain that John and Christ were the most accomplished sorcerers. The Jesuits are 'idolaters, anti-christs, vagabonds, rebels, whoremongers, sodomites, hangmen, and bedevilled magicians.' For such crimes, however, the law decreed a variety of heavy penalties, such as execution by the sword and confiscation of property; death by fire or by the fury of wild beasts. At the present time quartering was the usual mode of punishment. 'I myself,' said Ziegler, 'was one of an enormous crowd of onlookers who witnessed the manner in which, in the famous town of Brunswick, a diabolical criminal of this sort was dealt with. His fingers were chopped off, he was pinched four times with red-hot tongs, his body was torn asunder and cut up into four quarters. . . .' 'And you Jesuits, you traitors and rebels, men full of raging insolence and all lasciviousness, you monsters who are working so infamously to bring ruin on our Fatherland, to overthrow the Roman Empire, and to destroy our Church with fire and pillage,

¹ We shall return later on to this fabulous story.

you presume, do you, to live in the same atmosphere as we do? Out with you, I say, out with you! You shall no longer ravage the earth with your swords, no longer hold your fire-brands in readiness to hurl them over our lands.' If there was any reluctance to slaughter the Jesuits, the speaker said in conclusion, these wretches must, at any rate, be driven as fast as possible out of the Empire, which would otherwise be completely broken up, while every German would have his goods and chattels, his wife and children, all torn from him. There would be a wholesale massacre of the entire nation.¹

Such was the 'condition of continuous spiritual warfare by pen and pulpit,' in which Germany was involved before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War of annihilation. 'Almost all the strength and energy of German intellect and study were wasted'—so contemporaries complained—'in godless wrangling, disputing, cursing and anathematising. The influence of the press on the great masses of the people was neither educative nor ennobling, but demoralising and upsetting.

¹ *Relegatio Jesuitarum ex omni bene ordinata republica* (1612); see especially the dedication and pp. 27-29, 47-49, 55-56, 65-66, 80-81, 84-85. A scholar who belongs to the bitterest opponents of the Jesuits, Krebs (*Publicistik*, p. 68), remarks concerning this pamphlet: 'All that enmity towards the Jesuits has so far brought to light has been welded together by Lonner into a confused whole in order to convince the princes of the necessity for expelling the Jesuits from every well-regulated State. If we take into account that Lonner also accepts credulously all the many absurd calumnies against the Order, and even embellishes and enlarges them from his own fancy, we may form an approximate idea of the quality of the book. For its full characterisation, however, it is necessary also to consider its form. Lonner is gifted with decided talent for adroit and invariably suggestive writing; he has excellent ideas and an extraordinarily rich vocabulary, but he abuses his gift of language in the most shameless manner. Such vulgarity of style and such abject grovelling in the mire of vileness is rare even in those times.'

No ruling authority, secular or spiritual, was safe from the abuse and calumnies of the press ; there was no confession of faith which the press did not misrepresent and distort, no rite of worship which it did not scoff at and turn to ridicule ; the sayings of the Holy Scriptures became as tennis-balls tossed to and fro between sinister lust of innovation and blind charges of heresy. The lofty teachings of Christianity—its injunctions to have pity on the poor and the sick, to do works of penitence, to show love to one's enemies, seemed well-nigh forgotten by and expunged from the hearts of those who plumed themselves on being the teachers and friends of the people.' Nearly all the printed publications of the period bore the stamp of unbounded hatred : the press had become a veritable curse. The multitudinous company of scribes disseminated everywhere, in ever augmenting ratio, ' mistrust, suspicion, envy and hostility,' stirred up every evil passion, and seemed to have no other aim than to ' incite princes, great lords, and common people to rebellion and to the sword.' Well, therefore, might the ' Simple Layman,' in 1617, express his wonder ' that matters had not long ago come to universal bloodshed.'¹

¹ See vol. ix. pp. 520-523. In the ' *Responsum de recuperanda Saxonia*,' published in Schwarz's *Zehn Gutachten*, p. 52 ff., the press is described as a powerful medium in the hands of the new religionists for the dissemination of their doctrines. The innovators understood how to rule public opinion. While the Catholics for the most part opposed no resistance to the spread of antagonistic writings, the opposite party did all they could to hinder the production and circulation of Catholic publications ; whatever fell into their hands they stamped out ; and this explains why so many Catholic pamphlets and books of the sixteenth century are extraordinarily rare. The author of the memorandum on the re-Catholicisation of Saxony emphatically urges greater activity in writing and distributing concise, well-constructed Catholic pamphlets. The Dominican Bartholomew Kleindienst suggests, as the best means of enlightening the

Meanwhile, the political conditions of the Empire, since the establishment of the Protestant League, had lapsed into worse and worse disorder, and year after year voices were loud in the outcry that the country was on the eve of a great war.

ignorant and confirming the wavering in the faith, the publication of a short, popular, truthful history of the schism in the Church. He recommended, nevertheless, that those who should 'undertake a useful work of this sort should recount the truth without abuse and libels,' for 'in proportion as the one course is profitable, so is the other injurious' (*Hist.-polit. Bl.* 109 [1892], pp. 500-501).

BOOK III

GENERAL POLITICAL CONFUSION IN THE DECADE
PRECEDING THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR

CHAPTER I

POLITICO - RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE IMPERIAL
HEREDITARY LANDS, AND THEIR REACTION ON THE
EMPIRE, 1603-1609

AFTER the Archduke Matthias, 'favoured by fate,' had robbed his imperial brother 'of his finest lands,'¹ he returned to Vienna on July 14, 1608, in order to receive homage from the hereditary dominions, first of all in Austria, and then in Moravia and Hungary. But already on June 23 his 'new friends and dear allies,' the Calvinistic heads of these three lands, had concluded between them, in the Archduke's camp at Sterbohol, a secret alliance which left the new sovereign little to expect. For it was not for his benefit, but solely for their own advantage that they had taken up arms against the Emperor. Scarcely had Matthias entered Vienna than the Protestant Estates of the Archduchies of Upper and Lower Austria declared that they would not render him homage until all their 'grievances' had been redressed, and above all until

¹ See vol. ix. pp. 500 ff.

‘unrestricted freedom of religious worship’ had been granted: and this freedom must not be confined to the nobles only, but must extend to the towns and boroughs. Before an answer had arrived the Estates caused the Protestant churches and schools of all districts to be opened, took possession of Linz, installed officials according to their own liking, raised the taxes, enlisted soldiers, and in short usurped and exercised every single princely right. To their new ‘dear territorial lord’ they intimated that the negation of their demands would lead to bloodshed. What the Estates had in view was the utter annihilation of the power of the princes, coupled with the full reduction of the Catholic Estates to subordinate rank.¹

‘They want to have a republic and to be free,’ wrote Melchior Klesl, the most influential councillor of the Archduke, on October 11.² Their ‘leader and spokesman,’ ‘the Tribune of the Evangelicals,’ George Erasmus, Freiherr von Tschernembl, a zealous Calvinist, said out frankly that ‘his party had the right to whatever they had the might to seize;’ the supreme power lay with the people who ‘elected their sovereign and had power also to repudiate him.’ By ‘the people’ he meant the majority of the aristocracy. ‘Everything rests with the nobles,’ he said once in conversation at the Senate house at Vienna; ‘if they are satisfied, the clergy and prelates have no cause to make difficulties. The latter are obliged to keep the right eye on Rome and the left on the Fatherland. The greater number of

¹ Stülz, p. 175 ff.; see Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe aus dem Jahren 1590 bis 1610*, Bd. 7, and the *Abhandl. der Hist. Klasse der Münchener Akademie*, 20 (München, 1893), p. 747.

² Hammer, ii.; *Urkunden*, Bd. 139; see Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 550 ff.

the towns are on our side ; and over 300 of the nobles, scarcely eighty of whom are Catholics. The prelates being out of consideration, and the towns with the majority of the nobility being Calvinist, these latter constitute the Estates.’¹

The Protestants alone were to be regarded as the actual possessors of power, and as the only friends of the Fatherland. Some of the nobles gave the Archdukes no higher title than Counts of Habsburg, and boasted that they themselves were of more ancient lineage ; others were heard to say that the country could do very well without a prince, but a prince could not exist without a country.²

As the Protestant Estates of Lower Austria associated themselves with the demands of the Upper Austrians, Matthias went first to Moravia, and there at the end of August, after according full religious freedom to the nobles and investing them, to the great detriment of the people, with unlimited power, he received homage as King. Complaints of the peasants against tyrant nobles were henceforth no longer to be brought before the ruling prince ; the towns were reduced to impotence by the utter powerlessness into which their kingly protector had sunk.³

On the ground of the ‘ Concession ’ of Maximilian II., Matthias wanted also to grant the nobles of Upper and Lower Austria free exercise of their religion. The Estates, he said at a provincial diet at Vienna, had

¹ Stülz, p. 174. ‘ An adherent of the reformed religion, Tschernembl had fed on the most extreme doctrines of Calvinistic state policy, and he combined with a cold and gloomy fanaticism the stubbornness by which his fellow-religionists were characterised. He went headlong forward at his object ’ (Chlumecky, i. 541).

² Hurter, vi. 194.

³ Chlumecky, i. 514-517, 524.

not the right to refuse him homage, when he had confirmed 'existing rights and privileges.' The Estates, however, stood out for added privileges: the whole nation was to be made participators in 'the true Evangel.' 'How could we have entered into alliance against the former hereditary lords, and made light of our former oath of allegiance,' they said, 'if we had not been encouraged to hope for redress of our grievances?' 'There is no doubt whatever,' wrote a Lutheran from Vienna on September 19, 'that the leaders among the nobles 'are bent on introducing that accursed Calvinism, which is a far worse devil than the popish Satan.' The Protestant nobles, indignant that Matthias would not fall in with their opinions, suddenly left the Diet and betook themselves to Horn. The Catholic Estates did homage to the new King on October 8. Their example was followed by two non-Catholic lords and by all the towns of Lower Austria.¹

The men of Horn, strengthened by the accession of their co-religionists of Upper Austria, asked the Hungarians for armed support, and appealed also for help to the Protestant Union. In Hungary, however, Matthias gained over the leader of the Calvinists, Illeshazy, by appointing him Palatine and endowing him richly with the goods of the church of Grau. The nobles, as in Moravia, were invested with unlimited dominion; the Archduke was solemnly crowned on November 19, but was King only in title.²

Meanwhile Tschernembl, in the name of his party, had offered alliance to Prince Christian of Anhalt, the

¹ Gindely, *Rudolf*, i. 268; Klapp, i. 59.

² Gindely, *Rudolf*, i. 262-269; Hammer, ii. 100 ff.; Hurter, vi. 87 ff.; Chlumecky, pp. 548-549; *Theol. Miscellen.*, Heft 1 (einziges Heft), pp. 29-30; Huber, iv. 529 ff.

actual founder of the exclusive Protestant League, in case the princes of the Union should espouse the cause of the latter against Matthias ; Richard of Starhemberg went to Germany to carry out more detailed transactions.¹

Christian, who at a meeting of the Union at Rothenburg in the month of August was appointed Lieutenant-General in chief and Field-Marshal to the Union,² indulged in the highest expectations : ‘ God at this time,’ he wrote on September 3, ‘ was affording the evangelicals a wonderful opportunity for withstanding the Roman chair ; a general Protestant League would give the death-blow to the House of Habsburg and the Catholic cause.’ On September 24 he sent the following communication to the Duke of Bouillon : ‘ If we have Hungary, Moravia, Austria, and Silesia on our side, there will only remain to the House of Habsburg Bohemia, Bavaria, and a few bishops, and we are, humanly speaking, strong enough not only to withstand the opponents, but also to subjugate everything to our religion and to reform the whole of the clergy. Should Bavaria by chance take up arms against Austria, on account of this country joining the Union, we must then make a raid on Bavaria, snatch Donauwörth from her clutches, and seize two or three bishoprics to defray the war-costs.’ Italy was the only power they had cause to fear, and the question turned entirely on whether France would guarantee the allies security against Italy. ‘ If only we act skilfully we shall be able to dictate our own laws to all, and appoint rulers of our own choice.’³

¹ Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 90, No. 38, note 1 ; Gindely, i. 271-272.

² Ritter, ii. 61.

³ ‘ Quand nous aurions la Hongrie, Moravie, Autriche et Silésie pour

Christian's object was to show what it would be possible to accomplish if the Union attacked the Austrian Habsburgers conjointly with France; he did not, however, succeed in winning over the confederates to such a policy.¹ Dissatisfied with the hesitating attitude of his friends, he betook himself in the middle of November to Wittengau, a castle belonging to Peter Wock of Rosenberg;² here he fell in with Tschernembl, the delegate of the Horn conspirators. They discussed the plan of taking possession of the town of Vienna: 'the Turks had offered their help; with 10,000 men the town could be captured; if it were besieged, famine would reduce it in ten days.' By the seizure of Vienna the papacy would be strongly upheaved, and the Union would be reinforced in means and in dignity.³ 'We try,' said Tschernembl to the delegates from Moravia,

nous, il n'y auroit autres forces dont ladite maison [Habsburg] se peust servir contre nous que Boeme et Bavière et quelque peu d'evesques, contre lesquels, parlant humainement, nous serions assez forts non seulement pour les soutenir, *mais pour reformer tout le clergé et soumettre tout à la religion, et n'y auroit rien à craindre sinon l'Italie.* Car en Pais-bas, quelque pied que les affaires y prennent, les troubles y recommenceront, et rien ne nous empescheroit. Selon l'advis de monseigneur [Anhalt] le jeu se commenceroit en cette façon: aussitost que Bavière armeroit pour forcer l'Autriche (presupposé membre de l'union), nous armerions pour courir sus à Bavière et reprendre Donavert, par mesme moyen attirer 2 ou 3 evesques *per aiuto di costa.* Or il faudroit en tel cas estre assuré d'Italie, et monseigneur prie led. sieur de Bouillon de lui dire ce qu'en ce cas on se pourroit promettre de la France pour divertir l'Italie, et en somme ce que la France feroit en ce remuement. Certes, il semble que procédant dextrement, moyennant la grace de Dieu, nous pourrions par ce moyen donner la loy à tous et installer des chefs tels que nous voudrions' (Anhalt's instructions for Christopher of Dohna, September 24, 1608, in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 104). For criticism of this document and of Anhalt's influence generally, see Huber, iv. 525 ff. and Bernd, p. 24, note 2.

¹ Bernd, *Gesch. der österreichischen Unruhen*, p. 25.

² See above, p. 327.

³ Christian's 'Aufzeichnungen,' in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 138-141; see Bernd, p. 28.

‘to arrange unions and correspondence with the whole world, we have delegates everywhere. If it comes to war, prelates and priests will be our first booty: the climax will be the extermination of the whole clerical order.’¹ Christian called on the Horn conspirators to incite the generals of King Matthias to breach of faith and to desertion; in imagination he saw himself already commander-in-chief of the Austrian troops.² Tschernembl informed him at the beginning of February 1609 that it was his intention to ask the allied princes for a governor belonging to the reformed Confession to help them.³ ‘Unless they had a leader taken out of the Empire,’ the Austrian Estates ‘would accomplish little and would not remain united in the confederacy,’ for ‘none would respect the other, each would be as good as the other;’ God would send a special punishment not only on the hereditary lord, but also on the lands, and ‘the lands of the stem and House of Austria would have to be cut off and would pass into the hands of foreign potentates.’⁴

‘Helpless and feckless,’ Matthias did not know where to turn. In order to save his throne he concluded on March 19 a compact with the Estates, the so-called ‘*Kapitulations-Resolution*,’ in which he substantially consented to all the stipulations of the people of Horn.⁵ ‘Oh, Matthias, Matthias!’ wrote the Archduke Leopold, ‘you are the cause of your own and of our House’s ruin.’⁶ The Viennese Bishop, Melchior Klesl, who, in conjunction with the Bishop of Passau and the Catholic Estates, had entered a solemn protest against

¹ Stülz, pp. 189–190.

² Chlumecky, i. 555 ff.

³ Chlumecky, i. 555–558.

⁴ Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 186–188.

⁵ Stülz, p. 190 ff.; Huber, iv. 541 ff.

⁶ Chlumecky, i. 560.

the concessions that had been made without their consent, said, 'The King has signed away a large part of our religion, for which action he cannot be exculpated; he had become despondent and hopeless because Moravia, Hungary, and Austria had united against him, and had all the sectaries on their side; Bohemia also had begun to rebel, and the Emperor too was opposed to him. He confided to me that he did not know himself how it had come about that he had subscribed to this agreement.' ¹

Tschernembl set himself up as a Dictator. In the name of the Protestant Estates he insisted that Matthias should forthwith rid the land of the obnoxious Klesl, who was endangering all peace and security by his machinations. The general of the army of the Estates made a devastating inroad on the Bishop's possessions. 'The Estates,' Tschernembl said unreservedly to the King after the conclusion of the '*Kapitulation*,' 'are in correspondence with the allied electors and princes, and will continue so to be; if in the future anything disastrous should occur, let no one accuse us of having kept back anything from your Majesty.' ²

'I have received letters from Heidelberg,' wrote the Calvinist agitator Duplessis-Mornay in April 1609, 'saying that the Austrians have obtained a general guarantee of religious liberty, and that the Bohemians are standing out pertinaciously for the same object, and have leagued themselves together to attain their end.' 'The King of England has written a book against the Pope, and in the preface he exhorts all Christians to throw off the papal yoke by force.' 'The Arch-

¹ Hammer, ii. ; *Urkundensammlung*, No. 256, pp. 267-268.

² Hammer, ii. 139-140 ; Stülz, p. 190 ; Huber, iv. 544.

duke Ferdinand of Styria,' wrote Duplessis in July to the English ambassador at Venice, 'is the only prince who still refuses to grant religious liberty, but he must be brought round by force: the League of the Princes grows stronger from day to day.'¹ In six years' time at the outside 'the downfall of the Roman Antichrist must inevitably happen.'²

On March 21, 1609, Count Ambrosius of Thurn, in a despatch to Archduke Ferdinand, described the position of things which had been brought about by Matthias. 'From the Catholics he has not merited any thanks; with the Emperor he is not reconciled; in the Empire he is detested; he has forfeited much of the esteem he possessed; he has put weapons into the hands of the provinces against himself, and he has brought things to such a pass that Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia are allying themselves with the Empire, with England, with Denmark and with Holland. From the Hungarians there is nothing else to expect than loss of the frontiers and the devastation of Austria: already they threaten invasion. All the fortresses are in their power; they are keeping the Germans out and showing pretty clearly what they intend to do so soon as they are in possession of the borderlands. The Emperor, indeed, still holds firmly to his religion, but he is in danger whichever course he takes. If he makes no concessions and the Bohemians and Silesians effect an alliance, they will then proceed in the same manner as the Austrians. There is no lack, moreover, of parties and factions in Bohemia. In the end also the common people may very likely interpose and massacre the lords who foment such disturbance

¹ Duplessis-Mornay, x. 322, 323, 356.

² *Id.* x. 249; see p. 326.

and quarrelling in the land. These nobles battle too much among themselves for his Majesty's sceptre; they want to manage everything and everybody according to their own ideas; they depose the high officials, instal soldiers in the towns, burden the whole land with taxes. Before six months have passed, many startling and strange intrigues may possibly come to light in the Empire and in other places. God only grant that a truly fraternal reconciliation may take place between the Emperor and King Matthias.' ¹

But, far from there being any approach to such a reconciliation, the brothers continued unintermittently to 'work antagonistically towards each other,' and on the side of the opponents of the House of Habsburg everything was done to strengthen their hostility and hatred. Christian of Anhalt was especially active in this direction. The Margrave Joachim Ernest of Ansbach also considered it 'of the highest importance' that the disagreement between the brothers should be kept up: to this end, he said, they must 'labour everywhere.' ²

The results of all these efforts became as palpable in Bohemia as in Austria.

The Emperor had given leave to the Protestant Estates of Bohemia to summon a provincial diet, at which religious affairs should be settled.³ When this meeting took place, at the end of January 1609, the Estates, under the influence of the spiritual head of the 'Fraternal Union,' Wenzel Budowec von Budowa,

¹ Hurter, vi. 132-134.

² A letter of January 9, 1609, to Christian of Anhalt. Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 174-175.

³ See vol. ix. pp. 509, 510.

demanding not only religious liberty, but also the management of all matters connected with divine worship, and the control of education. The Prague University, with which the rest of the schools were in close connection, was to be given over to their direction. Their aim was, not to establish religious equality between the Catholics and the Protestants, but to bring about the complete suppression of the former; and to this end Budowec laboured with all the weapons of force, ambitious to establish on the ruins of the old Church and of the royal throne an unlimited Czechish-Protestant sovereignty of the nobles. The chiefs of the Lutherans, Count Andreas von Schlick and Count Stephen of Sternberg and 'other moderates among the Augsburg Confessionists' were forced by Budowec into the background.

Among the members of the Emperor's Council Popel von Lobkowitz, Wilhelm von Slawata, and Jaroslav von Martinitz resolutely opposed the demands brought forward, and thus called forth once more the threat of the members of the assembly: 'Those fellows must be thrown out of the window.' The Emperor, filled only with thoughts of vengeance against Matthias, wavered this way and that in his decisions. A delegate of Archduke Albert found him more inclined to the Protestants than the Catholics; he had been heard to say that by giving in to the Protestants he could do the greatest injury to his brother. Finally, however, he rejected the demands, and on April 1 the provincial Diet was dissolved. Then the Estates, at the instigation of Budowec, who was in close relations with an agent of the Palatine Elector, sought the help of foreign princes, and at the end of April they assembled again

at Prague in large numbers and with an armed escort. In opposition to the will of Rudolf they inaugurated a secessionist Diet in the council-house at Neustadt, and threatened to assert their claims with armed force. Their soldiers filled the streets and the neighbourhood of the town, and watched for the signal of their lords to fall on the Catholics and on the Emperor. Destitute for the moment of all help, Rudolf relapsed into his old distemper and sought to drown his sufferings in strong drink and other excesses. Although he had at first condemned the independent conclave of the towns as an act of rebellion, he described it a few weeks later as a 'loyal and honourable' proceeding, and on May 25 he summoned another provincial Diet. Archduke Leopold, who had come to Prague at the end of May, found everything in the greatest confusion. 'The selfsame devil,' he wrote to Archduke Ferdinand, 'that is let loose in Austria is also carrying on his work here in person : ' ' the Bohemians are pressing the Emperor hard with their threats and in other unbecoming ways ; ' ' open and secret enemies are active.'

It was thanks to the influence of Leopold and of the papal nuncio that at the second provincial Diet also Rudolf did not yield at once : he would grant no more than a *de facto* religious liberty, general toleration, such as had existed under Maximilian II. ; the consistory and the University were to remain under the control of the territorial lord. If the Estates were not satisfied with this, the Emperor said, the whole dispute must be referred to the decision of the entire body of electors.

The Estates, however, insisted that their demands should be granted forthwith with seal and charter,

and they began to consider the plan of open rebellion. At the suggestion of Count Heinrich Matthias of Thurn they resolved (June 24) on a general arming of the people ; throughout Bohemia every fifth man was to be enlisted, and within six weeks a military tax was to be levied on all immovable possessions, and all money property. Three generals were appointed to manage the business of recruiting, thirty directors installed as a provisional government, and alliances concluded with the Protestants of Silesia for mutual armed assistance. Rudolf, paralysed with fear, made fresh concessions. He granted the Protestants freedom of confession and a consistorium of their own which should be solely dependent on them ; as regards the control of the University he merely claimed for himself the right to appoint at his own discretion six out of the twelve directors whom the Estates should propose to him. But not even this much would they concede to the Emperor.

‘Rudolf’s terms,’ wrote the Saxon ambassador Gerstenberger, who had been commissioned by the Elector Christian to undertake the rôle of mediator at Prague, ‘are perfectly satisfying ; the demands of the Protestants exceed all bounds.’

On June 26 the Estates had declared the meeting dissolved and had left the castle amid tumult and uproar. ‘It sounded exactly,’ says a report of June 27 to the Palatine Elector, ‘as if they were a pack of wolves, hounds, and cats.’ Several of the delegates actually rushed into the Emperor’s antechamber, while he was at his evening meal, and insisted on an immediate answer.¹

¹ See Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 716.

Wock von Rosenberg, who through the medium of a commanding officer encouraged the insurgents in their stubbornness, wrote to Christian of Anhalt on July 3: 'If the Emperor does not give in we may expect events of great importance.' The matter at stake was no less a one than wresting the government of Bohemia from the Emperor, concluding an alliance with neighbouring princes and countries, and above all with the German Union, and occupying the passes. Prince Christian was chosen as Commander-in-chief; Rudolf's incapacity for government was to be declared officially, and the Elector Palatine was then to be installed as Administrator of the Empire.¹

While the conflict between Rudolf and the Bohemian Estates was threatening to end in open war, a diet of the Union was held at Schwäbisch-Hall on the 19th to the 20th of May, and the Union was strengthened by the accession of the towns of Strasburg, Ulm, and Nuremberg. At Nuremberg, however, there had been grave misgivings among the members of the council as to the advisability of joining the separatist League: the alliance of the towns with the princes was, they said, dangerous for the former; the Emperor might easily set down the League as rebellion, and this would afford the papists ground for contemplating a counter-league; 'a general rupture and disturbance of the peace was to be apprehended in Germany, and it was quite certain that the papists would blame the evangelicals as the source and cause of all the disorder, mischief, and disaster arising therefrom.' On the other hand it was insisted that by refusing to join they would offend the allied princes; the evangelical Estates were

¹ Chlumecky, i. 596-597.

threatened with great danger because the papists were determined to massacre them all wholesale! By these arguments the town had been prevailed on to enter the Union.¹

Frankfort-on-the-Main, refusing to join the Union, was accused at the Towns' Diet at Spires in October 1608, of 'godless indifference to the evangel and penal treachery to the common liberties.'²

At the assembly of the Union at Schwäbisch-Hall it was decided that a closer alliance with France and England 'was not advisable at present,' but the Elector Palatine and Würtemberg were to keep up 'the good relations' entered on with these powers. At present also there was to be no recourse to force on account of the town of Donauwörth; both in respect of this town—so ran the resolution—and also of the other Protestant grievances, amicable measures must first be tried, and to this end an embassy headed by Christian of Anhalt must be sent to the Emperor. Christian must in such wise 'commend' the Union to the Emperor as to cause him 'to look on it with a favourable eye and to place reliance on it.' But, at the same time, he must also cultivate friendly relations with the Protestant Estates of Hungary, Bohemia, Silesia, and Bavaria, in order to learn what their intentions were. The formation of a general league of all these countries was the aim of the confederates. An agent was also to be sent to Venice 'to sound matters and determine how best to bring odium on the papacy in that quarter.'³

¹ From the *Nürnberg Unionssakten II.*, contributed by v. Höfler.

² Kirchner, ii. 344.

³ 'Protokolle und Abschiede des Tages,' in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 246-272. See Chlumecky, i. 599.

Christian hoped to be able to play a decisive part at Prague, and to place himself at the head of the provisional government; he even for a time entertained the idea of becoming King of Bohemia.¹ But when he reached Prague on July 14, the decision had already been made.

On July 9 the Emperor, in the so-called '*Majestätsbrief*,' had given his consent to the demands of the Protestants. '*Summa Summarum*,' wrote Archduke Leopold to Maximilian of Bavaria, 'the Emperor has not only been compelled to grant all the demands, but he has forsooth been obliged to back up his concessions with a *Privilegium*, the thought of which goes nigh to making my heart burst in my body.' The Lutherans reproached the Calvinists with having muddled in the '*Majestätsbrief* in order to be able to fill the Bohemian sheepfold with mangy sheep.'²

On this same 9th of July there had also been concluded, with the assent of Rudolf, an 'agreement between the Catholic and Protestant Estates,' which went beyond the '*Majestätsbrief*' in an exceedingly important point. The so-called 'Bohemian Confession,' a mixture of Hussite, Lutheran, and Calvinistic doctrines, was made free, in both documents, to all the inhabitants of Bohemia without distinction of class. Not so, however, the right of building churches. In the '*Majestätsbrief*' this right was only granted to the three higher Estates: that is, to the lords, knights, and royal cities; in the 'agreement' it was further granted to the 'dwellers in the royal possessions.' Concerning the meaning of this phrase bitter contentions soon arose. The

¹ Gindely, *Rudolf*, pp. 2, 4, 14; Ritter, ii. 420, note 2.

² Hurter, vii. 236.

Protestants, for instance, understood by 'royal possessions' ecclesiastical possessions also, and insisted that to the inhabitants of these the right of building their own churches, without the consent of their ecclesiastical chiefs, should be accorded, for the ecclesiastical Estate was not the possessor but only the usufructuary of the Church property; the real right of ownership belonged to the King alone; the latter could mortgage, give away, or sell the property at pleasure—and kings, moreover, had repeatedly exercised this right. The Catholics, on the other hand, held firmly to the position that the King was only the chief protector, not the supreme owner of the Church property. With regard also to all the Church goods which the kings had confiscated, the ecclesiastical incumbents, so long as they had held them, had enjoyed the same right and authority as every landed proprietor had over his property. Spiritual lords had always received homage and submission from their subjects just as much as secular lords. If, therefore, an ecclesiastical 'possessor' had hitherto enjoyed and exercised all the same rights as secular proprietors, one of these privileges could not now be snatched from them arbitrarily; and if no subject was entitled to build a church on the property of a layman without that layman's permission, the same restriction must hold good in the case of the subjects of an ecclesiastical lord.¹

At Braunau and Klostergrab the dissensions which soon arose on the meaning of the 'agreement' led to a disastrous breach of the peace.

¹ See fuller details in Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Ausstandes*, i. 61–70, and in Swoboda, 'Die Kirchenschliessung zu Klostergrab und Braunau,' in the *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theologie*, Jahrg. x. 385–417.

The forcible measures by which the '*Majestätsbrief*' had been extorted did not meet with the approval of Karl von Zierotin, the head of the Moravian Protestants, who feared that 'freedom would degenerate into licence, and produce discord and schism, and that the drama would end, as it had begun, with violence and oppression.'¹

The Emperor's hope that the Protestants, having obtained all their demands, would now forthwith lay down their arms, was not realised. Budowec and Thurn, knitting more closely their alliance with Christian of Anhalt, had recourse to further measures of violence. They extorted from Rudolf the issue of a document guaranteeing the Estates exemption from punishment for all their proceedings up to the present date. When the Emperor refused to ratify the alliance which the Estates had concluded with the Silesians, the provincial Diet passed a resolution to the effect that this alliance was valid and legitimate without the imperial sanction. The provincial Diet, said Budowec, possessed unlimited authority; it was the fountain of all law and justice in Bohemia. Rudolf was bound to grant to the 'Defensors' appointed by the Estates authority to summon the representatives of all the Bohemian circles to Prague to consult about Protestant affairs.

From henceforth the Protestant Estates formed as it were a state within a state.²

As in Moravia and Hungary, so too now in Bohemia, the nobles 'were freed from all subjection to their King and their territorial prince,' and they could oppress the common people without let or hindrance. 'Do you not think,' asks someone in a satirical dialogue,

¹ Chlumecky, i. 631.

² Fuller details in Gindely, *Rudolf*, ii. 8-27. See also Huber, iv. 555.

‘that as regards the poor people the last state of things is worse than the first?’ ‘You know under what terrible bondage the land-owners have for some time past kept the poorer classes, so much so that if these land-owners had not stood in fear of their King, they would not have scrupled to tear their subjects’ skins off their bodies. This fear has now been abolished, and the poor have no refuge in this extremity. Can this be called a good use of heaven-born liberty? The devil may believe it, but I do not.’¹

The Protestant Estates of Silesia also obtained a ‘*Majestätsbrief*’ from the Emperor. The merit of this achievement lay especially with the Landgrave of Leuchtenberg, an influential member of the Imperial Privy Council: his reward was a heavy chest of silver.²

To Prince Christian of Anhalt the condition of affairs offered a ‘splendid opportunity’ for making the union acceptable to the sick Emperor, ‘robbed almost of all authority,’ and of filling him with fears of popish conspiracies. At the end of July Christian with his suite, which included the Palatine Elector’s councillor Camerarius, obtained audience of Rudolf. Camerarius made a verbal statement of the claims of the allied princes; the town of Donauwörth must be restored to its ancient position; the judicial proceedings must be stopped, the ‘evil-minded persons’ must be removed from the imperial council-board. A written document was handed to the Emperor, in which all these points

¹ Chmel, *Handschriften*, i. 267.

² ‘*Paupertas meretrix*,’ wrote the Bavarian agent Boden with regard to this present to the needy Landgrave; ‘would to God,’ he added, ‘that this style of things were at an end’ (Chlumecky, i. 603). Concerning the ‘*Majestätsbrief*’ for the Silesians, see Grünhagen, *Gesch. Schlesiens*, ii. 140 ff.

were treated in full: at Donauwörth it was said the abbot of the Holy Cross was to blame for all the unpleasantness that had occurred; that the imperial work of justice was a lawful institution could not be proved; the Emperor was surrounded with traitors. The councillors—so the document stated among other things—give their sanction and approval to highly mischievous books which teach that the Religious Peace never possessed any legal validity, or at any rate that it was annulled by the Council of Trent, and that the evangelical professors of the Confession of Augsburg, both of high and low degree, should be exterminated with sword, fire, war, poison, and in every other imaginable way persecuted, killed, destroyed, and rooted out. Not content with having already deprived the Emperor of some of his hereditary lands, his councillors are bent also on wresting the German and Bohemian crowns from off his head, and on plunging these two empires into a frightful deluge of blood and ruin. They are taking bribes right and left, and intend, by means of trenchant proceedings against the Protestants, to grow rich in a very short time. If the demands of the allied princes are not reciprocated, great complications and disasters will probably ensue in the Empire.¹

On August 5 the Emperor sent the Prince of Anhalt three casks of wine, two cartloads of oats, a stag and a pig, and on August 14 he granted Christian a private audience, in the course of which he learnt startling things from his lips. The allied Estates, the Prince told him, had leagued themselves together for the sole purpose of maintaining and strengthening the Emperor

¹ The document is in Londorp, *Acta publ.* i. 53-57; see Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 355-371.

in his dignity and authority. If Rudolf fell in with their wishes the Estates would as it were 'carry him in their arms;' the Emperor was the sun of the Empire; 'if this sun did not let its beams shine forth, the Empire must of necessity be in darkness.' The Union had been organised for the protection of Rudolf and as a counterfoil to the confederacy which the archdukes had formed in 1606 for despoiling him; this confederacy, however, had not been ratified and signed at Vienna or at Graz, but at Madrid and Rome by the Pope and the Spanish King; so little, he said, could the Emperor trust these sovereigns. France and England had already begun to pay court to the Union; the Estates, however, had not yet decided about coming to terms with them. The French King, not without reason, was suspected of intending, with the Pope's help, to re-establish the Empire of Charlemagne, in which France and Germany had been incorporated under *one* sceptre. There was therefore no safer course for the Emperor than to remain in friendly relations with the allies and with Bohemia.¹ Christian's chief endeavour was to throw the Emperor into consternation by depicting to him all manner of dangers. He warned Rudolf that he would do well to read for himself all the letters addressed to him, and 'to bear in mind the most memorable example' of the fate of the great Julius Cæsar. When the latter was going for the last time to the Capitol at Rome he was warned in a letter of the conspiracy hatched against him: 'had he opened and read that letter, he would have escaped the five and twenty wounds by which he was treacherously assassinated.' The

¹ Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 396-402

terrified Emperor asked if the prince knew as a fact that something dangerous was being plotted against him in Bohemia, Austria, or the Empire. Christian answered that he had only mentioned the example of Cæsar as a warning ; as to leagues and alliances he knew nothing ; but it was said all over the Empire that King Matthias was espousing the cause of the Donauwörthers, that in so doing he was seeking his own advantage and would find it, especially if the Emperor gave a negative answer to the complaints of the allies. If the allies, he added threateningly, were still further oppressed in violation of their ‘rights and liberties,’ they were resolved to support each other with counsel and with action.¹

Meanwhile Christian negotiated also in the name of the Union with the Protestant Estates of Bohemia and Silesia respecting mutual aid ; there was no doubt, he said, that ‘the Antichrist and his followers’ were bent ‘on oppressing and then exterminating the adherents of evangelical truth.’ The charter of the League contained the following statement : ‘If anybody should attempt to molest any members of the Union—either present or future ones, or the evangelical Estates of Bohemia and Silesia, or the subjects of the said Estates, with respect to their schools and churches, or on account of the reform either begun or about to be begun, in the Church establishments and revenues, in a matter at variance with the “rightful understanding” of the Religious Peace, the allied princes must stand by each other with mutual support. They must allow no military recruiting against a member of the League, they must prevent exportation from their lands and

¹ Beckmann, v. 318 ff. ; Sattler, vi. ; Beilage, pp. 39–57.

transit through them ; on the other hand, they must mutually guarantee each other enlistment of troops and purchase of the necessaries of war. The number of armed men with which they were to come to each other's assistance was to be fixed at a later assembly.'¹

From the Court of Prague Christian received the promise that Donauwörth should be restored to its former condition within four months ; in the ' affair of Jülich ' the Emperor declared himself gladly willing to accept the proposals of the Palatine Elector.²

¹ Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 409, note 1.

² Ritter, ii. 419, note 1, 420.

CHAPTER II

DISPUTE CONCERNING THE JÜLICH-CLEVES SUCCESSION—
PLANS OF THE UNION AND THE GREAT LEAGUE FOR
THE OVERTHROW OF THE HOUSE OF HABSBURG,
1609–1610

ON March 25, 1609, the feeble-minded Duke John William of Jülich-Cleve-Berg had died childless, and ‘nobody in the land knew to whom the splendid inheritance,’ one of the largest and wealthiest principalities of Germany, ‘ought to descend:’ ‘nobles and commoners, “great jack and little jack,” all made haste to place their possessions in security outside the territory.’ The principal claimants were: the Elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg as the husband of a daughter of John William’s eldest sister; the Count Palatine Philip Louis of Neuberg as husband of the second daughter; Duke John of Zweibrücken as husband of the third; the Margrave Charles of Burgau as husband of the fourth sister. The House of Saxony also, on the basis of older reversions bestowed by former Emperors, laid claims to Jülich, Berg, and Ravensberg. The Count Palatine claimed some portions of the Jülich lands, of which he was the feoffer, and he had been for years in understanding with Brandenburg and the States-General not to allow the Jülich inheritance to fall into Catholic hands.

At the court of Prague, in conformity with the con-

stitution of the Empire, it had been settled, immediately after the death of John William, that the government of the land was to be entrusted to the Dowager Duchess and her councillors, subject to the guidance of the imperial plenipotentiaries, until the question of the succession had been decided. The claimants were all invited to appear before the Imperial Aulic Council with a view to considering this question.

Instead, however, of responding to this summons, Brandenburg and Neuberg placed themselves with all haste in possession of the land, and insisted that the question of right should be decided by an amicable committee, or else by a court of arbitrators composed entirely 'of Protestant princes.' These two princes received the name of 'Possessioners' As early as April 6, Christian of Anhalt had written to Wolfgang William, the son of Philip Louis, that 'the time was especially favourable for active procedure, for the Catholic court was in the worst state of embarrassment, and the Austrian court was more divided than ever; besides that, its strength was impaired; if they only seized the right opportunity they would carry the evangelical cause triumphantly through; from France alone, he said, was any great obstruction to be feared.¹

France, however, was, as a matter of fact, inclined to favour this cause, with a view to mixing herself up in German affairs and preparing the downfall of the Habsburg Imperial House. There were German princes even who themselves besought the intervention of France.

The Elector John Sigismund, in the months of

¹ Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii, 214, note 2.

April and May, appealed for help to Henry IV., asking that, if he should be forcibly assailed in his rights of inheritance, the King would support him 'with veritable defence;' no one of his co-claimants, he said, 'came near to the House of Brandenburg in traditional affection for the King of France.'¹ Later on the Kurbrandenburg councillor Diskau urged on a French ambassador that if Henry thought of securing the dignity of Roman King for himself or for the Dauphin, he had better give his support to the House of Brandenburg; by this means he would gain the alliance of the Count Palatine also; it was of great importance for the King that the mightiest of the German princes should be in submission to him, in order that he might break the power of the House of Austria or gain a firm footing in Germany, as well as help and support in foreign and civil wars.²

The Elector also applied to James I. of England and 'based his claim to English assistance on the interests of the Netherlands, the Protestant religion, and, above all, the cause of freedom.'³ The King was ready to give any amount of support. He would show himself, he assured the Brandenburg ambassador, 'a true defender of the faith;' the Elector's claims were the best founded, and in order to maintain and propagate 'religion'—namely, Protestantism—it was necessary that *one* princely house in Germany should be made powerful. 'So many small princes in the land

¹ Ritter, ii. 231–232.

² ' . . . qu'il importe à S.M. d'avoir les plus puissants en Allemagne à sa devotion pour abaisser la maison d'Autriche, pour y establir ses affaires, pour le secours et assistance es guerres etrangeres ou eiviles ' (Ritter, ii. 348).

³ Ritter, ii. 232, note 1.

were of no real good.’¹ ‘These were his Royal Majesty’s actual words, the ambassador reported to his lord.’²

Henry IV. took the most active interest in the matter. At the end of May he sent a delegate to Germany to offer to the Protestant princes, ‘the ancient allies of France,’ the services ‘of a true ally and a good neighbour.’ ‘Not by an imperial decree,’ he informed the Palatine Elector, ‘must this question of rightful inheritance be settled, but by the free choice and the arms of the Jülich lands:’ he desired the Elector to see to it that the interested parties should without delay, if possible with the help of their friends, take steps in both these ways. He promised his support to the Elector of Brandenburg and advised him, above all, to conciliate Neuberg and Zweibrücken.³

Through the mediation of the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse an agreement was concluded on June 10 between Brandenburg and Neuberg, by which, for a time, the latter were to share the government of the appropriated lands.⁴

When this news reached Prague, imperial mandates were issued to both princes on July 7 and 11, stating that any further assertion of claims to these lands would be punished by ‘*Acht und Oberacht*,’ ban and outlawry.

On the side of the Protestants it seemed a matter of course that the Emperor, in agreement with Spain, should take possession of the Jülich inheritance and make use of it either for the aggrandisement of Spain or for the strengthening of his own house. But Rudolf

¹ ‘. . . Tant de petits princes n’y font rien qui vaille.’

² Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 467–468.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 274–277.

⁴ John Sigismund had already, April 1–10, begged the Landgrave Moritz to work with all his might for the Brandenburg claimant (Despatch in Wackenfeld, p. 31).

had neither the one nor the other idea in his mind. With the court of Madrid he had fallen out completely on account of the Spanish attempts to settle the succession in the Empire; in July he actually forbade the Spanish ambassador at Prague to return to his palace, so that he might not arouse suspicion among the Protestants. With his brothers the Emperor lived in bitter enmity, and in the blackness of his hatred for Matthias he had no thoughts but of revenge and of recovering the lands which had been taken from him. The Archduke Leopold, a younger brother of Ferdinand of Styria, an adventurous youth of two and twenty, was to be his assistant in the matter.

On July 11, two days after the signature of the Bohemian '*Majestätsbrief*,' Leopold had proffered his services to the Emperor and had been adopted by Rudolf in the place of a son. According to Rudolf's plan, Leopold was to be King of Bohemia and his own successor in the Empire, and thus Matthias was to be punished and ruined. In order to predispose the spiritual electors in favour of the Archduke at the next imperial election, he began by committing to them the task of ousting the 'Possessioners' from the Jülich inheritance. When this task had been accomplished there would be every hope of obtaining also the Elector of Saxony's vote for Leopold; for Rudolf had mentally destined the Jülich inheritance to Saxony, whose claims, both in his own and his councillors' opinions, were the most valid. The Archduke was only to have temporary possession of the lands as imperial plenipotentiary until the legal decision had been made.¹

¹ The oft-quoted, notorious memorandum of the imperial vice-chancellor, Leopold von Stralendorff, concerning the Jülich inheritance is a

Disguised as a servant he came to the Rhine, and the fortress of Jülich, which had been closed by its general to the 'Possessioners,' was opened to him on July 23. But all the means which he had at command for maintaining his position in the fortress, and for further conquest of the country, consisted, on his own statement, of no more than 160,000 florins.¹ His whole force in troops was only nine hundred men.² For the Rhenish bishops and for the Spanish Netherlands it was a vital question into whose hands the Jülich-Cleves territories would permanently fall. If they became the possessions of the species of Protestants who were in league on the one hand with the Palatiners and on the other with the States-General, then, as 'everybody could plainly see, it would soon be all up with the splendour of the ecclesiastical princes and the popish belief,' and Archduke Albert in Brussels, threatened with a threefold enemy on the borders of his land, 'would soon have to pack up and be off.'³

Leopold might therefore reasonably have expected powerful succour from a people 'threatened almost in their very existence.' Among the ecclesiastical electors, however, Treves alone was ready to 'contribute at once a subsidy in ready money,' and this

falsification, and in all probability was concocted by the attorney of the Elector of Brandenburg; see Stieve's *Abhandlungen in den Sitzungsberichten der philos.-philol. und hist. Klasse der K. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1883, Heft 3, pp. 437-474. Concerning the so-called Stralendorff memorandum, see also Meinecke in the *Markische Forschungen*, x. (Berlin, 1886) 293-349, and also Stieve in the *Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie*, iii. (1886) 445-471, and Hirn in the *Hist. Jahrb.* x. (1889) 603-608.

¹ Hurter, vi. 346, note 12.

² Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 315.

³ 'Aufzeichnungen des Dr. juris Alexander Hopmann, anno 1609, September,' in the *Convolute*, cited above at p. 350, note 1.

subsidy 'amounted in all to 12,000 florins, which were eventually to be recovered from Leopold by imperial taxes levied later on.'¹ The help sent to the Archduke from the Spanish court was not even enough for the maintenance of the fortress of Jülich, still less for the expulsion of the 'Possessioners' from the territories of which they had taken possession. The Emperor, who had again relapsed into his mental illness, left his adopted son altogether in the lurch, and Pope Paul V., intimidated by the threats of France, did not dare interfere in the affairs of Jülich and give his support to Leopold.²

The whole decision rested with France. An ambassador whom the Archduke had sent to Paris in order, at any rate, to persuade Henry IV. to remain neutral, was informed by the French statesmen that his sovereign could not and would not forsake Brandenburg and Neuberg; that he was fully justified in interfering in German affairs, 'for his right to protect justice was co-equal with his might.'³

On July 23, the same day on which Leopold entered Jülich, Henry IV. wrote to his ambassador Bongars: 'The name and the authority of the Emperor is nothing more than a phantom and a mere scarecrow';⁴ and as for Spain, he said a few days later, 'the kingdom was all in pieces and more downtrodden than ever.'⁵

¹ Hurter, vi. 347.

² Gindely, *Rudolf*, ii. 62, 64.

³ Gindely, ii. 37-38. Equally fruitless with Henry IV. were the efforts of the ecclesiastical electors (Despatch of the latter of August 20, 1609, in *Londorp. Acta publ.* i. 85) and those of an imperial ambassador (Ritter, ii. 428).

⁴ '... qui n'est qu'un fantôme et vray épouvantail de chènevières' (Ritter, ii. 300). To the Brandenburg councillors, who were still in awe of the Emperor, Bongars said that, 'ce nom n'estoit plus qu'une illusion et une couverture de fainéantise' (ii. 354).

⁵ '... deschen et abatu plus qu'il ne fut oncques' (Ritter, ii. 317).

In public documents, on the other hand, there was constant talk of the overweening might of the House of Habsburg and of its endeavours after world-wide dominion, and of the imperative necessity of fighting against both the branches of this house for the sake of European and German freedom.

On the grave of Imperial and Spanish power the supremacy of France was to be erected, and the German princes, as Richelieu once said later on, were to serve 'as it were as footstools to the most Christian King.' In his private letters Henry spoke with the utmost contempt of these princes, who 'only drink and sleep ;' ¹ and concerning the princesses also, 'those female drinkers,' he indulged in highly depreciatory remarks.² At the end of July he offered the 'Possessioners' an army of 15,000 men, and promised, if necessary, to come in person to their assistance in the field with 40,000 men and twenty-five pieces of artillery.³ At the same time he assured the papal nuncio that his intention was to constitute himself the arbiter of the Protestant claims for the benefit of the Catholic religion, for he hoped by this means to separate the princes from one another, and to incense them against each other, or at any rate to manage that each of them should only get a portion of the inheritance.⁴

¹ Ritter, ii. 310.

² See *Oeconomies royales*, iii. 171.

³ Ritter, ii. 311, note.

⁴ ' . . . stimava servitio della religione cattolica nel governarsi in modo con protestanti da poter haver credito da loro et di venir arbitro delle loro pretensioni, perchè per questa via sperava di poterli dividere e mettere alle mani l' uno contro l' altro, o almeno dare quelli stati un pezzo all' uno et un pezzo all' altro ' (Despatch of Ubaldini of August 4, 1609, in Ritter, ii. 325-326). In November Duplessis-Mornay gave an account to a confidential friend, of Henry IV.'s plan of procedure. 'On payera aux princes cohéritiers l'argent qu'on leur doit tout à une fois, pour faire une

To set the 'Possessioners' by the ears would not have been difficult for Henry, for the relations between them were anything but those of friendship, and the conditions in the country were desperate. 'There is no proper combination here,' wrote the ambassadors of Würtemberg and Baden from Düsseldorf on September 26, 1609, 'no order, no management, no authority.'¹ When Christian of Anhalt was in Düsseldorf at the beginning of November 'each of the two "Possessioners" told him of their mutual suspicion that the other would usurp the advantage.' The burgomasters, the tax-gatherers, and the town council complained most bitterly of the disorderliness of the soldiers who formed the body-guards of the princes; they robbed, plundered, and committed murder; they did not behave like Christians, but were tyrannical and barbarous; and all their iniquities went unpunished; on an inspection of the two companies quartered in the town, 258 women and children had been discovered. The troops lying round Jülich, Prince Christian wrote, 'for want of discipline are completely devastating the land, to the exasperation of the peasants and the provincial Estates.'² 'Those who pretend to be rulers and friends of the land,' it says in the memoirs of a jurist of Cleves (November 3), 'behave no better than Turks in an enemy's land, plunder, burn, and violate women

bonne armée, lesquels cependant sont exhortés à se bien unir. Par là nous gauchissons les plaintes de l'empereur et du pape. M. de Bongars s'en va de la part de sa majesté trouver ces princes à Dusseldorf, de là en Brandebourg' (*Mémoires et Correspondance*, x. 431). From Kassel Bongars wrote on December 24, to the Minister Villeroy: 'The King has none but Protestant friends; all who are Catholic in Germany are hostile to him' (Ritter, ii. 525).

¹ Ritter, ii. 424.

² *Id.* ii. 491, and note 1.

and young girls ; all complaints remain unnoticed ; the poor people are drained to the very marrow, while persons of importance, the councillors and the generals, indulge in such extravagant banqueting and drinking-bouts, that, in view of the general need and wretchedness, it is enough to make one's heart burst.' ¹

Both the princes begged Christian to undertake the management of the war, and summoned the Union to their help ; for there was ' a new popish League on foot,' and consequently great danger that the lands of which they had taken possession would again be wrested from them ; if this should happen ' the complete ruin of all the evangelical Estates' would ensue.' ² Towards the end of September terrible news was already in circulation. The Duke of Würtemberg and the Margrave of Baden were informed from Düsseldorf that the Jesuits in Cologne had confided to a young Catholic nobleman that ' in a few days Düsseldorf would be surprised and captured, and then, because the burghers of the town had been the first to let in the " Possessioners," they would all be massacred as a deterrent example.' A ' great undertaking of the opponents ' was imminent ; the parsons in Cologne were holding days of prayer and fasting, and organising processions for its success ; 4,000 Spaniards were marching to Aix-la-Chapelle ; numbers of other troops were in movement ; Archduke Ferdinand had arrived in Jülich ; 400,000 thalers had been smuggled in in butter-casks. They must be prepared for the worst ; the opponents could easily ' get both the princes in Düsseldorf into their hands and lead them in triumph where they liked,

¹ *Aufzeichnungen Hopmanns* ; see above, p. 431, note 3.

² Ritter, ii. 481, note 1.

and by executing the ban on the burghers, and a certain amount of incendiarism and tyranny, they might get possession of the country in one day.' 'If this be done, and done successfully, it is worth the trouble of a thorough rampage within and without the Empire, happen what may.' For 'the honour and reputation of all Germans' and of 'noble freedom' were at stake.

Preliminary negotiations with regard to joining the Union were to be held at Stuttgart on the occasion of the marriage of Duke John Frederic of Württemberg with a princess of Brandenburg. For full eight days, from November 5 to November 13, 'the high princely festivities' lasted on there; from one who was present they evoked the following lament: 'There was no hint or echo there of the cruel need and poverty with which nearly all the land was crushed, and which were unceasingly brought forward by the provincial Estates in loud complaints; nothing but empty revelry and extravagant dissipation.'

To these festivities there had flocked seventeen princes and twenty-two princesses, fifty-two counts and countesses, over five hundred nobles, and one hundred young ladies of high and low nobility; the joint retinues amounted to nearly two thousand servants and three thousand horses. The princes' table was served with eighty dishes; there were also artistic shows; for instance, Mount Helicon and the Hippocrene, the Muses and Pegasus, the Actæon, and the Rape of the Sabine women, a ship with the Prophet Jonah, in which 'sixty fiery shells, filled with perfumes, were hidden, which went off one after the other.' The table utensils were mostly silver, but some of them even gold, studded with precious stones. In all the different pageants of

the princes, the nobles, and the court people, there appeared, in company with different personifications of Virtues, Dame Venus and her suite, and also Joshua, David, and Judas Maccabæus, Nestor, Achilles, Hector, Alexander, Cæsar, and other great heroes of antiquity 'to remind the gazers of daring military exploits.' In the hall of the knights twelve nymphs performed wonderful dances with twelve knights in Roman costume. Ring-racing, tournaments on foot and on horseback, and fireworks 'of the greatest costliness' added further excitement to the proceedings, which ended on November 13 with a 'Quintain-tilting, in which Scotchmen, Turks, Tartars, and Amazons took part.' 'It might well have been imagined,' said an eye-witness, 'that people and princes were in the highest affluence, and that peace and prosperity reigned in the Empire.'¹

The allies, wrote Caspar Schoppe, 'have no longer any scruples in speaking openly before everyone of their intentions and of the actual object of their Union, as is plainly seen from the historical narrative of the Würtemberg wedding which appeared in print at Stuttgart in 1610.' At p. 94 of this book we read: 'The Duke of Würtemberg and others of his compeers have pledged themselves with lips and heart to the maintenance of religion, justice, and German freedom, and are determined to defend and protect the reputation of Germany at the risk of life and property.' The reasons which impelled him and others to such a conjuration or conspiracy are stated at pp. 87 and 91: 'Because our noble and precious German freedom is no

¹ *Beschreibung bei Pfaff*, Miscellen, pp. 81-90; *Müllers und Falkes Zeitschr. für deutsche Kulturgesch.* Jahrg. 1859, pp. 266-271; *Beschreibung einer hochfürstlichen Hochzeit*, &c. (1609), pp. 3-8.

longer held in any honour, but is trampled under foot and dragged in the dirt, and because religion and justice are placed in equal peril.' What they understood by religion we learn at p. 121 in the description of the Margrave of Baden's procession, where he uses the watchword 'Pure religion, exterminator of idolatry:'¹ that is to say, according to their meaning, the Catholic religion; and at p. 233 it says: 'This Baden pageant is a veritable Judæa and a perfect example of a well-regulated government.'²

On the last day of the wedding festivities, November 13, those princes of the Union who were present agreed to summon a meeting of the Union at Schwäbisch-Hall on the 10th of the following January, when they would settle in detail what help was to be given to the 'Possessioners.' Christian of Anhalt was despatched to Paris to wind up the negotiations with Henry IV.

When he reached the French capital he found the King more than ever resolved on war. The constraining motive was a fierce passion which he had conceived for the wife of Prince Henry of Condé. Condé had left the French court in order to save the honour of his House. Then, when the King had planned to carry off the Princess by a nocturnal surprise, Condé had fled with her to Brussels in November 1609; had he not resolved on this step, he said, his wife would have fallen a victim to the arts of seduction with which Henry IV. had been surrounding her for the last two years.³ Scarcely master of himself, Henry demanded of Archduke Albert the surrender of the fugitives. But

¹ *Religio pura, Idololatriæ exterminatrix.*

² v. Friedberg, p. 63.

³ Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, iii. 530; see Klopp, i. 87 ff.

his evil designs were frustrated by the honourable conduct of the Archduke, and also of the King of Spain, who, like the General Ambrosius Spinola, declared that the right of hospitality was sacred; a fugitive prince who only sought protection for his imperilled honour could not be denied the boon he asked; only, of course, care must be taken that the Prince was in no respect violating the duties of fidelity and obedience towards his territorial lord.¹

To the papal nuncio Henry pretended that he demanded the return of the Princess in the character of 'Protector and defender of the freedom of his subjects.'² He wanted to make believe that he was by no means in love with the Princess, but that his royal dignity would be injured if her 'liberation' was refused.³ In reality his passion was so overwhelming that many people thought it would drive him to insanity.⁴ He struggled

¹ v. Polenz, v. 22-23.

² Henrard, p. 270.

³ It was a calumny, said Henry, 'that he was in any way moved by the lady's charms' (Gardiner, ii. 96). Gardiner, not unjustly, calls the King 'the old profligate.' Fuller details concerning the transactions for the surrender of the Princess are given in Cornelius, 'Der grosse Plan Heinrichs IV.,' in the Munich *Histor. Jahrbuch* of 1866, p. 33 ff. See Heurard, p. 194 ff. One of the King's mistresses, the Marquise de Verneuil, said to Henry respecting the Princess: 'N'êtes-vous pas bien méchant de vouloir coucher avec la femme de votre fils? Car vous sçavés bien que vous m'avés dit qu'il l'estoit.' 'A fresh scandal at court,' writes L'Estoile, 'where all piety and fear of God are extinct. One sees nothing but vice reigning, and blasphemy held in honour; gambling is the ruling passion, and in higher credit than ever.' See v. Polenz, v. 6-7. 'The immense and far-reaching plans of the King,' says the publisher of the *Lettres Missives*, 7, XVI., 'are disclosed in the despatches addressed to the ambassadors in March and Arpil 1610. In the midst of the instructions contained in these despatches and the minute orders to all the generals are heard the laments of a desperate passion, which, according to Henry's own statement, is killing him and leaving only the skin on his bones (et ne lui laisse que la peau sur les os).' See v. Polenz, iv. 837.

⁴ Ritter, iii. 144.

in vain to persuade the Spanish delegate at his court that Albert and Philip III. might send the Princess back to France without any fear of injury to their honour. 'The King,' says a report of the ambassador, 'went on incessantly exclaiming that "the Princess is detained in Brussels like a prisoner, and nevertheless she is not a subject of Spain but of France." I answered: "She is the subject of her husband." "No," retorted the King, "of France." And thus, four times running, we bandied assertion against assertion, while the King tore up and down the room, roaring like a lion.'

And now 'the liberation of the Princess' was to be made the special motive of a war against the Netherlands and against Spain, and the Jülich affair was 'to set the stone rolling.' This business, Richelieu said later to Henry's wife, 'would have been a sufficiently valid and dignified reason for the King's great undertaking, but love was by no means the least of the determining motives.'¹

Christian of Anhalt, wrote the Dutch ambassador, Francis van Aerssen, from Paris to Duplessis-Mornay at the beginning of January 1610, promised the King that 'the German princes would bring into the field 8,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry, and from twenty to twenty-five cannons;' whereupon Henry IV. also promised to contribute an equal amount of military forces. They wanted to develop the affair of Jülich into a 'general concern,' and Henry was ready to 'drive the Spaniards across the mountains.'² As early as the end of December 1609 the minister Sully had confided to the ambassadors that 'the King meant to drive the Spaniards completely out of the Netherlands, to take

¹ v. Polenz, v. 23.

² Duplessis-Mornay, x. 494.

part of the country for himself, and to give the rest to the States-General.' ¹ Now, he said, the right moment had come for striking the first blow, for Archduke Albert was without troops, the King of Spain powerless, and withal threatened by the Moors; in Italy, also, the Duke of Savoy would keep him so busily employed that he would not be able to send even a single soldier into the Netherlands.²

On April 8, 1609, the States-General had concluded a twelve-years' truce with Spain, but the solemn assurances then given did not hinder them from promising their help to the German allies and to the French King. Accordingly, on January 22, Henry IV. laid his plan of war before the ambassador van Aerssen: from three separate quarters, and with three separate armies, they must suddenly surprise the Spaniards. In this sense also he negotiated with the Protestant princes. The Jülich affair afforded an admirable pretext. The result would follow all the more easily as the King of Spain, 'that blockhead, and minion of his minister Lerma,' was stripped bare of resources and was about to be pressed unexpectedly on the Italian side by the claims of another war.³

Two years before, in 1607, Du Fresne-Canoye, the French ambassador at Venice, had already declared a war with Italy to be the right way 'of healing the internal maladies of France and of her friends, and of resuscitating French renown and influence in Italy,

¹ ' . . . en prendre une partie, nous donner l'autre.'

² Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 516-524, 526-531.

³ Ritter, iii. 17-20. The French ambassador at the Spanish court wrote on December 24, 1609, that a war with France was apprehended in Madrid: 'Leurs caves sont bien basses et craignent fort de se brouiller avec votre Majesté' (Ritter, ii. 525, No. 286).

where they have been in abeyance since the disastrous battle of Pavia.’¹ In the same year Duke Charles Emmanuel of Savoy had declared himself willing to enter into a family compact with Henry IV., and into an alliance on behalf of the recovery of the Duchy of Milan; as soon as he had got possession of this duchy with the King’s help, he would cede to France his whole ancestral land of Savoy.² Since then Henry IV. and Charles Emmanuel had carried on frequent negotiations and had been awaiting ‘the best time for striking, in order to drive the Spaniards clean out of Italy.’

For this undertaking the Republic of Venice was also to be won over. The bitter conflict between Venice and Pope Paul V. had been amicably settled in 1607. But this peace was only an outward one. In the bosom of the Free State a powerful party was at work, struggling ‘to win town and country for the cause of the pure evangel, and if possible to rid the whole of Italy of the dominion of the Roman Antichrist by means of a formidable war.’ The soul of these endeavours was the renegade Servite monk, Fra Paolo Sarpi, who stood in the highest esteem with the senate³ as State councillor, and who maintained intimate relations with the most zealous Calvinists of France and Switzerland. His confidential friend, the English ambassador Wotton, organised a distribution of Geneva

¹ See *Blicke in die Zustände Venedigs*, p. 195.

² Ritter, ii. 543–544. On another occasion Charles Emmanuel begged Henry IV. to assist him in the conquest of the county of Burgundy. See Erdmannsdörffer, p. 61.

³ The Calvinist Du Fresne wrote on June 16, 1607, concerning Sarpi: ‘Questo huomo possede tutto questo Senato, et è di grandissimo valore et prudenza’ (*Blicke in die Zustände Venedigs*, p. 348, note 2).

Bibles in Italy, and aimed at founding a reformed community in Venice; from 12,000 to 15,000 people, Sarpi wrote, had determined to apostatise from the Pope. 'All is ready,' a secretary of Wotton reported in 1608; 'it remains only to set fire to the mine. Already Venice seems like a new world. The Jesuits are inveighed against from the pulpits; they are mortally detested.' Three-fourths of the nobles were 'inclined to the truth.' To these belonged the Doge himself. A considerable number of clergy, who impressed on their penitents in the confessional that it was their duty to obey the Pope, were secretly executed.¹ Duplessis-Mornay, 'the Huguenot Pope,' was of opinion that the time had already come for bearing down upon the Antichrist in his own land, provided only the alliance of Venice with the Swiss Cantons, with the Elector of the Palatinate, and with other German princes were concluded; after the establishment 'of the pure religion' in Hungary, Austria, Moravia, and Bohemia, the yoke of the papacy would be everywhere thrown off. So long as the Germans and French, Sarpi maintained, 'directed their energies to the outside extremities only,' their efforts must remain fruitless; they ought 'to aim their blows at the heart itself;' in Italy 'the fount of life was the Pope and the Jesuits.'² Sarpi's fellow conspirator, Diodati, a Calvinist preacher at Geneva, was of the same opinion: a war, he said, must be kindled in Italy.³ 'We must attack the beast in the centre

¹ Höfler, *Englisch-französische Propaganda*, pp. 816, 824 ff.; *Blicke in die Zustände Venedigs*, pp. 348-357.

² *Blicke in die Zustände Venedigs*, p. 397.

³ '... embraser une guerre en Italie, qui est à tout jugement humain la seule ouverture, par où la vérité y entrera; il faut un peu repurger ceste estable,' and so forth (February 1609 to Duplessis-Mornay, x. 282, 299).

and in the heart,' he wrote to Duplessis-Mornay in July 1609.¹

Six months before, the French ambassador Bongars had advised that Venice should be influenced to break with Rome when she had made sure of the friendship of the Protestant princes. He suggested that the Palatine Elector should despatch an ambassador thither to assure the senate of his friendship.² The Count Palatine sent off an agent, John Lenk, who attached himself to Sarpi, and at first negotiated only in secret with the members of Sarpi's party, but later on was solemnly recognised by the senate as the representative of the allied princes.³ An ambassador from the Netherlands also, whom Prince Maurice of Orange had despatched at the instigation of Duplessis-Mornay, met with reception from the senate similar to that which it used to bestow on the envoys of crowned heads. Sarpi was jubilant at having prepared this mortification for the courts of Rome and Madrid, and looked forward to the best results for the progress of 'the evangel' in Italy from the alliance of Venice with the Union and the States-General.⁴ 'In war alone is our hope,' he wrote; 'to war alone can we look for salvation.'⁵ One of his

¹ 'Les affaires d'Allemagne sont des grands coups ; mais c'est encores en la circonférence ; il fault attaquer la beste au centre et au cœur' (Duplessis-Mornay, x. 340).

² Duplessis-Mornay, x. 266-267.

³ On September 4, 1609, Duplessis wrote that Lenk was coming to Venice, '*pour résider pres de la seigneurie, secretement neanmoins.*' On March 15, 1610, he was recognised as agent of the confederate princes, '*en plein senat et avec tout accueil*' (Duplessis-Mornay, x. 367, and xi. 3-5 ; *Blicke in die Zustände Venedigs*, p. 358 ff.).

⁴ Duplessis-Mornay, x. 347, 393, 457.

⁵ '... sicuti magni morbi per contrarios curantur, sic in bello spes . . . non aliunde nostra salus provenire potest' (*Opere di F. Paolo Sarpi*, vi. 79 ; see *Blicke in die Zustände Venedigs*, pp. 360 ff., 366).

fellow conspirators hugged himself with the assured conviction that the Roman See, 'that great beast, is near to its end in Italy.'¹ Equally convinced was Duplessis-Mornay that the war about to break out would 'lead to the downfall of that Babylon.' 'From one small spark,' he said triumphantly, 'there will proceed a fire which will spread its flames over the whole of Europe.'² Lenk also, at the end of September, prognosticated a general overthrow of all things. 'The wisest heads in Venice,' he wrote to Germany, 'are of opinion that two things must be accomplished: first, Bohemia must be provided with a head and must take possession of the person of the Emperor; and, secondly, the undertaking of Carinthia and Styria must be backed up, as it would otherwise be impossible to introduce the evangel into Italy. For these two operations Venice might well contribute substantial support.'³ The selfsame advice was given by Sarpi on September 11 to Prince Christian of Anhalt.⁴

The idea was that in Carinthia, Carniola, and Styria, as soon as the great war had been kindled, and a rising of the Protestants stirred up against the Archduke Ferdinand, that 'prime flunkey and aider and abettor of the Antichrist,' the heaviest wound was to be inflicted on 'the Roman harlot,' as Sarpi expressed himself.⁵

¹ ' . . . cette grande bête proche de sa fin en Italie ' (Asselineau to Duplessis-Mornay on March 15, 1610. xi, 4).

² Duplessis-Mornay, xi. 11, 12. ' . . . ab una quasi scintilla quantum ignis Europam propediem universam conflagraturum.'

³ Ritter, ii. 462-463.

⁴ Gindely, ii. 4, note 2.

⁵ See *Blicke in die Zustände Venedigs*, pp. 395-396. On May 12, 1609. Asselineau, one of the conspirators, wrote from Venice to Duplessis-Mornay: ' *Tout ira encores mieulx en Allemagne, si ceulx de la Carinthie et Carniole contraignent aussi, comme le bruict est, leur archiduc à octroyer*

At the same time Erasmus of Tschernembl was 'planning great things' in Austria. Fresh quarrels had broken out there between King Matthias and the Protestant Estates; the Estates summoned their allies in Hungary and Moravia, and also the Union to their help. Tschernembl solicited the Elector Palatine to send troops to Austria, and on December 31, 1609, he was able to inform him with thanks 'that the army was already on the road.'¹ The Hungarian magnate Thurzo threatened the King at a provincial diet at Vienna with a 'general war of all the allied lands' if he did not grant all the demands of the Estates. It was in vain that Matthias protested that he had done more than any other prince in the Empire; that by his action he had exposed himself to the ill-will of all the Catholic princes, and had incurred many mortifications; and now, instead of meeting with pity from the Protestant Estates, he received only ill-treatment. In February 1610 he saw himself reduced to complete surrender, especially as, on the one hand, the Union had espoused the cause of the Estates, while, on the other hand, the Emperor had entered into alliance with them in order to recover the lands of which his brother had robbed him, and was making them the most seductive overtures.²

The Estates had obtained all they wanted from Matthias, but they continued in 'loyal correspondence'

la liberté de conscience, et soient fomentés des Hongrois par la demande de certaines places qu'ils prétendent du dict archiduc, comme usurpées de leur ancien domaine; car ce nous seroit ouvrir un passage de secours bien voisin. Il ne tiendra qu'au roy d'Angleterre qu'on ne vienne à quelque genereuse resolution, et s'il sera aussi prodigue de ses navires que de sa plume, il y a apparence que serons à la veille de quelque grande merveille (Duplessis-Mornay, x. 326).

¹ Gindely, ii. 96, note 1.

² Fuller details in Stülz, pp. 193-206.

with the Union, and towards the end of March assured the Palatine Elector that they would 'promote and encourage everything that was conducive to the honour of God, to His pure evangel, and to the peace of the Empire and of the Christian dominions, and would oppose with all their might any plans of the allies which were inimical to these ends.'¹

The way in which the allies intended to 'safeguard the peace of the Empire and the Austrian dominions' revealed itself more clearly than ever in January and February at a meeting of the Union at Schwäbisch-Hall.

The meeting was numerously attended, and the League was strengthened by the accession of the Elector of Brandenburg, the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse-Cassel, and several imperial towns. The French envoy Boissise presided at the debates.² He had been instructed to put obstacles in the way of any pacific agreement concerning the Jülich affair, and to impress upon the allies that it was necessary for their safety to drive the Spaniards out of the Netherlands and to take the imperial crown away from the House of Austria.³ He described the meritorious services of Henry IV. on behalf of 'the welfare and the freedom of Germany.' Christian of Anhalt gave an account of his embassy to France, and assured the assembly that 'there was no doubt that a general change was at hand;' they must prepare themselves 'for a transfer' of the Imperial House, for the House of Austria was complained of by all the Estates. He on his part had first, immediately after the Recess at Ahausen, been of opinion that they

¹ Ritter, iii. 153.

² Höfler, *Heinrichs IV.* Plan 22.

³ Gindely, ii. 77-78.

‘ought to arm;’ later on, however, he had given the contrary advice because the opportune moment had been missed. Now everything was favourable. ‘Spain was ill-provisioned, her garrisons were weak, her fortresses falling into ruin.’ ‘If the King of France threw the dice the States-General must perforce join in the game,’ and, in fact, both Maurice of Orange and Oldenbarneveldt were well inclined to expel the Spaniards; the Venetians also would lend a helping hand. If proceedings were begun this year against the King of Spain, ‘merchants would be found to attack him in his own country.’ The Margrave of Ansbach ‘allowed that Henry IV. had no reason for breaking the peace, since he had himself helped to conclude it with the States-General; as, however, the French King was now anxious to do so, the opportunity was not to be thrown away; the undertaking was an easy one, for the House of Austria, inwardly rent and enfeebled, would be unable to do anything if the King gave his support to the evangelicals. Baden declared that they had ‘come to the times of which Ezekiel writes, of Gog and Magog.’ The Estates of the Spanish Netherlands would be won by the assurance that they should be made free like the Dutch; since France had allied herself with Saxony, the war might without any difficulty be transferred to Italy. The members in conclave resolved to appeal also for help to England, Denmark, Venice, and the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, and to enter into further negotiations with the Protestant Estates of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and Austria through the agency of Christian of Anhalt. In all the territories of the allies prayers were to be offered up, and by means of ‘such prayers the subjects were to be

imbued with the spirit of the Union.' Christian was instructed to make a fresh appeal to the French King, urging him, for the furtherance 'of public peace,' and for riddance 'of the Spanish yoke,' and 'under the pretext of help to Jülich,' to surprise the Archduke Albert with a great army in the Netherlands. As soon as Henry IV. and the States-General embarked on open war with Spain, the allied princes and the 'Possessioners' would put into the field, at their own expense, 8,000 infantry and 2,200 cavalry for the current year, and, in case the war lasted longer, 4,000 infantry and 1,000 cavalry for the following year.

The Catholic Union, later on called the League, which was then in process of formation, did not cause the conspirators any anxiety. Christian declared, on the ground of most accurate information, that 'the ecclesiastical Estates, with the exception of Würzburg, were doing nothing, and that they had not yet even collected the necessary means for organising their Union; Austria had quite separated itself; Bavaria also was little to be feared, for though it had two regiments it counted on the fact that the matter concerned Donauwörth alone, and it would confine itself to self-defence: they must not let themselves be disconcerted on account of Bavaria.'¹

'The true and actual aim' of the conspirators at Schwäbisch-Hall rested, wrote Caspar Schoppe, 'on three points.' The first was the protection of that religion which was the destroyer of the papacy. The second was the defence of justice, by which was meant that nobody was any longer to be subject to the sentence and judgment of the Emperor, but that justice was

¹ *Die Verhandlungen*, in Ritter, iii. 36-113.

to be obtained from the Count Palatine; the third point was the protection of liberty—that is to say, freedom for each individual ruler to do and suffer to be done whatever he himself thought right, and that none were to be hindered from carrying out their own wills by imperial mandates and executions. ‘For instance, Maurice of Hesse confiscates a cloister belonging to a prince,¹ and forces the subjects into the Calvinist religion, and it is settled with the Count Palatine that he has acted quite rightly. And because he is a free German, he is to be hindered by nobody. Now if the Emperor were to punish him for such a deed as being contrary to the plain letter of the Religious Peace, and were to order him to restore the convent to its former condition and to turn out the Calvinists as being a sect forbidden in the Empire, this would instantly be denounced as an attack on German liberty, and a long elegy or satire would be printed against the Emperor, showing him up as a tyrant. But what may be expected from such free lords and princes—not only by the ecclesiastical Estates, but also by the knights and the free cities—if the freedom they claim is granted them, any fool may easily guess. At the end of the Book of Judges we read: “At that time there was no King in Israel, but everyone did that which was right in his own eyes.” Whereas now our “corresponding princes” want to have precisely the same amount of freedom, in order that each one may do what seems to him right, it is as much as to say that they will not put up with any King in Israel, *i.e.* any Emperor in Germany, who shall keep them within the bounds of law and justice.’ Herefrom, also, it is easy to understand what was meant at

¹ *Die Reichsabtei Hersfeld.*

the Diet at Ratisbon in 1608 by the Elector, the Count Palatine, and the Landgrave Maurice, who reiterated daily that 'the Empire must be cast in a new mould, or else nothing would be done and *oleum et opera* would be wasted on the wearisome transactions.'¹

The French were jubilant over the state of things. Bongars, who had met with Boissise at Hall, wrote to the King on February 12, 1610: 'Your Majesty is the disposer of the fate of these princes, of their safety or their ruin, and their rank is such that it will be of the greatest importance to the whole of Christendom, and especially to France, whether good or evil befalls them. We have reached the moment which must decide the fate of the House of Austria. Hungary, Bohemia, and the Austrian hereditary lands have resolved to accept no territorial lord from the line of Graz, which is as debased and corrupt as it can be. Those of the other line are still more degenerate than those of Graz. Your Majesty will soon witness the end of the House if you but strengthen the allied princes, and through them the resolutions passed in the said Austrian hereditary lands.' Boissise, he said, would give fuller information about all that was necessary.² The latter wrote to the King that 'he had proposed to the princes collectively, and to each one of them individually, to transfer the imperial crown to another princely house and to remove the Spaniards from their neighbourhood, and that they had responded with great eagerness to these proposals. In order to accomplish this transfer of the crown there was still one thing to be achieved: namely, to obtain the accession of Saxony to the Union, and

¹ v. Friedberg, pp. 72-74.

² Ritter, iii. 87-88, note 1, and 114, note 1.

this the Elector of Brandenburg hoped to arrange with Christian II.' ¹

This hope did not meet with fulfilment. Christian rejected the proposal on March 18 because 'it was manifest' that the whole intention of the allies was 'not to obey the imperial orders;' moreover, he said, it was very hazardous to draw foreign powers into the League. No blame, he added, could be cast on the Catholics, because they too, instigated by proceedings of the Union, had thought of getting into readiness.²

A report published in the year 1610, emanating probably from Doctor Helfrich, the Resident of the Saxon Electorate at Paris, disclosed the plans of the conspirators respecting the installation of a new king. The writer mentioned the names of the persons concerned in the scheme, the means proposed for its accomplishment, and the provisions already made. Either the King of France or the King of Denmark was to ascend the German throne. 'Whereas all counsels are directed towards the abasement of the House of Austria and of the papal Estates, the confederates have in mind first of all to invade Alsatia and the Austrian frontier lands, and if the inhabitants of Lorraine or the Burgundians should refuse passage to the King of France, then the allied army must attack them in their own lands and scatter and destroy them. Above all things they were bent on seizing the bishopric of Strasburg and the (Western) frontier lands, and on planting their religion there, and driving out the Catholics and the papists, and for this purpose they aimed at securing Breisach, which was the strongest

¹ Ritter, iii. 113-114.

² *Id.* iii. 209, note 2.

fastness in the land.' 'They flatter themselves that, if once in possession of this town, they would be lords of the whole Rhine, and would then have a war base, where they could entrench their troops and whence they could make sorties, overmaster the land on both sides at their pleasure, and maintain their religion and prestige in it undisturbed by Spain and Austria. But, above all, when they had secured this place, the Palatine Elector and Brandenburg were to occupy it with their people, rule over it until the election of a Roman King, and be helped with money and men by the King of France.' The acquisition of the town of Freiburg in the Breisgau was also contemplated; Bongars had 'lately had several maps of all these lands made at Strasburg, with special plans of the towns of Breisach and Freiburg.'¹ 'And when the bishopric of Strasburg and its lands had been confiscated they were to invade the bishoprics of Spire and Worms and the territories lying between them.' 'And although the Bishops of Worms, Spire, Mayence, and others have really no connection with the affair of Jülich,' designs are nevertheless made on these prelates because 'the German princes would gladly introduce their religion into their bishoprics as well as into all the others, and would also be very glad to instal in them the needy members among the nobility, the counts and the lords. They would expect by this means to secure still greater stability to their hitherto confiscated convents, abbeys, provostries, and bishoprics.' In league with France, Denmark, England and Sweden, with the Netherlands and

¹ Among the effects of a prisoner at Breisach, according to the report of a councillor of King Matthias, there was found a document stating that a painter from Basle had made a plan of the town.

all the other reformed states of the Empire, the German princes had no fear 'that Austria would be strong enough to oppose them, for the King of Spain and the whole House of Austria in general, depleted by wars of all sorts, had but little left.' Since Spain had not even been able to overmaster the Netherlands, but had been forced to agree to an amnesty, it was easy to calculate how little help exhausted Austria could hope for in that direction, in the event of having simultaneously to deal with the German princes and the foreign powers.¹

At the end of March the Elector of Saxony's councillors were informed that 'the Palatiners had given their assurance on oath that the Palatine Elector would be able to bring up with all speed 30,000 men of his own people, counting only those who were experienced in arms; this was a large number, and everybody therefore wished that the war might begin quickly.'² In order 'to raise a substantial supply of money' for his preparations, Frederic IV. informed his people that 'whereas the turbulent popish party' were endeavouring to stir up dangerous disturbances in Germany, the Elector and other evangelical princes were obliged to hold themselves ready for defence; the subjects were therefore requested, especially all guardians who had money to place out for their wards, to lend this money to the electoral commissariats. They were promised good security and interest; notice was also given that 'no more moneys were to be lent out in other and foreign quarters.'³

¹ Report in *Hist.-polit. Bl.* 27, 77-88, 153-170. Duke Henry Julius of Brunswick brought this report to the notice of King Matthias, in order to influence him to make peace with the Emperor. See Senkenberg, xxiii. 250-252.

² Ritter, iii. 155, No. 61.

³ Ritter, iii. 155, No. 61, note 1.

A deputation of the allies to James I. of England, on April 28, represented to him in forcible language that ‘Satan at the present time was doing all he could to ruin those who had thrown off the yoke of the Antichrist. The Pope and the Jesuits had begun a fierce persecution entirely at variance with the laws enacted for the maintenance of the dignity, freedom, religion, and privileges of the Estates of the Empire.’ Thus, for instance, the imperial town of Donauwörth, simply and solely because, on the strength of the Religious Peace, it had stopped the scandalous processions ‘of a neighbouring abbot,’ had been placed under ban ‘without hearing or trial;’ and the Duke of Bavaria, who had enforced the sentence of the ban, altogether illegally, had compelled the burghers either to renounce their religion or to forsake their homes and possessions. What the Pope could not achieve by means of the Jesuits he accomplished through imperial councillors bribed by the Jesuits; the influence of the electors was annulled, lawlessness was rampant everywhere, and everybody was declaring openly that they would not be bound by any religious peace.’ In this dire extremity the Protestant Estates had resolved on the measure so often suggested to them by neighbouring powers, especially by Queen Elizabeth and by King James himself; they had leagued themselves together for the maintenance of their religion, rights, and dignity, and they would be glad also to enter into a close alliance with England. For the support of the “Possessioners” in the Jülich lands they had, to commence with, raised 4,000 infantry and 1,000 cavalry; the King of France had promised double the number for the same object; their petition now was that James would not do less.’

The King replied that 'the Union had his full approval;' 'he would agree to whatever might be required of him on its behalf.' In the affair of Jülich he had already promised a definite amount of help, and he would grant still more if necessary, until the matter was satisfactorily arranged.¹ The English help promised at the end of February amounted to 4,000 men.²

Henry IV. no longer doubted as to a complete and rapid victory. 'He should manage his business so well,' he said to the Venetian ambassadors, 'and, with the help of England, Denmark, the Netherlands, the allied German princes, the Savoyards, the Grisons, and a few Italian princes, it would be so easy to bear down upon the Habsburg forces simultaneously from all directions, that Venice might rest assured that with one stride, and without serious difficulties, they would pass straight from peace to victory—all the more so in consideration of the weakness under which Spain at present laboured.'³ After the agreement between himself and Charles Emmanuel, who was to invade Milan, had been concluded on April 25, he wrote to Boissise on May 2: 'he hoped towards the end of the month to have an army of 30,000 men ready for marching; the States-General, it was true, were not willing to break the amnesty with Spain during the current year, but they had promised him to send 12,000 infantry and 1,600 cavalry to the help of the "Possessioners." With these troops the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse must unite whatever contingent of the allied forces he was able to

¹ Ritter, iii. 224 227

² Ritter, iii. 124. See Acrssen's letter of March 13, 1610, to Duplessis-Mornay, xi. 2.

³ Höfler, *Plan Heinrichs IV.*, p. 25.

collect. On the same day Henry IV. encouraged Prince Christian of Anhalt, who was already in the Netherlands, to go on valiantly : he had no need, he told him, to fear the enemies, for, to his knowledge, they were an ignorant, timid, and feeble lot.¹ Meanwhile, Christian, supported by the States-General with twenty-eight regiments of cavalry, had surprised the Jülich infantry of Archduke Leopold, and, as he reported to his wife, ‘gained no slight victory.’ On May 7 he informed the French ambassador Boissise that he had decided to begin the war in the territory of the Archduke Albert. Archduke Leopold, wrote Boissise, was without money, without soldiers, and without hope of succour, and would therefore be obliged to give up Jülich.² Archduke Albert managed to evade the war : on May 13 he granted Henry IV.’s army the right of transit through the Duchy of Luxembourg ;³ and he gave friendly assurances to the allies.⁴ At the head of 34,000 men Henry IV. had planned to march against Germany, and from Jülich to invade Belgium, in order ‘to liberate’ the Princess of Condé. But on May 14 the dagger of Ravallac turned all his plans to nothingness.

¹ Ritter, iii. 229–231.

² Ritter, iii. 239, 242, 251–252.

³ Letter of Albert in Cornelius, *Der grosse Plan*, p. 61, note 25 ; Henrard, pp. 284–285. Concerning the hopeless position of the court of Brussels, see Gardiner, ii. 98.

⁴ Ritter, iii. 238, No. 136, note 1.

CHAPTER III

MILITARY DEEDS AND FRESH PLANS OF THE ALLIES, 1610

By the murder of Henry IV. the House of Habsburg was freed from its most dangerous enemy, and 'the great war' which was to have crushed all the power of this House, and to have established the supremacy of France in Europe, had to be deferred to some future time. 'The small war,' however, lasted on, 'frightfully and gruesomely for all the lands in which it was waged.'

'We think best at all events,' wrote Frederic IV. of the Palatinate on May 19, 1610, to the Elector of Brandenburg, 'not to deviate from the course embarked upon.'¹ James I. declared his intentions of fulfilling his promise to the German princes.² The Queen-Regent Maria de' Medici also promised an envoy of the allies on June 24, that she should 'follow in the footsteps of Henry IV., and in order to do this she should send the princes the help promised them by his late Majesty.'³ The States-General, on July 26, expressed their willingness to conclude a treaty with the Union.⁴

On May 5, Frederic IV. had made application to the Bishops of Spire and Worms for the supply of very considerable sums towards the costs of his military preparations, for by these preparations, he had the audacity

¹ Ritter, iii. 256, note 1.

² '... he was determined to fulfil his engagements to the German princes' (Gardiner, ii. 99).

³ Ritter, iii. 378.

⁴ *Id.* iii. 370.

to assert, their domains would be placed 'in safety.' In vain the Bishops protested that they were at enmity with no one, and that their subjects had fallen into the greatest poverty and need, through bad harvests, having soldiers quartered on them, and troops passing through the land, and through the imposition of military taxes; they begged that the Elector would oppress them no further. But Frederic knew no mercy. At the end of May he caused contributions to be levied in several districts of the two bishoprics; at the same time the troops of the Margrave of Ansbach quartered themselves uncereemoniously in two districts of the electorate of Mayence, and took forcible possession of the peasants' food supplies, carts and horses. In the middle of June there resounded from the three bishoprics fresh complaints of the plundering of the people by Palatine and Hessian soldiers. 'By having troops quartered on them for the third time,' the Bishop of Spire's wrote to the Count Palatine on June 21, the subjects were almost completely drained.¹ The territories of Bamberg and Würzburg were invaded by the Margraves of Ansbach and Baden, and 'for several weeks the lands were wantonly ravaged.'²

The prediction of a Protestant delegate in 1608 at the Diet at Ratisbon was now having its fulfilment. 'When once our fists have clutched hold of weapons we shall give some of those priests' pates such a tremendous shearing, as will not be forgotten by them for a long time.'³ This 'shearing' did live indeed also in the memory of the helpless subjects.

Meanwhile, in the Jülich lands the devastations of

¹ Ritter, iii. 258-259, 290-292.

² *Id.* iii. 309, 310, note 1.

³ Schreiber, *Maximilian*, p. 128.

‘the enemies of the Roman Antichrist and the whole papal yoke’ went on in such a manner that ‘the very stones might have cried out in pity.’ ‘To put it briefly,’ Dr. Alexander Hopmann of Cleves wrote on May 27, ‘to such an extent has everything been plundered, devoured, burnt and destroyed, that in most villages and hamlets there is literally nothing but tracts of empty desert.’¹

As early as March 21 the Count Palatine Wolfgang Wilhelm had written to Christian of Anhalt: ‘The whole land of Jülich is almost eaten up, all the inhabitants rich enough to keep horses had fled; everything was in such chaos that one couldn’t tell where to begin first.’² In August the Hessian ambassador Johann Zobel reported from Düsseldorf to the Landgrave Moritz: ‘The inhabitants are starved down to their last bones, and so completely drained out that they have left everything and run away;’ ‘the blood and poverty’ of the unhappy people cry aloud to heaven.³ In Clèves it became known that Christian of Anhalt had made the following announcement: ‘When once we have got Jülich in our hands we intend to deal out good solid lessons to the papists, and we shall have the States-General and England on our side.’⁴

In Alsatia ‘good solid lessons’ were already being dealt out. Archduke Leopold, administrator of the bishopric of Strasburg, had established there a body of troops for watching the movements of France. In order to destroy this corps the Margraves of Ansbach and Baden advanced into the Strasburg district and

¹ See above, p. 431, note 3.

² Ritter, iii. 152.

³ Ritter, iii. 394-395, 407.

⁴ *Aufzeichnungen Alex. Hopmanns*; see above, p. 431, note 3.

plundered and levied contributions wherever they came. The Elector Palatine himself was filled with terror at them. Such unwarrantable proceedings, he wrote to the Margrave on August 4, would make the Union hated, and would afford the towns, already displeased at the Alsatian enterprise, fresh inducement to retire from the alliance. Besides the towns, moreover, 'other allied Estates, to whom the above expedition was equally obnoxious, might easily also be influenced to withdraw their hands and their help.'¹ The Strasburg and the Nüremberg councillors of war begged the Elector to arrange for the improvement of the military discipline, and to manage 'that the Union should no longer be made odious to both friends and foes, as unfortunately had happened everywhere hitherto, and that there should be no chance of its breaking up into the depths of disgrace and shame.'²

When the Duke of Würtemberg, in the middle of June, demanded of the provincial committees help for the expenses of the Union, he was answered that 'it had been represented to them that the alliance had for its object the defence of the Fatherland;' but these 'intentions' had been departed from, and 'the money supplies had been unnecessarily squandered on the Jülich and Strasburg disturbances.' In this way 'the Catholics who had abandoned house and home in Alsatia, and sought refuge in the duchy, were all the more exasperated:' the Duke was accused of being the chief promoter of the enterprise, and now, if he could do so with honour, he was advised to separate himself from it.³

¹ Ritter, iii. 365-366.

² Ritter, iii. 439, note 2.

³ Sattler, vi. 51.

On August 9, three Lutheran princes, the Elector of Saxony, the Duke of Brunswick, and the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, addressed an earnest written appeal to Frederic IV. and his colleagues. The Union, they said, repudiated the charge of intending any proceedings against the Emperor, the Public Peace, and the Religious Peace. But it was now clearly established that 'this Union, the appeals to foreign potentates, and all the existing military preparations had no other object than to stimulate disobedience and indifference to the imperial behests, and to punish the Catholic Estates.' Proof sufficient of this was the quartering of soldiers and the marching of troops through the bishoprics in opposition to the laws of the realm, the invasion of the bishopric of Strasburg, the threats against other bishoprics, and also against the Lutheran Estates. If the allies 'remained in an armed condition and ready to attack now one Estate, now another,' it would be necessary for the Estates that were loyal to the Emperor, whether Catholic or evangelical, to consider as to needful ways and means of defence against such violence.¹

Nevertheless, the allies did not let themselves 'be disturbed by anything.' An Imperial mandate which complained of their deeds of violence and wantonness, and insisted on the abolition of their League, was regarded by them as unbinding and as offensive to their honour: they were placed, they said, in a position of extremity, and were only intent on the consolidation of the Public Peace and the Religious Peace.²

In February 1610 the Emperor had said in a public proclamation that he advanced no claim whatever

¹ Ritter, iii. 397-399. See Klopp, i. 96 ff.

² Ritter, iii. 309-310, 373-375.

to the Jülich lands for the House of Austria;¹ on July 7 he had solemnly enfeoffed the House of Saxony with these lands.² In a bond drawn up on the occasion Saxony had agreed that this enfeoffment should be in no way prejudicial to the constitutional rights of the Emperor and the Empire, to the rights of other princes, especially the claimants, or, finally, to the rights and the traditions of the Jülich lands in both ecclesiastical and secular matters: if the enfeoffment was disputed by anybody the Elector would abide by the decision of the Emperor as incontestable arbiter.³ Archduke Leopold had abandoned Jülich as early as in June, and had come forward in support of the Saxon claims.

But ‘everything that the Emperor does,’ remarked Alexander Hopmann, ‘is mere sport and jest for those who have the power and the weapons; they laugh finely over it and say with their foreign allies: “We are the lords.”’⁴ On July 28 Prince Maurice of Orange appeared with his army and was received by Christian of Anhalt in the neighbourhood of Jülich. His forces, including two Franco-Netherlandish regiments and the English troops, amounted to 136 companies of infantry and 38 of cavalry. On August 18 Christian and Maurice were joined by the French Marshal La Chatre, who brought with him 5,000 French and Swiss infantry and 900 cavalry. On one occasion when the Marshal was entertaining the chief commanding officers at table, and dishes of fish were being served, Maurice remarked somewhat loud in French: ‘What an idiotic religion it is which teaches that salvation is obtained

¹ Ritter, *Sachsen und der Jülicher Erbfolgestreit*, p. 50.

² Gindely, ii. 118.

³ Ritter, *Sachsen*, pp. 53–54. ⁴ See above, p. 431, note 3.

through eating fish !' 'Everybody remained silent.' On September 1 the fortress of Jülich was surrendered to the besieging army.¹

For the allies the question now was, What next was to happen ?

The Landgrave Maurice of Hesse had already arranged with Christian of Anhalt at the beginning of June that as soon as Jülich was taken, the troops, 'for which for a time there would be no special work,' were to be allowed to 'relax themselves' in the bishoprics of Münster and Paderborn. Count John of Nassau also approved of this plan. If, after the successful ending of the Jülich enterprise, he wrote to Maurice on June 17, the soldiers were allowed 'a period of relaxation in the lands of the papists,' great advantages would accrue therefrom : 'we should then have ready at hand a supply of troops in fighting trim, and at the same time the ecclesiastics, who would also be obliged to keep themselves to a certain extent armed,' would be enfeebled. It would also be necessary, as Maurice had proposed, 'to levy contributions on the ecclesiastical Estates, which would be almost high enough to defray the costs of the war.' Furthermore, 'by good far-seeing management they would be able to set their subjects and the common people at their throats.' Count John, who was extolled by his preachers as a divinely equipped 'champion of the dear evangel according to Calvin,' openly sanctioned such proceedings as permissible and honourable. As, however, he himself did not enjoy the necessary prestige, the Landgrave, he said, must manage the business at Düsseldorf with the Union and the 'Possessioners.'²

¹ Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, iii. 425-430.

² *Id.* iii. 288, note 1.

The Elector Palatine, Frederic IV., had warned the Duke of Würtemberg on August 17 that, 'as the conquest of Jülich was near at hand, they must consider betimes in what way it would be most beneficial to the general evangelical cause, and most conducive to the settlement of the grievances which had so long been complained of in vain, to utilise the large body of troops which they would then have at their disposal. If they did not use them for these objects at this opportune moment, it would be difficult, when necessity urged, to get together again so powerful an army. For securing redress of grievances the most advantageous way would be, after the capture of Jülich, to keep part at least of the army together, and 'in view of this to negotiate in good time with the King of England and the States-General.' ¹

On September 17, after the taking of Jülich, the Elector Palatine reverted again 'to the opinion that it would be advisable now, since they had got so very much the better of their opponents, to remain prepared with a considerable body of forces in the upper territories, as well as in Jülich, in order by this means to get redress for their grievances, and also to secure a 'lasting peace'—that is to say, the remodelling of the Imperial constitution according to the wishes of the allies. 'To this end' he solicited Christian of Anhalt to 'prevail on the ambassadors of the auxiliary potentates to hold at the disposal of the allied electors and princes a considerable portion of their military forces; the troops either to be kept at the expense of their lordships, for a short period only, or quartered (on Münster and Paderborn) as proposed.' ²

¹ Ritter, iii. 414-415.

² *Id.* iii. 447.

Two days later all this fabric of plots and plans was rent in pieces by death. The Elector Frederic IV. expired on September 19, a victim to his excesses. When Henry IV. was assassinated there was 'general lament among the allies that such a helper and friend of princely liberty, one from whom so much was hoped, should have been prematurely snatched away.' Now Christian of Anhalt wrote to his wife: 'I cannot describe to you what lamentation the death of the Elector Palatine has occasioned. Verily, it is too much in *one* year to lose two such great and good patrons and friends.' The Union was left without a head, and its negotiations with England and with the States-General had not yet been brought to a conclusion. In the Palatinate there ensued a contest of far-reaching significance between the Count Palatine Philip Louis of Neuberg, who claimed the right of regency over the land, and the Count Palatine of Zweibrücken, who practically held it. In France an internal revolution in political affairs, and external changes in foreign alliances without, were brewing, while in the Empire a Catholic League had developed into power, and its leader, Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, superior to all other princes in powers of mind and capacity for action, had no intention of allowing the plans of the revolutionary party 'to take effect quietly, without a formidable crossing of swords.'

CHAPTER IV

CATHOLIC LEAGUE OF DEFENCE—ITS POSITION WITH
REGARD TO THE UNION—A CATHOLIC-LUTHERAN
LEAGUE PROJECTED, 1609–1610

UP to the year 1606 Duke Maximilian of Bavaria had still felt no inclination to found a Catholic League of Defence; ¹ but his opinions had changed since he had become aware of the continuous progress of the Palatine revolutionary party, and since the enforcement of the ban at Donauwörth, by which, as he wrote on October 3, 1608, to the imperial vice-chancellor von Strahlendorf, ‘he had drawn down on himself the hatred and enmity of all the Protestant princes and Estates.’ ² The Palatine party had broken up the Ratisbon Diet in 1608, and soon afterwards had organised their League at Ahausen; the Emperor, by the successful insurrection of his brother Matthias, had been robbed of all influence and authority in the Empire. Maximilian accordingly set himself, with infinite tact, perseverance, and self-sacrifice, to call into existence a ‘Protective Union’ which should prevent the complete suppression of the Catholic Estates and the overthrow of the imperial constitution. Whereas, however, the Emperor was not

¹ See above, vol. ix. chap. 21.

² Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 340. See the ‘Diskurs’ of Duke Maximilian for Cardinal Millino on a Catholic alliance (June 1608) in Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, 6, 418 ff., and *ibid.* 436 ff., a ‘Diskurs’ issuing from the court of Munich at the beginning of July on the necessity for a Catholic League.

in a position to guarantee protection, and since his lasting enmity with Matthias, and the overwhelming power to which the Protestant Estates had attained, gave reason to fear fresh formidable convulsions in the Austrian hereditary lands, if not the complete downfall of the Habsburg House, Maximilian was anxious to have the 'Protective Alliance' concluded independently of this House. In following this course he by no means contemplated ousting the Habsburgs from the throne and securing it for himself. He was merely guided by a true instinct which taught him that under existing circumstances every league whose efficiency depended on the court of Prague or on that of Vienna would either be doomed to impotence from the outset, or else would become involved in complications which would work most ruinously for the Estates of the Empire. There was, indeed, no hope of achieving any real and thorough-going organisation for defence of the Catholic religion so long as the dynasty of Maximilian II. retained the imperial crown. Under Rudolf II. the Catholics had sufficiently realised this fact: under Matthias the same truth was again to become evident. 'To deal out fair-seeming words this way and that, on one side and the other, all at the same time, but to do next to nothing, or else, according to Viennese custom, to attach only five days' importance to all commands and prohibitions—never more, at any cost—thereby increasing the contempt of all parties, such has been, since the time of Maximilian II.,' we read in an old satirical dialogue of 1617, 'the imperial watchword.'¹

A policy of this kind could not commend itself to the Bavarian Duke. What he desired was 'a well-

¹ *Ein kurzes anmuthliches Gespräch*, pp. 5-6.

considered, sagacious, and at the same time energetic and active championship of justice and peace : ' a definite policy, and the necessary measures for carrying it out, for which every right-minded man, and, above all, every prince of Catholic faith and German blood, would think no labour and no sacrifice too great.'¹ But it was not at the imperial court only that action towards a definite end and devoted labour and self-sacrifice were lacking. Among the ecclesiastical Estates, who had resolved on forming a protective alliance, there was a lamentable deficiency in this respect, as Maximilian learnt fast enough, ' to his no slight vexation and wrath.'

After lengthy efforts on the part of the Duke, a treaty was signed at Munich on July 10, 1609, which laid the foundation of a Catholic Union, the so-called League of a later date. The contracting parties were the plenipotentiaries of the Duke, the Bishops of Passau, Constance, Augsburg, and Ratisbon, the Provost of Ellwangen, and the Abbot of Kempten. The Bishop of Würzburg had also sent delegates to Munich, but the latter were only instructed to confer and report. The object of the alliance was declared to be the defence of the Catholic faith and the maintenance of the Religious Peace and the other laws of the Empire. The confederates were to support each other mutually against all attacks. Maximilian was appointed head of the League, and for the defrayment of its expenses the establishment of a fund was discussed. But Maximilian was foiled in his authority by three delegates from the three circles of the Oberland, with whom he had to

¹ Quoted as an utterance of Maximilian in a letter of the Mayence official, Hans Wiederhopf, September 13, 1613.

reckon at every step. Immediate control over the general fund was denied him ; and no agreement was arrived at respecting the internal regulations of the League, a common system of defence, and the organisation of the future army of the League.¹ Thus from the outset any rapid and decisive action was rendered impossible. Christian of Anhalt, who had spied out everything, wrote with justice on December 12, 1609 : ‘ The Catholic Union is not to be compared with ours, either in matter or form, and the nature of it plainly shows the imbecility of the papists.’²

The Estates were no more willing to yield their proud independence to the chiefs of the League than they were ready to submit to the Emperor in imperial matters, and they were as determined as ever to avoid any military enterprise which would occasion trouble and expense. The clerical electors, at whose head stood the imperial chancellor John Schweikart of Mayence, had not been able to resist the conviction that they were threatened with ever-growing danger from the allies. Maximilian had done his utmost to encourage them. So far, however, they had shown themselves vacillating and dilatory. As recently as May 24, 1609, the Duke had complained of the Elector’s indifference and bad management. ‘ He always pushed things from him and procrastinated, and never, so far as we can remember, showed overmuch inclination to take this work in hand in earnest.’ But ‘ we are of opinion,’ Maximilian had added, in a tone of admonition to the Elector of Cologne, ‘ that your Excellency’s eyes will be in some measure opened by the unheard-of violences lately perpetrated in the Empire by the Count Palatine

¹ Cornelius, *Gründung der Liga*, pp. 18-23.

² Ritter, ii. 517, note.

against the bishopric of Spire.' The bishopric of Mayence, he said, 'was quite likely to be treated in the same way,' and therefore it was to be hoped that John Schweikart 'would take up this matter with more zeal and would help to bring it to a final settlement.' For from this conduct of the Count Palatine it was plainly manifest that, if nothing else was done 'on the Catholic side, the Protestants would follow the Count's example and attack one Catholic Estate after another until they had brought them all under their dominion.'¹

The Palatine aggressions did actually make the exact impression which Maximilian desired. On August 30 the ecclesiastical electors agreed to the treaty of Munich, adding, however, the proviso that the Elector of Mayence should be appointed second in command of the League under the Duke of Bavaria. 'The Duke, however, was to remain sole field-marshal.' The electors undertook the task of gaining their suffragans and the ecclesiastical foundations subject to them, while Maximilian was to exert himself to bring in the prelates, the knights of the Empire, and the imperial cities. When, however, the Duke asked that a general meeting of the Union should be summoned in order to arrange all the details that were still unsettled, 'the old dilatoriness' reappeared in John Schweikart. It needed strong pressure from the Electors of Cologne and Treves to bring him to consent to a diet at Würzburg. In February 1610, delegates from all the principal Catholic Estates of the Empire, excepting Austria and Salzburg, assembled at Würzburg, and agreed that the contributions of the different members of the Union should be regulated according to the usual imperial Matrikel.

¹ Cornelius, *Gründung*, p. 24.

During the current year forty-two Roman months were to be paid up ; the different Estates were also to hold themselves in readiness with a definite supply of artillery in case of need. The admission of the whole House of Austria could not, ' for certain reasons which it is needless to recount, take place this time,' but attempts were made to draw into the Union the Archdukes Ferdinand of Styria, Maximilian, governor of the Tyrol and the Austrian borderlands, and Albert, Stattholder of the Netherlands. The Rhenish bishops recommended interference on the part of the League in the question of the Jülich succession ; but the Duke of Bavaria expressed himself decidedly against such a course, which, he said, would involve the League in a struggle with the foreign powers who supported the ' Possessioners ' and the allied princes.

In the course of the transactions at Würzburg Maximilian received the news that neither the King of Spain nor the Pope, whose support had been solicited, were ready to give any help so long as the House of Austria was debarred from a prominent position in the Protective Union. In a despatch of June 24, 1609, the Duke had described to the Pope the dangers with which the victorious progress of the Protestant Estates was fraught, not only for the safety of the Catholic religion in Germany, but also, in the future, for Italy and the Holy See. He had bestirred himself, he said, to unite the Catholic Estates in a defensive Union ; he had already had some success, and he hoped for still more ; but the Protestant Estates far exceeded the Catholic ones in number and in strength, especially as the latter were without foreign help, whereas the other side had the support of Denmark, Sweden, England, Holland,

‘and, alas ! other powers as well.’ He begged, therefore, that the Pope himself, and at his instigation Spain and Tuscany and other foreign princes, would assist the Catholic Union with money and, where necessary, with troops ; otherwise there was no hope of rescue for religion. But Paul V., intimidated by France, only gave vague, general assurances, and it was a long time before he could be prevailed on to promise a contribution of eight thousand florins monthly to the fund. Spain made her support conditional on the Archduke Ferdinand’s becoming co-director and head of the League.

The existence of the Union seemed again called in question. Not one of all its members, up to April 1610, had sent in any contributions, in spite of the promises of the previous July and August, and Maximilian, in a letter to his grey-haired old father, to whom he sent intelligence of all unpropitious proceedings, announced his intention of resigning his presidency of the League. ‘It is with astonishment and with lively displeasure,’ William V. answered on May 19, ‘that I have read your communication to me. I wonder more at the Pope than at Spain. The Roman court requires that all the world should be at its service, but itself it will do little or nothing for others. The Austria-Maximilian line has never been well affected towards Bavaria, although it has received much benefit from this land. The Archdukes have always feared that the Bavarian House might become too great. The other branch—*i.e.* the Styrian—is, I believe, less unfavourably disposed towards us, apart from its obligations with respect to Spain, on whose counsels the court of Graz entirely depends. Of this I have been informed several

times in confidence from Graz by your sister, Archduke Ferdinand's wife. As regards your resignation of the presidency of the League, I advise you to delay it for a short time, until you see clearly whither affairs are tending, and especially what line France means to take. Otherwise it would certainly be best to leave them to make what mess they like of their affairs, for it is evident that they are violently bent on their own ruin. But I counsel you to keep an eye on them a little longer. Possibly things may take some other turn. It surprises me that the Elector of Cologne, your uncle, does not show more ardour in what concerns Bavaria, and that he makes himself quite useless.' ¹

Meanwhile the aggressive proceedings against the bishoprics of Würzburg and Bamberg had become more and more violent. The troops of Würtemberg and Ansbach, which had invaded these bishoprics in the midst of peace, now held over fifty places in their power, and became daily more terrible 'through pillage, robbery, rapine, and assaults on women.' They also did violence to the property of the reigning prince, for they waylaid and robbed a cart laden with money which was on its way to Munich with the Bishop of Würzburg's contributions to the League. The Margrave of Baden extorted contributions in the archbishopric of Mayence, seized the Elector's ambassadors, and threw them into prison.² This led to Maximilian summoning his 'adjuncts' to Munich in order to consult with them how best to lend a helping hand to the members of the League who were molested by the soldiers of the Protestant Union of Electors, Princes, and Estates, and how,

¹ Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 549-550.

² Wolf, pp. 550-551 ; Schreiber, p. 140.

under the existing difficult and alarming conditions, to secure immunity from further oppression.

The delegates of the ecclesiastical electors, the Bishops of Passau, Augsburg, and Spire, and the Suabian imperial prelates wished at once to adopt practical measures of help for the victims of the Jülich affair, but they soon found that the Catholic League was too weak to oppose the Union, and they determined accordingly to begin by sending an admonitory letter to the allies—a letter ‘not couched in the most severe language, but of a more or less conciliatory nature.’ Bavaria contended that a document of this sort would have little result. If, however, the plan was decided on, the Estates must, at any rate, hold themselves in readiness, in case of an unfavourable answer, to meet force with force. If they had no money supplies they must follow the example of the Protestants, who in such cases were quite ready to borrow loans and to mortgage their lands; for now there was danger in delay. Each one must do his utmost to meet the emergency. However, the delegates had not received any instructions with regard to such proposals.

Again and again Maximilian reiterated his conviction that ‘the matter could not be accomplished without some inconvenience; they would never be able to free themselves from this cross, and from the oppressions of the Calvinists, if they could not bring themselves to make any sacrifice. The clergy had far better give up, once for all, the half of their yearly incomes than let the whole fall into the hands of the enemy. Had the Bishop of Würzburg, for instance, ‘spent on his own defence all that of which the Würtemberg and Ansbach troops robbed him, he would have been able

to expel them from the land, and drive them heaven knows where.' But, he said, 'in cases of this sort—all too numerous, alas! at the present time—where the Protestant Estates take up arms against the Catholics and resort to all manner of violence,' most of his colleagues were not willing to make ready for defence, to enrol cavalry and infantry, and to meet force with force. They preferred to spend their time in writing despatches and admonitions, and they threw all the burden of action on him (the Duke), expecting him, through his influence with the Protestants, to do all he could to save them from their danger. Should he himself, however, be at any time attacked by the Protestants on account of the Catholic League, he would have little or indeed no help to hope for from his brother princes.¹

These reasons were quite sufficient explanation of his resolution to resign the presidency of the League. In addition he informed the delegates from his adjuncts at Munich on May 23, that 'whereas Spain and the Pope were only willing to contribute help if the House of Austria was invested with the leadership of the League, he intended to hand over his post entirely to that House. By this means he should eradicate the suspicion that he was an opponent of the said House, and that he was in league with its enemies.' France had proposed to the Protestant princes to offer the imperial crown to the Bavarian House of Wittelsbach, with the intention undoubtedly of 'so incensing Bavaria and Austria against each other that one of them would inevitably ruin the other.' He, the Duke, was far

¹ *Maximilians Instruction für Joachim von Donnersberg vom 26 Juni, 1610*, in Wolf, ii. 566-568, 571-572.

from having any such idea. Even after resigning his office of president he was determined to do all he could for the benefit of the League, and he asked that strict silence should be observed respecting his intention of resigning, so that the adversaries might not reap any advantage from it.¹

It was only at the urgent entreaty of the delegates that Maximilian promised to retain his office until the next meeting of the League, which was to be held in six weeks. His threat of retirement brought Spain to reducing the claims she had previously advanced. On August 14 an agreement was concluded by which Philip III. pledged himself to a monthly payment of thirty thousand ducats, under the sole condition that Archduke Ferdinand should be vice-protector in the place of the King, with the titles of Co-director and Commander of the League.²

Maximilian's assistant-general, the Elector of Mayence, who was at Prague for an assembly of princes, had at first urged all sorts of excuses for postponing the summoning of an assembly of the League, but the inroads of the allies into the Strasburg district determined him in favour of instant action. 'We cannot sufficiently wonder at the extraordinary supineness of the ecclesiastical Estates,' the Duke had sent word to his ambassador at Prague by a courier on July 21, 'when not only have the long-standing aggressions of the Protestants been brought vividly under their very eyes, but also the prelude with Würzburg and Bamberg has clearly established in the bishopric of Strasburg that

¹ Wolf, ii. 554-557 ; Schreiber, pp. 147-149.

² Fuller details concerning the transactions with Spain, the Pope, and the Italian princes in Cornelius, pp. 29-35, 42-44 ; Gindely, ii. 50 ff., 62-70.

the Protestants will by degrees get possession of all the other bishoprics, and that therefore the lands and subjects of the ecclesiastics, together with the latter's own persons, position, and vocation, are exposed to fatal danger.' 'Our beloved brother, the coadjutor of Cologne, writes to us in great distress that he is in danger of losing his archbishopric. After the great success of King Matthias in penetrating to Prague, and even into the imperial residence, and forcing the Emperor to comply with all his demands, the Protestants are now in hopes that they will be able to establish their own arbitrary regulations everywhere in the Roman Empire.' 'If the Elector of Mayence still at this juncture persists in a mere pen-and-paper campaign of letters and despatches against the Protestants, we now declare before God and the world that, if any disaster occurs, the blame will not be due to us who have hitherto, for no private, interested motive whatever, done all we could at our own pains and exertions to help in the matter, but that it will be chiefly the fault of those who before all others were in duty bound to dare the utmost for the rescue of the Catholic religion. In the event of such a course being pursued we should withdraw entirely from the League and its leadership.'

The Elector now declared himself ready to fall in with whatever the Duke might require. At an assembly of the League, which met on August 22 at Munich, it was unanimously resolved to collect, at the general expense, an army of 15,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry, and in case of need to raise a further regiment of Lanzknechts. John Tserclaes, Baron of Tilly, was appointed field-marshal of the army. A letter was addressed to the Protestant Union on September 7,

reproaching them in strong language for their proceedings against the Catholic bishoprics, and demanding instant withdrawal of the troops and compensation for damages.¹

It was the first time that the Catholic Estates had come forward with decision to insist on the recognition of their good rights, and to emphasise their words by serious military preparations. In Bavaria especially the work of equipment went on vigorously.

The result was a favourable one. The Union, which had not yet concluded its negotiations with foreign powers, saw itself obliged to postpone the execution of its plans. It sent an embassy to Munich to 'offer terms of peace.' On October 24 a treaty was arranged with a view to disarming on both sides.²

The Catholic territories were freed from the troops of the Union. Force was not to be resorted to for obtaining the stipulated damages, but 'amicable measures or a legal settlement before the defendants' regular tribunal.' 'Nothing more was heard about them.'

Maximilian explained to his fellow-members of the League the reasons why he had signed the agreement. 'The whole Catholic League,' he said, 'has only been organised for defence,' and therefore its end was accomplished when the opponents of their own accord offered to lay down their arms. By an aggressive war, which 'was contrary to the plain terms of the charter of the League,' they would not only bring down upon them the allies, but also 'all the Protestant Estates of the Empire, together with their foreign confederates.' The Pope

¹ Wolf, ii. 605-630.

² Ritter, iii. 473-483; Senkenberg, xxiii. 301-324; Wolf, ii. 633-655.

and the King of Spain had 'by no means granted their money contributions for an offensive league,' and so far had sent nothing. 'They must also bear in mind that the Spanish envoy at Prague and the papal nuncio had frequently said to the ambassadors from Cologne and Bavaria that there was nothing better and more to be desired than that unity and tranquillity should be restored in the Empire of the German nation by means of conciliatory measures.'¹

These statements in no way corresponded with the continued reports of the Protestants and their controversial writers that from Rome and Madrid nothing else was being planned than 'to exterminate the evangelical Estates with fire and sword, and to drown Germany in its own blood.'

Shortly after the conclusion of the Munich compact at the end of October 1610, the Elector of Mayence, at a diet at Cologne, at which the Jülich disturbances were to be amicably adjusted, represented to the ambassadors of Saxony, Brunswick, and Hesse-Darmstadt the necessity for a league between the Catholics and the loyal Lutheran Estates.

In the previous April Archduke Leopold had sent an ambassador to Dresden with the petition that Christian II. 'would help to devise ways and means for organising a strong alliance between the members of both the religions which were permitted in the Empire, in case, as indeed there was imminent fear, they should be attacked by the Calvinists.' The four directors of the League were to be the Elector of Mayence

¹ *Ursachen und Beweggründe, warum auf Ansuchen der unierten protestantischen Kurfürsten, Fürsten und Stände wegen Ablegung der Waffen der gesuchten Handlung stattgethan worden, bei Wolf, ii. 655-664.*

and the Duke of Bavaria on the Catholic side, and the Elector of Saxony and the Duke of Brunswick on the Lutheran side, and all of them were to be subject to the Emperor as supreme head.¹

In the course of the summer, at an assembly of princes at Prague, the Electors of Mayence and Cologne had endeavoured to influence several Lutheran Estates in favour of such a league,² and now the Vicegerent of Mayence, in agreement with the Elector of Cologne, handed over to the above-named ambassadors a formal draft of a Union. The main substance of this draft was that, 'in consideration of the unlawful alliances that had been contracted in the Empire, of the violent aggressions on unoffending Estates, of the dangerous introduction of foreign troops, the obstruction of justice, and other signs of insubordination towards the Emperor, they the undersigned Estates had, with imperial permission, combined together in a League for the maintenance of religion and the public peace. Their object was to try to undo the mischief which had arisen from the distortions and the conflicting interpretations of the Augsburg Peace, and to remove the existing hindrances to the administration of justice. If any Estate of the League, of either religion, should be subject to forcible invasion, the other Estates guaranteed their succour in repelling the attack, and above all in driving away any foreign troops that may be striving to effect an entrance.' Two directors, to be nominated by friendly agreement of all the members, shall be placed at the head of the

¹ Ritter, *Sachsen und der Jülicher Erbfolgestreit*, p. 51, note 2.

² See the letter of the Duke of Brunswick to Christian II. of Saxony (December 25, 1610) in Moser's *Patriot. Archiv*, vi. 477, 482. See Ritter, *Politik*, p. 88, note 1.

League. 'The confederates of both confessions bind themselves with a solemn oath faithfully and truly to observe the Religious Peace and the Public Peace, and forthwith to turn out of the League any member who shall act in opposition to the said treaties. Further, the confederates engage never to attack, slander, or injure anybody on account of religion, but in all matters whatsoever to show themselves friendly and well-disposed, and to refer all religious questions to the judgment of God; above all, no one Estate must commit the slightest offence against another in matters of religion. The instruction of the young shall be carried on without reviling and calumny of the opposite party; also every Estate must enjoin its clergy to abstain from slander and abuse in their pulpits, because invective of this sort does more harm than good to the listeners. Caricatures, scurrilous verses, and so forth are most strictly forbidden; transgressors of this injunction will be punished without respect of persons. Whereas the League has for its sole object the maintenance of the imperial prestige, of the Religious Peace and the decrees of the Empire, the administration of justice and protection from hostile invasions, the Emperor has been solicited to ratify the said alliance.'¹

'Had such an alliance been organised,' said the Elector of Mayence later on, amid the anarchy of the Thirty Years' War, 'much bitterness and bloodshed would have been avoided, and foreign potentates would not have acquired such a footing and so much power in the Empire.'²

The ambassadors of the Saxon Electorate commended

¹ Senkenberg, xxiii. 338-345.

² Quoted in *Etliche Legationen bei Mainz und Trier* (1625), p. 17.

to Christian II. the two spiritual Electors' proposals for an alliance; the plenipotentiaries of Saxe-Coburg, Brunswick, and Hesse-Darmstadt also reported that they saw nothing to object to in these. There was a great deal of talk, they said, about the Pope and the plans of the Jesuits; in this case, however, they had only to do with distinguished German princes who, since the settlement of the Religious Peace, had never done injury to any Protestant Estate on account of religion, and who had again of late come forward with overtures for peaceful intercourse; it was right, therefore, to show towards them the same confidence that the Protestants expected from the Catholics.¹

The Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt showed instant inclination to join the League, and after a conversation with John Schweikart he instructed an ambassador to prevail on the town of Strasburg also to join.² Christian II. conferred on his brother John Casimir, Duke of Saxe-Coburg, plenary power for further negotiations with Mayence. Neutrality, he wrote, under the disastrous conditions in the Empire, was no longer to be thought of; if they did not wish to incur great danger, they must look around them for good friends, and such friends were to be sought among those who had at heart the maintenance of the imperial dignity, of the statutes of the realm, and of the peace of the Empire. He would rather associate himself with Estates thus minded than with those 'who put the constitution of the Empire wholly out of sight, who vouchsafed only the semblance of reverence and mere lip-homage to the head of the Empire, while in reality they insulted and vilified him, and refused to be bound by any obedience to

¹ Senkenberg, xxiii. 338.

² *Id.* xxiii. 346.

imperial decrees and ordinances.' On the strength of this plenary power, John Casimir informed the Elector of Mayence that 'The whole House of Saxony intended to join the projected Catholic-Protestant Union; he begged that timely notice might be sent of the next meeting of the League which was to be held, in order that the whole House of Saxony might send representatives to it.'¹ When, however, the directors of the League, in March 1611, issued invitations for a meeting at Würzburg, the Elector of Saxony, under the influence of Duke Julius of Brunswick,² had become undecided, and he sent word to Mayence that 'he still, as before, approved of the Catholic Union, but he thought it would be more advantageous both to the Empire and to the Catholic Estates that the House of Saxony should maintain the neutrality it had hitherto observed, and he should therefore not be over-precipitate in entering the League.'³

At the moment when Saxony sent in this answer, April 9, 1611, events were occurring in Bohemia which led finally to the Emperor's joining the Protestant Union.

¹ Wolf, iii. 21-24.

² See his letter quoted above. p. 481. note 2.

³ Senkenberg, xxiii. 347-349.

CHAPTER V

FRESH DISTURBANCES IN THE IMPERIAL HEREDITARY
LANDS—MEETING OF ELECTORS AT NUREMBERG,
1611—RUDOLF II.'S LAST PLAN, †1612

THE King of Spain and the Pope were unintermittent in their endeavours to bring about a reconciliation between the Emperor and his brother Matthias, in order that the House of Habsburg might not lose its patrimony and the imperial crown. The Catholic and several of the Lutheran princes also were bent on the same object; among the Lutherans may be specially mentioned the Elector Christian II. of Saxony and Duke Henry Julius of Brunswick. At the beginning of May 1610 an assembly of princes was opened at Prague, and lengthy transactions took place respecting this reconciliation. In the course of the proceedings Christian of Anhalt, the soul of the Union, took every possible trouble to set the two brothers more fiercely than ever by the ears; as he had done before, he set Rudolf against Matthias and Matthias against Rudolf, with a view to perpetuating the anarchy in Austria, and if possible kindling a civil war. He represented to the Emperor that his life was in as great danger as that of Julius Cæsar, or of Henry IV. of France; he was living on longer than was agreeable to a certain person—namely, his brother Matthias; Spain and the Pope were in agreement with the latter to overthrow him;

the councillors of Matthias showed plainly by their behaviour that 'their one aim was to annihilate the House of Austria ;' on the other hand, everything in which he, Prince Christian, had had a hand—the Jülich affair, the Union, the French enlistments to help the League—was all undertaken on behalf of the Emperor ; it was only from the Union that Rudolf could expect any help.¹ Rudolf was seized with abject terror of assassination. 'He would frequently jump out of bed in the middle of the night,' wrote the Bavarian ambassador Donnersberg from Prague, 'and institute a search by the captain of his guard in every corner of his castle.' 'In the evening he behaves in a most eccentric manner with his valets ; he often points his rapier at their chief's heart.'² In June Rudolf had ordered the dissolution of the Union, and threatened the soldiers with ban and outlawry in case of their continuing in the service of the allies ;³ but, on the other hand, on September 7, Rosenberg was in a position to inform the Elector Palatine that the Emperor had sent word to him confidentially through the General Gotthard von Starhemberg that he (Rudolf) was willing to join the Union.⁴

Matthias, at this same time, was playing a clever double game. He sent ambassadors to the allied princes, offering to enter into alliance with them, and endeavoured to win over to his side King James I. of England, who boasted 'of his inextinguishable enmity against the papacy, and of his large following ;' on the other hand, Matthias assured the Catholic princes of his 'strong Church proclivities, and recommended an

¹ Chlumecky, i. 537 ff., 706-707.

² Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 599.

³ Ritter, iii. 309-310.

⁴ *Id.* iii. 432.

alliance with Spain and the Pope in order to crush the insolence of the Protestants.’¹

‘On both sides promises were as cheap as blackberries.’ After ‘lengthy and incredibly wearisome transactions,’ in which the Duke of Brunswick distinguished himself pre-eminently by indefatigable zeal, the princes at Prague at last succeeded in effecting a treaty of reconciliation. It was signed by the Emperor on the 10th, and by Matthias on September 30. The latter herein recognised his brother as his feudal lord with regard to the Austrian lands, and promised to beg pardon for the past. Within the space of a month, the troops which both brothers had enlisted were to be disbanded; if this could not be done quite so quickly, neither Rudolf nor Matthias was to use their soldiers against each other.

As regards the Emperor, the stipulation for disbanding referred especially to those troops which he had had recruited in the bishopric of Passau by his Administrator, Archduke Leopold. These troops, however, were not discharged; on the contrary, they were strengthened by fresh enlistments and sent into the field against Matthias; they were to be the means of ‘satisfying imperial revenge.’

At the end of December, General Ramée, in command of 8,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry, pressed on towards Upper Austria. The Spanish ambassador had vainly endeavoured to deter the Emperor from this ‘terrible decision,’ which was so utterly at variance with the treaty concluded with Matthias. Rudolf thought of nothing but the predictions of his astrologers,

¹ Chlumecky, i. 705.

viz. that 'the imperial army would defeat Matthias and take him prisoner.'¹

'The invasion of the Passau troops,' said the French ambassador, 'is the prologue of a long tragedy.'² Duke Maximilian of Bavaria foresaw that this proceeding would cost the Emperor his Bohemian crown.³

In the bishopric of Passau the soldiers, who were mostly receiving no pay, had already behaved in the most terrible manner. The troops, wrote Maximilian to Leopold, have become an undisciplined horde, presenting often the strange anomaly of captains who do not know their soldiers, and soldiers who do not know their captains; they have plunged the bishopric into the most abject poverty; the inhabitants are in despair, and many are abandoning house and home.⁴

In Austria the troops, with their train of some 2,000 vagrants and dissolute women,⁵ behaved 'like brutal robbers and incendiaries.' Count Starhemberg had promised the Emperor that the Austrian nobility would rise in his favour against Matthias. But no one stirred a finger for Rudolf; on the contrary, the country set itself in movement against the incendiaries. Ramée, after accomplishing 2,000,000 florins' worth of damage within five weeks, saw himself compelled to beat a retreat. His hordes carted off their booty in 269 waggons, and poured themselves down over the south of Bohemia.⁶

'And now again,' laments a contemporary, 'the

¹ Gindely, *Rudolf*, ii. 164-183; Chlumecky, i. 720-721, 739.

² Chlumecky, i. 759.

³ Gindely, ii. 184.

⁴ Hurter, vi. 356.

⁵ Gindely, ii. 183.

⁶ Gindely, ii. 184-186. See F. Kurz, *Der Einfall des von Kaiser Rudolf II. in Passau angeworbenen Kriegsvolkes in Oberösterreich und Böhmen, 1610 bis 1611* (Linz, 1897). See Hirn, in the *Österr. Litt.-Blatt*,

poor subjects were everywhere obliged to gulp down the soup which the worldly greed and ambition of their overlords had cooked for them, and the Catholic religion and the Catholic clergy were again obliged to pay the reckoning ; for they—above all, the Jesuits : so the poor oppressed and emaciated people were lyingly and shamelessly told—were the cause of all the misfortune.’ It was they who had brought about the inroad of the Passau troops in order by their means ‘to root out the holy evangel from Austria and Bohemia, and also from the Empire, and with the help of Spain to institute a tremendous and bloody massacre among the confessors of the pure doctrine.’¹

In Prague reports of this sort bore sanguinary fruit.

After Ramée had taken possession of Krumau, Budweis, and Tabor, he advanced on February 13, 1611, to Prague. And now Archduke Leopold, unmindful of the admonitions of the papal nuncio and the Spanish ambassador, laid aside his ecclesiastical garb and undertook the chief command of the troops. He wished to attain to the Bohemian crown and thus secure to himself the succession in the Empire, the prospect of which had been held out to him by the Electors of Mayence, Cologne, and Saxony. He should not rest, he told the nuncio, until his head was encircled with a crown. It was in vain that the Pope adjured him that ‘as a Bishop he ought to go back to his flock and withdraw from a theatre of ambition and fighting

vii. 744, who rightly remarks : ‘The Passau troops were genuine precursors of the ferocious hordes of the Thirty Years’ War. This mob included in its numbers many persons of the rank of lords, and over 300 members of the imperial nobility and of distinguished families.’

¹ *Ein kurzes anmuthiges Gespräch*, pp. 11-12.

which an anointed servant of God had no business to enter.' ¹

After a fierce and bloody conflict with the troops of the Bohemian Estates, the 'Leopoldites' occupied the suburbs, and strove to force their way into the old town, which instantly became the scene of a Hussite religious riot. The infuriated populace, armed with pikes, pitchforks, and clubs, fell murderously on the defenceless priests, monks, and nuns, and pillaged churches and convents. In the Franciscan convent at Maria-Schnee, fourteen Fathers and Brothers were put to death with the utmost refinement of cruelty; four of the murdered men were thrown out on the street stark naked, and left lying there for three whole days. Amid the wild yelling of women glutted with blood, the abbot of a convent was emasculated; his bones were crushed to pieces, and the scalp of his head torn off; one of the Fathers was hacked to bits.²

'They wanted above all to air their evangelical vengeance against the treacherous Jesuits.' John Cambilhon, who gave himself out as a former member of the Order, had circulated the fabulous tale that 'over the vault of the Jesuit church at Prague, as he himself had seen, thousands of spiked clubs, iron flails, &c., were concealed; all around were placed field-pieces, flints, muskets, and lances.'³ This fable had gained credence in Prague. Numbers of soldiers also—

¹ Gindely, ii. 195 ff.

² Gindely, ii. 203–206; Chlumecky, i. 731. Copper-prints were published representing the looting of the convent of Maria-Schnee and the murder of fourteen monks. See Drugulin, p. 107, Nos. 1230 and 1231.

³ Cambilhon had never belonged to the Order; see *Gretseri Opp.* xi. 793. Respecting Cambilhon's scurrilous pamphlet, first written in Latin and translated into German under the auspices of the Augsburg preachers; see *ibid.* xi. 826–828.

so it was said—were hidden in their house. Accordingly, ‘the bloodthirsty Fathers’ were now ‘to be led to the slaughter-house by the people as a signal example to other traitors.’ About 3,000 men advanced against the college. But near by stood the cavalry of the Bohemian Estates; and at the head of their cavalry was the Utraquist George of Wratislaw, who in his youth had been a pupil of the Fathers, and who now, out of gratitude, undertook the protection of the Jesuits against the bloodthirsty masses. The Utraquist Wenzel von Kinsky also, in spite of his hostility to the Catholics, zealously espoused the cause of the Fathers. An imperial garrison was placed in their house, and they were left free from maltreatment; one Jesuit only was killed—drowned by the populace in the Moldau. In order to quiet the people, who had been goaded into fury by preachers and by ‘libellous pamphlets,’ the Protestant Estates had the convent carefully searched through three times, and drew up a report of the results, which was signed and sealed by Henry Matthias von Thurn, Adam von Sternberg, Johann von Bubna, and other directors. The report ran as follows: ‘Whereas, at sundry different times, reports have been spread against the Jesuits to the effect that they had an enormous store of military ammunition in their college, also that, to the detriment of the town and of the common Fatherland, they had collected together with all serious intent no inconsiderable number of soldiers, we have caused most careful search to be made, three successive times, by certain persons whom we ourselves have selected for the task from all three Estates of the kingdom—from the lords, knights, and burgesses—assisted by military officers; the whole college has been inspected, and

every room, vault, cellar, crypt, church-tower, above ground and underground, has been thoroughly searched and examined through and through, but not even the very smallest quantity either of muskets, powder or other ammunition could be discovered, and soldiers still less. Indeed, we have quite positively assured ourselves that all these stories have been trumped up against the worthy Fathers by their enemies out of pure hatred and contrary to all Christian justice, and that the said Fathers have been proved to be quite innocent.’¹

This public document of the Protestant directors was not of much use to the Jesuits later on. In fresh lampoons and libellous pamphlets it was declared that what Cambilhon had said about the Prague college was

¹ ‘Urkunde vom 23 Sept. 1611,’ in Londorp, *Acta publ.* i. 484-485; Gretser, xi. 862. See in Gretser, xi. 863-864, the letter of Father George Sturn, of June 11, 1611, concerning the way in which the convent was searched. See also Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 57 ff. The lies related above were circulated among the people in libellous verses. Thus, for instance, in ‘*Ein schönes neues Lied*,’ about the Passau soldiers of 1611 it was said that among the Jesuits

In the cloisters there were hidden
Arms for several hundred fighters;
By Leopold this had been bidden
To gratify the Jesuiters.
Also there were found with speed
Of powder twenty tons indeed,
With which they meant, this murderous race,
To slay the Christians in that place. . . .

Contributed by H. Pallmann in the *Mitteil. des Ver. für Gesch. und Altertumskunde in Frankfurt am Main*, vi. 146. Another song (p. 141) relates that in Prague, in 1611, ‘they treacherously murdered many pious Christians:’

That the Jesuits, in sooth,
Were masters of this sport,
Can be proved in very truth
By the arms they stored
In their cursed idols’ den
Where we found them all,
And secretly they scurried them
From out the city wall.

‘undoubtedly proved to be true by the researches instituted.’ Soon the accusation was extended to ‘numbers of Jesuitical nests and holes in large towns which were the hiding-places of firearms, swords, and munitions of war of demoniacal strength.’ ‘Things,’ they said, ‘that could no longer be denied in Prague, after undoubted exposure, would be found to be equally true of other places also, if only these devil’s nests were searched more closely.’¹

The Emperor had at first declared that he was innocent ‘as regards the Passau business.’ As soon, however, as the troops appeared in Prague, he pronounced them to be his faithful servants; he was their general, he said, and it was ‘his business to secure the kingdom.’ Then, when the reign of atrocities began in Prague, when robber bands threw the whole neighbourhood of the town into consternation, and the peasants flew to arms in order to strike at the landowning nobles, their tyrants and oppressors, and when at the same time there came news that King Matthias was hastening with large military forces to the help of the people of the old town, Rudolf again became ‘of a different mind,’ and at the request of the Protestant Estates caused an army to be raised against the Passauers. The latter were disbanded, received their pay, and withdrew on March 11.

On the same day, however, the Protestant Estates invited Matthias to come to Prague, and, as King of Bohemia, to undertake their defence against Rudolf. At the time of the invasion of Austria by the Passau troops, Matthias had applied for help to the Elector

¹ *Augenscheinlicher Beweiss*, Bl. 3^b, C. See above, pp. 341–343 and 398, what Lonner and Rüdinger say.

Palatine and to the Union, and by the advice of Karl von Zierotin he had concluded alliances with the chiefs of the Bohemian Protestants. He had warned the Bohemian Estates against the Emperor, who, he told them, was only watching his opportunity to recall the *Majestätsbrief*, and to annul all the liberties of the country; he, the King, on the contrary, had never once broken his word, and would rather die than not fulfil his promises. On March 8 he left Vienna, and on the 15th arrived at Iglau, where the delegates of the Bohemian Estates welcomed him. General Schönberg, in the name of the allied princes, assured him of the support of the Union, and Matthias, on his part, was so lavish with his inviolable asseverations that Zierotin and other Protestant party leaders of his suite expressed their opinion to Schönberg that the rule of Protestantism in Austria was now safely assured.

Meanwhile the Emperor was treated like a prisoner by the Bohemian Estates. The ambassadors of the Electors of Mayence and Saxony, who asked that Rudolf might be dealt with more urbanely, were answered by some of the Estates that 'if the Electors wished it they were ready to send them the Emperor and the Elector of Bohemia back to them in a sack.'

Destitute of all help, Rudolf gave his brother to understand that 'his coming to Bohemia would not be objectionable to him.' On March 24 Matthias made a brilliant entry into Prague, and a provincial Diet was opened with the object of raising him to the Bohemian throne. Rudolf saw himself compelled to abdicate. He gave vent to an oath—so says report—as he signed the document, and bit the pen with which he had subscribed his name. On Whitmonday, March 3,

the coronation of the new King and the ceremony of homage from the Estates took place.¹

‘Proceedings here,’ it says in a letter to Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, ‘have the evil appearance of being more directed towards the overthrow of the Catholic religion than to the elevation of Matthias. The Emperor is so badly treated by the Bohemians that even the enemies of his house have pity on him. In verity it may now be said that neither he nor King Matthias, but the first best disturber of the peace, is lord here. A serious war must be the final outcome of all this.’²

In the eyes of the Elector John Schweikart of Mayence, the merciless treatment of the head of the Empire was a disgrace which blackened the Empire and the German nation itself. ‘The Emperor,’ wrote Schweikart on May 24 to Archduke Albert at Brussels, ‘is even deprived of the right of free coming and going in the Empire; his very life is in danger. Were we to keep silence any longer, and not to take some cognisance at least of these wicked plottings, it would certainly not be his Majesty’s fate only that would be sealed, but the covert intrigues which have now gone on for so many years would break out with such violence that we might then, however much we wished it, be powerless to overmaster them.’ ‘For, as we have been informed, these machinations are not the work of the Bohemians alone, but are, on the contrary, organised and directed by others; it seems indeed that the States-General have had their

¹ Fuller details in Gindely, ii. 243-309; Chlumecky, i. 740-760 Hurter, vi. 423-529.

² Hurter, vi. 502.

ambassadors at Prague up to the present date, and that it is they who have managed this affair, and also many another. If this be so, then all the Catholic potentates within and without the Empire will have to be well on their guard.’¹

From the Emperor himself these powers were threatened with still fresh dangers. After his resignation of Bohemia, Rudolf had forthwith declared that the act was invalid because it had been extorted from him by violence. He now set to work in conjunction with the Union to overthrow his brother. His former counsellors had lost all influence over him; more now than ever, ‘valets, painters, alchemists, distillers, and people of this sort had got the reins in their hands.’ The acme of imperial favour was enjoyed by the valets Rucky and Hastal, who perpetrated the most abominable frauds, and by the court secretaries Wacker and Härtl, who were in the pay of the Palatine electoral court. But the person who had most influence with the Emperor was the English agent Gunderot, a greedy adventurer, who had for years kept up secret relations with Christian of Anhalt and with the Union. Through him Rudolf, towards the end of June, sent word to Christian and to the Margrave Joachim Ernest of Ansbach that he desired the assistance of the Union for the safe preservation of his person and the maintenance of the honour of the Empire; all this revolution in Bohemia had been the work of Spain and the Pope, who wanted, he said, ‘to start Gravamina in the Empire as had been done at Graz;’ Matthias was at the mercy of popish councillors. ‘Whereas his Majesty was so forsaken,’ he

¹ von Höfler, *Fränkische Studien*, pp. 280–283.

begged that the two princes 'might come to him at Prague.' 'He did not even dare,' the Emperor told Joachim Ernest, 'so much as mention the name of his House.' In August he sent an embassy to a meeting of the Union at Rotenburg and appealed to the whole League for help.¹

At the same time an appeal was made to the Union by Matthias, who also sent an ambassador to Rotenburg to solicit help in case of the Emperor's attacking him.² Hoping with the help of the Union to attain to the imperial crown, he had, as early as February 3, written to the Duke of Würtemberg that he was ready to do all he could 'for the allied princes and electors on behalf of the general peace of the Empire;' the remainder, he said, could not be entrusted to pen and paper. Matthias and the allies, said the Elector of Mayence on April 2, were, so he heard, in league together: 'I am curious to know which will first deceive the other.' In July the Würtemberg councillors declared that 'Matthias was the most desirable successor to the Emperor.'³

The question of the succession was to be discussed at an assembly of princes at Nüremberg.

'It was a right brotherly Diet' that assembled at Nüremberg in the middle of October, 1611. 'Their Excellencies the electors and princes forgot for the time being all need and misery, discussed and enjoyed themselves lustily with jovial feasting and huge banquets.'

¹ Gindely, ii. 310 ff.; Chlumecky, i. 778 ff.; Ritter, *Politik und Geschichte der Union*, pp. 102, 147-148.

² Ritter, *Politik*, pp. 149-150.

³ Ritter, *Politik*, p. 105, and note 1, 111, note 1.

The three spiritual electors, with the new Elector of Saxony, John George—the brother and successor of Christian II., who had died in July—were present in person ; John Sigismund of Brandenburg was represented by ambassadors ; at the suggestion of John Schweikart of Mayence, Duke John of Zweibrücken, administrator of the county palatine, was admitted into the College of Electors. Matthias, as King of Bohemia, solicited his own admission by means of ‘an imposing embassy,’ which was also instructed to press for his future election as Emperor. At the head of this embassy was Bishop Melchior Klesl, who spoke ‘with so much affection and in such eloquent language in favour of his overlord that the electors and councillors were all astounded.’ ‘The parson has a famous jaw,’ said John George of Saxony, ‘and this same jaw was already quite close to what it wanted to snap up.’

When Klesl made his entry, and on every subsequent occasion when he appeared in his carriage, he was pursued by the jeers and abuse of the people. Because he was the son of a baker he was called the baker’s journeyman, and certain coppersmiths’ apprentices declared that, if only they had this baker in the street, ‘they would sift his flour for him.’ A monk who was in his suite was regarded as a monster. By order of the council the arquebusier Wolf Teufel was obliged to stand continuously outside the residence of Klesl, with a whip in his hand to keep back the thronging masses. ‘And so,’ says a chronicler (making a play on the name *Teufel*), ‘the devil became the protector of the Bishop and of the clerical Father, so long as he and his monk remained here.’ The Elector of

Mayence also, 'a fine, venerable-looking, delightful person,' was once outrageously insulted in the public streets, while the following wish was shouted at his retinue: 'You priestly rabble, may you all of you be carried off alive by the devil.' 'No whit less did the Lutherans and Calvinists among the people mutually revile each other;' 'and it was a terrible state of things, all the more so because the princes and their retinues numbered more than two thousand persons, few of whom, either of the foreigners or of men of the land, paid the slightest attention to the orders of the council.' One of the preachers, who was in the habit of 'relegating the papists and Calvinists in one lump to the devil,' had been most strictly enjoined by the council to abstain from all vilifying, blackguarding, calling people heretics, and anathematising them during the assembly of princes.' The sacristans were enjoined to look after the strangers in the churches, to keep dogs out of the sacred buildings, and to keep the chairs clean; the hymn '*Erhalt uns, Herr, bei deinem Wort und steur des Papsts und Türken Mord,*' was not to be sung during the stay of the princes.

'All the same, however, in numbers of sermons there was much talk of murder and bloodshed and Calvinistic and popish immorality and devilry.' While the princes 'were banqueting in brotherly fashion, their preachers were wearing themselves out in the service of the true doctrine.' 'The Saxon court preacher Daniel Hanisch took up the cudgels in the pulpit with especial vehemence against the papists and the Calvinists, and contradicted their false doctrines and their calumnies.' In this way he acquired 'great renown and attracted a large audience both of high and low, who were eager

to hear his sermons; many of the burghers would often wait two hours in the hall before the sermon began, and they always went away well comforted.' 'And as the Palatinate and Saxony were situated quite close to each other, he occasionally had a fling at the Palatinate, saying: "And indeed doctrine of this sort is taught nowadays in our own neighbourhood." ' When John George, 'owing to the complaints of the Administrator Duke John, attempted to put a bit on the preacher's mouth, the latter became all the more audacious.' The ambassador from Bremen complained of Hanisch that he had told the people that a preacher of this town had proclaimed openly from the pulpit that Christ was not in His right senses when at the Last Supper He spoke the words: 'This is My body.' On the other side Bartholomew Petiscus, Calvinist court preacher to the Administrator of the Palatinate, was indefatigable in the production of 'slandering sermons: ' he distributed tracts and booklets 'in order, writes a Nüremberg chronicler, 'to smuggle the mischievous Calvinist doctrine into their town and to procure himself a following; ' but the town council caused the books to be taken away from the burghers. The conflict even found its way into a banqueting hall of the princes. Two boys belonging to the nobility—one of them a Saxon and the other a Palatiner—who were in attendance at a banquet, came to blows in a contest as to the right way of repeating the *Pater Noster*. 'Thus, before all the electors and lords, they fought lustily over religion; their Excellencies laughed heartily, and did not attempt to check the combat, which went on till the boys, tired out with their conflict, stopped of their own accord.'

‘The august and princely lords spent great part of the day in banquets, which were for the most part much too exquisite and costly.’ At the Elector of Saxony’s they once remained seven hours long at table. Joachim Ernest of Ansbach had as many as 104 dishes served up, besides artificial dishes of a most expensive kind, which he had procured from Augsburg. Still more extravagant in its pomp was the entertaining of the Elector of Cologne, who, merely at the ‘collation,’ provided 124 dishes of confectionery which he had obtained from Antwerp for the sum of 1,500 crowns. At a banquet given by the Palatine Administrator, ‘the sweet must and the costly wine from Bacharach accomplished their full effect.’ ‘The next day the electors, laid up by their drunken carousals, could not attend the council in person.’ ‘This,’ says a reporter, ‘is not in good accord with the Golden Bull, in which such banquets are forbidden with the utmost severity.’

Before the beginning of the debates the lords, in order to fortify themselves, were always served with a regular supply of Malvoisie, Rheinfall, egg-rings, confects, and so forth. The cost of this early luncheon was no less than two hundred florins.

The assembly of electors lasted full four weeks and ended with the resolution that in the following May an electoral Diet should be held at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and that Matthias should also be invited to it as King of Bohemia. It was also decided to send an embassy to the Emperor, asking him for his consent to this plan of electing a king.¹

¹ ‘Ausführlicher vertraulicher Bericht über den Kurfürstentag von Melchior Goldast von Hainingsfeld’ (a jurist attached to the embassy of King Matthias) ‘an den Rat zu Frankfurt,’ from Nüremberg, November 20,

But Rudolf rejected the Elector's proposal. He had made up his mind, before the electoral Diet, to make a journey into the Empire and, with the help of the allied princes, two of whom—the Margrave of Ansbach and Prince John of Anhalt—were staying at Prague, to ‘exterminate’ his enemies. On the Catholic side it was feared that he too would then join the Protestant religion. His alliance with the Union was near to being concluded.¹

The international revolutionary party, left since the death of Henry IV. ‘without head and leader, gathered fresh courage and cherished the hope that it would now soon be pitted in overpowering combat against the Beast, the Roman Antichrist and his followers.’ ‘Our whole endeavours,’ wrote one of the Venetian confederates, ‘hoping for the downfall of the great beast,’ on August 16, 1611, to Duplessis-Mornay, ‘must be concentrated on kindling a war in Italy; this is the opportune moment, since the Duke of Savoy is inclined that way.’² Duplessis at the same time summoned the King of England to a war of religion. ‘You,’ he said, ‘who have so successfully hit the Pope with your pen, cannot fail to be the most eager for the glory of thrusting him through with your avenging sword? Lay now your pen aside, great 1611, in the *Reichstagsakten*, Bd. 94, 18 folio pages. *Schreiben eines Unbekannten aus der Begleitung des Erzbischofs von Mainz*, from Nürnberg, November 14, 1611; Senkenberg, xxiii. 432–445; Soden, *Kriegs- und Sittengesch.* i. 157–159, 186–187, 207–221, 234.

¹ Fuller details in Gindely, ii. 310–336; Chlumecky, i. 778–786.

² ‘. . . de quelque endroit qu’elle [la guerre] nous vienne, elle ne peult estre sans insignes progrès . . . et c’est là où doit estre toute nostre mire, et notamment en ceste saison que nous avons ce duc de Savoye, qui seul entre les princes d’Italie la recherche : car tant que ce cœur ci battrà en son aise, il ne fault esperer la chute de cette grande beste’ (Asselineau, in Duplessis-Mornay, xi. 268).

King ; I too, weary of writing, have thrown my pen from me. These times call for a different mode of action, and different weapons are therefore necessary. Let a new Constantine come forth from Britain to tread down this Maxentius, this second Pharaoh, on the Milvian bridge.'

Fearlessly, he said, and without any risk of danger, he would precipitate himself on Rome. 'Oh, most illustrious King, may the great and good God, who has chosen thee out for this holy war, protect thee from all thine enemies and preserve thee for His Church, for thy kingdom and for all the company of the believers.'¹ James I. answered in October that 'a war of offence in matters of religion could not be justified by Holy Scripture and the teaching of the primitive Church ; moreover, his strength was not adequate for the annihilation of the Roman beast ; but he was labouring incessantly to unite all princes in a close alliance against the assaults of Satan and his representative at Rome.'² Duplessis now turned his hopes more than ever to a war in Germany. The Emperor, he wrote to Venice at the end of December, is seeking to connect himself with the allies ; the number of these grows daily, and their delegates intend to assemble at Heidelberg in order to negotiate concerning affairs of the utmost importance ; the Kings of France, England, and Denmark will also be represented at this conference by confidential persons.³

Hans Reinhard Brömser, the vicegerent of Mayence,

¹ *Epistola suasoria* prefacing the work : *Mysterium Iniquitatis seu Historia Papatus*, 1611. See Kowallek, pp. 434-435.

² October 7, 1611 (Duplessis-Mornay, xi. 310-311).

³ December 28, 1611, to Asselineau (Duplessis-Mornay, xi. 374).

who was at the head of the electoral embassy to the Emperor, feared that the following spring would see the outbreak of a great war in the Empire. But at this juncture Rudolf died. Dropsy had developed in his system; a wound opened on the thigh, mortification set in, and in a few days he breathed his last, on January 20, 1612.¹

‘It is a great blessing for the Empire,’ wrote Brömser on February 13, ‘that this death has taken place. It was hoped, had the Emperor returned to the Empire, to use him as a tool for letting fly at the Catholic Estates, and for accomplishing now what was postponed in 1610, namely, the redress of all their pretended grievances, the organisation of justice according to their ideas, the free establishment of Calvinism in the Empire and in the archbishoprics and bishoprics, and the gradual confiscation of these dioceses and their transformation into secular lordships.

‘Now, however, that the Emperor has been snatched away by death, the danger of a great civil war seems again deferred. For how long it may be deferred will depend on those who honourably desire peace—be they Catholic or Lutheran Estates. If they do not rally together for joint defence, then, with the help of foreign powers, the fury of war will one day break out unexpectedly. And then, *Finis Germaniae*.’²

¹ See Stieve in the *Allgem. deutsche Biographie*, xxix. 514.

² To Karl von Egenolph in Frankfort-on-the-Main on January 16 and February 13, 1612.

CHAPTER VI

ELECTION OF THE EMPEROR MATTHIAS, 1612 ¹—

THE DIRECTOR OF THE NEW EMPEROR

IMMEDIATELY after the death of Rudolf II.. Christian of Anhalt represented to King Matthias, through the Margrave of Ansbach, that in view of his election to the Empire he would do well ‘to show favour to the allies,’ ‘to promise all possible conciliatoriness in the matter of grievances,’ and above all to maintain good relations with the Palatinate, because ‘this territory had at all times openly stood up for him,’ and as head of the Union ‘might be able to render him good service.’ The Margrave of Ansbach appeared at Prague on behalf of confidential negotiations with Matthias, and was sent by the latter into the Empire charged to push on his election. ‘In my mind there is no doubt,’ said the Margrave in a memorandum respecting the forthcoming election, ‘that for this time they will stick to the House of Austria.’ The members of this House most advantageous to the Catholics were the King of

¹ See Kohl, *Die Politik Kursachsens während des Interregnums und der Kaiserwahl 1612, nach archivalischen Quellen dargestellt* (Hallenser Dissertation von 1887). Here, p. 9, is quoted a confidential letter of the Calvinist Landgrave Maurice of Hesse-Cassel to the Elector of Saxony, dated January 30, 1612, in which Maurice endeavours to win over the Elector to the idea of a Protestant Empire; in such a case the crown would be offered to Saxony, at the same time, however, accession to the Union would be insisted on. Saxony, nevertheless, refused (J. Heling, *Die Wahl des römischen Königs Matthias*). The first part (Belgard, 1892) was not accessible to me.

Spain, Archduke Albert, and Archduke Ferdinand of Styria. The first, however, they would not be able to carry through, and the last was too resourceless, besides which he had 'the Turk for his near neighbour, and likewise Hungary and Austria, which countries were chiefly evangelical; the Venetians also were near to him, and these were not sufficiently Catholic.' The best candidate for the Protestants as opposed to Archduke Albert was Matthias, whom it was 'all the more advisable to uphold' as he was 'opposed to the Catholic Electors.' If Matthias came to the throne through the exertions of the Protestants 'he would be all the more bound to favour the Union.'

His lands were for the most part evangelical, and had 'now acquired so much freedom' that there was no reason to fear that he would use his power to the prejudice of the evangelical religion. For still greater security they had the means of 'allying themselves with the said royal and hereditary dominions.' True, it was feared that his elevation to the throne would establish the House of Austria more firmly; but this danger was lessened by the fact that Matthias, by his election, would fall into enmity with Archduke Albert. The Pope and the King of Spain had only recommended Matthias in order to 'disconcert the evangelicals.'¹ The Moravian district governor, Karl von Zierotin, when asked his opinion by the Elector Palatine, also spoke in favour of Matthias: the princes, he said, 'could make no better choice; from no one else had they more to hope and less to fear.' It was true, said Duplessis-Mornay, that Matthias would not accept 'the true light'—that is to say, Calvinism—'but

¹ Ritter, *Politik und Gesch. der Union*, pp. 157-158.

at any rate he would not set himself in opposition to this light ;' during his reign the Protestants would gain time to organise themselves in such a manner as to command the next election at their will.¹

In order to dispose the ecclesiastical Electors in his favour, Matthias caused it to be intimated to them that 'by his public devotions he was showing himself a fervent Catholic and that he was furthering all Catholic interests ; that for many years he had advised the late Emperor to take back from the Protestants what Maximilian II. had granted them ; that he had abolished the preachers and forbidden attendance at Protestant sermons ; in Bohemia he had wanted to defend the Catholic religion against Rudolf's '*Majestätsbrief*' with armed force, but had not been able to obtain from the Pope, the King of Spain, and other Catholic princes the help necessary for the purpose ; the concessions which he had made to the Protestants were merely a matter of expediency, and they were not binding on his heirs and successors ; moreover, the strength of his leaning towards the Catholics was patent from the complaints of the Protestants that he did not fulfil the promises he made them.'²

Least of any did the Elector Ferdinand of Cologne trust the assurances of 'the man who was no less double-tongued than his father Maximilian.' 'According to all appearance,' wrote Ferdinand before the opening of the electoral Diet at the beginning of May, to his brother Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, 'we shall be landed in such serious complications as must not only result in the overthrow of the Catholic religion but also in further disturbances and risings in the Empire.

¹ Chlumecky, i. 797, 798.

² Hammer, ii. ; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 401-405.

For even the Prince of Anhalt has informed the Elector of Mayence in confidence that the King of Hungary has come to terms with them, *i.e.* the Protestants, and received promises of powerful help from them. On this matter the Pope and the King of Spain keep silence as though they knew nothing of such things, or did not wish to know. To us electors also they, the Protestants, very strongly recommend the said King of Hungary. This makes some of our party so chicken-hearted, and causes them to sink into such forgetfulness of their duty to God, that they can never be justified in the eyes of posterity. All this would not have come about if the Pope and Spain had adopted measures in good time.'

Matthias, said Ferdinand in a second despatch, 'must of necessity compass the ruin of the Roman Empire.'¹ Already during the election negotiations the Elector had feared violent action from the Calvinists. 'It is now positively certain,' he wrote to Maximilian, 'that if it were in the power of the Calvinists to do so, they would undoubtedly stir up some disturbance and surprise us spiritual Electors with violence. I therefore deem it advisable that your Excellency should place yourself somewhat in readiness, so that if the turbulent rabble should perchance begin their villainy and make a forcible attack on us spiritual electors, you may be prepared for the emergency. For it is certain that the opposite party are plotting some knavish work, which, if they could, they would gladly carry out against us.'²

At the beginning of the election negotiations at Frankfort-on-the-Main, the ecclesiastical Electors were

¹ Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 287, 290.

² Wolf, iii. 297.

still exerting themselves on behalf of Archduke Albert. The latter had, however, on December 27, 1611, concluded a treaty with the other archdukes, according to which Matthias was to be put forward as the claimant to the imperial throne on the side of their House. Matthias had gained the support of Spain and of the Pope by solemn assurances of ‘unutterable devotion to the Catholic faith,’ and the Spanish ambassador, Balthasar Zuniga, in conjunction with Bishop Klesl at Frankfort, was his most zealous champion. Zuniga procured him the votes of the ecclesiastical Electors—nevertheless, only on the security that Spain would defend the Catholic religion against every enemy, even against the new Emperor.¹

¹ Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 118; Chlumecky, i. 798; Gindely, *Rudolf*, ii. 157; and *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, ii. Schmid, in the *Hist. Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, Jahrg. 1885, pp. 194–195. In the document informing the Pope of the election, the three ecclesiastical Electors expressed the following wishes, the fulfilment of which he should urge upon the newly-elected Emperor. I. Before all he is to use his authority to enforce the restitution of all the Church property confiscated by the opponents of Catholicism. II. The Emperor shall not himself enact any decree, nor shall he give his consent or approval to any decree which might in any way prejudice the Catholic religion and the rights, statutes, usages, goods, and revenues of the Church. III. He shall retract, in an authentic document, any promises he may have made to the opponents—either by his free will or under compulsion—to the detriment of the Catholic religion or of single churches. IV. Within the course of a year, without delay and subterfuge, he shall, by means of a legally conducted election, have a King of the Romans established at his side. V. If it should become necessary to take up arms in self-defence, the Emperor shall favour, support, and defend the Catholic party with imperial authority. VI. That which the Electors, and others in their name, have done up to the present time in the interest of the public election shall not be ill-construed by him, nor shall he, under any pretext whatever, embark on a legally irregular course of proceeding against anyone. VII. What has been done by Archduke Leopold, he shall cover with the mantle of brotherly love, and not make into a pretext for forming a hostile resolution against his person, his goods, or his dependents. If he should already have formed any such resolution, he must recall it and restore everything

On June 13, 1612, Matthias was unanimously elected and afterwards crowned with his consort in the cathedral.¹

Feats of running the ring and dancing concluded the solemnities. 'The last dance,' it says in a report of the coronation, 'was performed by his Imperial Majesty with the wife of the Administrator-Elector of the Palatinate.'²

Another kind of dance was soon to begin.

'All seems, to outward appearances,' wrote a member of the retinue of the Elector of Mayence, 'to have gone off peaceably; but the bitterness of feeling which prevailed during the transactions respecting the Emperor's capitulation, and which by no means wore itself out, gives reason to fear very different issues in the Empire.'³

Matthias was fifty-five years of age when he acceded to the imperial government. He was a 'good-humoured, affable prince,' very tenacious of external tokens of honour and glittering state ceremonies, such as 'befitted the secular head of Christendom.' Although 'his

to the *status quo antea*. VIII. Above all he must be untiring in promoting everything which may tend to the glory of God, the exaltation of the Church, and the maintenance of peace in the Empire. In conclusion the Electors praised the behaviour of the Cologne nuncio in these and in other transactions (Schmid, in the *Hist. Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, Jahrg. 1885, p. 196). Respecting the part played by the Pope, see also Lämmer, *Melet. Romanor. mantissa*, p. 310.

¹ Khevenhiller says, writes Senkenberg, xxiii. 512, that Matthias, kneeling at the altar before the Archbishop of Mayence, requested that his consort might be crowned also, 'but I cannot believe that such request was made in a kneeling posture.' The detailed account of the coronation in the *Frankfurter Wahltagakten*, xiv. 43, confirms Khevenhiller's statement.

² *Frankfurter Wahltagakten*, xiv. 47.

³ Concerning the capitulation business, see Wolf, iii. 299-308; Ritter, *Politik*, pp. 118-120.

coffers were in a chronic state of emptiness,' 'the court household must nevertheless be magnificent,' even if 'debts should be heaped on debts.' Serious intellectual activity had never been to his taste; he concerned himself little or not at all about the affairs of government, was always dependent on his councillors, whom he trusted for better or for worse.

Bishop Klesl, whom, in reward for his services, he had appointed President of the Ministry, once said frankly to him: 'Your Majesty must indeed exert yourself and not give way to indolence; for where the master does not work himself, the servants grow lazy, and land and people go to ruin. Never to give audience to the Imperial Chamber, to the Council of War, to the Privy Council, is not the way to keep the State together, and must end in disaster. It grieves me respecting your Majesty that I cannot alter your nature as I gladly would.' 'Your Majesty,' he admonished Matthias another time, 'will not look after your interests yourself, but you let things happen as they may, so long as you yourself enjoy peace and quiet.' 'What your counsellors advise, that you do; what the majority votes for, you agree to, so that you may have no worry; you never think of what the consequences may be. When, however, people will not attend to their own work, then follows surely a reckoning with God.'¹ Klesl himself, a man of robust, unimpaired bodily vigour, of simple, temperate, and blameless living, 'worked like a horse,' and even when his labours 'went long without result, was always enthusiastically active.' 'He was not only President of the Privy Council, whose business it was to appoint the other court and privy councillors to their offices,' but also 'Director of the

¹ Hammer, iii. ; *Urkundenband*, pp. 54, 410-411.

Emperor,' and the actual 'Factotum' during the whole of Matthias's reign. His influence over the feeble sovereign was all the greater for the reason that out of his wealthy fortune and his yearly revenue of 40,000 thalers, he was able to advance considerable sums to the ever impecunious prince. If at times he declared that he was 'nothing but a humble and faithful servant of his lord,' he also boasted at other times that 'Matthias owed everything to him; he had helped him to all his crowns.'¹ 'At open table, in the presence of electors and princes, Klesl'—so the Electors Ferdinand and Maximilian complained—'had had the audacity to say: "Here sits the Emperor; let them flock to the Emperor, to the Empress, let them complain, let them petition, but nothing will be done except what I will; I have ordained it, I have decided it, I have commanded this, that, and the other."' To the Emperor's behests and commands no obedience, therefore, was rendered. State secrets, these electors said, had been ill-kept by Klesl; well-meant letters from the Elector of Mayence had been transmitted to the Margraves of Ansbach and Baden with the remark that they were 'ideas of the old fool,' and 'others of this sort.'² 'They are saying everywhere,' we read in a satirical dialogue on the political conditions, 'that Klesl, the Vice-Emperor, represents the Emperor in most transactions; he is all in all;' 'Spain gives him money, the Emperor gives him the world, the Pope gives him heaven.' 'Methinks this is enough for a baker's lad.' 'True, he is a papist, but he knows how to turn his coat according to the

¹ Kerschbaumer, pp. 243, 371-374. Concerning the revenues of Klesl, see pp. 391-394; Hurter, vii. 46.

² Ehmel, *Handschriften*, i. 282-284; Hammer, iv.; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 402, 404.

wind and to carry water on both shoulders.' 'Anyone who knows Klesl may make use of him; he knows indeed how to get paid for his jobs; but anyone who can manage to get round him rightly will get a hundred per cent., if not more, out of him.'

The worst thing about the all-powerful President of the Ministry was his unprincipled politics and his double-tonguedness, which deprived him of all confidence on the part of the Catholics as well as of the Protestants. Neither the one nor the other party, wrote the Venetian ambassador John Soranzo, could rely on Klesl, 'for he was able with skill and cunning and empty promises to keep hold of and influence both sides, so that affairs never came to any conclusion.'¹

The Viennese nuncio had spoken of Klesl's 'unfathomable wiles' as early as in 1610,² and at the same time warned Maximilian of Bavaria against the danger with which religion was threatened by his intrigues.³ 'I know the man,' wrote the Elector of Mayence to a friend in 1612, 'and I cannot trust him, for his genius is entirely directed towards turning good confidence into mistrust in order that he may accomplish his own ends.' Nobody was worth anything in his estimation, unless he chimed in with his own song. The allied princes boasted that they could now do anything at court by means of presents to Klesl, who was all-powerful.⁴

Soon, however, there was heard on the side of the allies the complaint that 'the false parson could not be trusted;' that 'Klesl was an abortion of Satan.'⁵

¹ Hurter, vii. 46.

² Kerschbaumer, p. 390, note 1.

³ Hammer, ii. ; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 190, 266. ⁴ Hammer, iii, 33, note.

⁵ Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 146, note 2, 169.

CHAPTER VII

UNION AND LEAGUE, 1612-1613

‘THE new Emperor is with us, but the real power in the Empire does not lie with him, or with his court, but elsewhere,’ wrote a Mayence chancellery official a few weeks after the coronation day at Frankfort, ‘and the Union is like a Damocles sword over the heads of the Catholics, and their Electoral Graces are in perpetual anxiety lest it should soon fall on them, and that the Holy Empire will be plunged in war and bloodshed.’¹

Already before the election the Elector John Schweikart had made known to the Elector of Saxony that ‘the States, especially those in the neighbourhood of the Rhine, were making vigorous military preparations; the Palatinate, Würtemberg, Strasburg, Baden, and others among the allies were engaged in recruiting commanding officers and were liberally dispensing recruiting fees; it was incumbent, therefore, on the Catholics to prepare themselves for defence in order to safeguard the peace of the Empire and of religion. During and after the formation of the Halle Union matters proceeded to such lengths that the intention of exterminating the Catholic Estates—especially the ecclesiastical ones—was not only declared secretly and proclaimed openly in speech and in pamphlets—of

¹ *Konzept eines Briefes aus der mainzischen Kanzlei, vom 17 Juli, 1612, contributed by Böhmer.*

which last indeed there was an abundant supply—but the adversaries, furthermore, did not scruple to proceed to action, to take up arms under a feigned pretext, and to invite foreign powers, lying under the Empire's suspicion, to join in the undertaking and enter the country. In short, they left nothing undone by which the peril of the Fatherland might be increased.' This storm-cloud might not indeed have passed over so lightly had not 'Almighty God interposed with His strong arm, and for this once, at any rate, frustrated these baneful counsels and turned them to nought.' But the Union was still persevering in the work of strengthening itself by means both of internal and external forces, and still continued to hold out threats to the Catholics; John Schweikart, therefore, begged the Elector of Saxony to point out what ought to be done, and to state what help the Catholic Estates might expect from him in case of need. Whereas the Union was in alliance with England, Denmark, and the States-General, and consequently superior in strength to the loyal and peaceable Estates, the question arose whether these last would not do well to send an influential deputation to France, Lorraine, Savoy, and Burgundy to solicit help in case of further molestation.¹

In April 1612 the King of England had concluded with the Union, whose protector-in-chief he had considered himself since the death of Henry IV., a six years' treaty, by which he pledged himself to a contribution of 4,000 men. Moreover, two years before this, negotiations had been initiated for a marriage between Frederic V. of the Palatinate, still a minor, and the Princess Elizabeth, a daughter of the King of England;

¹ Ritter, *Politik der Union*, pp. 159-162.

these negotiations were now brought to a conclusion. In February 1613 the matrimonial alliance was solemnised in London, and that 'with a splendour and magnificence seldom witnessed before.' One hundred thousand pounds sterling, an enormous sum according to the then value of money, were squandered on the occasion. The future Electress brought with her a court retinue and household of 374 persons. On the journey to Heidelberg she travelled from Cologne to Bonn in one of the Palatine ships which contained seven state rooms; among these was a silver-room, an armoury, and three splendid apartments adorned with sumptuous tapestry of red and blue velvet. The festivities lasted for several weeks.¹ There were masquerades, knightly games, hunts, banquetings; every day more than twenty *Fuders* (3,956 gallons) of wine were consumed. The luxury introduced by the daughter of England's King swallowed up the last resources of the country.² Heidelberg, wrote a traveller in 1616, was 'like a little Paris in the middle of Germany. Everything is done there according to a foreign model, and it is difficult to describe the magnificence which the court displays and the amount of frivolity that goes on. Prosperity, however, is quite at a standstill; from the starving, emaciated populace there come complaints which might move a heart of stone; it is notorious also how empty are the Elector's coffers and how his debts increase and multiply.'³

¹ The Heidelberg University sent the following greeting to the future Electress in Frankenthal by a young boy who presented her with an offering of fruits: 'Madame, la déesse Flora et Pomona Vous saluent, et souhaitent toute bénédiction et félicité: et Vous présentent cette corbeille' (Häusser, ii. 274).

² Fuller details in Häusser, ii. 258-275.

³ *Allerhand von gelehrten und curieusen Sachen*, pp. 23-24.

James I. had dreams of a kingly crown for his son-in-law. In a short time, he said, Frederic would ascend the Bohemian throne. He caused English money to be distributed in Prague by his messengers, in order to curry favour with the Protestant population. Bohemia, wrote a Bavarian confidential agent in April 1613, wore the aspect of a country in which a storm was beginning to gather ; for the people did not believe that the Emperor would keep his promises with regard to religion. Another agent had already reported in August 1612 that ‘ among all the Estates of the imperial hereditary dominions there is great agitation ; everywhere the spirit of republicanism is astir. At Vienna the English ambassador was engaged in a lively correspondence with the leading Protestant members of the Estates of Austria, and Erasmus of Tschernembl was unweariedly active in trying to bring about an alliance between the Union and the Estates.’¹

There was reason to fear the complete downfall of the House of Habsburg. Meanwhile, however, Klesl carried on private transactions with the allies, in order, as he hoped, ‘ to consolidate the said House.’ ‘ You may believe me, on my honour,’ he declared on September 7, 1612, to the Margrave of Ansbach, whose letter he had handed over to the Emperor and the Empress, ‘ that you are regarded as the child of the House, and I hope his Imperial Majesty will always make this manifest under all circumstances ; do you only remain faithful to this dynasty.’² Klesl—so Caspar Schoppe reported to Rome on July 6, 1613—was so vigorously

¹ Chlumecky, i. 821–825 ; Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 312–313 ; Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, i. 78, 186.

² Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 126, note.

supporting the claims of the Protestant princes, that it was to be feared that in a short time the Catholic Church would be exterminated all over Germany.¹

On December 30, 1612, the Emperor had summoned a Diet to meet at Ratisbon on the following April 24 for the chief purpose of deliberating concerning the organisation of the judicial system and the raising of a new Turkish subsidy.

The allied Estates intended to assert their demands on this occasion, and Klesl in the meanwhile made every possible exertion to induce the Catholics to give in at the outset. 'The rascally manœuvrer,' it says in a despatch of the councillor of the Elector of Mayence, William Ferdinand van Effern, 'in order to gain his purpose, scares the Catholics with pictures of the devil, and is willing to stake both honour and reputation.' The Elector of Mayence was informed from Vienna that the League of the Catholics was not equal to the Protestant Union; on external help they could not reckon with any certainty; the Pope was an old man; the King of Spain had not even been in a position to put down his rebellious subjects in the Netherlands, but had been obliged, on the contrary, to conclude an ignominious treaty with them; the French crown had enough to do with its own insurgent subjects, likewise the Poles with the rebels in the interior of the Empire, and with the Muscovites and Swedes; the Italian princes were solely occupied in looking after their own safety. On the other hand the allies were already on good terms with the Turks and the Austrian hereditary lands, as well as in close alliance with the States-General, with England, and with Switzerland. Against all these

¹ Kerschbaumer, p. 215.

Powers the Catholics, and also the Emperor, were much too weak, and it might well happen that the latter would be compelled to act entirely according to the will of the Protestants ; the Catholic religion would then be altogether rooted out of Germany. For these reasons, it was urged, the Catholic Estates should show themselves amenable to the Protestants, especially as regards the ecclesiastical reservation, against which the Protestants had invariably protested. This regulation had never been put into force against them ; on the contrary, they had always been left in tranquil possession of the abbeys which they had confiscated. It was desirable, therefore, that they should, according to the demand of the allies, give the present holder of the archbishopric of Augsburg, and the other Protestant bishops designate, seats and votes at the imperial Diets, and that the Religious Peace should be renewed as they wished. If their demands were not complied with they would certainly break up the forthcoming Diet, and then all justice would be at an end in the State and the whole Empire would go to the ground. Now it was the opinion of the theologians that if any given course was likely to result in more injury than profit to the Catholic religion, such course should not be chosen. But far greater disaster would certainly accrue if the Turks and the heretics should get all Germany into their power and should be able to crush out the Catholic religion all over the land, than if, in a few matters, the Catholics were to give in.¹

John Schweikart, constitutionally anxious-minded and desponding, and averse to all military proceedings, had already often enough accommodated himself to the

¹ Wolf, iii. 331-332, 337-340.

Protestants, and 'wished to arrange fresh compromises with the latter';¹ but he had come to the conviction that in 'all compromising' only 'the Catholics had to pay the costs.' Moreover, he said to a colleague on the Frankfort Council, 'it is impossible to trust to the assurances of the Calvinists; if they are allowed to seize one finger to-day, to-morrow they want two or three, and the next day the whole hand and arm to pull down the man who at first gave them but a finger.' 'The Lutherans themselves,' he added, 'had no less cause than the Catholics to be on their guard, and if only they begin to look about them to see how things had fared with them wherever the Calvinists were in power, especially during the last years in Hesse,² they would see how empty were all their promises, however solemnly they might have been recorded in writing. If the imperial court was working for the dissolution of the Protestant and Catholic unions and leagues on the ground that such confederacies were highly injurious to the Holy Empire, he, the Elector, must recognise that their harmfulness was patent to the eyes of the world, and that nothing would be better than the dissolution of these leagues, provided both sides behaved honourably, and that the measure was initiated by those who had first organised the leagues and compelled the Catholics to put themselves on the defensive. But that the Catholics should themselves begin to break up their League, as had been proposed, and should do so just now, when the Diet was close at hand, and the Protestant confederates were visibly growing stronger and conspiring with foreign powers, would be beyond

¹ For instance, in the year 1607. See above, pp 472, 473.

² See above, p. 286 ff.

measure senseless, and he could not advise or help them to such a course ; on the contrary, he should work with all his might in the opposite direction ; not, however, for the sake of stirring up discord and obtaining the possessions of others, but solely with the object of protecting himself and the Catholics in their just rights and property.' ¹

He had always thought, the Elector wrote to Klesl, that leagues in the Empire were dangerous and injurious, and for his own part, he had used all his power to secure the maintenance and strict observance of the imperial decrees of the Public Peace and the Religious Peace ; he cherished no higher wish than that, through the power of the Emperor, peace and security should be guaranteed to both the clerical and secular adherents of the Catholic religion. But the opposite party, in banding together as they had done, had given the first incentive to secession, had leagued themselves with all the enemies of the Catholic religion and of the Empire, even with the Turks and the Tartars ; as their actions and their writings showed, they were intent on rooting out all the Catholics and overturning the constitution of the realm, and as a step to this they were aiming at the destruction of the House of Habsburg. 'It is known to all the world that among these people all proper respect for the Imperial Majesty is at an end, and that all administration of justice and enforcement of the law is blocked by them ; on the other hand, stubbornness, treachery, deceit, and cunning have increased among them to such an extent that no reliance can be placed either on their solemnly attested word, or

¹ *Aufzeichnungen des Mainzer Rathes von Effern*, of July 13, 1613, contributed by Böhmer.

on the treaties which they concluded, or on their letters and seals, or on their sacred oaths ; for all such pledges, according to the detestable doctrine of Machiavelli, must on every occasion give way to "reasons of state," as they are called.¹ What abundant proofs of this can be adduced from the events of a few years is well known to you.'

'We Catholics,' Schweikart went on, 'through overmuch credulity and trustfulness, have already lost the greater part of our belongings, and we stand in great danger with regard to the remnant that is left us. But if the peace-loving and loyal Catholic Estates, together with the loss of their territories and their subjects, should allow their religion also to be torn from them, this could never find justification in the sight of God, or escape the eternal reproach of ignominy from posterity.' Since it was obvious that the Catholic Estates could not obtain any security by ordinary means, nobody ought to find fault with them for making preparations for necessary defence, in order to preserve for themselves and their subjects free exercise of their religion, and the enjoyment of all the benefits of the Empire that were consistent with obedience to the Emperor ; herein alone lay the aim and object of the Catholic Union. As for what concerned the Elector of Saxony and other peace-loving Estates of the Augsburg Confession, he hoped and believed, from the uprightness which he had hitherto observed in all their counsels and actions, that they would have no reason to change their intentions. Furthermore, Klesl knew full well how little the goodwill of these people was to be reckoned on, whenever

¹ ' . . . sed haec omnia ad quamvis occasionem ex detestanda Machiavelli doctrina "rationi status," ut vocant, cedere cogantur.'

religion and all the matters dependent thereon came in question, especially if any hope of gain was held out to them. Besides which it was well known how energetically they had worked, to what wiles and calumnies they had had recourse, in order to gain over to their own side these same princes, above all the Elector of Saxony, who, owing to his high prestige and power, had up till then maintained the balance between the two parties. If these attempts should succeed, the Austrian House and all the Catholic Estates would be exposed to great danger, unless they prepared themselves for defence. If the Catholics came unprepared, and without means of protection, to the forthcoming Diet, the Emperor would not be able to carry through any of his wishes, and the Catholic cause would come to terrible grief.¹

Maximilian of Bavaria also opposed most resolutely the opinion of the Viennese court that because the Catholics were weak they should give in with regard to the Ecclesiastical Reservation and renew the Religious Peace according to the will of the Protestants. 'We cannot and dare not,' he said in his instructions to his ambassadors, 'grant the holder of the archbishopric of Magdeburg and other Protestant occupiers of ecclesiastical benefices, votes and seats at imperial and other Diets, because to do so would be at variance with the Religious Peace. Were we to respond to this demand the Protestants would straightway encroach further,

¹ In v. Höfler, *Fränkische Studien*, pp. 283-285. In October 1612 the Augsburg Bishop, Henry von Knöringen, sent the Pope a report on the formation and the significance of the League, in the conclusion of which he had been especially active. The only way of warding off the attacks of the heretics was, he said, by the closest possible union of the whole body of Catholics 'ad resistendum eorum conatibus et Catholicos omnes, imprimis autem ecclesiasticos, ab eorum invasionibus securos praestandos' (in Steichele, *Beiträge*, i. 66).

and numbers of secular Estates would intrude themselves into the benefices in the character of archbishops, bishops, and abbots. Even now it was a question not only of Magdeburg, but also of the archbishopric of Bremen and the bishoprics of Halberstadt, Minden, Verden, Osnabrück, Lübeck, and others, in all sixteen bishoprics. Thus, by this measure, the Protestant contingent in the council of princes would be strengthened by sixteen votes, and would become a majority, and so at all future Diets they would carry everything their own way, and in a short time would be able to banish the Catholic religion from the whole country, and this, indeed, all the more easily as they had already got the upper hand in town councils. No Catholic Estate would any longer be in a position to obtain justice, for the instant a complaint was made against a Protestant Estate, it would be turned into a religious question, which, instead of being settled by an imperial tribunal, would be brought before the Diet, where the Protestants were in a majority, and decided there. Further, the Catholic imperial cities would be compelled to grant the non-Catholics free exercise of their religion and to admit them to seats on the council and to public offices, and gradually also religious autonomy would be forced upon clerical foundations and Catholic territorial princes.

‘Of what use would it be to enter into new treaties of alliance with the Protestants? They had pledged themselves with most solemn oaths to the Passau Treaty and the Religious Peace, and nevertheless, in violation of the plain letter of these compacts, they had seized every favourable opportunity to possess themselves of bishoprics and convents.

‘That the Catholics, on account of their inferior strength, ought to give in, he could not at all allow. If the Catholic Estates, he said, would only stand firmly and loyally together, there was not at present any danger of their being put to the rout by the Protestants. The Pope, Spain, the Swiss Catholics, the Governor of the Spanish Netherlands, the Catholic princes and the House of Lorraine were on good terms with the Catholics, and would not look on with indifference at their complete annihilation. If, however, the sword should decide against them, they would at any rate have saved their honour in a valiant struggle, and even if their cause were lost they themselves would be exonerated before God and man. On the other hand, it would be an eternal disgrace to them if they were to succumb without a stroke of the sword, and to become traitors to their Church. If their predecessors had been more steadfast they themselves would not have become involved in this labyrinth of complications.’

From these principles Maximilian declared that he should not budge. His proposal was that ‘everything should be avoided which could give the House of Saxony cause for mistrust or fear of any measures of violence; the imperial Estates must be assured that on the part of the Catholics there was no demand for any change; the terms of the Religious Peace must be unalterably observed. If at the Diet, as was to be expected, the Emperor should insist strongly on the dissolution of all unions and confederacies in the Empire, the Catholics must not decide on breaking up their League until they had been guaranteed sufficient security that their

opponents in the faith would not take advantage of them.¹

At the instigation of the Duke an assembly of the League was held at Frankfort-on-the-Main on March 11, 1613, when the following resolutions were agreed upon :

First, the Catholics, now as before, are fully resolved to abide uprightly and honourably by the Religious Pacification of Augsburg. If the Protestants at the Diet should propose a renewal of this treaty, and are satisfied 'with its being renewed in the same sense and spirit in which it was renewed at Augsburg in 1566,' we can give in to them so far as to allow that the renewal shall take place with a view to silencing every 'writer and clamourer' who declares the Peace 'to be no permanent bond, but only a temporary measure of conciliation.' It must, however, be expressly stated in the Recess of the Diet that 'this renewal shall prevent no one from pleading his case in court, and that it will in no wise justify any action undertaken in opposition to the Peace.'

Secondly, at the imperial Diets and at the meetings of deputies all matters of religion and of government must, now as before, be settled by a majority of votes. The Emperor must be solicited not to consent in any way to those demands which were put forward by the Protestant Estates in contradiction to this long-standing tradition and to the decrees of the Empire ; but, on the contrary, to protect both himself and the Catholic Estates 'in this customary, laudable usage and tradition.' If the majority of votes was no longer to have any value, there was no way left for checking

¹ Wolf, iii. 340-350.

the dissensions in the Empire and reconciling the Estates; the Empire would be involved in continual disturbances, and in a short time would meet with its ruin.

Thirdly, the Protestant occupiers of the archbishoprics and bishoprics which had been seized since the Religious Peace cannot be recognised by the Catholic Estates as the rightful possessors, and there is no obligation to accord them seats and votes at the Diets in violation of the Religious Peace. The Emperor must be appealed to to reject a possible claim of this sort from the Protestants.

Fourthly, the customary visitations of the Imperial Chamber, with inclusion of the four convent cases, must be brought into operation again. The proposal of the Protestant Estates for the dismissal of these convent cases must be repudiated; for the sole object of such a proposal is to make it impossible in future for the oppressed Catholic Estates to make any complaints, to pave a free way for the Protestants to the acquisition of the still remaining benefices and Church possessions, and in this manner to deprive the Catholics of the enjoyment of their rights and of the Religious Peace.

Fifthly, with regard to the imperial jurisdiction which the Protestants disputed, and the concurrence of the Aulic Council with the Imperial Chamber, there was no doubt whatever that the Emperor would know how to protect himself against baseless encroachments on this his highest jurisdiction, the actual basis indeed of his authority. But for the Catholic Estates also it was of great importance that the Emperor should be recognised as the fount of all jurisdiction, and that the

scope of his juridical privileges should be still more comprehensive than those of the Imperial Chamber; the said Estates therefore intended to strive with all their power for the maintenance of this imperial supremacy.

Altogether the Catholic Estates are resolved to combine together, with life and property, for the defence of the Religious and the Public Peace, and of other ordinances of the Empire, and for the repulsion of the force with which they were threatened. With a view to this defence each of the Estates agreed, already before the Diet, to remit to the general of the League a contribution of twenty-five Roman months, and in the case, which was scarcely to be hoped for, that action should be taken even prior to the opening of the Diet, they would add a further sum of ten months, in order that those who had the management of the war might be able to count on support. If things should go to the length of a general rising and a general scheme of war, the Estates will stand together like one man and throw all their worldly goods into the cause. All this they promise on their princely honour, and give their faithful word in place of a formal oath.¹

The ambassadors of some of the Catholic Estates not belonging to the League also took part in framing this daring Recess. After the departure of these latter, the members of the League continued their transactions until March 15, on which day they signed a second Recess authorising their chief to enter into negotiations with France, Lorraine, Savoy and other Italian princes respecting help to be granted in case of need. The Pope and the King of Spain were to be solicited for

¹ Abschied des Frankfurter Tages vom 11. März, 1613, in Stumpf, *Beil.* 22-39.

further pecuniary support. If the non-Catholic confederates should come to the aid of the Protestant Union, with which they were already allied, the Bishop of Constance was to endeavour to prevail on the Swiss Catholics to attack them in their own country.¹

Shortly after the Frankfort assembly the allies held a Diet at Rotenburg. This meeting had already been summoned by the Administrator of the Palatinate on January 10 with a view to arriving at a closer agreement respecting the proceedings at the Diet. It was unanimously resolved to stick fast to the Union, even if the Catholics should guarantee the dissolution of their own League. Negotiations concerning a closer understanding were to be carried on with the Swiss through Baden and Strasburg, active correspondence was to be kept up with the Austrian, Bohemian, and Moravian Estates, and the Estates were to be requested 'not to allow the opposite party the privilege of recruiting in their lands, or any other advantage;' correspondence was also to be continued with Venice, and the King of England, who had already come to an understanding with the allies, was to be solicited to apply to Sweden and Denmark for their assistance in 'establishing the common evangelical life on a firmer basis, especially in Germany.' In order to 'achieve righteous unity among the evangelicals' the assembled allies once more invited the Elector of Saxony, Duke Henry Julius of Brunswick, and the Landgrave Louis of Hesse-Darmstadt to join the Union. A confederacy of all the evangelicals, they said, was all the more urgent at the present juncture because the League was strengthening its forces more and more, and 'its

¹ Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 362-368.

dangerous intentions' could be discerned only too plainly in its summons to its assembly at Frankfort and in its alliance with the Pope and with Spain, of which 'credible information' was to hand.¹

The princes declined the invitation.²

The town of Frankfort-on-the-Main was also repeatedly urged to join the Union; but it decided to remain neutral because the worst evil was to be feared from separate leagues. They were convinced at Frank-

¹ Senkenberg, xxiii. 547-549.

² As early as in 1610, the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse-Cassel had asked the Landgrave Ludwig of Hesse-Darmstadt to join the League, but he and his brother Philip had both declined the proposal. The Calvinistic Estates, Philip wrote to Ludwig in the middle of January, had long entertained the design of being included in the Religious and the Imperial Peace, and of filling the Imperial Aulic Council at Prague as well as the Imperial Chamber at Spire with their own co-religionists. This was one of the objects of their Union. It must not, however, be encouraged, as it would place restraints on the true religion and its propagation. There was also no doubt that the Catholic Estates of the Empire on account of this Union, seeing that Lutherans and Calvinists were allied together, would no longer abide by the Religious Peace which had been concluded with the Augsburg Confessionists, and small blame to them. "And in our opinion the effect would be to ruin altogether the Religious Peace which had been so well established on a permanent basis." Furthermore, great grievances would spring up in the Hessian lands if the inhabitants were obliged to contribute men and money. How much evil, moreover, had accrued to those who had mixed themselves up in foreign quarrels and had solicited foreign potentates for help, and entered into alliances with them, had become well known to Germany a few years ago: these foreigners, as the saying goes, will not keep watch over the Holy Sepulchre without pay. It was, indeed, easy to see, apart from this, what sort of fate was to be expected from this Union if, as seemed likely, it should set itself in opposition to the Imperial Majesty as the supreme authority placed over the Estates by God. For it is written: "Render to the Emperor that which is the Emperor's, whether he be a pagan, or, at any rate, not a Christian, as was undoubtedly the case with the Emperors in the time of Christ." Finally, it was naturally to be expected that as the greater part of the allies were Calvinists, the Estates of the unaltered Augsburg Confession would have to dance to their piping, and would accordingly not find themselves very comfortably off." (In the *Archiv für hessische Gesch. und Alterthumskunde*, x. 313-316.)

fort that, 'unless matters were so arranged as to do away with the need for these special alliances and to make it possible to bring back into force the ancient, wisely framed constitutions of the Empire and the circles, no proper order could be maintained any longer, and it would be necessary to establish a fresh kind of control by means of the sword.'¹

With regard to the 'grievances of the Evangelicals,' it was decided at the Rotenburg Diet to stand firmly by the demands respecting the imperial Aulic Council and the statement of the four convents business. The Administrator of Magdeburg must be assured a seat and a vote, the town of Donauwörth, from which the Duke of Bavaria would not withdraw without compensation for the heavy expenses of execution, was to be restored to its former status according to the promise of Rudolf II., and the damages charged to those 'who had originated the quarrel.' Altogether the Union was prepared to bring forward all the grievances of the different Estates and to refuse 'to enter into any deliberations or decisions concerning alliance until these had been settled.' At any rate, they insisted, the principal grievances, about which the Emperor alone could decide, must be removed, or else they would not consent to any subsidies against the Turks. If nothing could be obtained, then 'either a secession or the close' of the Diet must be decided on 'by a majority of votes.'

If the princes of the Union were sufficiently prepared against every emergency, and sure of alliance with foreign princes and lords, the 'dissolution of the Diet

¹ 'Rechtsgutachten an den Rat und die Protokolle der Ratssitzungen' in the *Reichstagsakten*, 95 fol. 27, 37, 41.

might be allowed to take place without any anxiety; and as for the contributions, they had already been refused.' ¹

During the transactions the allies jointly petitioned the King of Denmark for help against the papists. In May, at the request of James I. of England,² a treaty was signed by the States-General with the princes of the Union, by which the two parties engaged themselves for fifteen years to give mutual succour to one another in case of need. Thenceforth the States became the actual backbone of the Union, and exercised the most important influence on the course of events.

Of the Diet at Ratisbon, even before its opening, it might easily have been predicted in the words of the councillor of the Elector of Mayence: 'All pains are useless: an accommodation in the Empire is no longer to be hoped for.'

¹ Recess of the Rotenburg Diet of March 28, 1613, contributed by v. Höfler (Ritter, *Politik der Union*, pp. 162-167).

² Gardiner, ii. 162; cf. Wenzelburger, ii. 860.

CHAPTER VIII

DIET AT RATISBON, 1613

THE Diet was summoned for April 24, but was not opened till August. As the Emperor, on the 4th of this month, approached the town of Ratisbon, the notables, who had already arrived, came forward to meet him 'with great pomp and with about 1,000 caparisoned horses.' Matthias had brought with him an immense retinue and more than 800 horses, and his progress 'compared with that of the Estates was as the sun in comparison to the moon.' He wore a white garment, threaded with gold and set with precious stones; a costly white hat with a plume of hern-feathers, a mantle of orange-coloured velvet lined with white gold-threaded stuff; the saddle and bridle of his horse were embroidered with pearls and precious stones. The Empress drove in a gilt chariot, on which stood a silver lion with a gilt crown; the coachmen were also arrayed in gold cloth. Behind one of the two trumpeters, who rode in advance, blowing his instrument, there figured a monkey dressed in red.

'Certain shrewd observers were heard to remark that all the outward ostentation of this spectacle, to anyone not ignorant of the real condition of affairs in the Holy Empire, was nothing but apish foolery.'

'The ghastly splendour of the imperial get-up' did

not at any rate correspond with 'the crushing need of money which weighed down his Majesty.'¹ 'It was only with difficulty,' wrote Klesl from Ratisbon to the president of the court councillor of war, von Mollart, that the Emperor had been able to obtain a loan from the Spanish ambassador and from a banker to defray the costs of his sojourn. 'It is certain that here in the Empire we have not a farthing of income; we do nothing but consume.' 'We negotiate with states, with republics, with princes, spiritual and temporal, but nobody will take pity on us; all the people are disposed of, all offices and revenues mortgaged and prescribed. The maintenance of the imperial court involves immense outlays. What are we to do? Nobody will lend to us, nobody is in our debt, and we ourselves have literally nothing.' 'The Emperor gives away and mortgages, down to his very shirt, whatever is mortgageable; the poor unpaid retinue of the court of Prague is perishing for want and cannot get enough blood.'²

The imperial horse-guards and halberdiers were in fact reduced—so the Brandenburg ambassador, Abraham von Dohna, reported on September 1—'to going to the butchers and catching the blood of the slaughtered cattle to cook for their food; so that the misery of the great gentlemen was often greater than that of the commoner people.'³

On August 13, at the opening of the Diet, the proceedings were initiated by a Lutheran prince, the Landgrave Louis of Hesse-Darmstadt. In the name

¹ Despatch of the Elector of Mayence's councillor, Charles Henry Feyerabend, of August 13, 1613. Description in Khevenhiller, viii. 550-556. See Gumpelzhaimer, ii. 1051 to 1052. Senkenberg, xxiii. 565-567.

² In Hammer, iii.; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 68-69.

³ Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 138, note 3.

of the Emperor he delivered a short address to the assembly, begging them 'to give an attentive hearing and careful consideration to the Emperor's proposal.'¹

This proposal related to the dissolution of the separate alliances in the Empire, the Union and the League, and the defence of the Empire against the attacks of the Turks. If those 'dangerous confederacies and counter-confederacies' were not opposed in good time, it was urged, they would result in the final overthrow of the Religious and the Public Peace,' and then 'all sorts of hostile elements, which had been engendered by the surrounding insurrections and wars, and which had threatened the Empire for many years past, would as it were be dragged into the Empire and would lead to its total ruin.' Instead of all these different leagues, unity should be restored among the Estates, and in view of this 'the first thing to be done was to consider how the disorganised judicial system and the Imperial Chamber might be restored to efficiency.'² For the defence of Transylvania and the Hungarian frontiers the Estates demanded such exorbitant aid that the Lübeck ambassador wrote: 'It is a more unreasonable and extravagant exaction than has ever been made by any Emperor; it would amount in all to over twenty-six millions of imperial thalers.'³ As

¹ Senkenberg, xxiii. 570.

² Original printed version of the proposal in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 95, 88; see Senkenberg, xxiii. 571; Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 125. In consequence of the chaos in the judicial system the number of law-suits in which revision was solicited had risen in 1612 to over four hundred, 'so that,' as Zachariah Geizkoffer wrote in a memorandum for the Emperor, 'for each and all judicial decisions, even in fiscal cases, revision is resorted to by the defendants in order to escape from the verdict' (in Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 778).

³ Brockes, ii. 275, note 8.

a matter of fact the danger threatened by the Turks was so great that it justified such a demand.¹

‘A highly significant symptom’ for the Diet at the very outset was the fact that none of the allied princes came in person. As late as February they had given reassuring promises to the Emperor, who, through an ambassador, Gundakar von Polheim, had begged for their personal attendance at the transactions; but at the meeting of the Union at Rotenburg it had been afterwards decided that none of them should appear at Ratisbon.² ‘The Emperor has put down the question of “Justice” first in order,’ wrote Klesl on August 31 to the Margrave of Ansbach, but the whole of the Union is keeping away, and plays with trifles, or is seeking to create misunderstandings. Very different tales were told to his Majesty at Frankfort, and all sorts of assurances sent through Herr von Polheim, as his Majesty daily and hourly announces with great feeling.’³

The delegates of the allies considered it their first duty to incite the whole body of Protestants to form separate leagues in the Palatine quarter, and to embark on a general movement according to the resolutions formed at Rotenburg. In the case of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt their efforts were fruitless; they succeeded, however, in winning over Mecklenburg, Lauenburg, Brunswick-Lüneburg, Pomerania-Stettin, the counts of Wetterau, and a number of towns not belonging to the Union: Lübeck, Ratisbon, Lindau, and others. The allies again took the name of ‘corresponding Estates.’

¹ Respecting the Turkish danger, see Klopp, i. 154 ff.

² Sattler, vi. 72.

³ Ritter, *Politik der Union*, pp. 127, 133, note 3.

Owing to them the Diet came to a standstill as early as August 17, just when the deliberations on the imperial proposals were to have begun. On this day, namely, they made the announcement that 'in a few days they should hand in their "grievances," and that, until the Emperor had given his decision on this matter, they would not take part in any transactions.' At the same time they did not deny that 'this sort of secession might appear rather strange and unmannerly to some people.'¹

In a document of August 19, among other grievances which the Emperor ought at once to remove, they demanded that 'The imperial Aulic Council should not henceforth lay claim to any jurisdiction except in the matter of refusing or granting imperial fiefs, and in cases of violation of the public peace; appointments to the Imperial Chamber must be made according to their wishes, the Protestant administrators of bishoprics must be granted seats and votes at the Diets, and the town of Donauwörth must be restored to its former freedom.'² 'Grievances' of this sort were forsooth to be redressed by the Emperor, demands of this sort to be granted without regard to the majority of votes—hence all constitutional methods set at defiance.

In accordance with a list drawn up, the validity of a majority of votes was rejected in the following cases. First in matters of religion and conscience, then with regard to the granting of subsidies, to affairs

¹ 'Protokoll, was der Korrespondierenden Deputation bei Pfalz-Neuburg der Korrespondenz-Sachen halber gehandelt den 1, 10 September,' in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 95, 140-142.

² *Die Beschwerden der Korrespondierenden* in Senkenberg; *Sammlung*, ii. 153 to 177; Goldast, *Polit. Reichshündel*, pp. 1050-1055; Londorp, *Acta publ.* pp. 119-123. See Ritter, *Politik*, p. 129.

of the Imperial Chamber, to the exemptions, privileges, and immunities of the Estates, to all which concerned the Religious Peace and cognate subjects, as also to questions relating to the well-being and tranquillity of the common Fatherland. Further, it was settled that in the contentions between the Catholics and the evangelicals nothing must be decided by a majority ; also in questions of violation of justice, of freed tribunals, of the constitutions of the Empire, of the execution of the ban, and of the Golden Bull ; also with regard to dynastic contracts, to negotiations, alliances and so forth.¹

Demands of this nature were a direct mockery of every constitutional principle. With a party which put forward such pretensions, no transactions at a Diet could lead to any kind of goal.²

While the Emperor became engaged in an exchange of letters with the corresponding princes, the Catholic Estates on their part were preparing a petition of grievances which they presented on September 10. In view of the general distress, they said, they would gladly have spared the Emperor the pain of their special complaints. But the ambassadors of some of the Estates, who had assumed the appellation—strangely unfamiliar in the Empire—of ‘corresponding princes,’ had come forward with alleged grievances, and had declared that, unless these grievances were redressed, they would not take part in any of the proceedings of the Diet. The Catholic Estates had resolved, therefore, that they too would make known their grievances,

¹ In Londorp, *Acta publ.* i. 138.

² Karl August Müller, *Forschungen*, iii. XXXV., puts the question whether ‘a conflict against such a faction was a religious conflict?’

without, however, thereby hindering the business of the Diet: they begged that the Emperor, at his convenience, would take into consideration the removal of these grievances. In the most incisive language the Catholic Estates reiterated all that they had already said at former Diets against the proceedings of the 'new sects.'¹ 'If it could be settled,' they urged, 'that only the old Catholic religion and the religion of the Augsburg Confessionists were to be maintained in the Holy Empire, it would be possible for both sides to come to a better and more friendly understanding with each other;' but the new sectaries called in question the whole contents of the Religious Peace. The amount of reviling and calumniating in which they indulged from their pulpits was known to everyone: the Pope, who in the Hungarian wars and in other circumstances had certainly deserved better both from them and from the Empire, was denounced by them in the most disgraceful manner; the Catholic princes were shamelessly insulted by everyone of their party in caricatures and scurrilous lampoons, and the Estates of the Augsburg Confession, who strove to live in peace and amity with the Catholics, were overwhelmed with scoffing, names of opprobrium, and calumnies. The Protestants were trying to close up every avenue of justice to the Catholics, the jurisdiction of the Imperial Chamber was arrested, and every effort was being made to abolish also the supreme imperial jurisdiction, 'and in this way to deprive the Catholics of all means both of recovering what had been wrested from them and of continuing in quiet possession of the small remnant left to them.' Not only did the

¹ See above, pp. 207-209.

Protestants openly refuse to give up the numerous important archbishoprics and bishoprics, lands and people of which, in defiance of the Religious Peace, they had despoiled the Catholics, but they persisted from year to year in making further seizures, and partly by cunning, partly by force, in appropriating more and more of the Church possessions ; cases in point were known to everybody. After bringing forward a number of other complaints, the Estates begged the Emperor that he would see to it that henceforth they should be protected from oppression by the decrees of the Empire and by the Religious and Profane Peace, and that they should no longer be exposed like outlaws to the tender mercies of their opponents.¹

In the Imperial Council Klesl and the Imperial Vice-Chancellor, Hans Ludwig von Ulm, stood hostilely and bitterly opposed to each other. While the former still maintained friendly intercourse with the corresponding princes, and wanted 'to tack and to make compromises,' the Vice-Chancellor had assumed a repellent attitude towards them. To their petition of grievances the Emperor had answered : ' On the Catholic side also grievances had been handed in ; both petitions should be examined into, and the business of redress should be attended to with the other affairs of the Diet ;' he entertained fatherly and earnest hopes that the corresponding princes would not in future shut themselves out from participation in the deliberations. Thereupon the princes handed in a counter-statement through the Palatine ambassadors, declaring that they abided by their former pronouncement. Ulm addressed to them

¹ ' Die Beschwerden der Katholischen Stände,' in Londorp, *Acta publ.* i. 133-137 ; Goldast, *Politische Reichshündel*, pp. 1055-1059.

the question, 'From whom had they received orders to present this document?' and to their answer, 'that they had received orders from their committents,' came the retort: 'What committents? What sort of a word is that? Is it an English or a Dutch word?' Ulm, it appeared, was uninformed as to the secret alliances of the Estates with England and with the States-General.¹ In speaking to some of his friends at the Ratisbon Council, Ulm expressed himself very strongly against the corresponding princes. The Emperor, he said, had come into the Empire with the best intentions in order to re-establish the course of the law, to enforce and administer impartially the terms of the Religious Peace and the Public Peace, and to do away with all leagues, unions, and factions. But the corresponding princes had not even been willing to join in deliberation over the Emperor's proposals until the grievances they had petitioned against had been redressed according to their own wishes. Besides which, they wanted to abolish the validity of a majority of votes, and they would not allow the head of the Empire any right of decision in the matter. The Emperor was all the more distressed as he had in good faith promised and determined to do his utmost at this Diet to put straight the misunderstandings that had arisen, and to restore the town of Donauwörth, by which the other towns possibly set great store, to its former position. The Catholic Estates had also handed in their grievances—much greater ones indeed—but had been recommended to be patient. To settle the matter in advance entirely according to the will of one party was an impossibility. 'In addition to this it seems very strange and is very

¹ Sattler, vi. 74.

distressing to his Majesty that the Ratisboners, for the time being directors in the council of the Estates, besides some other imperial cities, should unite themselves with those who have hitherto hindered his Majesty and the common interest in the manner above stated. If the towns wish to correspond, why do they not rather correspond with their head, the Emperor, and with Saxony, Brunswick, Hesse-Darmstadt and others here present who, with the Emperor, desire that the Religious and the Public Peace should be maintained? Ratisbon and other towns have little reason to make themselves dependent on those who are seeking to overturn the existing constitution and to organise everything according to their own will and liking, and who would prefer to drag the Emperor away ignominiously without his having accomplished anything, and to let everything in the dear Fatherland go to ruin, and even fall a prey to the hereditary enemy. The towns ought not to let themselves be so taken in by those who come into the Empire boasting of immense foreign succour, and who even, in order to strike greater terror, threaten the Emperor to his very face with France, England, and the States-General. For we have trustworthy information that not all the sovereigns and lands they hold over our heads are quite so much at their beck and call as they make out. And if ever, contrary to our better hopes, things should come to the worst, the Emperor will certainly not be wanting either in heart or in resolution, still less in such a case will he lack for help, both within and without the Empire, from those who, like his Majesty, would stake everything to defend the Religious and the Public Peace, as well as other statutes of the Empire, and the imperial honour, dignity, and jurisdic-

tion. Besides the above-named foreign powers, namely, France, England, and the States-General, the allies of the Emperor in Spain, in the Netherlands, in Italy, Poland and Denmark, irrespective of religion, are burning to invade our beloved Fatherland, and not without good reason perhaps. Such a contingency, however, ought never to be suffered by right-minded German men and princes, still less should they be the ones to give the provocative cause. They might confidently believe, he said, that neither he nor others would counsel or help the Emperor to adopt such a policy, but in their advice to his Majesty, as also in their proceedings at this imperial assembly, they should strive, as far as was humanly possible, that a good understanding should be restored, and sacred peace be maintained as long as possible. On the other hand, however, they and others who had separated themselves ought to come to a better mind; they ought to return to take their part in the usual deliberations and help to make a start with this laudable and most necessary work. By this means the dear Fatherland would long be preserved both from inward and outward danger.’¹

This ‘*Ermahnung*’ (admonition) of the Vice-Chancellor, which was widely circulated, incited the corresponding princes to address to the Emperor a very trenchant document, in which they insisted on their loyalty and implored the Emperor not to suffer them any longer to be assailed with such undeserved and heavy threatenings. Otherwise they should be justified

¹ ‘*Ermanung an die Stat Regensburg*, August 20, 30, 1613,’ in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 96^a, 101–104; cf. the report from a Ratisbon chronicle in Gumpelzhaimer, ii. 1056–1558.

in demanding that the Emperor would remove from among the councillors who advised him 'respecting matters and transactions affecting themselves and their well-being, persons so ill affected towards them as the Vice-Chancellor Ulm.'¹

Meantime, while at the Diet 'everything had fallen into great confusion,'² the Turks had begun their warlike undertakings with an army of 80,000 men, and Bethlen Gabor had invaded Transylvania with an armed force. In view of these increasing dangers a new way of coming to an understanding with the corresponding princes was attempted at the suggestion of Klesl. It was proposed that all the different matters of complaint should be discussed and settled, not by the regular procedure of the Diet, but by independent agreement among the Electors, and by an impartially constituted committee of the remaining Estates. Archduke Maximilian, the brother of the Emperor, was proposed as intermediary between the two parties, and he came to Ratisbon at the end of September. But the transactions led to no result.³ 'We stood opposite each other,' wrote the Brandenburg ambassador von Dohna on October 10, 'like two rams which would yield to nobody.'⁴

¹ In the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 96^b, 106–109 (from September 25 to October 5, 1613).

² See Klesl's letter of September 27, 1613, in Hammer, iii. ; *Urkundenbd.* p. 70.

³ Fuller details in Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 139 ff.

⁴ Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 146, note 1. Respecting the 'fanatical Calvinist,' Abraham von Dohna, see the monograph of A. Chroust, *Abraham v. Dohna, Sein Leben und sein Gedicht auf den Reichstag von 1613* (Munich, 1896). See also *Zeitschr. für Kulturgesch.* ii. 410 ff., and Zöckhaur in the *Histor. Jahrb.* 1896, p. 629 ; the latter rightly remarks with regard to the '*Historische reimen von dem ungereimten Reichstag anno*

When Klesl realised that ‘nothing was to be achieved with the corresponding princes against the Turks,’ he veered round a little to the Catholics, who, together with some of the Lutheran Estates, had pronounced themselves willing to pay down thirty Roman months to the Emperor; the demands of the corresponding princes no longer found an advocate in Klesl.¹

Since ‘nothing was to be expected from the corresponding princes,’ the Emperor, on October 15, made an attempt to gain the towns at any rate. He had them requested through Klesl and other privy councillors to agree to the aids promised by the ‘obedient Estates.’² He begged that they would not desert him at a time when the inward and outward needs of the Fatherland had grown greater than ever before. He was exerting himself in good faith, and trying all possible ways and means to bring about a real redress of the grievances on both sides; but the suspension of justice and the curtailment of the imperial jurisdiction he could not sanction; the town of Donauwörth, as he had repeatedly given assurance through his brother Maximilian, ‘should be restored according to law, and in such a manner that nobody again would have reason to complain on that score.’ ‘It is a question now,’ said Klesl, ‘not of

1613,’ published by Chroust, that the authorship of Abraham is not established with complete certainty.

¹ Despatch of Charles Henry Feyerabend, October 13, 1613. ‘The Catholic Estates,’ wrote Klesl to a friend, ‘would hear nothing of accommodation, and stood firmly to their principles, but they are doing what they can for the Emperor. The other Estates also abide by their claims, but they make the Emperor suffer for it, and want to punish him when he is in no way guilty. Both parties boast of their loyalty and devotion to the Emperor, but the Catholics show their love in works and words, the Protestants only in intentions’ (Schmidt, *Neuere Gesch.* vii. 18–19).

² Ritter, *Politik der Union*, p. 169.

religion or of anything that requires much deliberation or delicacy, but simply of whether the towns will leave the Emperor, their supreme head, in the lurch, in his direst need and expose him to destruction, and allow the whole of Christendom to be ruined and to fall a prey to the Turks, who will know well how to profit by an opportunity like this.’¹ All endeavours were fruitless. On the following day the corresponding princes handed in a resolution to the effect that ‘prior to their demands being granted they could not agree to anything; in particular, they said, the well-known processes of execution must be stayed, because otherwise necessary commercial transactions would be impeded, and internecine bloodshed would result in the Empire. Their motives were altogether good, and aiming at peace, tranquillity, and security, and it would be very distressing to them if these intentions should bring on themselves the malediction of posterity.’²

On October 19 the whole body of corresponding princes gave in their ultimatum, in which, among other things, they insisted that ‘The right of the majority claimed by their opponents was “the chief and the heaviest grievance;” their lords and masters would never humble themselves under such a yoke; they would rather throw land and people and all that was dear to them to the winds. They could not see their way to joining in any further transactions, and they had now resolved to go back home and report everything to their chiefs, whose only desire was to maintain peace

¹ The transactions with the towns in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 96^a, 1.

² The resolution of the towns, in Senkenberg (*Sammlung*, ii. 254–258).

and tranquillity in the Empire and to establish a good understanding.'

As before, at the dissolution of the Diet of 1608, so toonow, they reproached the Catholic Estates with being the cause of 'all the vexation that had arisen.' In case by any chance, they added, a Recess should be drawn up by these Estates and published as an imperial Recess, they herewith recorded their strong protest against it, and declared that they should not consider themselves bound by it.¹

On October 22 the imperial Recess was completed, and a fresh Diet was summoned at Ratisbon for May 1 of the following year. Thirty Roman months, to be paid within two years, were voted to the Emperor as an immediate Turkish subsidy. Klesl thought 'thus to have achieved something great.' 'We have obtained a substantial triumph,' he wrote to the president of the war council, 'and we have accomplished the Recess

¹ In Senkenberg, *Samml.* ii. 259-276. 'The allies or corresponding princes, who, as spokesmen on behalf of the Protestant section of the Empire, attempted to obstruct the progress—or rather, indeed, the commencement—of the Diet, were only,' says Charles Adolphus Menzel, iii. 229-230, 'representatives of the Palatine Calvinistic party, and not of the whole Protestant part of the Empire, for the electorate of Saxony, together with the princes of the Ernestine line, and Darmstadt—the most zealous of the Lutherans, that is—were ranged with the Catholics on the Emperor's side. That the mode of procedure of the corresponding princes and their opposition to decision by the majority was irreconcilable with the principles of the common state and popular rights, is a matter beyond doubt.' 'History owes it to truth to recognise that the demands which the corresponding princes supported with the name of "religious grievances of the evangelicals" were not made by the old Protestant Estates in the interest of their faith and their Church reform, but solely by the Palatine Calvinist party as the outcome of the political intrigues they were carrying on in connection with foreign powers, and that books of history, both foreign and native, wrongly describe the two parties at this Diet under the names of "Catholics" and "Protestants." What was the actual object of these machinations was soon to come to the full light of day.'

with honour.’¹ The papal nuncio, who was present at the Diet, praised Klesl’s ‘steadfastness and zeal:’ he recommended that the Pope should send him an appreciative Breve.²

‘Klesl has told me,’ said Feyerabend on October 24, ‘that he had long been manœuvring with the corre-

¹ Hammer, iii. ; *Urkundenbd.* p. 73.

² Kerschbaumer, p. 195. In February 1614 a Breve of this nature was issued (Kerschbaumer, p. 217, note 3); on August 10 and September 7, 1613, the Cardinal and Secretary of State Borghese had written to Cardinal Madruzzi, charging him to instruct Bishop Klesl in the name of the Pope that ‘In matters of religion he must proceed with all fidelity and openness, and that he must never countenance evil with a view to bringing about good; questions and matters of the faith had nothing to do with “State reasons.”’ All the concessions hitherto made to the Protestants had been most detrimental to the Church; care must therefore be taken not to ‘occasion still greater disaster by fresh concessions.’ Personal considerations were also brought to bear on Klesl. Whereas he had for years been pressing on the Emperor his advancement to the dignity of ‘Crown-cardinal,’ it was signified to him that his mode of action ‘*potrebbe osttar molto alla sua pretensione nel Cardinalato*’ (Kerschbaumer, pp. 213–215). Klesl’s change of attitude at Ratisbon may be connected with this advice given to him. On September 1, 1614, he wrote to Borghese that he was quite ready to obey the Pope’s will in everything, for such obedience was the safest course for him (Kerschbaumer, p. 216, note 1). The letters which he wrote after the Pope had invested him with the purple are very significant. ‘Early this morning,’ he wrote to the Emperor on April 20, 1616, ‘the courier from Rome delivered to me letters from Cardinal Borghese and many other cardinals, congratulating me on the fact that *their lord* had proclaimed me Cardinal on April 10. God knows that it does not delight me; but in order to *fall in with* your Majesty’s wishes, and to refute the calumnies of wicked people, this thing must be, for a Roman Emperor cannot confer a greater temporal favour on an ecclesiastic than this. To me your Majesty’s favour, affection, and confidence are worth far more than the papacy itself’ (Hammer, iii. ; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 397–398). His language had a different ring on April 27 in a letter to Archduke Maximilian of Tyrol: ‘His Holiness the Pope has unexpectedly raised me, unworthy and undeserving as I am, to the very high dignity of the Cardinalate’ (Khevenhiller, viii. 894). According to a letter to the Bishop of Spiers on May 11, it was not the Emperor, but ‘the righteous God,’ who was the cause of his elevation. ‘How just and righteous is God, who has been pleased to vindicate me, the slandered one, by the public testimony of the whole Church’ (Kerschbaumer, p. 220).

sponding princes, and had tried to move the Emperor to various concessions, but he had realised that they would not budge from any of their pretensions, but, on the contrary, were determined to bring the Emperor completely under their dominion; with the Lutherans he intended to remain on good terms, but with the Calvinists there was nothing to be done, for they were backed up by foreign troops and potentates.' Later on also, Klesl frequently expressed himself in letters in no gentle terms concerning the 'faction of the corresponding princes.' To an opponent of theirs, the Lutheran Landgrave Louis of Hesse-Darmstadt, he wrote: 'The Catholics are robbed of what is their own, and that which is apportioned to them by legal judgment does not come into their possession, but is kept back from them by force. No fair and just sentence is put into execution. Every verdict that does not please the corresponding princes, however justly it may have been given, is regarded by them with suspicion. They set their dogs at the law and call that evangelical. Not to contribute help against the Turks, to drive so many beautiful Christian lands and so many Christian people down the throats of the Turks; to be ready to shed one another's blood and allow the Turk free play, except their own will be done: is that, too, to be called evangelical? I cannot understand it: formerly this would have been considered blindness.' ¹

'The corresponding princes,' Feyerabend said in his letter of October 24, 'now utterly detest Klesl; they curse him as a traitor.' Klesl was reported to have said—so the Brandenburg ambassador, Abraham von Dohna, had written ten days earlier—that he had

¹ June 14, 1614, in Hammer, iii. ; *Urkundenbd.* No. 428, p. 100.

prevailed on the loyal Estates to contribute such and such a sum to the Emperor, and that he meant to achieve still greater results; the day would yet come when the corresponding princes would be glad to be taken into favour. 'God will recompense the false priest for his treachery in dealing at Frankfort that they might safely make large promises to the heretics, for it was not necessary to fulfil them. And he has been as good as his word. Let him see to it that as from a baker he grew into a prince, so from a bishopric he does not pass to the gallows.'¹

Shortly after, however, Klesl again took up the cause of the corresponding princes.

'The affair that began with all the great outward splendour of the Emperor's entry has now come to a melancholy end, and the heat of both parties has grown all the more intense, and, unless God Almighty interposes miraculously, war must be close at the door.' In the course of a conversation Philip Hainhofer of Augsburg, the Elector of Treves, expressed his grief at the dissolution of the Diet and the existence of so many 'factions: ' 'Unionists, Leaguists, Neutralists, Componists, Cæsarites, Protestants, Correspondents.' 'No body can live without a head,' said the Bishop of Bamberg.²

'Equipped with promises only,' the Emperor returned to his hereditary dominions, and on November 10, 1613, described the situation of affairs to the Archduke Ferdinand. He was at the end, he wrote, of all auxiliary means for maintaining intact the dominion of his House. So long as he was alive, the building would at least

¹ Ritter, *Politik der Union*, pp. 146, note 2, 169.

² Häutle, *Phil. Hainhofer*, pp. 193, 196, 197.

hold together, but after his death everything would become disjointed, and the noble acquisition of the ancestors would not be inherited by the descendants. The Estates of Upper and Lower Austria, whom he had hoped to keep back from open insurrection by making the utmost possible concessions to them, were now watching their opportunity to free themselves from his dominion, and to welcome a foreign prince as territorial sovereign : for this purpose they had allied themselves with the Union and with Hungary. In Hungary he was completely powerless. Thurzo did just as he liked there, and did not concern himself about royal commands and interdicts. ‘ When it is a question of Hungary supporting me against the Turks, nobody stirs ; but if the Prince of Transylvania solicits help from them, the tocsin is rung all over the land. Their scheme is to depose our House ; the Palatine himself spoke approvingly on the subject at a social gathering. He cannot endure any Germans in the fortresses, he usurps kingly power at every turn, entices the counties and the nobles to his side, and altogether is intent only on preparing means whereby either he himself, or his successors in the Palatinate, shall wrest the crown from us. What else remains for us to do but to work day and night to meet the danger ? As for Bohemia, I cannot summon any provincial assembly there unless I am prepared to recognise the confederations of the Estates, and if I do not summon a provincial Diet I cannot reckon on any subsidies from this country. In Silesia the Margrave of Jägerndorf is carrying on disgraceful intrigues against our House. In Moravia the conditions are the same as in Hungary. The governor-general, Karl von Zierotin, rules in the land as though

he were the sovereign, and contracts alliances with foreign nations where and as he pleases.’¹ Three days before, Klesl had written to the president of the War Council, von Mollart, ‘The Calvinists are endeavouring to obtain the sovereignty over us by force.’²

Affairs took a specially ominous turn in Bohemia. While King James I. of England was hoping for the Bohemian crown for his son-in-law, Frederic V. of the Palatinate,³ Count Heinrich Matthias von Thurn, the prime originator of the later insurrection, in conjunction with the Counts Andreas Schlick and Wenzel Kinsky, caused the Elector of Saxony to be informed, in 1614, that the party hostile to the government had resolved on deposing the Habsburgers, and intended to offer the crown to the Elector. These noblemen, a Saxon confidential agent sent word to Dresden, were only the spokesmen of the sentiment in which all the rest of their party concurred. At an assembly of a considerable portion of the nobles, all present had unreservedly expressed their disaffection towards the Habsburg princely House, and their desire for a Saxon ruler.⁴ At the provincial Diet of 1614, the Bohemians, wrote Francis Christopher Khevenhiller, ‘had clearly enough revealed their rebellious intentions.’⁵

Now that the Emperor ‘stood weaponless and resourceless in face of all these conspiracies, every vestige of his reputation vanished by degrees, and in the Empire his Majesty was regarded as no more than a figure-

¹ Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, i. 79-80; Hurter, vii. 14-16.

² Hammer, iii.; *Urkundenbd.* p. 77.

³ See above, p. 517.

⁴ Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, i. 93-94. See Müller, *Forschungen*, iii. 205-206; Chlumecky, i. 830.

⁵ Wolf, *Bilder*, i. 156.

head,' and 'the commissioners and ambassadors deputed by him' were 'treated abominably.'¹ This was the case even in the loyal town of Frankfort-on-the-Main. At the beginning of January 1614, there appeared there 'the imperial ambassador,' Laurentius Rüdinger, charged to solicit the council for 'an obliging and willing loan of 150,000 florins.' As Frankfort had been fixed upon as the depot of the thirty Roman months promised at Ratisbon, the council would be able to get back into their hands the required sum out of the incoming moneys, or from 'other future imperial aids,' and 'so by degrees pay itself back.' Rüdinger addressed several highly moving speeches to the members of the council, who, he said, were like unto 'his Majesty's first-born children,' and therefore would surely not desert him in his dire necessity. But the councillors' ears were deaf. Then Rüdinger brought the sum down to 80,000 florins, then to 60,000, or even lower, and begged that they would call on the burghers for contributions: some of these had already offered to give ten, twenty, thirty, or forty florins. When all oratorical art proved fruitless, the imperial envoy asked that at least some five or six hundred florins might be advanced him on credit, as otherwise he would not be able to continue his journey. But this request also was not granted. 'It was no small matter of surprise to them,' the council informed the envoy, that though his petition had been three times rejected, he still continued his stay at Frankfort. What he had spent in the hostel from January 3 to 11 should be paid back to him; but nothing more. 'Then I shall be obliged,' Rüdinger replied, 'to send a special

¹ *Ein kurzes anmuthliches Gespräch*, p. 7.

courier to his Majesty to inform him of the state of things; for no one, I presume, will command me to sell my horses to pay mine host: if I've a brass farthing about me, may the D—— fetch me, etc. Why, it's the custom all the world over to make an ambassador at least free of his hotel bill, and it is indeed a wonder to me that you will not do even this much to please his Imperial Majesty.' The council used their authority to turn the ambassador out of the town.¹ At Lübeck an imperial ambassador who asked for a loan was at once sent away, without further demur, by the burgo-master Brockes, who said to him: 'They forsake us in our need; but when they want money, they know well how to find us out.' 'He could not,' writes Brockes, 'say much in answer to this,' and he promised to refer the matter to his Majesty.²

'It was not only by paying interest of thirty or forty per cent.,' wrote Klesl in 1615, that the imperial Treasury could obtain any loans, and 'the penury of the head of the Empire, which made all government in the Empire impossible, was as distressing as the confusion in the finances.' Klesl gave the Emperor a terrible account of the state of things, in order, he said, 'that your Majesty may see as in a mirror your own misery and ruin, whereby you must inevitably lose all your authority and renown and all your greatness.'

¹ A more detailed account in the Frankfort Archives, *Kaiserschreiben*, 18, fol. 5-46. The Council called on the host, with whom Rüdinger and six other people had lodged, for an exact account. For daily consumption the following items, for instance, were put down: For the night drink, twenty-six measures of wine; for the afternoon drink, sixteen measures of wine. 'A right merry instance,' said Doctor Karl Adelman, 'of possessing great thirst when possessing no money.'

² Brockes, ii. 286-287.

The bad management of the Treasury, he said, was indescribable. ‘All orators and foreign ambassadors must see that your Majesty and your Majesty’s officers have not enough bread to eat, that the horses are dying for want of food, that the grooms go about begging, the coachmen are dressed like waggon-drivers, the saddles, bridles, bits and trappings are fastened with rope and string such as the peasants use. No artisans’ children are such ragged figures as the boys of noblemen ; they run about wild and ungovernable, and are entirely without discipline. It is the same with the imperial lackeys ; those of the ordinary nobles are better dressed and provided for than those of your Majesty.’ ‘It is lamentable that your Majesty can barely obtain from the Treasury 1,000 florins to clothe your own body, and occasionally to tip a valet or a stoker with fifty florins : this is indeed beggary beyond all conception for one of such august, imperial blood.’ ‘What is dearer to the Roman Emperor’s heart than that justice should be well administered ? But, through all the long years that the Empire has existed, the Aulic Council has never been so meagrely filled ; no one indeed cares to belong to it, for nobody is paid or treated in a proper manner. Embassies which might secure justice, authority, and friendship for a Roman Emperor, and bring about peace and good order, can no longer be despatched ; it is with difficulty even that a courier, a postman, or a messenger can be paid ;’ all credit has disappeared. ‘It is a lamentable thing that, under the rule of your Majesty, everything should have gone to rack and ruin owing to the state of the Treasury.’ ‘The government councillors also, and the war councillors, the secretaries

and officers, even the privy councillors, are not paid, so that no competent man is either willing or able to serve the Emperor any longer. Any government must collapse under such conditions.’¹

¹ ‘Klesls Memorial und Vortrag nebst Vorschlägen zur Reform vom Jahre 1615,’ in Hammer, iii. ; *Urkundenbd.* No. 569-570, pp. 318-337.

CHAPTER IX

DISTURBANCES AND RISINGS IN THE YEARS 1614-1616—
THE STATES-GENERAL 'CHIEF RULERS IN THE
EMPIRE'

WHILE the Emperor had become completely powerless in his hereditary dominions, flames broke out in many parts of the Empire, which 'speedily kindled a great and general war conflagration.'

In the Jülich-Cleves lands 'the Possessioners,' the Princes of Kurbrandenburg and Pfalz-Neuburg, had been in continuous strife with one another since 1613. At the court of Neuburg hope had been cherished that the disagreements might be settled by a marriage between the Count Palatine Wolfgang Wilhelm and a daughter of the Elector John Sigismund. The latter, so it was planned, was then to declare himself ready to transfer the Brandenburg claims to those lands to his daughter. This hope was disappointed. Wolfgang Wilhelm, in November 1613, contracted a marriage with Magdalena, a sister of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, having several months before secretly adopted the Catholic faith. The Elector of Brandenburg, in the same year, went over to Calvinism.¹

At Düsseldorf, where the Count Palatine went with his bride, he experienced all sorts of unpleasantness from the Brandenburgers. When the Countess Palatine

¹ See above, p. 302 ff.

attended the Catholic divine service, shots were fired through the windows of the church.¹ Archbishop Ferdinand of Cologne wrote to his brother Maximilian on January 27, 1614, 'I am informed by my people, whom I gave my sister as escort, that large factions have already formed themselves, and that even the servants in the castle are divided into parties, one of which shouts "Long live Brandenburg" and the other "Long live Neuburg," and that meanwhile they throw their torches at one another. This is no good omen.' The bodyguards of both the princes, Wolfgang Wilhelm and Georg Wilhelm von Brandenburg, frequently crossed swords with one another.²

Maximilian and Ferdinand admonished their brother-in-law to use moderation, and warned him against measures of violence, telling him that he could place little reliance on the support of the Catholic powers. In a letter of Ferdinand to his brother we read as follows: 'Your Excellency's opinion that the Count Palatine should be more moderate in his proceedings coincides entirely with the advice which I have always given him, both by word and by letter. If there is a man on earth who abhors the tumult of war, it is myself; and I have had to pay my neighbours pretty dearly for my apprenticeship in this respect. But, between ourselves, people will not always follow good advice.' The Count Palatine, he said, had people about him who recommended resort to force because 'every man of the Catholics would and must stand by him and support him.' 'When, however, I consider how Spain has hitherto neglected her own affairs, that

¹ Schreiber, *Maximilian*, p. 170.

² Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 551, note.

France is more concerned about herself than about others, that the Pope is so timorous and so loth to spend money, that the zeal evinced by the Catholics of Germany in all our affairs is of a nature well calculated to freeze us to death, I cannot see how we are to extricate ourselves from this labyrinth, especially as the initiative must proceed from the Count Palatine.’¹

‘The initiative’ was taken by the Brandenburgers. During an absence of Wolfgang Wilhelm they attempted, on March 27, 1614, to take possession of the town of Düsseldorf, and on the failure of this plan the Brandenburg general of the fortress of Jülich summoned the Dutch into the land in order to get rid of the Neuburg troops which occupied the garrison with the Brandenburg troops. The Dutch took possession of the fortress, and George William transferred his court to Cleves, and began to enrol troops. The Dutch, said Doctor Matthew Wacker, ‘were solely and entirely to blame for the disastrous state of things in the Empire.’ ‘Although he had always been their friend and had before now admired their valiant deeds, he could not, nevertheless, sufficiently deprecate the madness and presumption which had led them to such repeated attempts against the Emperor and the Empire.’ By taking possession of Jülich they had ‘as it were bidden defiance to his Majesty and to the whole Empire.’²

Whereas the States-General, ‘by the forcible seizure of the fortress of Jülich, had as it were established their authority, and from this vantage ground could take possession of the Rhenish archbishoprics and bishoprics almost without a stroke of the sword,’ it was

¹ Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 556-557.

² *Archivum Unito-Protestantium*, pp. 41-42.

unanimously resolved, at a meeting of the League held at Ingoldstadt in July 1614, to fly to the help of the Count Palatine, and 'to put out the incipient fire in his neighbours' rather than in his own house.' If once the States-General 'should get the Rhine and the adjacent Catholic archbishoprics and abbeys into their power, they would,' it was feared, 'meet with all the less resistance in their attacks on the remaining benefices, and thus they would altogether root out the Catholic religion from Germany, and establish themselves everywhere as arbiters and masters,' and this, indeed, all the more easily, 'since they had the command of Brandenburg, of the corresponding princes, and also of the Crown of England.'¹ The succour which the League guaranteed to the Count Palatine amounted to about 80,000 florins.² This prince had constituted himself sole lord of Düsseldorf, and on May 25 had openly gone over to the Catholic faith.³

After the death of his father, Philip Louis, he entered on the Neuburg succession in August. He granted complete religious freedom to the Lutherans of his land, but ordained at the same time that it should be free to all Catholic subjects to profess their faith unhindered, and to carry on their divine service with Mass, preaching, organisation of Catholic schools,

¹ Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 625-626, 631.

² Wolf, iii. 638, note 2.

³ See Räss, *Konvertiten*, iv. 232 ff.; W. Werther, *Der Übertritt des Pfalzgrafen Wolfgang Wilhelm von Pfalz-Neuburg zum Katholizismus und der Jülichclevesche Erbfolgestreit, 1609-1614* (1874); G. Froschmaier, 'Quellenbeiträge zur Gesch. des Pfalzgrafen Wolfgang Wilhelm von Neuburg' (*Neuburg a. d. D. Gymn. Progr.* 1894) and *Histor. Jahrb.* 15, 894. For an account of the life of the Count Palatine Wolfgang Wilhelm, see also the introduction to the *Aktenstücke zur Geschichte des Pfalzgrafen Wolfgang Wilhelm von Neuburg* (Munich, 1896).

instruction to children, processions and pilgrimages. 'Whereas Otto Henry,' he said to the provincial Estates, 'had been authorised to introduce the Augsburg Confession unconditionally into his land, they could not and dare not deprive him, Otto's successor, of the right to allow his subjects to return to the Catholic Church, to their ancient, sacred, venerable mother.'¹ The Lutheran preachers and all the subjects received orders to abstain thenceforth from their practice of hurling abuse at the Catholics, even at the territorial Prince himself. Above all they were enjoined to desist, both in writing and in the pulpit, from the unwarrantable accusations which they were in the habit of heaping on the Catholics whose doctrines they completely distorted. On the other hand, the Catholics also were bidden to behave with all discretion. A heavy penalty was affixed to the violation of these injunctions.²

The only strong constraint which Wolfgang Wilhelm exercised was a decree enjoining that on the Catholic fast-days no more meat was to be eaten at public banquets and in public houses.³

In a news sheet emanating from Basle, the Protestant public was informed, in 1615, that the Count

¹ Lipowsky, *Gesch. der Landstände von Pfalz-Neuburg*, p. 116; *Verhandl. des histor. Vereins der Oberpfalz*, xx. (1861) 311.

² Philip Louis, the father of the Count Palatine, had proceeded quite differently against the Catholics. In a prayer for Sunday use, which he had introduced against them, they were described as 'idolatrous people,' 'raging wolves,' and so forth. By this means he hoped to fill the people with terror and abhorrence for the religion of their future prince. Cf. Menzel, iii. 235; Zirngiebl, pp. 360-361. Wolfgang Wilhelm's edict, which accorded the same religious rights to the Catholics as to the Protestants, was considered an act of tyrannical proselytism.

³ Meteren, *Niederländische Gesch.*, Fortsetzung II., Buch xxxii. 530.

Palatine had become Catholic because the Jesuits 'had shown him golden hills, predicting to him that he would not only obtain the Jülich territory, but also Bavaria, and possibly the Empire into the bargain.' In a letter to the Pope he had 'declared on oath' that he would eradicate Lutheranism from Germany, that he would be 'a Saul to the Roman Church, would break the Religious Peace, aim at the ruin and downfall of the Protestants,' and restore all bishoprics, abbeys, and convents. Thereupon Paul V. had answered that he would 'use his utmost power' to influence all Catholic princes, and would help him 'with intercession, with money and men, and would bring him to yet higher and greater honour.' 'For,' he wrote, 'by means of your Excellency's help and counsel great profit and advancement may accrue to us, and the final downfall and destruction of the Lutherans may be accomplished.'¹ In another equally veracious news sheet ('New Tidings'), it was asserted, on the strength of 'the most certain information,' that the Jesuits had already had '10,000 or 20,000 poisoned cannon-balls, daggers and so forth prepared, and that with these weapons the Count Palatine was to make war on the heretics quite unexpectedly.' 'For,' in the Consistory at Rome, 'it had been once for all decided and arranged that in a few years all heretics, as had already happened at Aix-la-Chapelle, must be trampled underfoot and barbarously extirpated, and that all their towns must be demolished and swept from the face of the earth, just as Mühlheim

¹ *Neue Zeitung oder bewegliche Ursachen und stattliche Bedencken, durch welche Herzog Wolfgang Wilhelm von Neuburg bewegt worden, zu dem römisch catholischen Glauben zu treten* (Basel, 1615), Bl. A 1^b. The forged letter of the Count Palatine of June 16, 1614, is given word for word. Bl. A 2-A 3; the answer of the Pope on July 4 is given at Bl. A 3-A 4.

on the Rhine had been destroyed with wanton bloodshed that had filled the world with horror.’¹

This ‘barbarous extirpation’ of the Protestants in Aix-la-Chapelle had happened as follows:

Since the Augsburg Diet of 1582 there had been issued, with respect to the town of Aix-la-Chapelle,² numerous imperial injunctions to the effect that ‘the old Catholic order of things was to be restored, and the Protestant councillors who had intruded themselves were to be dismissed.’ After ‘all the orders had been thrown to the wind,’ the Emperor, on June 30, 1598, pronounced the ban over the town,³ and the Protestants saw themselves reduced to submission. They were obliged to renounce the open exercise of their religion, and were excluded from all municipal offices.⁴ It was not till the outbreak of the Jülich-Cleves war of succession, above all after the conquest of the fortress of Jülich, when they had such a strong military force of co-religionists at hand to help them, that they summoned up courage on behalf of the dear evangel. ‘Then’—so an eye-witness narrates—‘they flocked on Sundays, fully armed, to distant places to hear non-Catholic sermons.’ The council, fearing disturbances, repeatedly, but vainly, forbade this ‘flocking out,’ and finally laid on five disobedient citizens the penalty ‘of giving a few pecks of rye to the poor.’ On their refusing to do this the council had them taken into custody with

¹ *Wahrhaftige neue erschreckliche Zeitung über die Giftpraktiken zu Hülff des Pfalzgrafen Wolfgang Wilhelm und die im Werck befindliche Austilgung aller Evangelischen* (‘Terrible true and new tidings concerning the poison-plots in aid of Count Wolfgang Wilhelm, and the extirpation of the evangelicals now in course of execution’) (1615), Bl. A 3-B 2.

² See above, vol. ix., pp. 25-26.

³ Keller, *Gegenreformation*, ii. 194.

⁴ Cf. Haagen, *Gesch. Aachens*, p. 183 ff.

a view to expelling them from the town. Thereupon 200 armed men banded together, proceeded to the council house, and insisted on the liberation of their co-religionists. Not content with this, they called out the town mob, took possession of the city gates, and, on July 6, broke into the church and the college of the Jesuits, smashed up the altars and images, dressed themselves in priestly garments, and held a mock Mass, trampled the Hosts under foot, ransacked everything, tore up the books in the library, wounded one of the Fathers, and dragged eight others to the council house, maltreating them seriously all the way along. 'Here comes the Emperor,' they bellowed out, 'the Archduke Leopold, the Antichrist, the imperial Herod.' Building on the help promised them by the 'Possessioners,' they seized the council house and the arsenal, and had the heavy artillery taken to the market place; they then deposed the Catholic council, and elected a fresh one from among their own numbers; 600 Kurbrandenburg and Pfalz-Neuburg soldiers marched into Aix-la-Chapelle. Negotiations for peace were instituted, delegates from Jülich representing the Protestants, delegates from the electorate of Cologne and Flanders the Catholic side. But it all came to nothing. The Union decided in August, at a meeting at Rotenburg, to espouse the cause of the Protestants. On the other hand, the Emperor ordered the allies, on October 1, under penalty of the ban, to desist from the contemplated 'rebellion,' and both in religious and political matters to restore all to their former condition; the Elector of Cologne and Archduke Albert of the Netherlands were appointed executors of the imperial orders. The Protestants, however, paid no heed to the command. An

imperial notary, who attempted to post it up in Aix-la-Chapelle, was seriously wounded.¹

After the death of Rudolf II. they appealed for help to the Count Palatine John of Zweibrücken as 'temporary vicar of the Empire,' and the latter in May 1612 issued through plenipotentiaries a decree to the effect that 'both parties, Catholics and Protestants, were to enjoy public exercise of their religion, and free access to the public offices which were to be refilled.' Thereupon the Protestants elected a Calvinist and a Lutheran Burgomaster and a Protestant council consisting of seventy-six Calvinists and forty Lutherans. The Catholics in their extremity addressed themselves to the Emperor Matthias, who promised them also to examine most carefully into the rights of the question, and meanwhile despatched plenipotentiaries in December to enjoin on the newly-elected Protestant council, 'under pain of his Majesty's extremest disfavour and penalties,' that 'they were thenceforth no more to molest the Catholic citizens with words or deeds, not to oppress them with fresh, unwonted imposts, and not to hinder or interfere with them in any way in their domestic arrangements, their trades and industries.' In May 1613 the Emperor reiterated the command that 'at the risk of incurring the imperial displeasure and irremissible arbitrary punishment, they must at once, without any parleying or delay, desist from all the

¹ In a verdict of December 3, 1616, pronounced on Martin Schmetz and Andreas Schwarz, it says: 'They treated the official employed to post up the imperial mandate in a manner highly disrespectful to his Imperial Majesty. When he had been already well-nigh mortally wounded by others, they marched him from place to place between weapons and fire-arms, and compelled him to tear down the said imperial mandate' (in Ropp, p. 250).

oppression that was complained of, and all actually penal proceedings.' Finding that all commands were fruitless, Matthias, on February 20, 1614, ratified the sentence of Rudolf II. of the year 1611; but, at the intercession of the Margrave Joachim Ernest of Ansbach, he postponed the execution, because, as Klesl wrote, 'he still persisted in the hope that at some future time a better and more submissive spirit would show itself.' This hope proved itself futile. At the request of the council, the Elector of Brandenburg, in July and at the beginning of August, sent some hundreds of men under General von Putliz to join the town soldiery; the city gates were occupied and partly walled up. There was then 'no other course open to the Emperor but the execution of his sentence.' The Elector of Cologne and Archduke Albert of the Netherlands, who were commissioned to enforce the penalty, had posted up at Aix-la-Chapelle, on August 23, the imperial decision that everything was to be restored to the same condition as before the disturbance of July 5, 1611. At the command of Albert, General Ambrosius Spinola had equipped himself with an army of 16,000 men. While he was drawing near, overtures for conciliatory measures were made by the plenipotentiaries of the two princes: 'Whereas, however, they found that the non-Catholics were quite obstinate in their determination, so much so that they' (the plenipotentiaries) 'were almost maltreated in the street, they gave orders to go on with the siege, and to carry out the sentence of punishment.' Scarcely had the formidable army appeared before the walls than the Protestants lost courage. They sent a deputation, headed by a papal nuncio, to beg Spinola to spare the

town and to promise full surrender. On August 26 they opened the gates to Spinola. The Brandenburg garrison was allowed to pass out with flying banners. The Catholic council was reinstated, and on September 10 issued the order that 'within three days the preachers were to abandon the town, and within six weeks all the Anabaptists and all the alien intruders who had not yet acquired the right of citizenship; none but Catholic schools and schoolmasters were in future to be tolerated; heretical books were not to be sold in the town; no dishes made of meat were to be eaten in inns on the fast days; at the public processions fitting homage was to be paid to the Holy Sacrament and the relics.'¹

Such was the nature of the so-called 'barbarous extirpation' of the 'innocent evangelicals' of Aix-la-Chapelle, who, as that 'veritable new tiding' of the year 1615 reported, 'had always been bent solely on peace and Christian unity, and had in no way molested or injured the Catholics.'²

'The melancholy example of the ancient imperial city of Aix-la-Chapelle afforded sufficient evidence'—so said a Calvinistic pamphlet that went through numerous reprints—'that everywhere the extinction of the evangelical light was being aimed at.' It was incumbent,

¹ Fuller details in Ropp, pp. 217-247; Meyer, *Aachensche Gesch.* pp. 548-588; 'Der Brief Klesls,' in Hammer, iii.; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 138-139; cf. Haagen, pp. 207-231.

² *Wahrhaftige neue Zeitung* (see above, p. 563, note 1), B 3. Matthias, in his declaration of the ban, had reserved to himself the punishment of the disturbers of peace. In the year 1616 these men were called to account by imperial sub-delegates. Two ringleaders were executed; more than a hundred who had taken part in the storming of the council house, the maltreatment of the imperial notary, the forcible appropriation of the town keys and the arsenal, and so forth, were sent into exile; many others were sentenced to the payment of money fines (Meyer, p. 583 ff.; Haagen, p. 231 ff.).

therefore, 'on all pious Christians to examine themselves, to pluck up undaunted hearts and valiant spirits, and to make willing surrender of life and property for the defence of their wives and children and their dear Fatherland against such barbarous tyrants, murderers, and depredators, to repulse the violence of these latter, and to stake their last drops of blood for their own and the general welfare.' They ought 'far rather to wish to perish with honour than from timidity and unseemly terror, put themselves in subjection to these enemies, and fall into their hands and power.'¹

In addition to this there was the 'very melancholy example of Mühlhausen,' from which it was obvious that 'all evangelical towns were to be rooted out of the earth.'

On August 26, 1610, a few days after the seizure of the fortress of Jülich, the princes of Brandenburg and Neuburg had addressed to the council at Cologne the injunction that they were not only to recognise them both as the rightful heirs of the Jülich lands, but also to accept them as the protectors of the town, to allow them to pass in and out unhindered by day and by night, and to send them, at the expense of the town, 500 infantry and 1,000 cavalry. Further, the council was to recall all the Protestants who had been banished, and to compensate them for all damages, while, on the other hand, under pain of punishment, they were to expel the Jesuits within eight or ten days.² Since then the council had watched all the measures of the 'Possessioners' with not unwarrantable suspicions, and had felt the greatest alarm when the latter, in 1612, formed

¹ *Kurzer Bericht wider die Spanier*, see v. Friedberg, pp. 43-44.

² Soden, *Kriegs- und Sittengesch.* i. 96.

the plan of converting the opposite district of Mühlheim into a strongly fortified place, and of raising it to a commercial centre of the first rank, with the obvious intention of waging a war of extermination against the papistical town of Cologne from this 'evangelical stronghold.' Immense ramparts, walls, and eleven bastions were to be erected in Mühlheim; three new churches, several schools, and an exchange were to be built, and two market places established; so long as the princes remained united, nearly 1,000 workmen, mostly forced to give their labour by surrounding administrations, were employed in the building operations. The council of Cologne entered a protest against these 'unlawful' proceedings, and addressed a complaint to the Emperor, appealing to the ancient privileges of Cologne, and to old deeds of heritage with the Jülich princes. At the beginning of July 1612, the Council prevailed on the Emperor to issue an order enjoining the 'Possessioners,' under penalty of payment of 100 marks, to desist from their building and to pull down what had already been erected.

But these princes replied that it was by no means their intention to erect a fortress; only 'out of most urgent, indispensable need had this work of building been undertaken,' solely 'to prevent the complete annihilation of these lands; and for the safety of the Prince's life, state, and name,' had they employed a means of defence permitted by the law of all nations. In spite of a renewed imperial penal edict, the building works were carried on vigorously, and in the summer of 1613 Mühlheim counted one hundred new houses. Then Matthias, 'for the maintenance of imperial authority,' ordered the destruction of the town, and appointed the

Elector of Cologne and the Archduke Albert as his plenipotentiaries in the execution of the work. The Count Palatine Wolfgang Wilhelm, completely at rupture with Brandenburg, recalled his workmen from Mühlheim, and, in token of his own submission, caused a wide breach to be made in the wall. The electoral Prince of Brandenburg, however, gave orders that the hole was to be filled up, and encouraged the workmen to proceed with their building, till at last Spinola, coming up from Aix-la-Chapelle, caused the walls to be pulled down and the houses demolished by Spanish troops and Cologne workmen.¹

At the time when Spinola had set his army in movement against Aix-la-Chapelle, Prince Maurice of Orange had invaded the Cleves territory with a Dutch army. In order to prevent his further advance, Spinola, at the beginning of September, had seized the towns of Rheinberg and Duisburg and the fortress of Wesel, while Maurice was erecting fresh works of fortification at Emmerich and Rees, and strengthening the garrison at Jülich.

Over against the complaints of the allies about the Archduke Albert's troops being quartered there, the perfectly legitimate question was asked on the Catholic side: 'Who first brought the foreigners into the Empire?' When Rudolf II., it says in a 'memorandum' of the year 1616, owing to fear of an insurrection, put the Cleves territory under sequestration, took possession of the fortress of Jülich, and placed before the claimants the way of judicial proceedings, the corresponding princes began enlisting troops, summoned Frenchmen, Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Dutch into

¹ Ennen, *Gesch. der Stadt Köln*, v. 550-565.

the Empire, seized Jülich by violence, and preferred to have foreign kings for their arbiters rather than the Emperor; 'and over all this they rejoice and triumph as though they had performed admirable deeds.' When, however, in 1614 the Archduke Albert, by imperial order, executed the penal verdict against the rebellious citizens of Aix-la-Chapelle, pulled down the new buildings of the Mühlheim fortress, marched with a victorious army against the Dutch who had already established themselves in Jülich, and contemplated conquering the whole country, and brought Wesel, Düren, and a few other places under the power of the Emperor, pending the issue of the contest, then the corresponding princes accused the Archduke of having committed unlawful attempts, and of having brought foreign soldiers into the land; 'even at the present day they demand, menacingly, compensation and restitution.' 'They have called in foreigners against the Emperor; the Emperor summons an imperial prince, his own brother in the flesh, to oppose resistance to the foreigners, and this, forsooth, seems unjust and intolerable to the corresponding princes, the other proceeding, however, holy and laudable.'¹

The agitation which the proceedings at Aix-la-Chapelle and Mühlheim had provoked was further aggravated by a tumult which had broken out at Frankfort-on-the-Main, which caused 'serious alarm in the whole Rhine district.'

In Frankfort the entire municipal government lay in the hands of a few patrician families who posed as 'Regents,' and treated the free imperial burghers as subjects. Justice was administered at their arbitrary

¹ In Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 929.

pleasure, and in the management of finance the most flagrant abuses were current. The councillors—so the burghers complained—were in the same boat with the usurious Jews; the latter, barely 2,000 in number, had command of the bulk of ready money; the Christian population, on the other hand, were obliged to pay forty or sixty, or sometimes even 100 per cent. for money loans, and they grew visibly poorer and poorer. When the Emperor Matthias was elected and crowned in 1612, ‘the city guilds and the burghers of Frankfort and Sachsenhausen,’ when proffering their homage, handed him a petition in which it was complained that ‘the Jews, who are in league with the council, live on the flesh and blood of the burghers, and get all the money into their own hands.’ ‘We, however,’ the petition went on, ‘do never doubt but that your Imperial Majesty will incline your paternal heart most graciously towards us, that you will extend to us the rights of children, and will not suffer that we burghers should be devoured by strangers, we freemen by bondsmen, and that we should be driven out of house and home, away from wife and children, and brought into poverty, need, and bond-service by such an accursed people which survives as an everlasting witness of crime and of the murder of the Lord Jesus.’ The council, to whom Matthias handed over this petition for their report on it, replied to the effect that the complaints of the burghers were unfounded, and called on the Emperor to inflict punishment on them.

Thereupon there ensued a rising in Frankfort, in which all the villages of the district took part. ‘Now there is freedom,’ was the general cry, ‘there is no longer any authority.’ At the head of the insurgents

was the confectioner Vincent Fettmilch, of the reformed religion, who had migrated from Hesse, and who 'had long been exasperated at the tyrannical yoke which oppressed his co-religionists in Frankfort.' The Calvinists, for the most part immigrants from the Netherlands, were in perpetual conflict with the Lutheran preachers, and, 'in spite of reiterated supplicatory entreaties from the council, they had not been able to obtain any freedom of religious worship. This grievance was now to be set right, and, together with the urgently needed civic reforms, the equality of the Reformed religionists and the Calvinists was to be established, and the latter were henceforward always to be admitted to the council and the civic offices.' Fettmilch, a bold and resolute demagogue, 'was determined, in short, not to budge an inch, and,' as he said in August 1614 to a delegate of the Elector of Mayence, 'meant also to be in the thick of it, if, elsewhere than in Frankfort, the working people and the artisans rose up against the tyrants and blood-suckers in the Empire.' To this end he and his friends 'had already laid good trains, and the Dutch too would promptly coalesce with them, as soon as it was necessary and the enterprise was ripe. Therefore they must proceed quietly and without boasting, for it was patent to the world how miserably the labouring classes were everywhere oppressed and fleeced; and it was quite likely that in the Empire, as in the Netherlands and in Switzerland, government by the people and republicanism would set in.'¹

Fettmilch and the insurrection party were joined by all the numerous foreign journeymen employed in Frankfort, who always took the most active part in all

¹ *Bericht von Karl Heinrich Feyerabend vom 12. August, 1614.*

risings and disturbances of any sort. They were 'the most numerous and the most zealous of the insurgents, when the onslaught was made on the godless Jews and rascally usurers,' and the 'Judengasse' was stormed and plundered on August 22, 1614.¹

The Elector of Mayence and the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt wrote repeatedly to the Emperor, warning him solemnly of the great danger to which the whole Empire, and especially the Rhine district, would be exposed, if the insurrection in Frankfort was not quickly put down, the populace, grown turbulent with all the anarchy of the times, restored to calm, and commerce and traffic replaced on their usual footing at the fairs. When, however, imperial officials made their appearance at Frankfort, and proceeded to re-establish justice and order, they were subjected to ignominy of all sorts. An edict of the Emperor, bearing the imperial signature, which was posted up on walls, was partly torn down, and an imperial herald was threatened with death. It was only with the greatest difficulty, and after Fettmilch had been imprisoned by sentence of the Emperor, that the tumult was gradually allayed. The ring-leaders, seven in number, were executed.²

During the insurrection at Frankfort, serious disturbances had also broken out in Worms on account of 'the usurious Jews,' of whom it was said that 'at

¹ The Jews were compelled to leave the town. 'The number of them, young and old, that was counted as they went out of the gates was 1,380' (Drugulin, p. 112, No. 1277; cf. 1278 and 1279). It was not till February 1616 that the Jews returned, when they did so by imperial mandate.

² Fuller details concerning the insurrection and its consequences in Kriegk, *Gesch. von Frankfurt*, pp. 237-417; Sauerland, in the *Korrespondenzblatt der Westdeutschen Zeitschr. für Gesch. und Kunst*, 9 (1890), No. 9, p. 222 ff., draws attention to a MS. with documents on the Fettmilch insurrection, in the Treves Library.

Worms, precisely as in Frankfort, they were favoured by one section of the council, and protected and patronised to the extreme detriment of all honourable Christian people.' On October 1, 1614, the whole body of citizens had obtained from the Imperial Chamber a stringent order to the effect that the council was to suppress the unlawful usury of the Jews; the latter were henceforth not to take more than 5 per cent. interest, and were to square accounts with the burghers in respect of all the excess of interest which they had exacted hitherto. Whereas 'no result followed all the same,' the burghers formed a committee, banded together, and on April 10, 1615, drove the Jews out of the town, and destroyed their synagogue and burying-ground, for, they said, 'all memory of the Jewish idolatry must be rooted out.' The council was powerless against the insurgents, and was obliged to obtain help from the Palatine Elector, who, on April 25, sent 4,000 men with six cannons and other military apparatus to Worms to restore order.¹ 'The princes and the mighty ones,' it says in a leaflet, 'are for the most part friends, and as it were house-comrades of the blasphemous Jews, and things will not be altered in this respect until the mighty ones themselves have been involved and swallowed up by a great war, such as indeed seems to stand at the door by the judgment of God.'²

More threatening even than the complications on the Rhine was a war-flame which flickered up in the duchy of Brunswick, and 'which might easily have developed into a great universal war in the Empire.'

¹ Senkenberg, 24, 37-44.

² *Gerechte Strafe gegen die wucherische Judenschaft in Worms. Einblatt-druck*, 1617.

The town of Brunswick had been for years past at strife with the dukes, and had fallen under the imperial ban. It had also refused the customary homage to the Duke Frederick Ulrich, who had succeeded his father, Henry Julius, in the summer of 1613. Inside the town 'the factions raged against each other;' in the year 1614 'the burghers, smarting under lengthy persecution and manifold oppression, revolted against their council and government.' The ducal councillors in Wolfenbüttel fomented the rebellion; 'they gave the common people great encouragement, told them that they had been treated shamefully by their town council, and reduced to the utmost need; they had no food and were obliged to pay cruelly heavy taxes. For this reason the community, they said, should separate itself from the council and conclude a treaty with the Duke.' Whereas the council was negotiating a league with the Calvinistic States-General, the preachers declaimed from the pulpits that 'they wanted to bring a new religion and a new nation into the town.' The burghers elected a committee of 100 persons and entered into negotiations with the Duke; all to no purpose, however. In the summer of 1615 Frederick Ulrich encamped before the town with a powerful army and demanded entire submission. But the so-called 'corresponding Hanseatic towns,' Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg, Magdeburg and Lüneburg, hastened to the help of the besieged town, while the Duke obtained assistance from King Christian IV. of Denmark. At the instigation of the Hanseatic towns the States-General directed Prince Henry of Nassau to march into the Brunswick territory with thirty-two companies of cavalry and 4,000 infantry. When the

ambassadors of the States pointed out on November 3 that the Prince had already entered the County of Ravenberg with the kernel of the people, under the best captains, 'we were manifestly delighted,' wrote the burgomaster Brockes of Lübeck, 'with such good news,' and this tidings also caused great rejoicing in Hamburg among the common people and in the Exchange—'more so indeed than if many new ships and consignments of goods had come into port.' As for the King of Denmark, on the other hand, 'tears rolled down his cheeks' at the news of the arrival of the Dutch, and he made ready to withdraw. Frederic Ulrich expressed himself as follows: 'The towns are plotting to ruin one prince after another and to establish another Switzerland; therefore it is high time for the princes to pull themselves together and to prevent this issue.' His call for help, however, fell everywhere on deaf ears. The Landgrave Maurice of Hesse advised him to give in, lest 'by the continuance of this discord other princes, foreign ones especially, should be drawn in, and the whole neighbourhood—if not the whole Empire—be plunged into war.' 'Throughout the whole war,' chuckled Brockes the burgomaster, 'it was plainly seen how little a prince in his extremity can rely on his blood relations and connections by marriage.' The Duke of Brunswick was related to, and matrimonially connected with, nearly all the evangelical kings and princes, 'but not one of them would take much interest in the matter, especially when the danger became greater and the might of the towns rose up on its legs.' What the King of Denmark did was not so much for the sake of the Duke as from hatred against the towns and on account

of his own interest in the hope that the conquest of the town of Brunswick would enable him afterwards to have his own way more with Lübeck and other towns.'

It was not, however, the might of the German towns, but the arrival of the Dutch troops that obliged the Duke to raise the siege, which had already cost him 10,000 men. He was compelled to make a very disadvantageous treaty with the town. 'The Dutch,' wrote Caspar Schoppe, 'might in truth boast that they were already as good as chief rulers and masters on the Rhine and in the north of the Empire; Hansa was practically impotent without the will of the worshipful States-General.' At the meetings of the Hansa—so Brockes relates—'the ambassadors of the lords of the States always took first rank.'

After the Brunswick affair had been settled, most of the Hanseatic towns, despite all the Emperor's admonitions, entered, in December 1615, into a league with the States-General, through which they obtained 'temporary succour against Denmark.'¹

Christian IV. had wanted these towns to be no more than 'a dependency' on his State; he had burdened their trade with intolerable taxes, and, as Brockes complained in 1612, 'had prescribed to them, as lord and sovereign of the sea, on what terms they were to carry on navigation in the East and North Seas.' When the Emperor had informed him threateningly, in 1613, that he could no longer overlook the Danish acts of violence against Lübeck, for 'the East Sea was undoubtedly subject to the German Empire,'

¹ Klopp, i. 198. Lübeck had already concluded an alliance with the States-General in May 1613; see *loc. cit.* 197.

Christian had answered that 'not the Empire, but Denmark, had at all times exercised authority over the East Sea.' When the Hanseatic towns in the following year complained, through a deputation to Copenhagen, of the molestation of their house of business in Bergen, they received the simple answer: 'The King has the right to confiscate entirely all their establishments and counting-houses.' In the year 1615 Christian wrote to James I. of England that 'on the strength of royal plenary power he had abolished the earlier liberties of the Hanseatic towns and that he no longer acknowledged them any right of commerce in his kingdom.' 'In these days when everybody grabs with impunity whatever he can get,' he said once at table at Wolfenbüttel, 'Denmark also must look out for its own advantage.'

In fulfilment of this object, he bethought him first of all of taking possession of the archbishopric of Bremen, and he soon began to set all levers in movement in order to establish his son there as coadjutor and successor of the Protestant archbishop. At the imperial court he alleged, in palliation of his scheme, that the Calvinists wanted to get hold of the archbishopric for themselves and to turn out the Augsburg Confessionists. To the Calvinistic States-General, on the other hand, from whom also he hoped to get help, he pleaded that 'the Spaniards and the papists, to the detriment of the evangelicals, were aiming with all their might at getting all the bishoprics in Germany into their own possession.' In Bremen he was reported to have said that 'he did not set so much store by the parsonages and bishoprics as by the rivers Weser and Elbe and the towns on their banks.' He began

‘recruiting cavalry and infantry on a large scale,’ desisted, however, temporarily from the undertaking on receiving news of the preparations of the corresponding Hanseatic towns, and the intention of the States-General to defend Bremen against him.¹

‘It is a notorious fact,’ the Emperor impressed on the imperial Estates on March 21, 1616, ‘how enormously the arrogance of the States has increased since their seizure of the imperial seaport at Emden; they are everlastingly committing acts of violence and depredation in the Empire, witness the aggression on the archbishoprics and bishoprics of Cologne, Münster, Paderborn, and Hildesheim, in the principalities of Jülich, Cleves, and Berg, in the counties and lordships of Mörs, Ravensberg, and elsewhere. By this means the States-General have gained possession of the principal passes on the Rhine, the Meuse, the Ems and the Weser, and, through the new league with the Hanseatic towns, of those also on the Elbe and the Oder—practically, therefore, all the passes in the Empire—and they now intend gradually to approach the heart of the Empire. Only lately, under pretext of obtaining help for the town of Brunswick, they brought serious losses on the obedient Estates of the realm by marching through their lands and levying contributions, and in the Jülich territory they captured several places anew.’ And, not content with all this, they are stirring up the Sultan to fresh acts of warfare.²

¹ The matter is dealt with by Broekes, ii. 34, 284, 288–294, 367, 414–415, 417–420, 422; *Braunschweigische Händel* (1616), pp. 8, 11; Senkenberg, xxiii. 666–667, and xxiv. 81.

² *Archivium Unito-Protestantium*, pp. 42–43; cf. Klesl’s *Gutachten* of March 3, 1616, in Hammer, iii.; *Urkundenbd.* p. 366 ff.

The States-General might indeed regard themselves as the 'principal rulers' in the Empire. In order to introduce 'government by the people' they associated themselves with every movement which involved resistance to princely power. 'What sort of a business have you Netherlanders in hand,' asks the author of the 'Discordista,' 'that you have thus fought against the Duke of Brunswick, and why did you stand by the town rather than by him? Why, he is connected by marriage with the Brandenburgers, your own confederates. There is no question of religion in this contest, for nowhere else are the Calvinists more hated than in the town of Brunswick. What other reason, then, can you give, but hatred of princely rule and love of popular government? Furthermore, Magdeburg has been received into your League. I should much like to know why a town so far removed from you should want to join your Union? I know the only answer you can give: namely, that you are fighting for all the towns against all the princes, and you do not consider the cause of the war but only the nature of the combatants.' ¹

Even on the part of the Union great anxiety arose respecting the plans of the States-General. 'A distinguished South German Prince'—probably the Duke of Würtemberg—at the beginning of December, uttered a very urgent warning in a letter to a Brandenburg councillor, against forming 'too close and intimate an alliance' with the States, who were not concerned about the cause of religion, but only about dominion

¹ *Discordista, sive secundus Scioppius*, &c.; cf. Haagen, *Zur politischen Gesch. Deutschlands*, pp. 309-311.

and rule. Even if, with the help of the latter, they should succeed in eradicating the papist Estates from the Empire and transferring their territories bodily into the hands of the Unionists, the best places would nevertheless still remain in the possession of the Netherlanders, who would then want to deprive the secular princes also of their lands. For the States-General were bent on establishing democratic government everywhere, and in these their endeavours they found plentiful help and support in the Empire itself. In the Palatinate and in some of the imperial cities there were numbers of immigrants from France, Holland, Scotland, England, and so forth, who were in constant alliance with the Netherlands, and who would afford the States guidance and succour to carry out their plans whenever they should come into the Empire. 'If there are any who will not believe this, let them remember the Frankfort and Worms rebellion, which was not only plotted and started by the Dutch, but also kept going by them so long that it was a work of immense trouble and labour, and one that required years for its accomplishment, to restore the disturbed conditions to some sort of order;' by many people, indeed, a fresh outbreak of the fire is greatly feared. Moreover, the States were already in league with the Hanseatic towns, and how much trouble could be raised by a single one of these towns was shown by the proceedings at Brunswick. 'A third circumstance in favour of the States-General is the general intention of all the imperial cities, if not of the senates, at any rate of all the citizens, who have no other aim than to establish a universal democracy and to clear out

of the way all obstacles opposed to this end.' For this purpose an alliance with the like-minded Netherlanders would afford the most eligible opportunity. And over and above the fact that some of the princes and lords owed debts and mortgages to the towns, the state of the princely treasuries was known to the towns, 'so that they had all the less cause to fear the power of the princes.' If, however, the States-General, the Hanseatic towns, and the imperial cities were to join their forces and attack the princes and counts, who would be able to resist them, more especially if the possessions of the clergy were in the hands of the States? If innovations of this sort were to come about in the Empire, the country folk and the common people would readily hail them gladly, for they were indeed eager for such changes, and hoped by means of them to obtain their freedom. The country folk, long hard-pressed with all sorts of usual and unusual imposts and grievances, would either support these foreign guests and take up arms—which in many places they were well exercised in—against their rulers themselves, or else they would make but a poor show of zeal in defence of the latter; and thus 'princes and estates would in any case have to give in.'

With ingenuous candour this confidential letter discloses the actual plans of the Union, which nominally thought only of defence: 'If we only tackle the business rightly,' says the 'distinguished South German Prince,' 'means will be at hand to carry out our intention without the help of the States, and to eradicate the papists.' 'Otherwise,' he goes on, 'it would be much better to let the whole work pause, and to go on as

heretofore, tacking and temporising and dallying with the idea of revision and improvement of the Religious Peace.'¹

'Tacking and temporising' formed the policy of the Union during the following years.

¹ In the *Archivium Unito-Protestantium*, App. pp. 243-251. In Höfler, *Fränkische Studien*, pp. 285-290, under the title 'Vertrautes Schreiben an einen kurfürstlich brandenburgischen Rat von einem fürnehmen oberländischen Fürsten 29. November (a. St.), 1614;' cf. Pfaff. *Gesch. von Württemberg*, ii. 68; and Klopp, i. 185 ff., 188.

CHAPTER X

MEASURES OF THE UNION AND 'DANGEROUS MACHINATIONS OF THE PAPISTS'—DISSOLUTION OF THE CATHOLIC LEAGUE OF DEFENCE, 1614–1616.

AFTER the Ratisbon Diet of 1613, the princes of the Union and the Estates in correspondence with them had published a so-called 'exhaustive account' of the transactions of the assembly, in which they attributed all failures to the fault of the Catholic Estates. The latter, it was said, under pretext of the imperial decrees and sacred justice, had aimed at nothing else than 'the suppression and ruin of the whole evangelical body.' 'With the majority obtained by their united votes they thought to control and regulate everything according to their own will, and as it were to rule supreme over all the evangelical Electors and Estates.'¹

'The papistical Estates,' wrote Duke John Frederic of Würtemberg, at the beginning of January 1614, to Duke Frederic Ulrich of Brunswick, urgently entreating him to join the Union—'the papistical Estates will not enter into any amicable negotiations in the matter of the convents, and they set themselves against all needful reforms of imperial legislation;' consequently it is to be feared that the evangelicals will be forced by them to surrender not the convents only,

¹ '... cum tamen, maxime in libero imperio, par in parem non habeat imperium' (Senckenberg, *Sammlung*, ii. 151).

but even their lands and people.¹ The Landgrave Maurice of Hesse also declared that the papists were ready for a war of aggression. 'They mean to attempt the utmost and to risk the remnants left them in striving to recover what they have lost.'²

To strengthen the Union was therefore regarded as 'the most highly essential work.' In the first months of the year 1614 several of the allied princes resolved, at an assembly at Stuttgart, 'that they would do all they could to draw Bern and Zürich into the Union.'³ The Landgrave Maurice was despatched on a journey to the Low Countries in order to solicit the mediation of the States-General on behalf of an alliance of the Union with Sweden.⁴ The young King of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, who had 'such an indescribable love of war,'⁵ stood forth as one of the most powerful future helpers of 'the Evangel.' As early as January 1613 Maurice had commended the cause of the Union to him through the Count Palatine John Casimir, a younger brother of the Count Palatine of Zweibrücken, who had been educated in Cassel, was employed in the Swedish service, and in the following year married the half-sister of Gustavus Adolphus.⁶ After the King, in April 1614, had concluded a league of friendship and protection with the States-General, Maurice sent, as confidential agent to Stockholm, a man who was later on employed in the most important

¹ Letter of December 27, 1613 (o. s.) in Sattler, vi. Beil. pp. 90-94.

² Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 326, note 324.

³ Senkenberg, pp. 23, 726; cf. Sugenheim, *Frankreichs Einfluss*, pp. 2, 7, note.

⁴ Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 329, note 329.

⁵ So wrote Falkenberg to Maurice in February 1616 (Rommel, iii. 333. note 334).

⁶ Rommel, iii. 332; cf. Brockes, ii. 288.

embassies to France, England, and the Netherlands, and the Hanseatic towns,¹ the privy councillor John Zobel. His business at Stockholm was 'to manage certain important matters.'² In September the allies gathered together at a Diet at Heilbronn, signed and sealed collectively the covenant contracted by the Count Palatine with the States-General in May 1613, and addressed a formal invitation to Gustavus Adolphus to join the Union.³ In order to make his people acquainted with the importance of the events going on in Germany, the King ordered a day of universal prayer for the favourable progress of the undertaking of their German co-religionists;⁴ from active participation in which he was obliged, he said, for the present to abstain, owing to his war in Poland. At the beginning of March 1615 he gave the princes and Estates the following answer to their request that he would 'extend to them a helping hand in case of their sustaining violence, and would aid them in maintaining the evangelical religion and German liberty.' 'It was a matter of world-wide notoriety that plots of the most highly dangerous nature had been stirred up by those connected with the papist League, not in the Empire only, but also in the neighbouring sovereignties, against the evangelical religion and its members. The Estates 'must be well aware how much he, the King, had also had to endure during the last years from the King of Poland, as a prominent member of the League.

¹ Rommel, ii. 471.

² See Brockes, ii. 282, note 15. In April 1614 Zobel was in Lübeck 'in order to inform himself about the conditions in Sweden.'

³ Lübeck was the means of conveying the address to the King (Brockes, ii. 288).

⁴ Geijer, *Gesch. von Schweden*, iii. 137.

The latter wanted to possess himself of this northern kingdom in order to be able to establish in it a war basis against all the neighbouring evangelical potentates, princes, and states.' With a view, however, to 'crippling this papistical enterprise' he was opposing vigorous resistance to the Poles. When his war with them was ended he would be ready, 'in consideration of the common danger, to stand by the Estates at their need, and would exert himself to the utmost to preserve for them their evangelical religion.'¹

In September of the same year the Landgrave Maurice again ordered off a plenipotentiary to Stockholm, and was anxious by means of the Dutch ambassadors at the Swedish court to arrange 'the marriage contracts between the King and his eldest daughter.'² In the following year Gustavus Adolphus called for the help of the Landgrave in order to bring about a political and religious alliance between Sweden and the electorate of Brandenburg.³

In February 1615, while the allies were still expecting the answer of the King of Sweden, they held a numerously attended meeting at Nüremberg, at which Frenchmen, Englishmen, Danes and Hollanders were also present. The whole of the evangelical Estates, it said in the Recess of the Diet, 'were undoubtedly in the greatest danger,' for it might be considered certain that 'the Roman Catholic Estates, being so determined to obtain restitution of the abbeys and convents, would devise and resort to all possible ways and means for compassing this end.' An 'effectual counter-organisation' was therefore imperatively neces-

¹ Sattler, vi. Beil. pp. 101-102.

² Broeckes, ii. 374, note 4.

³ Rommel, iii. 333, note 334.

sary.¹ The question of how to keep warm the alliance with the Protestant Estates of Bohemia was carefully discussed, and Christian of Anhalt was uninterruptedly active in endeavouring to keep the Union in close connection with its adherents in Austria, Moravia, and Silesia.² In a memorandum of the Palatine Elector, one of the allies, on January 30, had expressed his conviction that ‘if the ecclesiastical Estates saw and knew that we meant in good earnest to attack them, they would look out for themselves and their abbeys in good time and bethink them of measures of peace.’³

Two weeks earlier the Landgrave Maurice had drawn for his provincial Estates a terrible picture of the contemplated onslaught of the papists. ‘The Catholic League,’ he informed them, ‘protected by the Pope, the King of Spain, the court of Brussels and the Emperor, and newly strengthened by the accession of three ecclesiastical Electors, has ordered its munitions of war and resolved on a Spanish campaign, not merely—so he was credibly informed from France, Lorraine, and Italy—in order to make itself master of the Jülich lands, but with a view to the final execution of the decrees of the Council of Trent, to the extirpation of the evangelical religion, and to the election of Ferdinand of Styria as King.’ They must therefore equip themselves lustily, and if possible, within eight months, raise half, or at least an eighth, of a million florins. They must also stick fast to the Union, which alone

¹ ‘Abschied vom 12./22. Februar 1615,’ in Senkenberg, xxiv. xiv.—xxxvii. ; cf. Soden, *Kriegs- und Sittengesch.* i. 400–404.

² Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, i. 186.

³ In Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 833–834.

‘continued to defend the imperilled evangelical cause,’ although ‘many were of opinion that the Union gave provocation to war.’ ‘For if we abandon the Union, we too shall be abandoned by it, and not by it alone, but by all its dependents: France, England, the States-General, Sweden, the Hanseatic towns, Venice and Switzerland.’¹ A few months later, an English ambassador confided to the Lübeck burgomaster Brockes, that the States-General were negotiating with James I. concerning a league ‘against the Catholics.’²

Through the instrumentality of Ernest of Mansfeld the Union cemented relations with Duke Charles Emmanuel of Savoy, who still entertained the hope of gaining Milan. In 1615 the Duke sent an ambassador to Germany to negotiate concerning his formal reception into the Protestant Union; he promised to exert himself with all his might in its service.³

Greatly to the advantage of the Union the imperial cities, in October 1615, at an assembly at Esslingen decided to join the alliance between the Union and the States-General and to pay 45,000 florins annually into the fund.⁴ A member of the Nuremberg council had expressed himself most decidedly against any association of the imperial cities with the League of princes. ‘If we join the Union,’ he said in a memorandum of the year 1615, ‘there is no question but that we shall soon have to take up arms. The princes and lords will not regard us as other than walled-in

¹ Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 34 ff., 122–125.

² Brockes, ii. 409.

³ ‘... ceste union, laquelle je serviray, fomentaray et fortifieray de tout mon pouvoir, me faisans l’honneur de m’y admettre.’ Instruction for the ambassador Biandra in the year 1615, in Erdmannsdörffer, pp. 149–151; cf. p. 95 ff.

⁴ Senkenberg, xxiv. 29.

peasants, and they will keep the whole management of the war in their own hands. On us and on ours the troops will be quartered, from our coffers the payments will be made, from our granaries the provisions will be supplied; with the soldiers recruited by means of our money they will squeeze out of us whatever they please. Added to this, trade and industry will stagnate; we ourselves become victims of the imperial ban, and our wares exposed to seizure in foreign lands. If we are defeated, who will protect the towns which derive their freedom from the Emperor only? The whole fury of the flood will be poured out over them. But we have reason to fear victory also. The leaders of the war will retain the booty, and in our Lutheran imperial cities Calvinism will intrude itself. Already the princes, while still manœuvring for us and our money, have 'seriously distressed these towns with all the foreign riffraff they have brought over from France and the Netherlands, and have gone on the plan of transferring all industries, wealth, and provisions from the old imperial cities into their own dominions.' What will they do when once they are the victors? ¹

'There are many people,' wrote a Calvinist in this same year 1615, 'who feel all manner of scruples as to whether Lutherans and Calvinists should unite together against the Antichrist. But who at this juncture, when the whole evangelical cause is obviously at stake, and when we have to defend ourselves with person and property, honour and life against the murderous, sanguinary intrigues of the popish powers

¹ In Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 837-839; Senkenberg, *Sammlung*, iii. 293-303.

and the Jesuits—who, I ask, at such a time, would stand haggling over this or that future danger which the brain of this one or that one bodies forth? Is it not of far more importance that all those who do not wish to fall back under the yoke of popish extortion and idolatry should stand together as *one* man and take up arms conjointly, regardless of whether they are Lutheran or Calvinist, so that they may not be fallen upon unawares, lose town and land, house and home, and see their wives and children reduced to slavery; for the danger is great—yea, more than great. The armies of the antagonists are equipped, the commands allotted, and the mercenaries are awaiting the first beat of the drum to pour into the lands of the evangelicals and destroy everything with murder and incendiarism. Oh the blindness which will not see this! Oh the faithlessness and God-forgetfulness which will not fight valiantly for the Gospel! Oh the execrable greed and stinginess which will not contribute abundantly to save the beloved Fatherland and the precious heirloom of German liberty!’ ‘Up, up, ye Germans! Up with courage and zeal to battle with the tonsured, perjured parsons, and all their shallow-pated followers.’¹ The following lines occur in a contemporary *Kurzweiliges Gespräch* :

Some tidings new have come to me :
 In a few years, the parsons say.
 Everything reformed will be
 And earth move in the righteous way.
 I greatly hope to see before
 This year is out, a fresh priests' war.

¹ *Ein ehrliches deutsches Mahnwort an alle evangelischen Christen, so der Abgötterei und Knechtschaft entrinnen wollen* (Einblattdruck, 1615).

It maketh me uncommon glad
To see the parsons all so mad,
For ever stirring up fresh plots,
At last they'll strangle their own throats.¹

These plots of the 'mad parsons' were disclosed to the people in 1615 by a Calvinist who described himself as 'a true-hearted German Catholic.'²

He possessed, he said, accurate information concerning the plans 'of all zealous Catholics' in the Empire. With the help of the King of Spain they meant to begin the war in Germany. All who were not Catholic, especially the Calvinists and the rest of the princes of the Union, if they did not meanwhile adopt the Catholic faith, were doomed, in the spring of next year, 'in execution of the Tridentine Council, to forfeit their lives and to be rooted out wholesale with their religions.' Afterwards, 'under cover of religion, it was intended to bring the whole German nation under the Spanish yoke.'³ While, however, the religious war was being planned in this way by the 'Spanish and Jesuitical creatures,' the evangelicals were quite

¹ *Ein kurzweilig Gesprech zwischen einem Soldaten und Pfaffen und ihrer beiden Köchin*, 1615.

² *Wolmeinender warhafter Discurs, warum und wie die Römisch-Catholischen in Teutschland sich billich von Spaniern und Jesuiten absondern, und ihrer selbst bei disen izigen hochgefährlichen Zeiten wohl warnehmen sollen und können . . . durch einen trewherzigen Catholischen gestellt*, 1616. ('Well-meant and true discourse why and how the Roman Catholics in Germany could and should break with Spain and the Jesuits, and look after themselves in these perilous times, by a true-hearted German Catholic, 1616.') That the author was a Calvinist is shown by the whole contents of the composition. The refutation '*Draconicidium, dass ist, Dracken Mordt*,' &c., quoted by Werner, *Gesch. der apologetischen und polemischen Litteratur*, iv. 574, note 4; cf. Krebs, *Publicistik*, pp. 79 and 203 ff., according to whom the first edition of this pamphlet appeared in 1615. *Ibid* pp. 80 ff. and 204 ff., also concerning the refutation '*Draconicidium*.'

³ Pp. 8-9, 17-18.

destitute of arms. The Lutherans must therefore unite in a brotherly manner with the Calvinists, all Germans must combine 'to rid themselves of the Spaniards and their sworn minions the Jesuits,' and afterwards to negotiate 'amicable interpositions and compositions' between the Estates of the different religions. If these efforts should be fruitless, then the foreign potentates might come forward as friendly mediators and 'at the request of both sides, or also in their own interest,' to exert themselves to establish a lasting peace between the Catholics and the Protestants in Germany. These foreign powers might come to the agreement that those of the contending parties who would not accommodate themselves to these terms should be by them (the foreign powers) brought to submission, 'together with the obedient section' by force of arms. It was by proposals such as these that the 'true-hearted German' Calvinist thought to show his care for 'the Roman Catholics.'¹

Another Calvinist, 'Wernerus Albertus ab Obrinca,' sounded the war-cry especially against the ecclesiastical princes of the Empire.

He was impelled so to do by the appearance of two pamphlets published in 1616 by Caspar Schoppe under the names von Ungersdorff and von Friedberg, and written with the object of proving unmistakably from all the past utterings of the Calvinists, and from the pronouncements of their theologians and princes, that 'it was their intention to overthrow the Religious and the Public Peace, and the whole constitution of the Holy Roman Empire, and to eradicate the Augsburg Confession, as well as the Catholic faith, from the

¹ Pp. 40, 58, 97-132, 183-192, 212, 220-221.

Empire.’¹ Nobody could deny that on the side of the ‘non-Lutheran Christians’ it had been asserted, times innumerable, that the struggle against the papacy involved at the same time a struggle against the Roman Empire of the German nation. ‘Popedom and Emperordom,’ Zwingli and the Zürichers had written as early as 1530, ‘both of them from Rome do come.’ ‘They are so intermingled and interconnected, and so closely related to each other, that neither of them can stand or fall without the other. Accordingly, whosoever wishes to abolish the papacy must depose the Emperor, and *vice versa*.’² Calvinistic theologians clamoured unceasingly for the extermination of the Roman Empire. Benedictus Arretius, for instance, in his commentary on the Book of Revelation, explained that ‘the beast which fights against God was the Emperor, or the Roman Empire, and the dragon the devil which affixes its ornaments to the Empire.’³

Other theologians went more into detail. The beast described in the Apocalypse as having seven heads and ten horns signified the Roman Empire; the other beast with two horns signified the papacy, which served the first beast and exerted itself for its maintenance. The Pope insisted that people should worship the image of the first beast—namely, the constitution of the State, or the Golden Bull of Charles IV., and he bestowed life on this image, in that he confirmed the election of the Emperor and commanded everybody to adopt the mark

¹ See *Bücher-Verzeichniss* under: *Friedberg und Ungersdorff*; and Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 214 ff.

² Zwingl. *Opp.* viii. 388, 493; Bullinger, *Reformationsgesch.* ii. 342.

³ ‘Draco est Diabolus, qui sua ornamenta affingit Imperio.’

of the first beast—that is, to swear the oath of fealty to the Empire.¹

These and other explanations of the theologians, ‘Ungersdorff and Friedberg’ communicated to their readers, and even when addressing Calvinist princes these writers did not observe any reticence. That they should have provoked a rejoinder from ‘Wernerus Albertus,’ and have been denounced by him as ‘turbulent, desperate arch-villains,’ ‘outcast hang-dogs, fellows only fit for the wheel,’ and so forth, was by no means astonishing considering the prevalent tone of the polemics at the period.²

But Wernerus Albertus directed his actual attacks against ‘the tonsured, upstart princes’ of Mayence, Treves, Worms, Spires, and so forth—‘those flunkys on horseback who let the princes go on foot like lackeys,’ those ‘fools,’ those ‘disreputable, abandoned villains.’ ‘They want to lord it over a Roman Emperor at their own will and pleasure,’ although they derive their dignity ‘solely’ from the Pope at Rome—from ‘that beast.’ These ‘highly tonsured, dainty lordlings’ have

¹ ‘*Retinet homines in cultu prioris bestiae, facit ut prior bestia adoretur, id est, vult imperium sacrosanctum, augustum et venerabile esse, ut olim sub gentilibus fuit, vult imperatorem superstitiose coli et invictum appellari, vult omnes adorare et colere imaginem bestiae, sive formam reipublicae aut bullam auream Caroli IV., dat vitam huic imagini, dum imperatorem electum confirmat, jubet omnes recipere characterem prioris bestiae, id est praestare imperio juramentum fidelitatis.*’ Cf. these and other passages besides in Friedberg, pp. 3 ff., 75–77.

² *Kurze Erinnerung und Verwarnung auf die zwei verschiedene kurz vor endung dess erst verwichenen 1616 ten Jahrs wider die Calvinisten allein, jnnhalt der Ueberschriften, aber in Wahrheitsgrund wider alle und jede Evangelische Churfürsten und Stünd insgemein, unter dem namen Jacobi (sic) von Ungersdorff, und Christiani Gottliebs von Friedburgk, in offenem Truck aussgesprengte aufrührische Schmeckarten, Schand- und Lester-schriften. Von Wernerus Albertus ab Obrinca (1617), pp. 3, 4, 7, 19, 21, 22.*

now grown so puffed up that they aspire after the lands and subjects of the evangelical 'corresponding' electors and Estates—yea, even after their own persons, for they 'urge, stimulate, incite, and worry the Emperor,' dinning it into him that there is nothing further to be done with the Calvinistic electors and princes than to point the blade at their bellies, let them 'see the monkey in the glass' (?), and to suppress, degrade, and extirpate them. There was no other counsel to be given in the matter, and they proffered their help and willing support. 'Mayence, Treves, Worms, Spires . . . are determined to place themselves at the head of affairs, and first and foremost they intend to tackle and bring to order the Elector Count Palatine, their neighbour, whom they denounce as a rebellious, disobedient prince, and accuse of aspiring to take the crown from the Emperor, and to teach him how in future to venerate and honour the Roman Beast and the whole of the oiled pack.' The Protestants, however, 'if they did not at once fly to arms,' would at any rate 'point the dagger honourably' at the parsons who were donning their armour, and 'sing their Requiem for them in advance;' they would 'seize them manfully and valiantly by the hair,' and 'unfrock them,' as was 'right and fitting.'¹

Another vociferator, who gave himself out as a 'lover of the divine and the Lutheran truth,' announced his full confidence in a speedy victory, if only Lutherans

¹ *Kurze Erinnerung*, pp. 7-8, 10, 12-13, 22. Von Effern, one of the councillors of the Mayence electorate, who was the most fiercely attacked in this pamphlet, published, in 1617, in answer to the 'wicked calumniator, who goes by the fictitious name of Wernerus Albertus ab Obrinca,' a pamphlet entitled *Nothwendige Abgetrungenene Ehrenrettung*. He declared that he had not composed either of the two pamphlets attacked by

and Calvinists would make common cause against the papists, 'the Roman-Spanish foe,' and would take up arms conjointly :

The Spanish and Italian men
Are brimful of deceit and fraud,
But yet their hearts grow fearful when
A German jokes of drawing sword ;
They cannot tolerate the fun :
Like timid hares away they run.¹

'Oh, ye Lutheran princes and people,' exclaimed, on the other hand, a Catholic in an *Ernsthafte Vermahnung* ('earnest admonition'), 'do not let yourselves be befooled by the Calvinists, who are intent on war and bloodshed. Not from the Catholics have you anything to fear. They do not want war if only they are left in peace and in possession of what is their own. But you have reason to fear those who at all times are full of deceit and cunning, and who, ever since they forced themselves into the Holy Empire, have brought

Wernerus, and that he did not know their authors. It was untrue that he had said that the ecclesiastical princes need not keep the promises they had made to the Protestants. 'I have never in my life,' he said, 'done the least injury to the evangelical kings, electors, and princes, and I know, God be praised, better than you do how to show fitting honour to the rulers appointed by God, without respect of religion.' 'This much I can in very truth testify before God, that during all the time of my service (under the Elector of Mayence) no warlike counsels have ever been agreed upon, excepting such as God Himself and nature could have prompted in respect of legitimate defence on the part of the collective Catholic electors, princes, and Estates ; and if ever I or others offered the slightest suggestion in favour of war or the offensive, we were not tolerated at court.' In conclusion v. Effern challenges his opponent to appear 'before the Emperor and the Imperial Chamber at Spire, or before all the evangelical kings, electors, and princes, or before the Elector of Saxony.' He was ready, he said, to answer for himself before them, and to submit to their verdict (pp. 6, 7, 9).

¹ *Ventilatio . . . Erleuterung . . . der B päpstlichen Gloss* (1615), pp. 47-48.

nothing but discord, disturbance, and anarchy on lands and people. Is it unbeknown to you what sort of spirit dwells in them, and what you will have to undergo at their hands if they succeed in bringing their plots to pass? Does not history afford countless examples of this same spirit?'¹ A second admonition described the seven-headed spirit of Calvinism: '*Siebenköpfigen Calvinistengeist*;' it is as friendly as it is possible to be until it has established its sway; as meek as a lamb until it has gained its ends; as cunning as a fox behind the scenes; as insatiable as a wolf, which, the more it devours, wants the more; bloodthirsty as a leopard, fiery as a dragon, in all its doing and striving—the very counterpart of the devil:

And every day before our eyes
 Fresh massacres from it arise;
 With horriblest of fire-brands
 It devastates all realms and lands;
 Its raging, blazing flames of fire
 Mount fiercely upward, high and higher,
 Like unto hellish Satan, who
 From very first no good did do,
 But everywhere sowed villany;
 Thus too this baneful heresy,
 This spirit false of Calvinism,
 Works only misery and schism;
 Its words, its work, its thinking, all
 Tend only to its neighbour's fall.
 Christian true, of it beware,
 As you do value your welfare.²

'The great papist League,' which was described as 'in the highest degré threatening to the stability of all evangelicism in the Empire,' was indeed reduced to

¹ *Ernsthafte Vermahnung wider der Calvinisten Mordgeist und Blutpraktiken* (Einblattdruck, 1617).

² *Einblattdruck* of 1617, also in Scheible, *Fliegende Blätter*, pp. 209–211, from an impression of 1619.

a sorry plight, and had thought of nothing less than an attack on its opponents.

‘The princes of the League,’ said Duke Maximilian of Bavaria in 1613, ‘talk high Catholic sentiments, but when it comes to paying up, to paying up, it’s a sorry business with most of them.’ Many of the members failed to send in the contributions they had promised to the fund. Special defaulters were the Suabian prelates and counts of the Empire, who excused themselves on the plea of ‘total inability.’ When Maximilian summoned the tardy Count Caspar zu Hohenembs to pay his contribution, the Count answered: ‘I live in an out-of-the-way district, where I am seldom affected by the disturbances in the Empire, and they do not concern me at all.’ He was not in any way indebted to the League, he said; the Roman Empire was bound to protect him from damage and injury. The imperial abbess, Katherine von Buchau, would not contribute because ‘there were still numbers of important abbeys and princes not yet enrolled in the League,’ and it would be disgraceful and detrimental to herself if the world came to know that she was a member of the Catholic League.¹ At the assembly of the League at Frankfort-on-the-Main in March 1613, at which ‘such bold resolutions were made,’² the Bishop of Spire excused his own tardiness in paying up on the plea of the dilatoriness of other Estates which had been equally remiss. The Bishop of Ratisbon was willing to stake body and life for the Catholic religion, but ready money, he said, he could not give. Archduke Leopold, Administrator of the bishoprics of Passau and Strasburg, pleaded utter and entire want of means.

¹ Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 314–317.

² See above, p. 526. —

The new Archbishop of Salzburg had to make far too large an outlay on the building of a new cathedral church to be in a position to spend money on the League. The abbot of St. Emmeram, at Ratisbon, said he was unable to contribute to the fund owing to the 'well-known hospitality of his convent.'¹

'In view of such lamentable demeanour' it was by no means surprising that Maximilian should have caused the assembly at Frankfort to be informed that 'for weighty and important reasons he was obliged again to resign the leadership of the League.' In spite of all the assurances of the members present that their lords 'will solicit your Excellency in all friendliness, humility, and submissiveness not to withdraw, in these times of direst need and peril, from the post you have so admirably filled, and to abandon all Catholics to manifest danger,' the only encouragement they received from the Bavarian ambassador was that 'their petition should be duly reported at court.'²

In order to move Maximilian from this decision, the South German Estates sent Bishop Henry of Augsburg to Munich. The Bishop was most urgent in his attempts at persuasion, but the Duke for a long time refused to give in. 'Some of the Estates,' he said, 'had not yet even once paid up what had been required of them by the Recess of the League of 1610. He alone, with only the few zealous members, could not accomplish any satisfactory results. Things looked exactly as though it was intended to leave him helpless; for none of the contributions lately promised had yet come to hand.' 'God does not work miracles,' said Maximilian, 'when

¹ Stumpf, p. 76; Wolf, iii. 361-362.

² *Der Abschied* in Wolf, iii. 362-368.

people act presumptuously and fold their hands idly in their laps ; then only can we hope for God's blessing when we have put forth all our own strength and energies.' These reproaches did not touch the Bishop himself, for he was among the most zealous members of the League, but he considered them quite well-grounded. 'It is true,' he wrote to a clerical brother in office, 'that this matter concerns us clergy most closely. Religion, of which we are the priests, is in danger. We ought, therefore, to bestir ourselves more energetically than the secular Estates allied with us.' It was only with much difficulty that the Bishop obtained from Maximilian the promise to retain the command of the League until the next assembly of the members. Maximilian, however, made the stipulation that the Estates, without exception and without delay, should fulfil the obligations imposed on them by the Frankfort Recess.¹

All matters that had remained in abeyance at Frankfort were to be settled in fuller detail during the sitting of the Diet at Ratisbon, by a fresh assembly of the League. The proposed despatch of a 'solemn embassy' to Paris was regarded by Maximilian as unnecessary, because the leading French minister, Villeroy, had already given a Mayence delegate the distinct assurance that the King 'was not allied with the Protestant princes in the Empire nor with some of the Calvinists against a single Catholic prince ; but that, on the contrary, he would show himself a true friend to the Catholic electors, princes, and Estates in case of their suffering military aggression from the Protestant Estates.' The King of Spain—so Maximilian informed the Estates—had promised on April 1 'to do all in his

¹ Stumpf, pp. 76-78.

power for the maintenance of the Catholic League and for the furtherance of all that was favourable to the general defence of the Catholic faith.' The Duke reiterated his declaration that he could only carry on the leadership of the League if the members ceased from the irresoluteness, coldness, and torpor which they had hitherto shown with regard to the necessary provisions for defensive measures.' He proposed that, with a view to raising the necessary means for their self-preservation, the clergy should contribute the tenth part of their revenues for one year; for, he reminded them, it was they themselves whom the danger most nearly threatened. They would do well, also, he suggested, until the danger was overpast, to devote the abundant revenues of certain unoccupied clerical posts, with which no cures of souls were connected, to a fund for means of defence.¹

No business of this sort, however, was discussed at Ratisbon. On the contrary, through the efforts and influence of Klesl, any power that the Catholic League still possessed was brought down to the lowest ebb. Without the consent of Maximilian a fresh constitution was given to the League, and by this change the House of Austria not only became associated with Bavaria in the directorship, but was also invested with preponderating power. Under the former *régime* the Duke of Bavaria had at any rate been guaranteed, for all future occasions of war, undivided and unlimited control. By the new organisation, however, there were to be three 'military directorships'—a Bavarian one, a Rhenish one, under the Archduke Albert of the Netherlands, and an Austrian one, under the Archduke

¹ Wolf, iii. 456-468.

Maximilian of Tyrol. This change in the management must necessarily, as Maximilian's privy councillors pointed out, 'throw the affairs of the League into serious confusion, and produce lengthy and far-reaching delays and complications.' The directors, 'armed all three with equal plenary powers,' 'would not have time to consult together concerning measures to be adopted, because a variety of interests would be operating independently.' Furthermore, under the new constitution, it was necessary in every case, before proceeding to actual accomplishment of plans, to obtain the imperial consent, so that Klesl, the director of the Emperor, virtually retained the chief command of the League in his own hands. He could control 'the affairs of the League according to his own pleasure.' But that the Estates had no reason 'to expect any good and fruitful results from the change needed no pointing out,' the councillors emphatically declared: that 'the matter spoke for itself.' 'The imperial and Austrian ministers, the characters of these gentlemen, the way also in which they will carry on the management, how little they will respect the Catholic electors and Estates, all this is more than well known.' If, then, the opponents 'make a practice in future of invading the Catholics, robbing and confiscating their abbeys and convents, and going to the greatest lengths of coercion against them, and if the Catholics are obliged to defend themselves, it is not difficult to see that these ill-disposed, evil-affected ministers will arrange everything everywhere according to their own minds and liking.' An alliance with the Austrian army appeared also to the Duke dangerous for the Catholic League. 'Everybody knows how expensive, ostentatious, and, to speak truth,

how extravagant the pay and equipment of officers have become, especially in Austria; and that the pay of a single officer of high rank often amounts to as much as the joint subscriptions of six, seven, or eight members of the Catholic League. This Austrian extravagance would soon creep into the Bavarian directorship. But what is most serious of all, by alliance with Austria the Catholic League would be drawn into all the contests and wars going on there. The Emperor has lost the obedience of his subjects in almost all his lands, and he cannot raise five hundred men without the consent of the provincial Estates; besides which there seems likely to be a general insurrection in Hungaria, Bohemia, Silesia, and Moravia. For all these reasons the Austrian directorship would in a short time, and unexpectedly, command the services of the Bavarian, and what the Austrian ministers have allowed to drift and be lost at home, failing other means, they would regain by the help of the Catholic defence fund and the Austrian directory, and thus they would set themselves right at the expense of others.' ¹

For all these reasons combined Maximilian would not bother himself with the Ratisbon League Recess. In order, however, to avert the complete disruption of the League, it was decided at Munich 'that the best way of salvation' was that 'among a certain number of the Estates of South Germany' a special defensive league should be formed on the basis of the old constitution. Even if this league should not 'secure the

¹ *Abschied des Regensburgers Bundestags vom 23. Oktober 1613*; Wolf, iii. 469-478; *Gutachten der bayerischen Räte über den Abschied*, pp. 478-485; Maximilian's *Instruktion vom 20. Januar 1614*, for a meeting of the League at Augsburg, pp. 563-569.

Spanish and papal succour, which, after all, had not hitherto been of such great importance,' it would not at any rate 'be easy for anyone to attack and harass the allied Estates in their own lands.' The Rhenish princes of the League, with whom friendly relations were to be observed, would without doubt rally together with the assistance of Archduke Albert, and avert from themselves all threatened danger. 'If, then, the opposite party should want to bring on a general action, it would be easy afterwards to unite all the military forces, and then it could soon be settled, according to the exigencies of time, place, and the particular danger feared, which of the directors should be entrusted with the sole management.'¹

In March 1614 a closer defensive alliance of this sort was concluded between Bavaria, the Bishops of Bamberg, Würzburg, Eichstädt, and Augsburg, and the Provost of Ellwangen.² In June the Rhenish confederates assembled at Bingen, and resolved to stand firmly by the Ratisbon Recess, to negotiate with the Duke of Lorraine respecting his accession to the Union, and to obtain from Archduke Albert a promise that 'in case the allied Protestants should be supported either openly with military forces, or secretly with money, by the Dutch States, he would come in like manner to the help of the Catholics, either with men or with money.'³

Although 'everybody was aware that the dangers were steadily increasing, yet the Catholic League of Defence was allowed to fall visibly to pieces.'

While the Bavarian and Rhenish directorates were

¹ Wolf, iii. 484-485.

² *Id.* iii. 586-597.

³ *Id.* iii. 603-615.

severed, Archduke Maximilian, not content with the position assigned to him at Augsburg, demanded that the bishopric of Augsburg and the provostry of Ellwangen should pass 'entirely under the control of the Austrian directorate.' When this had been accomplished, and not before, he would make known 'the remainder of his grievances' at a meeting of the League. As if to seal the doom of the Catholic cause, he raised still further contentions. He insisted that Bavaria 'should surrender to him all the lands and people situated and dwelling above the Lech;' for Bavaria proper only extended as far as the Lech, and had no claims on any territory beyond this boundary. Writing to his brother Ferdinand in complaint of this 'new and unheard-of pretension,' Duke Maximilian said: 'I seem indeed to be the one whom people, at every opportunity and for every pretext, conspire to dispossess of his own.'¹ At the urgent solicitation of the Elector of Mayence he transferred the bishopric of Augsburg to the Austrian directorate; at the same time, however, at the beginning of the year 1616, he resigned his command of the League, stating his reasons for this now irrevocable decision in an exhaustive pamphlet. 'Nevertheless,' he reiterated again and again, 'we shall not altogether and entirely sever ourselves from the Catholics, but as far as lies in our power we shall do all we can for the Catholic cause.' Once more, in urgent language, the Bishops of Bamberg and Würzburg attempted to turn him from his purpose. 'They had hitherto,' they said, 'placed their sole hope and trust in him,' and they could not submit to any other directorate. If he

¹ Breyer, i. 25, note 12.

ceased to be head of the League, the whole confederacy would inevitably fall to pieces, and the adversaries would gain the wished-for opportunity for attack; then all would be over with the Catholic religion and the Fatherland. Had not the opponents themselves lately declared that if it had not been for the Duke of Bavaria they would have proceeded very differently against the bishoprics? The Duke, at any rate, was not exposed to such great dangers as they were, as the Protestants were more covetous of the clerical benefices than of the princely lands. 'If, however, the enemies' plans for utterly rooting out the Catholic religion should succeed, the ruin would spread finally to Bavaria also, as had happened to the powerful King of Spain through his own native subjects on account of religion.' When these representations proved fruitless, the Estates with whom Maximilian had contracted a close alliance in 1614 sent an embassy to Munich in April 1616, to inform the Duke that 'they were ready to place not a small sum only, but the whole of their fortunes at the disposal of the League.' They pointed out how grievous it was that this League, which the Spirit of God had fashioned to bind together the Catholic Estates, should be so lightly torn asunder again, 'whereas the confederacy which the adversary's spirit had created had hitherto, in spite of all contrarieties, stood so firmly together that neither the prestige of the Emperor nor the combined resistance of the Catholic electors, princes, and Estates, nor the disapproval of some of the Protestant princes, nor even the lamentable wailing and complaining of the poor ruined subjects, had been able to loosen it.'¹ But Maximilian adhered im-

¹ Breyer, i. 10-36.

movably to his resolution no longer to be head of the League, for 'he did not choose to be the servant of Austria.'

Through his withdrawal the League was as good as broken up. All that remained of it was 'a private, neighbourly understanding' arranged in May 1617 between Bavaria, the Bishops of Bamberg, Würzburg, and Eichstädt, and the Provost of Ellwangen. Not even Maximilian's brother, the Elector of Cologne, was granted his request to join.¹ And yet this very Elector was especially in need of help. 'A few days ago,' he wrote to Maximilian on April 13, 1617, 'General Gent, who serves under the States-General, under pretext of leading his troops into France, marched out of Gueldres into my bishopric of Münster with nineteen companies of cavalry numbering two thousand men, seized and pillaged the borough of Stadtlohn, injured and shot down the burgomaster and several other citizens, and altogether behaved in a very evil and hostile manner wherever they went.' After these undisciplined soldiers 'had committed all sorts of excesses in Münster, and had heavily molested the poor inhabitants, they went straight off to the bishopric of Paderborn, where also they perpetrated all sorts of enormities.' Three thousand imperial thalers had to be spent in purchasing their withdrawal. 'It is pitiable indeed that the Roman Empire should have fallen into such contempt that nowadays any and every one, even disorderly gangs, may boldly push their way across the soil of the Empire without asking permission, without even giving any warning, and be allowed to inflict the worst and most irreparable damages on the lands thus passed through,

¹ Breyer, i. 90-97.

without any resistance being offered. All this comes from the shattered and disrupted condition of the League, which makes it impossible for any one Estate to get help from another, and most especially so for me with my bishoprics.' ¹

¹ Breyer, i. 13-15, note.

CHAPTER XI

THE 'COMPOSITION' AND THE SUCCESSION IN THE
EMPIRE—VIOLENT MEASURES OF THE UNION, 1615–
1618

WHILE the Catholic League of Defence was in course of splitting up, the corresponding princes clamoured incessantly for a 'Composition Diet,' at which a fresh compact similar to the Passau Treaty should be concluded between them and the Catholic Estates. At the Ratisbon imperial Diet Klesl had recommended a meeting of this sort, and the Emperor had held out hopes of one in order to induce the corresponding princes to pay their promised Turkish aids.

But already at that time the Catholic Estates had refused their assent, because 'so far all contracts had begun and ended with sacrifices on their part.' 'The only object,' they had said, 'of the corresponding princes was to place themselves in secure possession of the ecclesiastical property confiscated after the conclusion of the Passau Treaty. To this, however, the Catholics could not consent without danger of also losing the remainder of their property; let the new treaty be drawn up as it might, it would all the same excite a desire for more and more, just as the Passau Treaty had done; it was therefore better, at the risk of some possible danger, to await the development of time and circumstances, than to subscribe at once to

certain danger.’¹ ‘There is much talk at present,’ said van Effern, counsellor of the Elector of Mayence, in a memorandum prepared for his lord during the Diet, ‘on the question whether the Catholic Estates can and should give up their rights in order to preserve peace in the Empire.’ The opponents, it is urged, ‘will support their delinquencies with armed force,’ whereas the Catholics were quite unprepared for war and would not be able to stand the attack ; it was therefore ‘better to yield in some measure than to imperil everything.’ On the other hand, it was retorted by others, ‘The Catholics, by manifold concessions—that is to say, by giving up the occupied abbeys and churches—give occasion to the Calvinists to encroach more and more and to rase the Catholic Church to the ground.’ In this opinion van Effern concurred. Even if the Catholics surrendered to the Protestants all that they had taken possession of, the former would still have no certainty of being able to retain what was left to them ; for on the part of the Calvinist corresponding Estates, as experience had proved, no promises or oaths were kept. It was therefore better, ‘by means of necessary defence,’ to save God’s honour and the Church, ‘than to lose everything by a policy of concession. ‘All Catholic emperors, kings, potentates, princes, and governors are bound to God by conscience, office, oath, and duty, to oppose threatened warfare with all their might—yea, with life and property.’²

In February 1615, at their assembly at Nüremberg, the corresponding princes once more begged of the Emperor that, after the example of King Ferdinand, he

¹ Schmidt, *Neuere Gesch.* vii. 12.

² Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 787–792.

would appoint peaceable and competent imperial Estates to act as mediators, to give a kindly hearing to both parties, to negotiate impartially between them, and, if possible, effect a reasonable agreement; which agreement should then be submitted to his Imperial Majesty and the collective Estates for their joint ratification. Matthias sent the document to the ecclesiastical electors for their opinion, and they answered on June 9 that, 'judging from the behaviour of the opponents up to the present time, they could not anticipate any good result from the negotiations; the corresponding princes must at any rate express themselves more fully respecting the objects and the terms of the agreement, and also state how this agreement, supposing it to be arranged, would insure more mutual security than the Religious Peace. Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, who was also solicited for an opinion, had already answered on May 15, that 'a matter of such high importance, and one concerning the whole body of Catholic Estates, should be laid before them for their collective consideration, and that the first step must be to summon an assembly of these Estates.' He personally was convinced 'that the plan of mediation would not have the desired result, but, on the contrary, would cause still greater disruption in the Empire;' for the two parties, to begin with, would never agree in the choice of a mediator, and if division arose on this point there would be nobody at hand to decide the matter, because everything was planned on the assumption of a friendly understanding, and the Emperor himself, by consenting to the 'composition,' had renounced the right of decision. Moreover, it was scarcely likely that in so difficult and complicated a dispute the mediators themselves

would be unanimous, and, even if they were, it is not to be expected that both parties would be content with their pronouncements, especially as the principal point in question is the curtailment of the imperial jurisdiction. And finally, even if a reasonable understanding should be brought about, the agreement must be sent in to the Estates for their confirmation, and this should be given, not by the majority, but individually in an amicable manner, and without allowing the Emperor to decide in doubtful cases. He failed, however, to see in what manner so great a desecration of imperial prestige and of the constitution of the Empire could promote the welfare of Germany.¹

Among the Catholics there was a tolerably firm conviction that 'the corresponding princes intended by means of this "composition" to get all that they wanted straight off, or else, as they threatened, to wield the sword to such purpose that there would be nothing left over respecting which they could come to amicable terms;' a composition was therefore an *a priori* impossibility because 'the corresponding princes would not tolerate any umpire who, in the event of a parity of votes on the matters under dispute, should give the casting vote by an equitable decision.'²

¹ Breyer, i. 39-52. Under appeal to a numerous correspondence in the Viennese State archives (*Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, i. 35), Gindely writes that the corresponding princes, just like the Catholics, 'at the Composition Diet would not take any part in affairs unless certain stipulations were granted them beforehand.' But the stipulations of the two parties 'alternately excluded each other.' The possibility of coming to any understanding was therefore out of the question.

² 'Bedenken' of the year 1616, in Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 934-935. The whole of this 'Bedenken' (pp. 923-937) sums up excellently the whole anarchic situation of the Empire. Respecting this document, cf. the accounts of Krebs, *Publicistik*, p. 208 ff.

In the imperial cabinet the corresponding princes gained a 'powerful advocate' in Klesl, who pleaded with the Emperor in favour of a Composition Diet, in order to defer as long as possible the decision respecting the succession in the Empire.¹

Immediately on the election of the Emperor, who had entered on the government at the age of fifty-five, the question of succession had been stirred up by the Spanish ambassador, and at the Diet at Ratisbon the ecclesiastical Electors and the papal nuncio had most warmly recommended its immediate settlement. They had been actuated by fear of the corresponding princes, who might easily profit by a change of rule in the Empire to procure the crown for one of themselves. Archduke Maximilian devoted his whole strength to the cause of his cousin, Archduke Ferdinand of Styria; for it seemed to him that this prince would best be able to revive the much weakened might of the House of Habsburg if, as King of Bohemia and Hungary and lord of the other hereditary lands, he was also elected Emperor. The ecclesiastical Electors showed themselves not unfavourable to this idea, and already in 1614 an Election Diet was proposed.²

Klesl, however, did not intend to lose his dominant influence over affairs of state and his position as 'Vice-Emperor' by an early settlement of the succession question. He was still so all-powerful with Matthias that Brömser, the ambassador from the Elector of Mayence, wrote to his lord on February 28, 1614, 'Without this man's consent and interposition nothing

¹ See A. Wahl, *Kompositions- und Successions-Verhandlungen unter Kaiser Matthias während der Jahre 1613-1615* (Dissert., Bonn, 1895).

² Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, i. 7-21.

can be accomplished.’¹ To the Archduke Maximilian, however, Klesl posed as an active promoter of the settlement of the succession. Nevertheless, he wrote to the Archduke at the end of October 1614, the matter could not be decided without that ‘unanimous agreement’ with the Catholics which the corresponding princes desired. Until this had been brought about the Count Palatine and the Elector of Brandenburg would not come to any Election Diet, but would, on the contrary, protest against any being held, possibly even set up an opposition election, and then ‘the House of Austria, the whole Empire, and the Catholic religion would be plunged in ruin.’ The Catholics must agree together respecting a Composition Diet, for the things they wanted were only private matters; the succession, on the other hand, was a universal matter; the first must give way to the latter. It was not the first time, moreover, that for the sake of a greater good it had been necessary to ‘bite into a hard and sour kind of apple which with time had become sweet and mellow.’ Even if the Catholics did not give in to their opponents at the Composition Diet they would at any rate maintain the sentiment of German trustfulness, fresh good feeling would be awakened by meeting together, the motives and intentions of the adversaries would be gauged, and possibly even a satisfactory termination be the result.² In view of this attitude of Klesl it is easily understood that the corresponding princes were anxious for his presence at such a meeting. ‘The much desiderated man,’ said they, ‘must be especially added to the Estates as a supporter; on the other hand

¹ Kerschbaumer, p. 198, note.

² Hammer, iii.; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 143-145.

the Lutheran Elector of Saxony and the Lutheran Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt must be excluded from the proceedings.'

While the Archduke Maximilian, conjointly with John Schweikau of Mayence, was besieging the Emperor with entreaties not to postpone any longer the fixing of a date for the Election Diet, Klesl signified anew, in the autumn of 1615, that an election was still impracticable because the Protestant Electors could not be persuaded to agree to such a measure ; ' the corresponding princes,' he said, ' as is openly known, are bent on nothing but an interregnum.'¹

But just for this very reason Maximilian and the ecclesiastical Electors were anxious to hasten on the election. They agreed in the opinion that a meeting of the Electors should be held, not for the sake of the ' composition ' wished for by the corresponding princes, but ' only on account of the succession question.'² On February 19, 1616, the Archduke addressed a letter to the Emperor, informing him that the ecclesiastical Electors were ready to proceed with the settlement of the election, and advising him to communicate personally with John George of Saxony, and to insure the latter's not only consenting himself to the election, but also gaining for it the approval of the Palatinate and Brandenburg. Even, however, if these two last Estates should raise difficulties and should not appear at the meeting of Electors, they would still be able to proceed to the election, for, according to the Golden Bull, the minority must submit to the majority, even as

¹ Hammer, iii. ; *Urkundenbd.* pp. 266-267.

² Letter of the Elector Ferdinand of Cologne to Maximilian of Bavaria, May 30, 1616, in Breyer, I. Beil. i. 4-5.

Ferdinand I. had been elected without the vote of the Elector of Saxony. But it was not in accordance with the Golden Bull for Maximilian to advise the Emperor that 'he must reserve to himself the choice of his successor in spite of the result of the election.' In order to be prepared against all adverse agencies, the Archduke urged emphatically, he would require that 'indispensable military equipment' which he (the Archduke) had recommended in another memorandum.¹ This other memorandum was to the effect that 'with the support of the courts of Brussels and Madrid, and under the command of Ferdinand of Styria, a well-organised army should be established on the soil of the Empire in order to intimidate the disobedient, to arouse the indifferent to a sense of their duties, and to strengthen the loyal and obedient.'² In the middle of March 1616 Matthias informed his brother that the proposed plan met with his approval, and that he intended to visit the Elector of Saxony and himself to take in hand the furtherance of the succession settlement in the Austrian lands.³ Maximilian no longer felt any doubts as to the speedy summoning of an Electoral Diet, after Klesl, to whom he had sent his memorandum of February 19, had answered him solemnly, on April 27, that 'he thought everything was most satisfactory, and that he would commend the settlement of the succession to the Emperor;' 'I could not advise him otherwise,' he said; 'I should be imperilling my conscience most seriously if I did.'⁴

¹ Maximilian's 'Gutachten' in Khevenhiller, viii. 882-888; Londorp *Acta publ.* i. 350-351; Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 916-919.

² Letter of the Elector of Cologne, see above, p. 617, note 1.

³ Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*.

⁴ Khevenhiller, viii. 891-893; Lünig, *Staatsconsilia*, i. 921-922.

But 'the man with the impenetrable arts'¹ did not further the cause of the election, but, on the contrary, opposed hostile resistance to the elevation of Ferdinand, and instilled into the Emperor anxious fears that he might experience from his brothers the same treatment of which he himself had been guilty towards Rudolf, that the archdukes must have evil designs against him, and that, on the other hand, the opponents of his House, furious in the extreme at the hurrying on of the succession question, were plotting his downfall.²

Into the hands of these opponents Maximilian's secret memorial of February 19 was smuggled; the Palatine court got possession of a copy of it, and soon the whole of Germany was acquainted with its contents.³ Maximilian had no doubt whatever that Klesl was the traitor. 'It astonished him,' he said, 'that the devil had not long ago carried off this lying scoundrel; Klesl was the pest of the House of Austria.'⁴

The Elector Frederic V. used this memorial as a warrant for casting it in the teeth of the Habsburgers that their intention was to abolish the Electors' rights of choosing the Emperor, to make the Empire hereditary; their stupendous armaments, he said, were meant to crush out every breath of freedom.⁵

But the scarecrow pictures which he conjured up of

¹ See above, pp. 512-513.

² Gindely, *Gesch. des böhmischen Aufstandes*, i. 38. See W. Meier, *Kompositions- und Successions-Verhandlungen unter Kaiser Matthias während der Jahre 1615-1618* (Dissert., Bonn, 1895). This work carries on the investigations of Wahl cited above at p. 615, note 1, and rectifies and largely supplements the account given by Gindely.

³ Hurter, vii. 61; Gindely, i. 39. Maximilian of Bavaria received the first intelligence of the memorial through Christian of Anhalt (Breyer, i. 59).

⁴ Wolf, *Maximilian*, iii. 657, note.

⁵ Gindely, i. 40.

the 'terrific' plans of the Habsburgers, and by which he tried also, though vainly, to frighten the Elector of Saxony, he by no means believed in himself. For he had learnt the true state of things with regard to the Habsburg House from two ambassadors who had been sent to Bohemia at the beginning of 1617 to inform themselves more fully concerning the situation of affairs. The first of these, Christopher von Dohna, after his return, collected together his observations and information in a report to the Prince of Anhalt: 'The Austrian monarchy,' he said, 'was tottering at every point; each separate province had its pretender to the throne, who was only waiting for the death of the Emperor to lift up his head. In Hungary any prince who had money, and who understood something of the Hungarian language, might stretch out his hand for the crown with hope of success. The lordship over Moravia and Austria was the prize which Prince Charles meant to get for himself; if the Protestants aided and abetted him, he would let the Mass go.' The Union enjoyed high repute everywhere, and it had gained especial favour by its flat refusal at the Diet at Ratisbon to grant the Emperor any pecuniary aid. It was desirable that the allies should deal sparingly with their means, in order that when once they drew the sword from its scabbard they might not have to put it back until everything was won. The Emperor, in case of war, had no resources at hand; the arsenals were empty; the state debts, which already amounted to twenty-five million florins, went on steadily augmenting, owing to non-payment of taxes; the Hungarian border fortresses were almost without garrisons. The second ambassador, the Palatine Councillor Camerarius, kept his

attention fixed chiefly on the question of the succession in Bohemia, and entered secretly into negotiations on the matter with Count Matthias von Thurn and his associates ; so great was the importance of the business that he thought it ' perilous ' to him to trust his experiences to pen and ink. Under the pretext of trying to bring about a ' Composition Diet ' Camerarius had had several interviews with the Emperor and with Klesl. He was able to report with satisfaction that the former was not in favour of the succession of Ferdinand, and that the latter was working zealously against it. Klesl was apprehensive, Dohna wrote ; he fought shy of opposing the Protestants, which was very fortunate for them.¹ Nevertheless, the first thing to happen in Bohemia was ' the utterly unexpected.'

Klesl had persistently explained his hesitation to work for Ferdinand's election on the ground that no agreement had yet been concluded with the King of Spain, who laid claims to the Austrian inheritance. Philip III., namely, as son of a daughter of Maximilian II., claimed that on the extinction of the latter's male descendants, he had a better right to the throne of Bohemia and Hungary than the collateral line of Graz, from which Ferdinand sprang. In the first months, however, of 1617, behind the back of Klesl and the Emperor, a compact was concluded between Ferdinand and the Spanish ambassador Oñate, by which Philip renounced ' his claims to the crown.' Ferdinand in exchange made two attestations on the strength of which, after his elevation to the imperial throne, every vacant German fief in Italy, besides Austrian Alsatia, was to pass over to Spain. Fortunately these fateful

¹ Gindely, i. 186-190.

agreements were not carried into practical effect; Philip himself later on voluntarily released Ferdinand from his engagement respecting Alsatia. In the presence of the Emperor and of Klesl, the Spanish ambassador, in the name of his sovereign, expressed satisfaction that the male descendants of Philip should be preferred before the female descendants of Ferdinand, and used all his influence and energy in favour of establishing the former on the throne of Bohemia and Hungary. Klesl was prevented by threats of imprisonment from further hindering the course of the election, and the Emperor, during a severe illness with which he was seized at the end of April, declared himself willing to summon a Bohemian provincial Diet on June 5.¹

At this Diet, 'to the utmost astonishment' of all the Protestants, Ferdinand was unanimously accepted as King by all three Estates. The Protestant Estates demanded of him a formal written attestation that he would respect all rights and privileges 'in all points and clauses, in like manner as the present Emperor and his ancestors, the Kings of Bohemia, had done.' The matter particularly in question here was the *Majestäts-brief*. Ferdinand consulted the Jesuits of Prague as to whether he could recognise this letter without violence to his conscience. The answer was unanimously in the affirmative; true, he ought never to have consented to such a letter, but, having once done so, he might ratify it. The wished-for attestation was written down, and the new King was solemnly crowned on June 29.²

A disconcerting event this for the Count Palatine Frederic V., who had already, in his suit for the King

¹ Fuller details in Gindely, i. 45-56.

² *Ibid.* 162-173.

of England's daughter, mentioned the Bohemian crown as his future possession.¹

As Bohemia—for the present at any rate—was out of their reach, it was above all important for the corresponding princes to prevent Ferdinand's selection to the imperial throne. They formed the plan of putting up the Duke of Lorraine as his opponent. To this end Frederic V., at the end of July 1617, repaired to the Duke of Bouillon, the old Huguenot leader, at Sedan, where an ambassador of the King of England also appeared to offer James I.'s help against Ferdinand. A compact was arranged regarding joint operations and the necessary preparations for future military equipment. The Dutch General Gent, who in April had ravaged the bishoprics of Münster and Paderborn,² was recalled to Sedan with three other generals, and it was arranged with him that he should come to the help of the allies with his cavalry. Thereupon Frederic sent an ambassador to Nancy with instructions to offer the Duke of Lorraine, in case of his being ready to compete for the crown, the assistance of the Union, of the States-General, of the King of England, and of the Duke of Savoy; at the decisive moment they would come forward resolutely and seize the electoral town of Frankfurt. But the Duke rejected all overtures and warned the Elector against undertakings of the sort.³

When this hope had been wrecked the corresponding princes turned their attention to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. Already in 1616, after Maximilian had resigned the leadership of the League, they had attempted

¹ Gindely, i. 186.

² See above, pp. 609-610.

³ Khevenhiller, viii. 1151-1152; Gindely, i. 191.

to enter into closer relations with him,¹ and now the Palatine court urged him to try for the dignity of Emperor. The Duke's privy councillors regarded the suggestion from the outset as 'a Calvinistic snare.' They divined that the Calvinistic party, realising that the election of Ferdinand could scarcely now be prevented, especially as the electors were all in favour of it, and even the Elector of Saxony inclined that way, were now doing their best at any rate to delay it. As, however, they were not in a position to do this unaided, they were endeavouring to draw the Duke into their scheme, and thus to secure powerful support. If the plan succeeded, the result would be disunion between the Electors and Estates of the realm, the bitterest hatred between Bavaria and Austria, and war and disaster in the Empire. There would undoubtedly be a dangerous interregnum, which the Calvinists would know how to prolong over the longest possible period, so that the Palatine Elector, as Vicar of the Empire, would practically remain Emperor, would rule the land at his own pleasure, and would very likely cast the government in a new mould.² When an Ansbach ambassador, in spite of a refusal from the Duke, pressed for further negotiations, Maximilian said to his privy councillor Jocher: 'I grow more and more confirmed in my opinion that these people must be spoken to in plainer German. Once for all, I have no intention of

¹ Breyer, i. 98-104.

² Breyer, i. 113-118. That the corresponding princes had laid their reckoning on an interregnum is plainly shown by a letter of Christian of Anhalt to the Palatine Chancellor Grün on November 2, 1617. He speaks in it of 'means' 'whereby to keep this matter still a long time *in suspensa*, and with the help of time to gain more and more advantage both within and without the Empire' (Breyer, i. 122, note).

letting myself be entangled with Austria, or led into complications by her on account of the succession ; I am convinced, moreover, that it would be more pernicious than advantageous to myself and my House to saddle myself with so heavy a burden as the imperial crown.' Even after this, in order to augment the mistrust between Austria and Bavaria, the corresponding princes spread the report that Maximilian was striving after the crown. The Duke, accordingly, on November 7, 1617, sent an ambassador to Ferdinand with the assurance that this was by no means the case, that, on the contrary, he had firmly repudiated all the Palatine overtures.¹

Frederic V., however, was determined to try his luck once more personally in Munich. Christian of Anhalt expressed himself in favour of his taking this journey, for, he said, ' if we do not now wrest the crown from the House of Habsburg we must give up the desperate task for ever.' But he entertained little hope of a change of mind in Maximilian, because ' the Palatine proposals were, as a matter of fact, to the advantage of the Catholics, and therefore calculated to stir up division ; ' the Duke would certainly see through this, and would not easily fall into the trap laid for him. After Frederic had assured himself of the approval of the Elector of Brandenburg he betook himself to Munich at the beginning of February 1618, and promised his own vote and that of Brandenburg ; Cologne, he said, could not fail to be on the Duke's side, and it would be quite easy to gain a fourth and even a fifth vote, and thus to secure the majority ; there was some hope also of Saxony as well as of Treves. He also produced a letter

¹ Gindely, i. 193-194.

from King James I. of England, in which this monarch expressed his great delight at the possible candidature of Bavaria for the crown, and not only promised his own support, but also his diplomatic intervention with France. Maximilian, however, 'was not caught in the trap.' Once more with the utmost decision he rejected all the advances made to him.¹

Meanwhile the Union had made ample provision 'for every future emergency.'

The Emperor on April 3, 1617, in a weighty and serious despatch to the electors of the Palatinate and of Mayence, had formally prohibited both the Leagues, Catholic and Protestant. The allies, assembled at a diet at Heilbronn on April 17, had replied to this command, 'it was only on account of the numerous enterprises directed against them that they had been obliged to form themselves into a league, and if it was broken up they did not know how they should be able to secure themselves against fresh molestations.' They prolonged the League, which was to have come to an end in May of the following year, for three years more; they bound the members over in any case to keep their subjects well trained in arms, and instructed the master of the ordnance, Jobst Nolden, to multiply and replenish the arsenals and provision stores. The treaty of help arranged by the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse with the Nether-Saxon imperial circle was ratified, and an ambassador from the Duke of Savoy met with 'good encouragement.'² Another attempt was also made to

¹ Gindely, i. 195, 198-199.

² Senkenberg, xxiv. 122-130; Schreiber, p. 178; Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 343. In the summer of 1617, Christian of Anhalt sent his own eldest son and heir to the throne to the Turin court, under the guardianship of the Count of Dolna, 'in order to further the evangelical cause and

win the people of Zürich and Berne over to the Union. A deputation was sent to represent to them that 'the enemies had not yet done with their bloody machinations; that they had nothing else in their minds than to root out religion, to deprive the evangelicals of their liberty and of everything that was dear to them, and finally to bring in the Spanish dominion. Hence, therefore, those who did not wish to subject themselves to the Spanish bondage must stand by each other and come to an agreement concerning mutual help; the sole object of the Union was defence.'¹

Whether this was in truth the case was soon to be evidenced anew.

Many years earlier the allies had already been occupied with the plan of taking possession of the fortress of Breisach, in the hope 'that if they held this town they would be lords of the whole Rhine, and would have a basis (*sedem belli*) in which they could establish military forces, and from which they could make sorties and control the country on both sides at their will and pleasure.'² In the autumn of 1617 this plan was again mooted by the statesmen of the Palatinate; with the help of the States-General it was thought that it could be worked. 'The affair with Breisach,' wrote Christian of Anhalt at the beginning of November to the chancellor of Frederic V., 'is of importance, and in my opinion the Palatine has no other course open to him

to procure more respect and consideration for the Union.' Cf. Dr. M. Regel, *Christians des Zweiten von Anhalt Gesandtschaftsreise nach Savoyen, 1617. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des 30jährigen Krieges. Wissenschaftliche Beigabe zum zehnten Jahresbericht des herzogl. Karls-Realgymnasiums zu Bernburg*, 1892.

¹ *Instruktion der Gesandten*, contributed by v. Höfler.

² See above, p. 453.

than to avail himself of the help of the States-General (of the Netherlands).’ ‘I will also arrange,’ he went on, ‘that by the time of the Palatine’s arrival we shall receive positive and detailed news from Prague.’¹ They were expecting, namely, a rising of the Protestant leaders in Bohemia, with whom Christian stood in perpetual alliance. Count Zollern, the Lord Chamberlain of the Duke of Bavaria, professed to know that Klesl also was engaged in treacherous dealings with the Calvinists. The House of Austria, said the papal nuncio, had ‘never had a bitterer enemy than Klesl.’² In the middle of December 1617 Frederic V. urged on the allies that in his opinion ‘necessity required of them all by all means to adhere strictly to the measures passed by the Union and to conform to the decrees it had made, in order that in any and every emergency they might with one mind and soul work for a definite purpose and put all their energy into it.’³

Five months later the rebellion broke out in Bohemia and afforded the German confederates the long-wished-for opportunity of putting their ‘resolutions’ into effect. The Heidelberg theologian Varrus drew attention in the same year to a prophecy that ‘a great king would arise who in a forty years’ war would persecute all tyrants, would subjugate Spain and Italy, burn down Rome, and put the Popes to death.’⁴

‘The tocsin and alarm-bell,’ said King Ferdinand to a Saxon ambassador in June 1618, ‘had not been set

¹ Despatch of October 22 (a. St.), 1617, in the *Archivium Unitio-Protestantium*, App. pp. 254-255.

² Gindely, i. 231. See the remarks of the Archduke Maximilian of May 31, 1618 (Kerschbaumer, p. 286).

³ Despatch of December 4-14, 1617, in the *Archivium*, App. p. 262.

⁴ See above, pp. 138, 139.

going by the Bohemians themselves,' but had been pulled from other places, namely: from Heidelberg, the Hague, and Turin.¹ In the following year the position of affairs was such that the Margrave Joachim Ernest of Ansbach said in a letter to Christian of Anhalt: 'We have in our hands the means to overturn the world.'²

¹ Müller, *Forschungen*, iii. 15.

² 'Nous avons le moyen entre nos mains de renverser le monde.' Letters of February 14 and 24, 1619, in the *Archivium*, App. iii. 26.

ADDENDUM

PAGES 557-558.

It was not till after this volume had gone through the press that I received information of the Dissertation of A. Müller, *Der Jülich-Clevesche Erbfolgestreit im Jahre 1614* (Munich, 1901).

INDEX OF PLACES

- AHAUSEN (Union), 435-441, 444, 447-457, 458-466, 467, 470 ff., 475-479, 484, 485 ff., 494, 496, 505, 514-532, 535-550, 560, 576, 580-593, 606, 611 ff., 620, 623 ff.
 Aix-la-Chapelle, 435, 563-570
 Alsatia, 452, 460, 621
 Altorf, in Mid-Franconia (university), 273, 294 (*n.* 2)
 Alzey, 366
 Amberg, 347, 364 (*n.* 3)
 Anhalt-Dessau (principality), 282
 Ansbach (margraviate). *See* Brandenburg-Ansbach
 Antwerp, 360 (*n.* 2), 374, 501
 Appenzell, 125 (*n.* 1)
 Armenia, 14
 Augsburg (bishopric), 469, 475, 523 (*n.* 1), 601 f., 606 f.
 Augsburg (Confession), 62, 72 (*n.* 2), 116, 129 f., 134, 169, 178 f., 186-189, 191, 216 f., 223, 239, 282, 291, 301, 306, 362, 387, 413, 422, 522, 530 (*n.* 2), 539, 561, 579, 594
 Augsburg (Diet, 1530), 178 ; (1555) 179 ; (1582) 180, 563
 Augsburg (ecclesiastical reservation), 184 (*n.* 3), 189, 523
 Augsburg (Interim), 182
 Augsburg (Religious Peace), 72 (*n.* 2), 125, 170 f., 178-213, 287, 422, 424, 450, 455, 462, 469, 481 f., 524-528, 530 (*n.* 2), 535, 538, 540 ff., 562, 584, 594, 613
 Augsburg (town), 25, 72, 86, 111, 159 (*n.* 1), 169, 232 ff., 331, 337, 490 (*n.* 3), 550, 607
 Austria, 69, 176, 453, 409-412, 424, 443, 446, 451, 468, 476, 487, 489, 493 f., 506, 603, 609
 Austria (House), 197, 405, 410, 412, 433, 448, 451 f., 463, 468, 472 f., 476, 485, 505 f., 517, 521, 551 ff., 603, 616, 620, 624 f. ; the Grätz line, 473 f.
 Austria, in the narrower sense, Upper and Lower Austria, 72, 403 ff., 485, 529, 551, 589
 Austria, outlying provinces of, 129, 452, 472
 Austrian dukes, 610, 430, 473
 BADEN-BADEN (town), 127 ; (religious discussion, 1589), 119 ff.
 Baden-Durlach (margraviate), 125, 282, 434-438, 448, 460, 474, 512, 529
 Baden-Hochberg, 116-129, 148 (*n.* 3)
 Baltic, the (East Sea), 578
 Bamberg (bishopric), 474, 477, 550, 606
 Bamberg (town), 135
 Basle (bishopric), 24 (*n.* 1)
 Basle (Council), 52 (*n.* 1)
 Basle (town), 4 (*n.* 4), 347, 453 (*n.* 1), 561
 Bautzen, 77
 Bavaria, 52 (*n.* 1), 126, 127 (*n.* 1), 129, 156, 176, 184 (*n.* 3), 205 (*n.* 1), 214, 216, 217 (*n.* 1), 329, 351, 356, 365, 407, 417 f., 421 (*n.* 2), 449, 455, 466, 480-481, 488, 507, 523, 557, 562, 600 f., 603, 613, 617 (*n.* 2), 619 (*n.* 3), 624 f., 628
 Belgium, 207, 296 (*n.* 1), 365, 457.
See Netherlands, Spanish
 Benevento (archbishopric), 37

- Berg (county), 426, 580. *See* Jülich-Cleves
- Bergen, near Magdeburg (Book of Concord), 120, 266 ff., 285 f., 301 f., 306, 308 f., 314
- Bergen, in Norway, 579
- Berlin (court and town), 77, 301, 309-318
- Bern, 53, 224, 586, 627
- Bingen (assembly of confederates, 1614), 606
- Birstein (Isenburg-, county), 284
- Bohemia, 81, 407-425, 430, 443, 445, 448, 451, 484, 488 ff., 498, 501, 517, 529, 551, 589, 605, 614 (n. 1), 615, 619 (n. 2), 620 f., 628 f. 628 f.; (Bohemian Brothers), 414 f., 417 f., Bohemian Confession, 418
- Bonn, 516
- Brandenburg (margraviate and electorate), 54, 140, 265, 301, 303, 426-429, 447, 452 f., 458, 498, 534, 544, 549, 557 ff., 564, 566, 581, 616 f., 625
- Brandenburg (town), 319
- Brandenburg-Ansbach (margraviate), 448. *See* Joachim Ernest
- Brandenburg - Ansbach - Baireuth (margraviate), 382 (n. 2). *See* George Frederic
- Brandenburg - Jägerndorf (margraviate). *See* John George
- Brandenburg-Cüstrin (margraviate). *See* John
- Braunau, 419
- Breisach, 453, 627
- Breisgau, 453
- Bremen (archbishopric), 81, 524, 579
- Bremen (town), 277, 279, 500, 576, 579
- Brieg (duchy), 300
- Brixen (bishopric), 89
- Brunswick (town), 77, 258, 334, 338, 340, 399, 575 ff.
- Brunswick-Lüneburg (duchy), 19, 377 (n. 1), 536
- Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (duchy), 19, 133, 360, 454 (n. 1), 462, 480 f., 483, 487, 529, 542, 575 ff., 585
- Brussels (court), 431, 438, 457 (n. 3), 495, 589, 618
- Buchau (imperial abbey), 600
- Budweis, 489
- Burgau (margraviate). *See* Charles
- Burgbernheim, 196
- Burgundy (county), 442 (n. 2), 452, 515
- CAMPO LONGO, in Friaul, 67
- Capua (archbishopric). *See* Gaetano
- Carinthia, 164, 278, 445
- Carniola, 445
- Cassel (Synod, 1593), 255
- Cleves (duchy). *See* Jülich-Cleves
- Cleves (town), 460, 559
- Cologne (archbishopric), 62, 185, 216, 470 f., 478, 481, 489, 501, 507, 558, 564, 566, 580, 609, 617 (n. 2)
- Cologne (town), 7 (n. 1), 68 (n. 1), 138, 215, 216 (n. 1), 435, 516, 568
- Cologne (university), 52 (n. 1)
- Cologne on the Spree, 313
- Constance (bishopric), 469, 529
- Constance (council), 52 (n. 1), 367
- Constance (town), 333
- Copenhagen, 579
- Cracow, 331 (n. 1), 360 (n. 2)
- Crete, 30
- Cyprus, 30
- DANTSIC, 315
- Delft, 394
- Denmark, 81, 257, 411, 448, 452 f., 456, 472, 503, 515, 529, 532, 543, 576-579, 588
- Dietmarschen, 81
- Dillingen, 324, 330
- Dinkelsbühl, 72
- Donauwörth, 72, 407, 417, 422, 425, 449, 455, 467, 531, 537, 541, 545
- Döpperschitz, 258 (n. 1), 262
- Dortmund, 251, 329
- Dresden, 133, 244, 332, 338 f., 552
- Duisburg, 570
- Düren, 571
- Durlach, 128. *See* Baden-Durlach
- Düsseldorf, 215 (n. 3), 434 f., 460, 464, 557, 559
- EGYPT, 194
- Eichsfeld, 72 (n. 2)

Eichstätt (bishopric), 606, 609
 Elbe, the, 580
 Ellwangen (provosty), 469, 607, 609
 Eltmann, in East Franconia, 88
 Emden, 580
 Emmendingen (town), 127
 Emmendingen (religious discussion, 1590), 120 ff.
 Emmerich, 570
 Ems (river), 580
 Engen, in Suabia, 149
 England, 101, 207, 265, 367, 411, 417, 423, 443, 448, 453, 455 f., 466, 472, 486, 496, 515, 541 ff., 560, 570, 582, 587
 Erfurt, 51
 Ermland (bishopric), 52 (*n.* 1)
 Esslingen (assembly of the representatives of the city, 1615), 590

FLANDERS, 564

Florence, 135 (*n.* 3), 296 (*n.* 1)
 Fossombrone (bishopric), 52 (*n.* 1)
 France, 54, 59, 258, 301, 350, 361, 371, 383, 407 f., 417, 423, 428, 432, 438, 448, 451, 458, 460, 463, 473, 486, 503, 516, 518, 528, 542, 559, 570, 582, 587-591, 609, 626 ; French Confession, 300 ; Jesuit Province, 384
 Franconia, 238
 Frankenberg, 290
 Frankenthal, 516 (*n.* 1)
 Frankfort on the Main, 7 (*n.* 1), 73, 105, 164, 168 f., 357 (*n.* 2), 275 (*n.* 1), 417, 501, 504 (*n.* 2), 520, 530, 536, 550, 553, 554 (*n.* 1), 571-575, 582, 623
 Frankfort on the Main (assembly of the League, 1613), 526 ff., 600 f.
 Frankfort on the Main (electoral Diet, 1612), 501 ff., 508 ff.
 Frankfort on the Oder (university), 302, 320
 Frauenburg, 52 (*n.* 1)
 Freiburg in the Breisgau, 128, 130, 453 ; (university), 122, 180
 Freiburg in Switzerland, 332
 Friaul, 67
 Friemar, near Gotha, 7 (*n.* 1)

GENEVA, 224, 226 (*n.* 2), 371
 German Empire. *See* Charles V. ; Ferdinand I. ; Rudolf II. ; Matthias ; Ratisbon and Augsburg, ecclesiastical reservation and Religious Pacification ; Ahausen, Union ; Munich, League ; Spires, Imperial Chamber ; Vienna, Imperial Chamber ; and Vienna and Prague, Aulic Council
 Giessen, 51, 246 (*n.* 1), 250, 208 (*n.* 1), 398
 Görlitz, 55
 Gran (archbishopric), 406
 Graz, 111, 332, 423, 474, 496
 Grisons, the, 456
 Guelders (province), 609

HAGEN, 263 (*n.* 2)
 Hagenau (town), 72
 Hague, the, 629
 Haina, in Hesse, 293
 Halberstadt (bishopric), 524
 Hall, in Suabia. *See* Schwäbisch-Hall
 Hall in the Tyrol, 149
 Halle, 263
 Halle (university), 38 (*n.* 2)
 Hamburg, 261 (*n.* 1), 577
 Hanau (county), 282
 Hanau (town), 272
 Hanover (town), 19, 224 (*n.* 3)
 Hanseatic towns, 578 ff., 587, 590
 Hasmar, 51
 Heidelberg (assembly of the League, 1612), 503
 Heidelberg (town and court), 218, 224, 410, 503, 516, 629
 Heidelberg (university), 67, 119, 218, 225 ff., 271, 299, 335 (*n.* 2), 364, 516, 629
 Heilbronn, 34 (*n.* 1)
 Heilbronn (assembly of the allies, 1614), 587, (1617) 626
 Helmstädt (university), 268 (*n.* 1)
 Hersfeld (imperial abbey), 288 (*n.* 1)
 Herzberg, 268
 Hesse-Cassel, 2, 20, 21 (*n.* 1), 49, 128, 146, 147 (*n.* 3), 168, 254, 284 (*n.* 1), 301, 315 f., 393, 429, 447, 450, 456, 459, 464, 505 (*n.* 1), 530 (*n.* 2), 573, 577, 586, 626

- Hesse-Darmstadt, 284, 462, 480,
 483, 529, 530 (*n.* 2), 534 *f.*, 542,
 547 (*n.* 1), 574, 617
 Hesse-Marbourg, 129, 288
 Hildesheim (bishopric), 580
 Hochberg (castle), 128
 Hohenleine, 322
 Holland (in the wider sense). *See*
 Netherlands.
 Holy Cross (abbey in Donauwörth),
 422
 Horn, 406
 Hungary, 81, 403, 406, 410 *f.*, 417,
 420, 443, 451, 506, 508, 535, 551,
 605, 615, 620, 622

 JCHTERSHAUSEN, 64
 Jglau, 494
 India (South American), 362
 Ingolstadt (assembly of the League,
 1614), 560
 Ingolstadt (town), 105, 113
 Ingolstadt (university), 84, 89, 208
 Innsbruck, 160
 Isenburg, 283
 Italy, 54, 59, 77, 219, 367 (*n.* 1),
 407, 441 *ff.*, 448, 456, 502 (*n.* 2),
 518, 528, 543, 589, 621, 628

 JÄGERNDORF (margraviate), 551
 Jena (town), 26 *ff.*, 38 (*n.* 2), 138
 (*n.* 4), 261
 Jena (university), 26, 261
 Joachimsthal, 161
 Jülich, or Jülich-Cleves-Berg
 (duchy), 426, 440, 447, 453, 457,
 472, 475, 480, 486, 557, 559, 568,
 580, 589
 Jülich (fortress), 431-435, 457, 460,
 464 *f.*, 559, 563, 568

 KAUFBEUREN, 72
 Kempten (abbey), 469
 Klostergrab, 419
 Kolmar, 223
 Königsberg (town), 321
 Königsberg (university), 78
 Kurbrandenburg, &c. &c. *See*
 Brandenburg, &c.

 LAUINGEN, 347 (*n.* 3)
 Lausanne, 224

 Lech, 607
 Leipzig (town), 169, 226
 Leutkirch, 72
 Liegnitz, or Liegnitz-Brieg (duchy),
 276 (*n.* 1), 300
 Lindau (imperial city), 536
 Lindau in the county of Ruppın, 319
 Linz, on the Danube, 404
 Lippe (county), 282
 Livonia, 81
 London, 516
 Lorraine (duchy), 452, 515, 525
 Lower Saxon circle, 626
 Lübeck (bishopric), 524
 Lübeck, 536, 554, 577 *f.*, 590. *See*
 Hanseatic towns
 Luckenwalde, 262
 Lüneburg (duchy). *See* Brunswick-
 Lüneburg
 Lüneburg (town), 576
 Luxemburg (duchy), 457

 MADRID, 423, 430, 441 (*n.* 3), 444,
 480, 618
 Magdeburg (archbishopric), 303, 523,
 524
 Magdeburg (town), 299, 576, 581
 Magdeburg (Centuriators), 7, 32,
 63, 246
 Mansfeld, 113
 Marburg, on the Lahn (town and
 university), 288 *f.*, 296 (*n.* 1)
 Maria-Schnee (Franciscan monas-
 tery at Prague), 490
 Markdorf, on the Lake of Constance,
 196
 Mayence (archbishopric), 74, 200,
 287, 453, 459, 471, 474, 477,
 480 *ff.*, 489, 494 *f.*, 508, 514, 518,
 532, 574, 596 *ff.*, 607, 612, 615
 Mayence (town), 23, 40, 205, 329
 (*n.* 3), 333, 484
 Mayence (university), 205
 Mecklenburg, 536
 Mecklenburg-Güstrow, 300
 Meuse, the, 580
 Milan (duchy), 456, 590
 Minden (bishopric), 524
 Moldau, the, 491
 Molsheim, 397 (*n.* 1)
 Moravia, 403, 405, 420, 443, 506,
 529, 551, 589, 605, 620
 Mörs (county), 580

- Northingen, in Lorraine, 64
 Mühlheim (Mülheim), on the Rhine,
 562, 569
 Muleta, 393
 Munich, 89, 149, 186, 216 (*n.* 2),
 330, 352, 353 (*n.* 1), 387, 467
 (*n.* 2), 474, 605, 608, 625
 Munich (assembly of the League,
 1610), 474, 476, 601
 Münster (bishopric), 80, 200, 623

 NANCY, 623
 Naumburg (bishopric), 243
 Netherlands, the, 40, 54, 101, 350,
 426, 431, 440, 444, 448, 453, 456,
 463, 472, 515, 518, 532, 541 ff.,
 560, 561 (*n.* 3), 564, 570, 573,
 576, 578-583, 606, 609, 623, 627 ;
 Spanish Netherlands, 456 f., 525
 (*cf.* Albert)
 North Sea, 578
 Nuremberg, 88, 239 (*n.* 1), 273, 277,
 294 (*n.* 2), 416, 461, 500, 590
 Nuremberg (Diet of Electors, 1611),
 497 ff.
 Nuremberg (Diet of the Union,
 1615), 588, 612

 ODER, the, 580
 Oldenburg, 277
 Olmütz (bishopric), 67
 Osnabrück (town), 77

 PADERBORN (bishopric), 464, 580,
 609, 623
 Paderborn (town), 360 (*n.* 2)
 Padua, 360 (*n.* 2)
 Palatinate (Electorate), 67, 69,
 119, 128, 180, 184, 201, 220, 225,
 270, 281, 316, 413, 421, 425-431,
 444, 447, 450 f., 458 ff., 466, 471,
 486, 493-494, 498, 500, 510, 515,
 529, 537 (*n.* 1), 540, 547 (*n.* 1),
 551, 565, 575, 582, 587, 589, 597,
 616-628 (*cf.* John Casimir)
 Paris, 432, 438, 440, 452, (uni-
 versity) 375
 Passau (bishopric), 409, 469, 475,
 488 f., 600. *See* Leopold
 Passau (treaty), 524, 611
 Pavia (battle), 442
 Perleberg, 261 (*n.* 1)

 Pfalz (Palatine) Lautern. *See* John
 Casimir
 Pfalz-Neuburg. *See* Philip Louis
 and Wolfgang William
 Pfalz-Simmern, 266
 Pfalz-Zweibrücken, 426, 466, 498,
 565, 586
 Pforzheim, 127, 283
 Plauen, 35
 Poland, 54, 81 f., 518, 543, 587 f.
 Pomerania-Stettin, 536
 Portugal, 361
 Prague (assembly of Princes, 1610),
 468, 481, 486 f., 489
 Prague ('*Majestätsbrief*'), 418,
 420 f., 430, 493, 507, 622
 Prague (town and court), 239 (*n.* 1),
 330, 360 (*n.* 2), 399, 413, 415, 418,
 425, 430, 468, 478, 486, 489 f.,
 492, 502, 505, 517, 530 (*n.* 2),
 534, 628 ; (Altstadt) 490 ; (Neu-
 stadt) 414 ; (university) 413 f.
 Prussia, 81

 RATISBON (assembly of League,
 1613), 602 ff.
 Ratisbon (bishopric), 469, 600
 Ratisbon (Diet, 1576), 171 ; (1608)
 451, 459, 467, 547 ; (1613), 518 ff.,
 529-550, 552, 585, 602, 611, 615,
 620 ; (1614) 547
 Ratisbon (religious conference),
 149 (*n.* 2)
 Rheims (archbishopric), 374 (*n.* 3)
 Rheinberg (fortress), 570
 Rhine, Rhinelands, 431, 453, 472,
 514, 559 f., 571, 575, 578, 606,
 627 ; Rhine, directorship, 603 ff.
 Riga, 72
 Rome (ancient), 195
 Rome (German College), 396
 Rome (fifth Lateran Council), 52
 (*n.* 1)
 Rome (papal), 4, 49, 52 (*n.* 1), 70,
 160, 219, 303, 313, 329, 347 (*n.* 3),
 375, 393, 423, 444 f., 472, 480,
 503, 547, 595 ff., 628
 Rome (university), 375
 Rostock, 268
 Rostock (university), 7 (*n.* 1), 272,
 321
 Rotenburg (meeting of the Union,
 1611), 497, 564 ; (1613) 529, 531,
 536

- Rothenburg, on the Tauber (meeting of the Union, 1608), 407
 Russia, 518
 SACHSENHAUSEN, 572
 St. Emmeram (abbey), 601
 Salzburg (archbishopric), 186, 471, 601
 Salzburg (town), 216
 Samaria, 313
 Savoy. *See* Charles Emmanuel
 Saxe-Coburg, 483
 Saxe-Lauenburg, 536
 Saxe-Weimar, 6, 18 (*n.* 3), 29 (*n.* 1)
 Saxony (electorate), 18, 29, 70 *f.*, 81, 225 *f.*, 263 (*n.* 2), 281, 283, 298, 306, 330, 401 (*n.* 1), 415, 426, 430, 451, 454, 462, 480, 481 (*n.* 1), 489, 494, 498-501, 505 (*n.* 1), 514, 522, 536, 542, 547 (*n.* 1), 552, 597 (*n.* 1), 617 *f.*, 628
 Saxony (Albertine lands), 133
 Schleswig-Holstein, 276 (*n.* 1)
 Schleswig-Holstein-Gottorp, 300
 Schönggraben, in Lower Austria, 33
 Schwäbisch-Hall, 247
 Schwäbisch-Hall (Diet of the Union, 1609), 416, 438; (1610), 447
 Scotland, 372, 570
 Sedan, 623
 Senftenberg, 263 (*n.* 2)
 Silesia, 300, 407, 411, 415, 420 *f.*, 424, 448, 551, 589, 605
 Slavonia, 81
 Smalcald (articles), 291, 302
 Smalcald (lordship), 291 *ff.*
 Smalcald (town), 193, 254, 291 *ff.*
 Spain, 54, 59, 214, 219, 361, 365, 371 (*n.* 1), 375, 429-433, 439 *ff.*, 448 *f.*, 472 *f.*, 476, 485, 487, 496, 506-509, 512, 518, 525, 534, 543, 558, 579, 589, 593, 602, 606, 622, 627
 Spires (bishopric), 453, 458 *f.*, 471, 475, 548 (*n.* 2), 597, 600
 Spires (Imperial Chamber), 169, 528, 530, 535, 537, 597 (*n.* 1)
 Spires (towns' Diet, 1608), 417
 Sprendlingen, 284
 Stadtlohn, 609
 States-General. *See* Netherlands
 Stendal, 319
 Sterbohol (secret alliance, 1608), 403
 Stettin, 308
 Stettin (synod, 1593), 301
 Stockholm, 586
 Stralsund, 308
 Strasburg (bishopric), 452, 460 *ff.*, 477, 600
 Strasburg (town), 244 (*n.* 4), 24 (*n.* 1), 31, 84, 85 (*n.* 1), 121, 224, 268, 344 (*n.* 6), 416, 452, 462, 514, 529
 Stuttgart, 57, 137, 233, 325, 436
 Stuttgart (assembly of Princes, 1614), 586
 Styria, 72, 445, 589. *See* Ferdinand
 Suabia, 457, 600
 Sweden, 81, 453, 472, 518, 529, 586 *ff.*
 Switzerland, 53, 224, 442 *f.*, 448, 463, 518, 525, 573, 590
 TABOR, 489
 Tartars, the, 521
 Thennenbach (Cistercian monastery), 123
 Thuringia, 11
 Tiber, the, 346 *f.*
 Toledo (province of the Jesuit Order), 376
 Transylvania, 535, 544, 551
 Trent (Council), 4, 59, 94, 119, 188, 199, 216, 325, 422, 589, 593
 Treves (archbishopric), 77, 431, 471, 550, 596 *f.*, 625
 Treves (town), 574 (*n.* 2)
 Tübingen (town), 31
 Tübingen (university), 61, 67, 111, 218 (*n.* 2), 268
 Turin (court), 626 (*n.* 2), 629
 Turkey, 13 *f.*, 20, 27, 60, 71, 79, 104, 197, 219, 221 (*n.* 1), 273, 312, 371 (*n.* 1), 396, 408, 506, 518, 521, 535, 549, 611
 Tuscany, 473
 Tyrol, the, 472
 ULM, 84, 416
 Upper Hesse, 147 (*nn.* 3 & 4), 287
 Ursel, 371 (*n.* 1)
 VENICE, 37, 373, 417, 442 *ff.*, 448, 456, 502 *f.*, 513, 529, 590
 Venice (Peace, 1177), 14

- Verden (bishopric), 524
 Vienna (Austrian Family treaty), 423
 Vienna, or Prague (Aulic Council),
 427, 530 f., 537, 555
 Vienna (town and court), 36 (*n.* 1),
 64, 72 (*n.* 2), 197, 205, 330, 334,
 (*n.* 2), 403 f., 406, 409, 423, 446,
 468, 494, 513
 Vienna (university), 52 (*n.* 1)
 Voigtland, 65
- WENDS, the, 81
 Werra, the, 290
 Wesel (fortress), 570
 Weser, the, 579
 Westphalia (Peace), 193 (*n.* 3)
 Wetterau (Counts of, in the Index
 of Persons)
 Weyra, 342
 Wittenberg (edition of Luther), 138
 (*n.* 4), 140, 153
 Wittengau (castle), 408
- Wolfenbüttel (duchy). *See* Bruns-
 wick-Wolfenbüttel.
 Wolfenbüttel (town), 576 ; (library)
 7
 Worms (bishopric), 453, 458, 597
 Worms (Diet, 1521), 206
 Würtemberg. 57, 61, 91, 93, 128,
 134, 144, 202, 217 f., 251, 268,
 282 (*n.* 1), 283, 399, 417, 435 ff.,
 461, 465, 474 f., 497, 514, 581, 585
 Würzburg (bishopric). 449, 461,
 469, 471, 474 f., 477, 606 f.
 Würzburg (Diet, 1601), 471 ; (1611)
 484
 Würzburg (town), 36 (*n.* 1), 77
 Würzburg (university), 205
- ZEITZ, 243 (*n.* 2)
 Zerbst, 278
 Zürich, 53, 224, 272, 586, 595, 627
 Zweibrücken (county). *See* Pfalz-
 Zweibrücken

INDEX OF PERSONS

- ADELMANN, KARL (doctor), 554
 (*n.* 1)
 Adiaphorists, 101
 Adolphus (Duke of Schleswig-Got-
 torp), 300
 Aerssen, Francis van (ambassador),
 440 f.
 Affelmann, John (Professor at
 Rostock), 272, 320
 Agnes (Popess Johanna), 32
 Alber Erasmus (superintendent),
 76
 Albert (Archduke, Governor of the
 Netherlands), 413, 431, 438 ff.,
 449, 457, 472, 495, 506, 509, 525,
 564, 566, 570 f., 603, 606
 Albertinus, Aegidius (Bavarian
 court secretary), 237
 Albigenses, 207, 265
 Albrecht V. (Duke of Bavaria), 176
 205 (*n.* 1), 214, 216, 329
 Albrecht Lorenz (convert), 36
 (*n.* 1)
 Alexander III. (Pope), 13 ff., 27,
 147
 Alexander VI. (Pope), 24 (*n.* 1)
 Altenrath, George, 268
 Althusius, John (jurist), 389
 Ambrosius, St. (Doctor of the
 Church), 195, 207
 Amsdorf, Nich. (preacher), 176
 Anabaptists, 101, 178, 222 (*n.* 1),
 224 (*n.* 3), 234
 Andreä, Conrad. *See* Vetter
 Andreä, James (Schmidlin, Chan-
 cellor), 83, 95 f., 119, 149, 173,
 251, 268 f., 306
 Anisius, Mich. (Franciscan at Bam-
 berg), 135
 Anna of Austria (Queen of Spain),
 621
 Anna of Denmark (Electress of
 Saxony), 285
 Anna of Jülich-Cleves (Countess
 Palatine of Neuburg), 426
 Anna of Prussia (Electress of Bran-
 denburg), 319, 426
 Anna of Tyrol (Empress), 510
 Anna von Bentheim-Tecklenburg
 (Princess of Anhalt), 457, 466
 Anne of Cleves (wife of Henry VIII.
 of England), 369
 Antiochus (King of Syria), 195
 Antonia of Lorraine (Duchess of
 Jülich-Cleves), 427
 Aquaviva, Claudius (General of
 Jesuits), 356 ff., 385
 Arians, 200, 225
 Arminius, James (Dutch theolo-
 gian), 257 (*n.* 1)
 Arretius, Bened., 595
 Aschhausen, Joh. Gottfr. von
 (Bishop of Bamberg), 550,
 606
 Asquillus, Publius (nominally a
 Jesuit), 240
 Assassins, 393
 Asselineau (French ambassador at
 Venice), 445 (*n.* 1), 503 (*n.* 3)
 Audebert, 149
 Augustine, St. (Father of the
 Church), 122 f., 183, 304
 Augustus I. (Eleotor of Saxony),
 225, 263 (*n.* 2), 306
 Aurifaber, 110
 Aventin, Joh. (Turmair, historian),
 12 (*n.* 2)
 Azor, Juan (S. J.), 388

- BACON, ROGER (Franciscan), 378
(*n.* 1)
- Bañez, Dom. (Catholic theologian), 389
- Barbara Sophia of Brandenburg (Duchess of Württemberg), 436
- Barns, Robert, 1
- Basse, Nich. (printer at Frankfort-on-the-Main), 168 f.
- Bayle, Pierre, 385 (*n.* 1)
- Becanus, Martin (S. J. at Mayence); 205-207, 213
- Behm, Joh. (court preacher at Königsberg), 321
- Bellarmin, Robert (Cardinal), 147, 241, 251, 343-348, 384 (*n.* 1)
- Benz, Joh., 225
- Berengar of Tours (heretic), 265
- Bernard, St., 5
- Berssmann, Gregory, 259 (*n.* 2), 278
- Bethlen, Gabor (Voyvode of Transylvania), 544
- Beza, Theodore, 149, 220, 226 (*n.* 2), 268 (*n.* 1), 271 f., 314, 371, 389
- Biandra (Savoyese ambassador), 590 (*n.* 3)
- Bidenbach, William (theologian at Stuttgart), 325
- Blyttershagius, 272
- Bobhard, James, 241
- Boden (Bavarian agent), 421 (*n.* 2)
- Bodin, Jean (French parliamentary councillor), 371 (*n.* 1)
- Boissise (French ambassador), 447, 451, 457
- Bonacasa, Mirabilis de (Eberhard von Weihe), 377
- Bongars, Jacques (French ambassador), 432 (*n.* 4), 433 (*n.* 4), 444, 451-453
- Boniface, St., 11
- Boniface III. (Pope), 21
- Borghese, Scipio (cardinal and State secretary), 548 (*n.* 2)
- Borgia, Francis, St. (General of Jesuits), 352
- Bouillon, Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Duc de (marshal), 407 f., 623
- Brahe, Tycho de (astronomer), 55
- Braun, Conrad (chancellor and canon at Mayence), 202 (*n.* 2), 221 (*n.* 1)
- Brenz, Joh. (Württemberg reformer), 268
- Brockes (burgomaster at Lübeck), 554, 577, 590
- Brömser, Hans Reinhard (Vicergerent of Mayence and ambassador), 503, 615
- Brutus, Stephanus Junius (Pseudonym of Duplessis-Mornay), 372, 389
- Bubna, Joh. v. (Bohemian noble), 491
- Bucer, Martin (reformer), 87, 220, 223, 374
- Buchanan, George (tutor to James I.), 373, 383
- Budowec von Budowa, Wenzel, 412, 420
- Bullinger, Henry (Swiss reformer), 224
- Bündig, M. Heinrich, 196
- Burkhard, Francis (chancellor of the Elector of Cologne), 183 f., 194 f., 201 f. *See* Erstenberger
- Busäus, Theodore (S. J.), 119
- CALVIN, 80, 149 (*n.* 1), 250, 261 (*n.* 2), 262 ff., 300, 312 ff., 369, 374, 389
- Calvinists, Calvinism, 178, 189, 226 (*n.* 2), 257-322, 344, 369 ff., 388, 403 ff., 442 f., 450, 464, 475, 499 f., 504 ff., 508, 520, 530 (*n.* 2), 547 (*n.* 1), 557, 565, 573, 591 ff., 612-624, 628
- Cambilhon, Jean, 490, 492
- Camerarius, Louis (Palatine councillor and ambassador), 421, 620
- Canisius, Petrus (S. J.), 36 (*n.* 1), 46, 159, 214, 324, 329 (*n.* 3), 352, 356
- Capuchins, 241
- Carlos, Don (Infant of Spain), 361
- Carlstadt (Andr. Rud. Bodenstein), 263, 312
- Carpzov, Benedict (jurist), 226 (*n.* 2)
- Casa, Giovanni de la (Archbishop of Benevent), 37 ff., 149
- Cäsius, George (pastor at Burgbernheim), 197 f.
- Cæsar, 485
- Cassander, George, 7 (*n.* 1)

- Catharine (Imperial Abbess of Buchau), 600
 Catherine of Siena, St., 99
 Catherine of Sweden (Countess Palatine of Zweibrücken), 586
 Celestinus, John Fred. (professor at Jena), 96, 261
 Cellarius (Hessian superintendent), 288
 Charles the Great (Charlemagne), 423
 Charles V. (Emperor), 133, 140, 178, 206, 214, 302
 Charles (Archduke of Styria), 172
 Charles (Margrave of Burgau), 426
 Charles Emmanuel I. (the Great, Duke of Savoy), 441 f., 456, 502, 515, 528, 590, 623, 626
 Charlotte, Margaret (Princess of Condé), 438 ff., 457
 Chastel, Jean (Calvinist), 391 (*n.* 2)
 Chatre, Claude de la (French marshal), 463
 Chemnitz. *See* Kemnitz
 Christian (Prince of Anhalt-Bernburg), 406, 412, 416 f., 427, 434, 438, 440, 445, 448 f., 457, 460, 464 ff., 470, 486, 496, 505, 620, 625
 Christian (hereditary Prince of Anhalt-Bernburg), 625
 Christian (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 360
 Christian IV. (King of Denmark). *See* Denmark
 Christian II. (Elector of Saxony), 415, 430, 462, 480 ff., 489, 494, 498
 Christian, William, of Brandenburg (administrator of Magdeburg), 523
 Christopher (Duke of Württemberg), 93
 Chrysostom. *See* Johannes
 Clement of Rome, 10
 Clement V. (Pope), 30
 Clement VII. (Pope), 21
 Clement VIII. (Pope), 38 (*n.* 2)
 Clément, Jacques (assassin of Henry III.), 48, 383, 395
 Clotho (Calvinist preacher), 318
 Cœlestin III. (Pope), 29
 Condé, Prince and Princess of. *See* Henry and Charlotte Margaret
 Conrad (superintendent at Stralsund), 308
 Copus, Alanus, 392
 Cosimo II. de' Medici (Grand Duke of Tuscany), 473
 Cottoni (S. J.), 384
 Cramer, Daniel (pastor and professor at Stettin), 308, 343
 Crato, Adam, 259
 Cromwell, Thomas (English State secretary), 368
 Cronberg (Archbishop). *See* Schweikart
 Cuno, Joh. (superintendent at Perleburg), 261
 Cusa, Nicholas of (cardinal), 52 (*n.* 1)
 DALBERG (archbishop). *See* Wolfgang
 Damasus II. (Pope), 21 (*n.* 1)
 Danäus (Daneau). Lambert (theologian), 226 (*n.* 2), 344 (*n.* 2)
 Dandalus, Franc. (King of Cyprus and Crete), 30
 Daniel (prophet), 67
 David (king), 311
 Decker, Conrad (professor at Heidelberg), 364
 Delfinus, Zacharias (cardinal, nuncio), 205 (*n.* 1)
 Dienheim, Eberhard v. (Bishop of Spire), 453, 458 f., 475
 Diestelmeier (Brandenburg chancellor), 301
 Dietrichstein (Count of), 67
 Diodati, Giovanni (preacher at Geneva), 443
 Dirsius, Joh. (S. J., Rector at Innsbruck), 160
 Diskau (Brandenburg councillor), 428
 Distlmeyr, Kleophas, 208 (*n.* 2)
 Dobereiner (canon at München), 216
 Dohna, Burgrave Abraham von Brandenburg (ambassador at Prague), 534, 544, 549
 Dohna, Burgrave Christopher von (Palatine ambassador), 407 (*n.* 3), 620 f., 626 (*n.* 2)
 Döllinger (Church historian), 221 (*n.* 1)
 Dominic, St., 5, 99

- Dominicans, 48, 73
Dommarein of Dissingau, 193, 194
(n. 1), 195, 200 (n. 1), 256
Donatists, the, 207
Donawer, Christopher (preacher at Ratisbon), 274
Donnersberg, Joachim v. (Bavarian ambassador at Prague), 476
(n. 1)
Dorothea Ursula of Baden (Duchess of Württemberg), 399
Dösch, Conrad (rector), 159 (n. 1)
Dötschmann, Peter (dean at Schwäbisch-Hall), 247
Du Fresne-Canoye (French ambassador at Venice), 442 (n. 3)
Dumoulin, Charles, 371
Duplessis-Mornay. *See* Mornay
Durandus (bishop), 41
- ECHART, H. (preacher), 232, 251 (n. 3), 349 (n. 1)
Echter von Mespelbrunn, Julius (Bishop of Würzburg), 449, 469, 474, 475, 606 f.
Ecker (Eckhart), George (Barefoot Friar), 136
Eder, George (Imperial court councillor), 171 ff., 183, 188, 200 ff.
Effern, William of (Bishop of Worms), 453, 458
Effern, William Ferdinand von (councillor of the Elector of Mayence), 518, 521 (n. 1), 532, 597 (n. 1), 612
Egenolph, Charles (at Frankfort-on-the-Main), 504 (n. 2)
Einsiedel. *See* Louis of Saxony
Eisengrein, Martin (vice-chancellor at Ingolstadt), 5 (n. 1), 84
Elizabeth of Eulenburg and Manderscheid (Margravine of Baden-Hochberg), 126
Elizabeth (Queen of England), 455
Elizabeth of England (Electress Palatine), 516, 623
Empsychovius, Hermann (preacher at Dortmund), 251, 329 (n. 3)
Emser, Jerome (theologian), 83
Engel, Andreas (pastor), 265
Engelmann, Joseph (doctor), 169
- Eremita, Daniel (from Belgium), 296 (n. 1)
Ernest of Bavaria (Elector of Cologne, Bishop of Liege, Hildesheim, and Münster), 216, 470 f., 481, 489, 501, 628
Ernest Fred. (Margrave of Baden-Durlach), 126 ff., 282
Ernest James (Prince of Baden-Hochberg), 129
Ernhof, Sigismund (S. J. at Graz), 111
Erstenberger, Andr. (secretary of the Aulic Council), 184 ff., 193 (n. 2), 200 ff., 213
Eybenhold, U. (controversialist), 18 (n. 3), 32 (n. 3)
Eyntzinger, K. L. (preacher), 348 (n. 1)
- FABER, ZACHAR. (preacher at Hohenleine, 322
Fabri, John (Dominican from Heilbronn), 34 (n. 1)
Fabricius, Andr. (theologian), 216
Fabricius, James (rector at Dantzic), 315
Fabronius, H. (court preacher), 286, 303
Ferdinand I. (Emperor), 179, 184 (n. 3), 612, 618
Ferdinand (Archduke of Styria, later King of Bohemia and Roman German Emperor F. II.), 201, 217, 411, 414, 430, 435, 445, 472 ff., 477, 495, 506, 512, 550, 589, 615, 617 ff., 621 ff., 628
Ferdinand of Bavaria (Coadjutor and later Archbishop of Cologne, Bishop of Liege, Hildesheim, Münster, and Paderborn), 478, 507, 558, 564, 570, 607, 617 (n. 2)
Ferdinand (Archduke of Tyrol), 129, 172
Fettmilch, Vincent (confectioner at Frankfort-on-the-Main), 573 f.
Feyerabend, Charles Henry (councillor of the Elector of Mayence), 534 (n. 1), 545 (n. 1), 548 f., 573 (n. 1)
Fickler, Joh. (jurist at Salzburg), 216

- Finck, Solomon (Brandenburg court preacher), 309, 318
- Fischart, Joh., 23, 40 f., 84, 98 ff., 250, 325
- Flacius, Matthew (styled Illyricus, theologian), 3-12. 34, 144, 329 (*n.* 3); Flacians, Flacianism, 101, 313
- Flasch, Sebastian (preacher at Mansfield, convert), 113 ff., 149
- Florentin (provincial of Jesuits), 355 (*n.* 2)
- Forner, Andr. (Franconian pastor), 238, 360 (*n.* 2)
- Francis II. (Duke of Saxe-Lauenburg), 536
- Francis of Assisi, St., 5, 92 f., 99 f., 135 (*n.* 3). 138; Franciscans, 135, 391 (*n.* 2)
- Franck, Sebastian, 21
- Frederic I. (Emperor), 12 ff., 27, 147
- Frederic III. (Elector Palatine), 225
- Frederic IV. (Elector Palatine), 119, 184, 413 f., 415 f., 425, 443, 446 f., 451, 459, 461, 486
- Frederic V. (Elector Palatine), 200, 493-494, 551, 619, 622 ff., 627
- Frederic (Duke of Schleswig-Holstein), 276 (*n.* 1)
- Frederic Ulrich (Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg), 19, 575 ff., 585
- Frei, Peter, 314 (*n.* 2)
- Frey, Joh. (professor), 127
- Freyberg, John Christopher v. (II. provost of Ellwangen), 606 f., 609
- Friedburg, Christian Gottlieb v. *See* Schoppe
- Frischlin, Nicod. (poet), 31, 270
- Füger, Caspar (preacher), 70
- Fugger von Kirchberg, James (Bishop of Constance), 469, 529
- Funk, F. X. (Church historian), 221 (*n.* 1)
- Füssel, Martin (Calvinist), 309, 318
- GALLUS, NICH. (superintendent at Ratisbon), 82, 95, 111
- Garcäus, Joachim (superintendent at Brandenburg), 320
- Gebhard, Truchsess von Waldburg (Archbishop of Cologne), 62, 184 (*n.* 3)
- Gedicke, Simon (cathedral provost and court preacher at Berlin), 309 ff., 319
- Geiler von Kaiserberg, 89
- Geizkoffler, Lucas, 231
- Geizkoffler, Zacharias, 535 (*n.* 2)
- Geldenhauer, 257 (*n.* 1)
- Gent (Dutch General), 609, 623
- Gentilis, Valentin, 226 (*n.* 2)
- Gentillet, Innocent (pseudonym Joachim Ursinus), 364
- George the Bearded (Duke of Saxony), 133
- George Frederic (Margrave of Baden-Durlach), 283, 435-438, 448, 460, 474, 512
- George Frederic (Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach), 93, 196, 227, 448
- George Rudolf (Duke of Liegnitz), 300
- George William (Electoral Prince of Brandenburg), 558, 559
- Gerhard, Joh. (superintendent), 389
- Gerstenberger (Saxon ambassador at Prague), 415
- Gifford, William (Archbishop of Rheims), 374 (*n.* 3)
- Giglio, Aloigi (physician), 52 (*n.* 1)
- Giglio, Antonio, 52 (*n.* 1)
- Gisenius, Joh. (professor at Giessen), 208 (*n.* 1), 220
- Goblerus, Caspar, 116
- Goldast, Sebastian, 344 (*n.* 6)
- Goldast v. Haininsfeld, Melchior, 343 f., 393 f., 396, 501 (*n.* 1)
- Goodman, Christopher (Scotch reformer), 372, 389
- Gottfriedus Innocentius (Calvinist), 267
- Gratian, 5
- Gregory I. (Pope), 34
- Gregory VII. (Pope), 11 ff., 21, 23, 27, 146
- Gregory XIII. (Pope), 205 (*n.* 1), 384 (*n.* 1); Gregorian Calendar, 52-74
- Gregory, St., 214
- Gregory of Valencia (S. J.), 159, 207, 356

- Greiffenklaun-Vollraths, George Frederic of (Bishop of Worms), 596 f.
- Gretser, James (S. J.), 12 (*n.* 2), 119 (*n.* 1), 332 (*n.* 2), 338 (*n.* 2), 343 ff., 347 (*nn.* 1, 2), 360 (*n.* 2), 369 (*n.* 3), 372 (*n.* 3), 373 (*n.* 1), 393, 396, 490 (*n.* 3)
- Grün (chancellor of the Palatine Elector), 624 (*n.* 2)
- Grundmann, 259 (*n.* 2)
- Grynäus, Joh. James (theologian at Basle), 257 (*n.* 1)
- Gudermann, Christian (doctor), 333, 340, 345 (*n.* 3)
- Gueux, the, 40
- Guignart, Jean de (S. J.), 391 (*n.* 2)
- Guise (family), 371
- Guise, Duke of, 370
- Guise (Duke of Lorraine). *See* Henry
- Gunderot (English agent at Prague, 496
- Gundling, Jerome Nich. (jurist at Halle), 38
- Gustavus II., Adolphus (King of Sweden),
- HAGEMANN, Christopher (ecclesiastical counsellor at Mayence), 126 (*n.* 1), 130 (*n.* 2)
- Hamelmann, Herm. (Oldenburg superintendent), 277, 316
- Hanau, Philip Louis (Count of), 282
- Hanenfeld, George, 316
- Hanisch, Daniel (Saxon court preacher), 499
- Hänlin, George (rector of the university at Freiburg), 122
- Hans, Albrecht (Duke of Mecklenburg-Güstrow), 300
- Hansonius, Peter, 330
- Härthl (Imperial court secretary), 496
- Hasenmüller, Elias (controversialist, 151, 208, 258, 334
- Hastal (Imperial valet), 496
- Hauffen, A. (historian), 3 (*n.* 1)
- Hausen, Wolfgang v. (second Bishop of Ratisbon), 469, 600
- Heckel, George, 338 (*n.* 2)
- Heerbrand, James (professor at Tübingen), 19, 61, 111 ff., 119, 159, 232, 235, 244, 250 f.
- Heilbrunner, James (theologian), 151 f., 343, 375
- Heilbrunner, Philip (theologian), 151 f., 340, 343
- Heinrichs, Gottthelf (counsellor-at-law), 169 (*n.* 2)
- Helbach, Albr. v. (chaplain to the court of Pfalz-Simmern), 263 (*n.* 2), 265
- Helfrich (doctor, Saxon resident in Paris), 452
- Hendl, Simon (S. J., rector at Munich), 356
- Henry IV. (Emperor), 23, 146
- Henry VI. (Emperor), 29
- Henry VII. (Emperor), 27
- Henry (Bishop of Augsburg). *See* Knöringen
- Henry the younger (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 133
- Henry II. (Prince of Condé), 438
- Henry VIII. (King of England), 368
- Henry III. (King of France), 48, 383
- Henry of Navarre (later, King Henry IV. of France), 423, 427, 429, 432, 433 (*n.* 4), 438, 439 (*n.* 3), 448, 452 f., 456 f., 466, 485
- Henry II. (Duke of Lorraine), 515, 528, 606, 623
- Henry Julius (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 454 (*n.* 1), 462, 480, 481 (*n.* 2), 483, 487, 529
- Hesshus, Tilm. (theologian), 95, 272, 324
- Hetzer (Anabaptist at Augsburg), 111
- Hilarius of Poitiers, St., 195
- Himricus, Joh. (preacher at Nuremberg), 274 (*n.* 2)
- Hobrecht, Bened., 317
- Hoe, Matthias (court preacher to the Elector of Saxony), 29, 35, 250, 272 (*n.* 2), 307, 311 ff., 322, 363
- Hoffäus, Paul (Jesuit provincial), 353
- Hoffmann (doctor), 260 (*n.* 2)
- Hoffmeister, Joh. (Augustinian prior at Colmar), 77, 223
- Hofmann, Daniel (professor at Helmstädt), 268 (*n.* 1)
- Hohenembs, Caspar (Count of), 600

- Hohenembs, Marx Sittich (Count of, Archbishop of Salzburg). 601
Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, Charles II. (Count of), 126
Hojeda, Stephen (S. J. inquisitor), 376
Holder, William (chief preacher and consistorial councillor at Stuttgart), 137 f., 218 (*n.* 2). 234
Hopmann, Alexander (doctor and jurist of Cleves), 431 (*n.* 3), 435 (*n.* 1), 460, 463
Hoserlein. *See* Osiander
Hosius, Stanisl. (cardinal), 111
Hospinian, 344 (*n.* 2)
Hotoman, Francis (jurist), 371
Huber, Hans, 150
Huber, Samuel (theologian at Wittenberg), 20, 38 (*n.* 2), 141 ff., 270, 343
Huguenots, the, 443 (*cf.* France and Calvinists)
Huitfeld, Harald (Danish Imperial Chancellor), 257 (*n.* 1)
Hunnius, Ægidius (theologian at Wittenberg), 140, 242, 511 (*n.* 1), 343
Huss, Hussites, 207, 418
Hutter, Leonard (theologian at Wittenberg), 232 (*n.* 1), 300, 302 (*n.* 3)

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH, St., 10 f.
Ignatius of Loyola, St., 150, 328, 335 f., 352, 364 (*n.* 1), 375
Illeshay, Stephen (magnate), 406
Innocentius, Gottfriedus (pseudonym), 267
Irenæus, St., 10
Isenburg, Counts of (Wolfgang Ernest v. J.-Birstein, Henry and Wolfgang v. J.-Nonnenburg), 283

JACOBI, DANIEL, 259
James III. (Margrave of Baden-Hochberg), 116 ff., 148 (*n.* 2)
James I. (King of England), 373, 410, 428, 455, 458, 486, 502, 515, 529, 532, 552, 579, 623, 626

Jesuits, 32 f., 46, 50, 59, 65 f., 75 ff., 89, 147, 149 ff., 157, 159, 169, 170 (*n.* 1), 180, 184, 194, 202-205, 218 (*n.* 2), 240 ff., 322-367, 339, 373-377, 383-400, 435, 443, 455, 483, 489-491, 562, 564
Joachim I. (Elector of Brandenburg), 140, 305
Joachim II. (Elector of Brandenburg), 301, 303, 305
Joachim II. Ernest (Prince of Anhalt), 282
Joachim Ernest (Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach), 412, 459 ff., 474, 496, 501, 505, 512, 517, 536, 566, 624, 629
Joachim Fred. (administrator of Magdeburg, then Elector of Brandenburg), 302
Joan (Popess), 32 f., 35, 39
Jobin, Bernard (bookseller at Strasburg), 24
Jocher (Bavarian councillor), 624
Johannes Chrysostomus (doctor of the Church), 195, 207
John VIII. (Pope), 59
John (Margrave of Brandenburg-Cüstrin), 305 (*n.* 3)
John of Münster. *See* Münster
John (Count of Oldenburg), 277
John II. (Count Palatine of Zweibrücken, administrator of the Palatinate), 426, 466, 498 ff., 510, 529, 565, 586
John Christian (Duke of Brieg), 300
John Frederic of Holstein-Gottorp (Archbishop of Bremen), 579
John Frederic (Duke of Würtemberg), 417, 435 ff., 461, 465, 474 f., 497, 514, 581, 585
John George I. (Prince of Anhalt-Dessau), 282, 502
John George (Elector of Brandenburg), 54, 184, 301 f.
John George (Margrave of Brandenburg-Jägerndorf, Stattholder of the Mark, administrator of Strasburg), 551
John George I. (Duke, later on Elector of Saxony), 498, 500, 514, 522, 536, 542, 547 (*n.* 1), 598, 617-620, 624 f.
John Gottfried (Bishop of Bamberg). *See* Aschhausen

- John Casimir (Count Palatine of Pfalz-Lautern, administrator of the Palatinate), 128, 270
- John Casimir (Count Palatine of Zweibrücken), 586
- John Casimir (Duke of Saxe-Coburg), 483
- John Schweikart of Cronberg (Archbishop of Mayence), 200, 453, 470, 474, 477, 478, 482, 484, 489, 494 f., 501, 508, 513, 519, 573, 596, 607, 612, 615
- John Sigismund (Elector of Brandenburg), 302, 319 f., 427 f., 447, 452 f., 458, 498, 557 f., 568, 616 f., 625
- John William (Duke of Jülich-Cleves), 426
- John of Salisbury, 367
- Jordanus, Christopher (Brandenburg preacher), 303
- Judex, Matthias, 8
- Julian, or Julius Ernest (Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg), 377 (n. 1), 483
- Julius (Bishop of Würzburg). *See* Echter
- Junius Brutus. *See* Brutus
- Junius, Francis (Calvinist), 226 (n. 2), 344 (n. 2)
- Justinus (Doctor of the Church), 10
- KELLER, JAMES (S. J. rector at Munich), 375, 388 ff.
- Kemnitius, Martin, 55, 324
- Kepler, Joh. (astronomer), 55
- Khevenhiller, Francis Christopher, 510 (n. 1), 552, 618 (n. 1), 623 (n. 3)
- Khuenberg, George v. (Archbishop of Salzburg), 186
- Kinsky, Wenzel (Count of), 491, 552
- Kleindienst, Barth. (Professor of Holy Scripture at Annaberg), 86 (n. 2), 87, 401 (n. 1)
- Klesl, Melchior (Bishop of Wiener-Neustadt; then, at the same time Archbishop of Vienna and Minister), 404, 409, 498, 509, 511 ff., 517, 521 ff., 534, 536, 540, 544-550, 552, 554, 556 (n. 1), 566, 603 f., 611, 615-618, 628
- Knöringen, Henry of (fifth Bishop of Augsburg), 469, 475, 523 (n. 1), 601, 606
- Knorr, Hans, 317
- Knox, John, 149 (n. 1), 372, 389
- Kohl (historian), 505 (n. 1)
- König, Louis (printer at Basle), 347
- Kreuzmann, Friedlieb, 74 (n. 2)
- LÄLIUS, 259 (n. 2)
- Lang, Andr. (Carinthian preacher), 168-170
- Languet, Hubert (Huguenot), 370-371
- Latomus, James, 77
- Lauterbach, Erhard (superintendent of the bishopric of Naumburg), 33 (n. 1), 243, 250 (n. 2)
- Lazarus, Theodore, 314 (n. 3)
- Leiser, Polycarp (Lutheran controversialist), 33, 151, 208, 244, 278, 560, 561 (n. 1), 343
- Lenk, Joh. (ambassador of the Union at Venice), 444
- Leo I. (Pope), 48
- Leopold V. (Archduke of Austrian Tyrol, Bishop of Passau, administrator of Strasburg), 409, 414, 418, 430 ff., 457, 463, 469, 475, 480, 487 ff., 509 (n. 1), 564, 600
- Leporinus, Melchior (preacher at Brunswick), 258, 334, 338
- Lerma, Francisco Gomez de Sandoval v. Rojas (Count, later Duke, Spanish Minister), 375, 441
- L'Estoile, 439 (n. 3)
- Lenchtenberg (Landgrave of), 421
- Lichtenfels, Melchior v. (Bishop of Basle), 24 (n. 1)
- Liechtenstein, Prince Charles of, 620
- Lippe, Simon (Count of), 282
- Lobkowitz, Popel v., 413
- Löfenius, Mich. (court jurist to the Palatine Elector), 220
- Lonner, Andr., 398-400
- Lorichius, Jod. (theologian at Freiburg), 180, 181 (n. 1), 183, 201 f.
- Lorraine (House), 371
- Loserth (historian), 218 (n. 2)
- Lossius, Lucas, 253

- Lothar v. Metternich (Archbishop of Treves), 431, 471, 550, 625
 Louis (Dauphin, later Louis XIII., King of France), 428, 503, 602
 Louis V. (Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt), 462, 480, 483, 529, 530 (*n.* 2), 534, 536, 542, 549, 574, 617
 Louis III. (the elder, Landgrave of Hesse-Marbourg), 129, 287
 Louis VI. (Palatine Elector), 67, 69
 Louis of Saxony (Louis of Einsiedel, Capuchin), 125 (*n.* 1)
 Louis III. (Duke of Württemberg), 57, 61, 128
 Luther and Lutheranism, 1-4, 16 ff., 19, 26, 35, 36 (*n.* 1), 52 (*n.* 1), 70, 78 ff., 87 ff., 96 ff., 100, 108-118, 121-124, 131-158, 162, 195 ff., 206, 213 ff., 218, 222 f., 243, 246 f., 250, 252, 257-261, 263, 265-270, 272, 284, 286 ff., 290, 292 f., 300, 304, 305 ff., 310, 312, 314-319, 320, 344, 347 (*n.* 3), 367 f., 374 f., 389, 397 (*n.* 1); Catechism, 288, 302; Table Talk, 110
- MAASSEN, FR., 221 (*n.* 1)
 Machiavelli, 522
 Madrucci, Charles Gaudentius (cardinal, Prince-Bishop of Trent), 548 (*n.* 2)
 Magdalena of Bavaria (Countess Palatine of Neuburg), 557
 Magdalena of Jülich-Cleves (Countess Palatine of Zweibrücken), 426
 Magirus, Joh. (Provost at Stuttgart), 57, 251
 Maier, Dav. (Pastor of Hanover), 19
 Major, George (professor), 173
 Maldonat (S. J.), 207
 Mansfeld, Ernest (Count of), 590
 Marbach, Joh. (superintendent at Strasburg), 84
 Maria Anna of Bavaria (Arch-duchess of Styria), 474
 Maria Eleonore of Jülich-Cleves (Duchess of Prussia), 427
 Mariana (Juan, S. J.), 371, 375
 Marnix, Phil. (lord of Aldegonde), 40-46
 Martin, St. (Bishop of Tours), 344 (*n.* 2)
 Martinitz, Jaroslaw v., 413
 Mary of Medici (Queen, later Regent, of France), 440, 458
 Mary Stuart (Queen of Scotland), 372
 Mästlin, Mich. (astronomer at Heidelberg, later at Tübingen), 55, 67 ff.
 Mathesius, Joh. (pastor at Joachimsthal), 160
 Matthias (Archduke, later Emperor), 403-412, 424, 430, 446, 453 (*n.* 1), 454 (*n.* 1), 467 f., 478, 485-488, 493 ff., 501, 505-512, 514, 517-523, 526 f., 533-556, 557 ff., 563-567, 569 ff., 604, 613, 615, 618
 Matthieu, Claud (S. J.), 384 (*n.* 1)
 Maurice. *See* Moritz
 Maximilian II. (Emperor), 171, 174, 185, 405, 414, 468, 507, 620
 Maximilian (Duke of Bavaria), 156, 418, 455, 466-479, 488, 507, 523, 557, 600 ff., 613, 618 f., 623 ff.
 Maximilian (Archduke, Grand-Master of the Teutonic Order), Governor of the Tyrol and the outlying Austrian provinces), 196, 512, 544 f., 548 (*n.* 2), 604, 605 (*n.* 1), 607, 615-619, 628 (*n.* 2)
 Mayrhofer, Matthias (S. J.), 213, 386
 Meier, G. (historian), 619 (*n.* 2)
 Melancthon, Philip, 7 (*n.* 1), 70 (*n.* 1), 123 (*n.* 1), 220, 224, 270 (*n.* 2), 368, 389
 Melchior, Bishop of Basle. *See* Lichtenfels
 Menage, Gilles (French savant), 38 (*n.* 2)
 Mengering, 249 (*n.* 2), 324 (*n.* 1), 345 (*n.* 1), 375 (*n.* 1)
 Menzel, C. A. (historian), 547 (*n.* 1)
 Mercurian, Eberhard (General of Jesuits), 159, 351
 Metternich (archbishop). *See* Lothar
 Meusch, Theob. (superintendent), 226
 Micron (preacher), 294 (*n.* 1)
 Middelburg, Paul v. (Bishop of Fossombrone), 52 (*n.* 1)

- Miller, George (Mylius, preacher at Augsburg, later professor at Jena), 25 f., 33 (*n.* 3), 35 and *n.* 2, 37, 38 (*n.* 2), 72 (*n.* 2), 249
- Milton, John, 374
- Minucci, Minutio, 125 (*n.* 1), 184 *n.* 3 (end of)
- Mirus, Martin (court preacher at Dresden), 18
- Modest, Joh. (pastor at Dopferschitz), 258 (*n.* 1), 262
- Mohammed, Mohammedanism, 11, 99, 145, 197, 263, 393
- Molanus, Joh. (S. J. professor at Löwen), 208 (*n.* 1)
- Molina (S. J.), 207
- Mollart, v. (president of the Court Council of War), 534, 552
- Monheim, Joh. (President of the gymnasium at Düsseldorf), 215
- Montgardo, Joh. de (secretary Bellarmin), 345
- Moritz (Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel), 287-300, 303, 393, 429, 447, 450 f., 456, 464, 505 (*n.* 1), 530 (*n.* 2), 577, 586, 589, 626
- Mornay, Phil. de (Seigneur Duplessis-Marly, statesman; pseudonym, Stephanus Junius Brutus), 372, 410 f., 433 (*n.* 4), 440, 443 (*n.* 3), 444 (*nn.* 1, 2, 3, 4); 445, 456 (*n.* 2), 502 (*n.* 2), 503 (*nn.* 2, 3), 506
- Münster, John v. (Maximilian Philo-
soph of Treves), 29, 30 (*n.* 1), 38 (*n.* 2), 247, 251, 300
- Murner, Thomas, 83
- Musculus (Meusel), Andr. (theolo-
gian), 301
- Mylius. *See* Miller
- NAGEL, ULRICH (archdeacon at Brandenburg), 320
- Nas, Joh. (Franciscan, Auxiliary Bishop at Brixen), 24 (*n.* 1), 77, 88, 94 ff., 99 ff., 104-111, 114, 174, 327 (*n.* 1)
- Nassau, Henry (Prince of), 576
- Nassau, John II. (Count of), 464
- Navio, Trajano (printer at Venice), 37
- Nero (Emperor), 195
- Neumeister, Erdmann, 261 (*n.* 1)
- Neuser, Adam, 225, 263
- Nicholas I. (Pope), 33
- Nicholas of Cusa, 52 (*n.* 1)
- Nicolai, Phil. (preacher at Unna, in Westphalia), 261
- Nidanus. *See* Pistorius
- Niedpruck, Caspar von (Imperial councillor), 8
- Nigrinus, George (Hessian superin-
tendent), 2, 3 (*n.* 1), 22, 50 f., 63, 100, 162 ff.
- ŒCOLAMPADIUS, 263, 308
- Oldenbarneveldt (statesman), 448
- Oliverius, Bern. (Jesuit provincial), 355 (*n.* 2)
- Onate (Spanish ambassador), 621
- Opitz, Joshua (preacher at Vienna), 36 (*n.* 1)
- Orange, Maurice (Prince of), 444, 448, 463, 570
- Osiander, Lucas (Württemberg court preacher), 57 ff., 95, 135, 202 ff., 226 (*n.* 2), 268, 286, 325, 360, 361 (*n.* 1)
- Osius (Hosius of Corduba), 7 (*n.* 1)
- Othlon (biographer of St. Boniface), 13
- Otto v. Freising, 18
- Otto (Prince of Hesse-Cassel, ad-
ministrator of Hersfeld), 288
- Otto Truchsess (Cardinal). *See* Truchsess
- Otto Henry (Count Palatine of Neuburg), 561
- PAPPUS, JOH. (preacher and pro-
fessor at Strasburg), 122
- Pareus, David (professor at Heidel-
berg), 119, 218, 271, 299, 343, 374
- Parsimonius, Joh. (Württemberg court preacher), 268
- Paul III. (Pope), 29 ff., 77, 329
- Paul IV. (Pope), 38 (*n.* 2)
- Paul V. (Pope), 355, 423, 432, 442, 455, 473, 476, 479, 483, 489, 496, 507 f., 518, 523 (*n.* 1), 539, 548, 559, 562, 589
- Paulus, Simon (doctor at Rostock), 268

- Pawlowsky von Pawlowitz, Stanislaus (second Bishop of Olmütz), 67
- Pelargus, Christopher (Brandenburg superintendent-general), 303, 308
- Peregrinus, A. S. (Andrew Schottus), 375 (*n.* 4)
- Perellius, Joh., 228
- Perner, Bernard, 126 (*n.* 1), 130
- Petiscus, Barth. (court preacher), 500
- Petit, Jean, 367
- Petrus Lombardus (Peter Lombard), 5
- Pezel, Christopher (preacher at Bremen), 231, 277, 279, 316, 328
- Pfaff (Hessian superintendent), 288
- Pfauser, Seb. (Imperial court preacher), 7 (*n.* 1)
- Pfeiffer, Joh., 366
- Pflug, Julius (Bishop of Naumburg), 96, (*n.* 1)
- Philip the Magnanimous (Landgrave of Hesse), 287
- Philip (Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt), 529 f.
- Philip II. (Duke of Pomerania-Stettin), 536
- Philip II. (King of Spain), 361, 365, 371 (*n.* 1)
- Philip III. (King of Spain), 376, 440, 441, 448, 454, 472, 477, 480, 485, 487, 505-506, 512, 518, 525, 589, 593, 602, 605, 608, 621, 627
- Philip, Louis (Count Palatine of Neuburg), 156, 426 f., 466, 558, 560
- Philos of Treves, Maximilian. *See* Münster, John v.
- Picardians, the, 265
- Pickhart, Jesuwalt. *See* Fischart
- Pighius, 77
- Pistorius, Joh. (Bavarian house physician), 38 (*n.* 2), 117 (*n.* 3), 126, 129 f., 141
- Pius IV. (Pope), 21
- Pleninger, Lambert Floridus (astronomer), 62 f., 324 (*n.* 1)
- Polheim, Gundakar v., 536
- Politianus, Joh. Angelus, 347
- Poltrot (de Meré), Jean, 370
- Possevin, Anton (S. J.), 68 (*n.* 1)
- Prætorius, Joh. (preacher at Halle), 37 (*n.* 1), 47, 263 ff., 280
- Preger (historian), 7 (*n.* 1)
- Probus, Antoninus (Weimar superintendent-general), 6, 18 (*n.* 3), 29 (*n.* 1)
- Pullitz, von (Brandenburg general), 566
- QUINET, EDGAR, 41 (*n.* 1)
- RAB, GOTTFRIED (Augustinian), 239 (*n.* 1)
- Rabe, James (convert), 84 f., 325, 327 (*n.* 1)
- Ramée (Imperial general), 487
- Rasch, Joh., 66
- Rauschenberg, 431
- Rauscher, Hieronymus (Palatine court preacher), 91-95
- Ravallac (assassin), 457
- Rechtenberg, Leonard (preacher), 298
- Regiomontanus (astronomer), 52 (*n.* 1)
- Rescius, Stanislaus, 257, 279
- Rhegius, Urban, 224
- Rhinegrave, the, 65
- Richelieu, Armand Jean Duplessis, Duc de (cardinal), 433, 440
- Ritter, Matthias (preacher at Frankfurt-on-the-Main), 105
- Rivander, Zach. (pastor at Luckenwalde), 60 (*n.* 1), 262 f., 275 (*n.* 1)
- Rodegast, Seb. (preacher at Nuremberg), 274
- Roding, William, 324
- Rosefius, Greg. (Christopher Rosenbusch, S. J.), 202 ff., 350, 360
- Rosenberg, Peter Wock v., 408, 416, 486
- Rosenbusch. *See* Rosefius
- Rossäus, William, 374 f., 392
- Rucky (Imperial valet), 496
- Rüdinger, Joh. (poet and pastor at Weyra), 342, 493 (*n.* 1)
- Rüdinger, Laur. (Imperial ambassador), 553
- Rudolf II. (Emperor), 52 (*n.* 1), 69, 130, 168 ff., 185, 205 (*n.* 1), 209, 403, 411-425, 445 f., 454 (*n.* 1), 462 f., 467 f., 478, 481 ff., 493-504, 505 ff., 531, 571, 619

- Rülich, Barth. (preacher at Augsburg), 158 f., 331
 Rülich, James (pastor at Augsburg), 72 (*n. 2*)
 Rungius, Dav. (professor at Wittenberg), 261
- SACCUS, SIEGFR., 27
 Sachs, Hans, 32
 Sacramentarians, 262 f., 300, 312
 Salig, A. Christopher (historian), 7 (*n. 1*)
 Salmasius, Claudius (scholar), 374
 Sarpi, Paolo, 374 (*n. 1*), 443
 Sartorius, Sixtus, 259 (*n. 2*)
 Saxony (House), 426, 463, 484 ; Ernestine line, 547
 Scheidlich, Paul, 324
 Schelhammer, Joh. (preacher at Nuremberg), 261 (*n. 1*), 273, 277
 Scherer, George (S. J., at Vienna), 32, 36 (*n. 1*), 198 (*n. 1*), 202, 205, 332, 350
 Schlick, Count Andreas v., 413, 552
 Schlüsselburg, Conrad (theologian), 19, 34, 308, 323
 Schmetz, Martin, 565 (*n. 1*)
 Schoolmen, the, 137
 Schönberg (General of the Union), 494
 Schoner, Valentine (Hessian superintendent), 288, 295 (*n. 2*)
 Schönfeld, Gregory (Hessian superintendent), 288, 295 (*n. 2*)
 Schoppe, Caspar (Ungersdorff, convert), 201 f., 437, 449, 517, 578, 594
 Schottus, Andreas. *See* Peregrinus
 Schwarz, Andr., 565
 Schweikart. *See* John
 Schwenkfeld, Casp. v., Schwenkfeldians, 101, 178, 239
 Sculteti, Joh. (Ermland Cathedral dean), 52
 Scultetus, Barth. (patrician at Görlitz), 55
 Sebastian (King of Portugal), 361
 Selnekker, Nich. (superintendent), 278, 281
 Servet, Mich., 220, 221 (*n. 1*)
 Sibyl of Jülich-Cleves (Margravine of Burgau), 426
 Sigelius (preacher at Nuremberg), 277
- Sigismund III. (King of Poland), 587
 Silvanus, James, 220
 Sirleto, Giacomo (cardinal), 52 (*n. 1*)
 Sittich. *See* Hohenembs
 Sixtus IV. (Pope), 52 (*n. 1*)
 Sixtus V. (Pope), 234
 Slavata, William von, 413
 Sleidan (historian), 38 (*n. 2*)
 Solomon (King), 194
 Soranzo, Joh (Venetian ambassador), 513
 Sötern, Phil. Christopher von (Bishop of Spires), 548 (*n. 2*), 596, 600
 Spangenberg, Cyriacus, 21, 33, 38 (*n. 2*), 82, 95 (*n. 3*), 96, 143, 147, 150, 307
 Spiess, Martin, 242
 Spindler, George, 271
 Spinola, Ambrosius (Spanish general), 439, 566, 570
 Staphylus, Fred. (convert), 77 f., 91, 96 (*n. 1*), 118
 Starhemberg, Gotthard v. (general), 486, 488
 Starhemberg, Richard v., 407
 Stein, Simon (professor at Heidelberg), 335 (*n. 2*)
 Sternberg, Adam v., 491
 Sternberg, Count Stephen of, 413
 Sternberger, Lucas (preacher), 239 (*n. 1*)
 Stevart, Peter (professor at Ingolstadt), 208
 Stöffel, John (theologian), 263
 Stralendorff, Leopold von (Imperial Vice-Chancellor), 430 (*n. 1*), 467
 Strigel, Viktorinus, 263
 Stüler (dean at Berlin), 318
 Sturm, John von, 268, 272
 Sturn, George (S. J., at Prague), 492 (*n. 1*)
 Sully, Max de Béthune, Baron de Rosny, Duc de (French Minister), 440
 Sylvester I. (Pope), 63
 Sylvester II. (Pope), 21, 27
 Synergists, the, 313
- TANNER, ADAM, 360 (*n. 2*)
 Teufel, Wolf (arquebusier), 498
 Teutonic Order, 289 (*n. 2*)

- Theodora (Empress), 195
 Thomas of Aquinas, St., 5, 207, 389
 Thou, De, 371
 Thurn, Ambrose (Count of), 411
 Thurn, Henry Matthias (Count of), 415, 420, 491, 552, 621
 Thurzo (magnate), 446, 551
 Tilesius, Nathanael (superintendent), 244 (*n.* 1)
 Tilly, John Tserclaes (Baron v.), 478
 Torquatus, Antonius, 197
 Tossanus, Daniel (professor), 271 ; his son Paul, 271 (*n.* 1)
 Toxites, 263 (*n.* 1)
 Truchsess von Waldburg, Gebhard (Archbishop). *See* Gebhard
 Truchsess von Waldburg, Otto (Bishop of Augsburg, Cardinal), 36 (*n.* 1)
 Tschernembl, George Erasmus (Baron v.), 404 ff., 446, 517
 Turmair. *See* Aventin
- UBALDINI (nuncio at Paris), 433 (*n.* 4), 439
 Ubiquists, 239
 Ulenberger, Caspar, 7 (*n.* 1)
 Ulm, Hans Louis (Imperial Vice-Chancellor), 540 f., 543
 Ulm, Henry von (Abbot of Kempten), 469
 Ulrich, St. (Bishop of Augsburg), 33 ff.
 Ungersdorff, Christopher von. *See* Schoppe
 Ursinus, Joachim (Gentillet), 365
 Utzinger, Alexander (preacher at Smalcald), 84, 193, 254
- VALENCIA. *See* Gregory
 Vasari (historian), 24 (*n.* 1)
 Verannemann (Jesuit provincial), 355
 Vergerius, Peter Paul (apostate), 33, 38 (*n.* 2)
 Vermigli, Petrus, martyr (professor), 224 (*n.* 2)
 Verneuil, Cath. Henr., Marquise de, 439 (*n.* 2)
 Vetter, Cons. (Cons. Andrea, S. J.), 149 ff., 344, 347 (*n.* 3), 375
- Victor, Jeremias (pastor at Giessen), 33, 250, 255, 295
 Villeroy, Nich. (II. de Neufville, Seigneur de, State secretary), 433 (*n.* 4), 602
 Vincentius (Roman presbyter), 7 (*n.* 1)
 Vitus (same as above), 7 (*n.* 1)
- WACKER, MATTHEW (Imperial court secretary), 496, 559
 Wackernagel, 24 (*n.* 1)
 Wagner, Marcus, 7 (*n.* 1)
 Waldenses, 265
 Weech (historian), 125 (*n.* 1)
 Wegele (historian), 12 (*n.* 2)
 Weigel, Val. (preacher), 280
 Weihe, Eberhard (Brunswick-Lüneburg chancellor), 377 (*n.* 1)
 Weissenbach, Kraft v. (Protestant Abbot of Hersfeld), 288 (*n.* 1)
 Werenfels, Samuel (reformer at Wesel), 304 (*n.* 2)
 Wernerus ab Obrinca, Albertus, 594
 Westerstetten, John Christopher v. (Provost of Ellwangen ; later, Bishop of Eichstätt), 469, 606, 609
 Wetterau, the Counts of the, 536
 Wickliffe, 265
 Wiederhopf, Hans (official of the Electorate of Mayence), 469 (*n.* 1)
 Wigand, John (theologian), 8, 34, 144, 324
 William V. (Duke of Bavaria), 52 (*n.* 1), 126, 128, 186, 351, 356, 473
 William IV. (Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel), 49, 128 f., 168, 285 ff.
 William IV. (Duke of Jülich-Cleves), 215
 Willibald (biographer of St. Boniface), 12 (*n.* 2)
 Windeck, John Paul (Canon at Markdorf), 196, 198-202, 392
 Winkelmaier (Bavarian secretary), 184 (*n.* 3)
 Winkelmann, John (court preacher in Cassel), 286
 Wittelsbach (House), 476, 624 f.
 Wolf, John (jurist), 329 (*n.* 3)

- Wolfgang von Dalberg (Archbishop of Mayence), 74
 Wolfgang (Bishop of Ratisbon). *See* Hausen
 Wolfgang (Count Palatine by the Rhine), 398, 427, 460, 557 ff.
 Wotton, Henry (English ambassador at Venice), 443
 Wouters, Cornelius, 7 (*n.* 1)
 Wratislaw, George v., 491
- ZANCHI, JEROME (reformer at Strasburg), 224
 Zanga (preacher), 324
- Zehender, John (court preacher at Baden), 121, 131
 Ziegler, Christopher (S. J.), 399
 Zierotin, Charles v. (head of the Moravian Protestants), 420, 494, 506, 551
 Zimmermann (superintendent at Graz), 112 (*n.* 2)
 Zobel, John (Hessian ambassador), 460, 587 (*n.* 2)
 Zollern, Count (Bavarian Lord Chamberlain), 628
 Zuniga, Balth. (Spanish ambassador), 509
 Zwingli, Zwinglians, 178, 189, 220, 224 (*n.* 3), 239, 263, 298, 312, 321, 369, 374, 389, 595

END OF THE TENTH VOLUME



9960 J-33
J-33

J. J. J. J.

Author
Title

NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

